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Abstract

This study examines sets of original English performing material for concerted music – for instruments and voices together – during the period c.1660 to 1800. Sets of original performing materials have been neglected as sources despite the advantages they offer over full scores in some respects, and as a resource in both historical and performance practice studies despite the wealth of information they offer on a diverse range of subjects. These include creative practices in the early musical ode; ensemble size and composition and patterns of instrument use in late seventeenth-century and eighteenth-century concerted music; seventeenth- and eighteenth century copying practices and data on copyists; and ensemble-leading practice. Parts can also include notated examples of ‘free’ ornamentation such as cadenzas and data such as names of performers.

A series of case studies examines the performing sets of the Oxford Music School of 1660 to c.1713, under the successive professorships of Edward Lowe and Richard Goodson senior; the surviving performing parts linked to G. F. Handel, and other eighteenth-century performing sets for his music; the parts for the court odes of William Boyce; and the performing sets for Boyce’s other works. Changes in both the physical appearance of the sets and the copying processes that produced them, and in the performance practice they reveal, such as ensemble size and patterns of woodwind use, are tracked throughout the period.
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1: Introduction

This study seeks to examine surviving sets of English manuscript performing parts for concerted music from the period 1660 to 1800. ‘Concerted music’ is defined here as music for an ensemble of voices and instruments that must include, as a minimum, basso continuo; parts for treble instruments of any type; and at least one ‘chorus’ for three or more voice parts, although sets in which the chorus is sung one-per-part by the soloists without additional ripienists are included. ‘English’ is defined as showing clear signs of having been either produced or used in England, though the work may have been composed abroad. A ‘performance part’ is defined in this study as any item of performing material that is essentially produced for a single occasion. This includes sets of loose-leaf parts (including the single-leaf or single-slip types described by John Milsom as ‘partleaves’); sets of formerly loose-leaf parts that have later been bound into volumes; and sets of parts that are stitched into paper-covered booklets or bound into boards to make slim books, but which contain works copied for performance on a single occasion.¹

A distinction is drawn here between ‘parts’ and ‘part-books’, and the latter are specifically excluded from this study. For clarity, any manuscripts that meet the criteria for inclusion are referred to as ‘parts’, regardless of whether they are loose-leaf, stitched into wrappers or bound in boards. ‘Part-books’ are defined as volumes which contain large numbers of ‘repertoire’ pieces, copied over a prolonged period and intended for use on many occasions. This category will inevitably include

almost all the choir and organ sets from English cathedrals. The reason for this exclusion is that part-books are of more limited value in the study of performance practice than single-occasion performance sets. This is due partly to the method of copying (music could be added haphazardly over decades or even over more than a century), partly to the pattern of use (choir part-books were continually in use, again sometimes for more than a century, making it harder to extrapolate from the marking-up they contain or generalise on performance practice) and partly to the nature of the repertoire (they contained a high proportion of anthems or other works for voices and organ but no other instrumental accompaniment). In addition to choir part-books, the criteria adopted here exclude certain other categories of manuscript performing material. Sets of parts or part-books for purely instrumental music are excluded, as are sets that are purely vocal apart from the bass line; as are any sets of parts that survive in English collections but which have clearly been imported from abroad and bear no signs of use in England. One of the main reasons for excluding these categories was to avoid duplicating other research. Sets of parts for instrumental music, both manuscript and printed, have recently been investigated in extensive studies by Richard Maunder; manuscript sets for concerted music in several continental collections have also received more attention from researchers than the surviving sets within Britain.

---


The other principal reason for excluding some material was the limited time and resources available, which made it necessary to limit the study geographically and in the time period covered. For this reason, only parts that survive within England have been examined: all performance sets in collections in Wales, Ireland and Scotland and other English-speaking countries, as well as the many sets that have been produced and used in England but later exported to collections elsewhere, are excluded. It is hoped that the study will eventually be expanded to include these.

The lower limit to the time period, 1660, was chosen because it was a convenient starting-point in terms of both English history and English musical history: the Restoration of Charles II in that year marked a significant change in the course of both. The Restoration was a factor in the growing interest in composing concerted music for increasingly large ensembles; it also effectively marked the beginning of composition in England for voices and violins together, after continental models. There are in any case few, if any, surviving performance sets for English concerted music from before this date. The upper limit, 1800, was chosen because the amount of material that survives from the nineteenth century would make extending the survey beyond this date difficult. Also, the considerable expansion in ensemble-size of around this date, particularly in the size of choirs, and the growth in importance of the amateur choir – all probably precipitated to some extent by the Handel Commemoration of 1784 – marked a change in performance practice and seemed a suitable point at which to end the study.

In the study of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century music, sets of original performance materials have been undervalued until recently. As a resource, particularly where complete, they can provide valuable information from both a historical and a performance practice perspective. This may include the likely size of the ensembles concerned; the number of players and singers per instrumental and vocal line; details of instrumentation that are not included in the score, such as the exact scoring of the bass line; whether it was common to share copies, or to notate ‘extemporised’ ornamentation; how leadership functioned within an ensemble and whether soloists also sang in the choruses; and records of the tempi of works. The historical information that can be extracted includes data on copyists and the music copying industry at the time; on the transmission of repertoire between different areas; and on the people that took part in the performances. Sets of parts may even give alternative versions of a work to that given in a score, where a composer has made alterations that are not entered into a score, or they may give information on different performance versions of a work at different dates or in different places.

Despite this, performance parts have often been overlooked as a resource. The lack of value placed on them has probably derived to some extent from the influence of the ‘Urtext’ mentality, the original aim of which was to determine a single, definitive version of a work drawn from the most authoritative sources, which were practically always the autograph scores. There were obvious problems with this approach, and it is many decades since it first began to be criticised: among the
earliest critics, for example, was Walter Emery in 1957. However, by the time it began to be challenged, the concept of ‘Urtext’ had already heavily influenced research methodology. In the course of the search for ‘definitive’ versions of works, for many of which no definitive version originally existed, a rigidly hierarchical method for the evaluation of sources had developed. Autograph scores were placed at the top, with other types of scores beneath; even less value was normally placed on non-score sources, such as sets of parts.

That this system quickly outstripped the limits of its usefulness has been acknowledged for some considerable time. Both the Neue Bach Ausgabe and the Neue Mozart Ausgabe, for example, have been criticised for underestimating the value of the information provided by extant sets of parts. Despite this, the influence of the concept of ‘Urtext’ on how the value of a source is assessed is both current and pervasive. The first full-length study to take sets of parts as the primary resource, Richard Maunder’s study of Baroque concertos, effected a wholesale reassessment of their value as evidence of performance practice, but only appeared in 2004.

Although Maunder has recently published a similar study of early Classical concertos, these have not been followed by any large-scale studies on similar topics by other authors for this period. Spitzer and Zaslaw’s history of the orchestra,

---


8 Maunder, *Scoring of Baroque Concertos*.

9 Maunder, *Scoring of Early Classical Concertos*. At least one study is underway examining handwritten annotations in nineteenth and early twentieth-century printed editions of string music: the
published in the same year as Maunder’s first study, managed to ignore the evidence of the surviving performance materials almost entirely, although it was in every other respect a highly valuable contribution to the subject. The long-running argument over whether Bach’s choral works were originally performed with one voice per part has revealed an unwillingness by some researchers to take the original performance materials seriously as evidence of Bach’s performance practice. As of this year, it is still possible for John Milsom to refer to what he describes as ‘partleaves’ (loose single-leaf or partial-leaf parts) as ‘a bibliographic phenomenon that is nowadays seldom met or mentioned’.

The lack of value placed on sets of parts and the concurrent over-valuing, at times, of scores, appear influenced by a modern misunderstanding of the relative functions of full scores and sets of parts during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The full score is currently widely regarded as the primary method by which a work is transmitted in its written form. Full scores of modern works are expected to contain all the information needed to reproduce the work in performance according to the composer’s intentions. Aspects such as instrumentation are rigidly controlled by the composer – unless he or she chooses to allow autonomy to performers in some respects – and not by overarching conventions of performance practice. In large-scale works that require a conductor, a copy of the full score will nowadays always be utilised in performance.


11 Parrott, Essential Bach Choir; see also note 6.

This was not always the case. Rebecca Herissone’s recent reassessment of creative processes in the late seventeenth century included an extensive reassessment of the manuscript sources of that period, including manuscript scores.\textsuperscript{13} Her conclusions – that modern musicological terminology used in the study of creativity is insufficient for assessing and categorising these manuscripts; and that the manuscript scores served a variety of functions, not all of which are comparable to modern scores, all of which must be understood before the sources can be assessed – apply to some extent to eighteenth-century sources also and are relevant to the present study. These findings highlight both the gulf between historical and contemporary practice and the invalidity of an assessment of sources based on modern assumptions and modern standards though the source may predate the standards on which the assessment is based.

In the eighteenth century the functions of the full score and of sets of parts differed from their respective functions today. An eighteenth-century manuscript score bearing the appearance of a ‘fair copy’ might be, for example, a composer’s file copy; a directing copy; a transmission copy produced by one musician or copyist from another score for the purpose of transferring repertoire; or a ‘presentation’ copy produced for sale or as a gift. As modern scores often tend to combine these functions, it is easy to assume that this was true of eighteenth-century scores and, as a result of this, to overlook the other type of source – the performance parts – that functioned in place of the score in some respects. The matter is further complicated by differences between the functions of published and manuscript scores, as discussed below.

Three facts serve to illustrate the gulf between modern and eighteenth-century understanding of this matter. Firstly, the dominant medium for the publication of instrumental music, at least, was sets of printed performance parts, not scores, for much of the eighteenth century. This was consistent with earlier practice: John Milsom concludes that one important function of sets of single-leaf parts – both printed and manuscript – during the sixteenth century was to transmit repertoire, though few of these sets survive.\textsuperscript{14} Pepusch had published an edition of Corelli’s trio sonatas in score as early as 1732, ‘that the Eye should have the Pleasure of discovering, by what unusual Methods ye Ear is captivated’.\textsuperscript{15} Yet when Charles Avison published several of his works in score in the late 1750s, a quarter of a century later, the decision was still so unusual that he devoted two paragraphs in the preface of each volume to explaining it, of which the following is a sample:

> Persons who are accustomed to peruse music thus published, very sensibly experience the advantages it gives them in performing music in general. For being thus enabled to judge, at one view, of the laws and effects of harmony, those various \textit{Melodies, Accompaniments [sic.], and Measures}, which constitute the \textit{WHOLE OF A MUSICAL DESIGN}, are immediately traced, and their beauties as well as defects, ascertained with the greatest precision. Hence, a complete and legible \textit{SCORE} is the best plan for any musical publication, not only as it renders the study of music more easy and entertaining, but also the performance of it more correct and judicious.\textsuperscript{16}

Despite such views, the practice of publishing instrumental works in sets of parts rather than in score remained the norm until the end of the eighteenth century at least.

Although it was admittedly less common for concerted music to be published in parts, it did occur: for example, Handel’s ‘Zadok the Priest’ was published as such in the 1770s, while the instrumental parts for John Walsh’s multi-volume series of

\textsuperscript{14} Milsom, ‘The Culture of Partleaves’.

\textsuperscript{15} Arcangelo Corelli ed. by J. C. Pepusch, \textit{The Score of the Four Setts of Sonatas Compos’d by Arcangelo Corelli For Two Violins & a Bass} (London: John Johnson, 1732).

Handel’s ‘Songs Selected from the most Celebrated Operas for the Harpsicord, Voice, Hoboy or German Flute’ could be ‘had Separate [sic.] to Compleat them for Concerts’.  

Walsh published a similar series giving songs from the oratorios; both were reissued many times. Additionally, it is clear that some manuscript sets of parts for concerted music were copied not from a score, but from other sets of parts: for example, the set for Messiah given to the Foundling Hospital under the terms of Handel’s will was apparently copied directly from the set used in the 1754 performance at the hospital. Thus, the principal function of a modern-day full score – transmitting the music – could be performed by a set of parts alone in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries for all types of music, including concerted.

Secondly, although engraved full scores of concerted works had been published in England since the 1680s at least – Luis Grabu’s *Pastoralle* of 1684 and *Albion and Albanius* of 1687 being two early examples – there were two important differences in their function compared with modern published full scores. As ‘luxury’ items – the cost of a published score remained scarcely less than that of a good manuscript copy for most of the eighteenth century – the purchasing of a published score was effectively a form of patronage. This was the case when


21 Calculation based on information on the cost of copying given by John Mathews in the 1760s; see Ch. 4.
Henry Purcell’s widow Frances published his Te Deum and Jubilate in 1697; and it remained so almost a century later, when Hannah Boyce published two collections of her husband’s anthems under similar circumstances in 1780 and 1790. In fact, whatever the purposes of published full scores in the first half of the century, transmitting a work in its entirety was not necessarily among them. The most obvious indicator of this is that scores from the first half of the century for large-scale concerted works, such as oratorios and operas, often lacked the recitatives and seem to have functioned as souvenirs or to facilitate home performance of arias rather than as faithful transmitters of a work. One symptom of the confusion on this subject is the failure of the article on the history of the score in Grove Music Online to distinguish consistently between published and manuscript scores throughout the discussion of the changing function of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century scores.

In addition, since many aspects of performance were governed by convention at that time, the score was not expected to present the work exactly as performed down to the last detail. The most obvious example of this is the frequent lack of reference in scores to instruments such as the bassoon, though it is clear from surviving performance materials that bassoons were usually part of the bass section. On the differences between some sets of Handel performance parts and the full scores, Shaw has claimed that Handel ‘would certainly consider that what he had put on paper in his scores contained all he needed to indicate. His purpose in bequeathing not only a score, but a set of vocal and instrumental parts of Messiah to the Foundling Hospital
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22 Henry Purcell, Te Deum & Jubilate, for Voices and Instruments, made for St Cecilia’s Day, 1694 (London: John Heptinstall, 1697); William Boyce, Fifteen Anthems by Dr Boyce, ed. by Philip Hayes (London, 1780) and A Collection of Anthems and a Short Service, ed. by Philip Hayes (London, 1790).

23 David Charlton, ‘(iii) 17th Century’ and ‘(iv) 18th Century’ in David Charlton and Kathryn Whitney, ‘Score (i)’ in GMO, accessed 3 June 2014.

was to facilitate future performances, not to amplify or clarify his text; but this is ascribing to Handel a modern understanding of the clear delineation in function between full scores and sets of parts.  

Thirdly, it was not necessarily the case that a full score – printed or manuscript – was used during performance in the direction of large-scale concerted music. The survival of significant numbers of specially-prepared keyboard parts that are not full scores suggests that the full score was not necessarily part of the performing material. Diderot’s and D’Alembert’s statement in the *Encyclopédie* of 1765, that ‘He who conducts a concert must have a score in front of him’, implies that the use of a score for direction was by that date fairly widespread but not universal; otherwise it would scarcely have been necessary to give the instruction.  

English practice in this matter is still unclear: it is known that William Boyce, and perhaps Maurice Greene, beat time standing at a table among the instrumentalists during the large-scale performances of the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy in the first half of the eighteenth century. However, it is not clear how far this practice extended to smaller-scale performances of concerted music, or whether a score was always used. The iconographic evidence is unclear: there are relatively few pictures depicting the practice in England.  

At least two, the engraving of the coronation of James II in 1685 and that of the performance of Garrick’s ‘Shakespeare Ode’ set by Thomas Shaw, ‘Some Contemporary Performance Parts’, p. 59.

Smith, ‘William Boyce and the Orchestra’. See also Ch. 5 and Ch. 6.


Peter Holman, ‘The Conductor at the Organ, or How Choral and Orchestral Music was Directed in Georgian England’, *Music and Performance Culture in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Temperley*, ed. by Bennett Zon (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), pp. 243-262 (p. 244).
Arne in 1769, do not appear to show scores in front of the time-beater.\textsuperscript{30} However, it is likely that the artists used some degree of license when depicting very crowded scenes and it is noticeable that the instrumentalists do not appear to have music in either of these engravings. It may be that music was regarded as an unnecessary detail except in the case of the singers, where it served to indicate their function.\textsuperscript{31}

It is therefore clear that at least two of the functions of the modern full score – as a component of the performance material and as the method by which a work was transmitted – could be fulfilled by the parts alone in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In these respects, the division between their function was less clearly delineated than is the case today and a blanket rule that one has primacy over the other as a source becomes harder to justify. In one respect, however, the parts have primacy over the scores: sets of performance parts are the only physical remnants of real performances. It makes sense to accord them their true value as the primary resource for information on contemporary performance practice that is not purely theoretical, such as that transmitted by treatises.

\textit{Dispersal and Loss of Sets of Parts in England}

Performance of concerted music was dependent upon the production of performing parts, as it was a genre of music in which oral tradition and memorisation, at least of


the music itself, played little part. Sets of manuscript performing parts must have been produced in large numbers in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; the industry was one that would have grown as concerted music grew in popularity. The overall trend during this period was towards ever longer and more complex concerted works, using ever larger forces and thus requiring increasingly large sets of parts; in the course of little more than a century, the genre had developed from the relatively short and small-scale academic odes of the Restoration period, to the lengthy oratorios by William and Philip Hayes that required large performance forces. The spread of popular concerted works, such as Handel’s oratorios, across the provinces increased the market for copied parts still further. However, most of the parts that must have been copied and used in England at this time, on the evidence of the rich concert life of the period, have not survived.

The large collections of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century performance parts surviving on the continent are an indicator of the volume of late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century parts that must once have existed in England. In Sweden, the substantial Düben Collection in Uppsala University Library contains large numbers of seventeenth-century performance sets from the Swedish court collected by the Kapellmeister Gustav Düben (1624-1690); while the large collection of late-eighteenth-century sets owned by Utile Dulci, a Stockholm literary and concert society, survives in the Music and Theatre Library, Stockholm.\footnote{See The Dissemination of Music in Seventeenth-Century Europe: Celebrating the Düben Collection, ed. by Erik Kjellberg (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010). Both of these collections have been digitised. For the Düben collection, see <http://www2.musik.uu.se/duben/DubenCollectionInfo.php> [accessed 3 June 2014]. For the Utile Dulci Collection, see <http://www3.smus.se/UtileDulci/UD_help.php?lang=en> [accessed 3 June 2014].} In Italy, a large collection of sets survives from the basilica of San Petronio in Bologna, which
possessed a substantial *cappella musicale*. In the Czech Republic the substantial Liechtenstein Collection, amassed by Pavel Vejvanovsky for Karl II von Liechtenstein-Kastelkorn, Prince-Bishop of Olomouc, survives at Kroměříž, currently numbering 1437 items of which most are sets of manuscript parts. In Germany several large collections of performance parts survive from various courts. Among others, those used by the Hofkapelle at Dresden are now in the Sächsischen Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden; those from the court at Darmstadt are now in the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Darmstadt; those from the court at Württemberg, including the court theatre, are now in the Württembergische Landesbibliothek Stuttgart; those from the court at Karlsruhe are in the Badische Landesbibliothek; those from the Bavarian court are now in the Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek; those from the collection of Hereditary Prince Friedrich Ludwig of Württemberg-Stuttgart (1698-1731) are in the Universitäts-Bibliothek, Rostock. Those from the Austrian court are in the Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Most of the surviving sets linked to J. S. Bach are split across three locations, the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin; the Bach-Archiv in Leipzig; and the

---


These collections are particularly valuable because of their large size – several of them contain thousands of items, the majority of which are manuscript parts – and because they originate from specific institutions. In addition, many smaller but valuable collections survive, such as the archive of the Tonkünstler-Societät in Vienna, now in the Wienbibliothek im Rathaus.

In Britain far fewer sets of original performing materials survive, partly because of the destruction of many collections by fire during the late-eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In London alone, five of the most important and longest-established theatres burned down – presumably with their libraries of performance material – between 1789 and 1830. The King’s Theatre in the Haymarket, the home of Italian opera, burned in 1789; followed by the Pantheon in 1792, Covent Garden in 1808, Drury Lane in 1809, after a 137-year history, and the Lyceum in 1830. The performance materials held by the English court of the seventeenth century may have been destroyed in 1698, when the palace of Whitehall burnt down, though it is in fact unclear whether a court music library of performing parts existed.

The second reason for the low survival rate of English manuscript performing parts appears to be the differing social structure of eighteenth-century Britain compared with most of the rest of Europe, coupled with the decline in monetary

---

36 All Bach’s performing material in these three collections can be accessed digitally via <http://www.bach-digital.de/content/bachdigital.xml> [accessed 17 June 2014].


value of manuscript performing parts that occurred in the late nineteenth and early
twentieth centuries. As musicology developed as a discipline, manuscript scores,
particularly composers’ autographs, increased in the value they held to scholars. As
they were not believed to have the same authority as the scores, performing parts
seem to have remained unaffected by this with few exceptions. Indeed, the
increasing availability and decreasing prices of printed music, coupled with the
outdated nature of the music in eighteenth-century manuscript performing materials,
caused their value to decrease.

Survival rate is generally highest for collections of performing material gathered
by institutions that were long-surviving, with formal administrative structures that
endured over centuries and which had institutional systems in place for storing
documents, manuscripts or books, coupled with a disinclination to throw anything
away. The Oxford Music School met this description; so did many of the small
courts of which Europe once largely consisted, whose music collections survive as
listed above. Even in the case of these collections, survival was haphazard and owed
much to chance: for example, the performing parts of Hereditary Prince Friedrich
Ludwig of Württemberg-Stuttgart survive in Rostock having travelled with his
daughter on her marriage.\textsuperscript{40} Many sets of seventeenth-century performing parts had
already been thrown away, burnt or sold as waste-paper by the end of the eighteenth
century, as Caspar Reutz, cantor of St Mary’s in Lübeck, Germany, described in
1753:

\begin{quote}
I inherited a large pile of church music from my late father-in-law Sibers and
grandfather-in-law Pagendarm […] Everything that these men wrote with so
much trouble and work, or at great expense collected and had copied, has not
the slightest value now, although no small amount of capital went into it. This
mass of musical paper from many years ago has diminished by about half;
much of it has gone into the stove in place of kindling, much has been used
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{40} See \textit{Music at German Courts}, ed. by Owens et al, p. 176.
around the house, and much has been given to people who can use all sorts of scrap and paper in their shops. But I have tried to save most of the scores of the old pieces [that is, but not the parts] for the sake of their antiquity and in order to see what the taste and character of music from those times was like. I predict no better fate for my own music…^41

In England the situation was worse because there was only one court, which, unlike most continental courts, did not maintain an ensemble of full-time musicians after 1690.42 The majority of performing sets produced and used in England were not owned by such an institution and so had little protection when their value depreciated towards the end of the nineteenth century. Generally they passed from owner to owner before being disposed of. In a strikingly similar note to Reutz’s, the English musicologist and collector Joseph Warren anticipated in the late nineteenth century that his manuscript scores would be ‘sold as Waste-paper’; the problem was clearly a widespread one.43

There must have been numerous examples of the type of disposal Reutz and Warren referred to. Most of these would have gone unrecorded; the exceptions usually occurred when the parts were saved after all. The set from Worcester to James Harris’s pasticcio Te Deum and Jubilate is one such: a note on the organ part signed by W. D Macray of the Bodleian Library records that ‘These Band Parts were given to me out of a mass of MSS music condemned to destruction at Worcester Cathedral, with various other pieces of some interest or value, upon my application


^42 Peter Holman, ‘2. Secular Music: (v) Decline’ in Nicholas Temperley et al, ‘London (i), §II: Music at Court’, GMO [accessed 25 June 2014]. See below for a discussion of the musical establishment of James Brydges, first duke of Chandos, the only English nobleman to maintain a musical establishment comparable to that of a small court.

^43 GB-Ot Ms. 1231, flyleaf.
to the Canon in Residence in the summer of 1862. A few manuscript parts surviving in the Fitzwilliam Museum, that derive from the collection of the Ferrar brothers of Stamford and Little Gidding, are a further example: they were apparently transferred to the museum from Magdalene College after the then Pepys Librarian, Stephen Gaselee, threatened to throw them away otherwise. In some cases, one single example of each type of instrument or voice part was retained, while duplicate copies were discarded. For example, one set of performing parts held in the British Library, a ‘Sonata a 4’ by ‘Carlo Ambrosio’, bears a tally-list of parts on the cover that is dated 1749. From this it is evident that the set originally consisted of two each of first and second violins, one cello and four ‘basso’ parts, though it now contains only one copy of each. This practice should be borne in mind when assessing any set consisting only of single parts.

Surviving sale catalogues and other library lists provide the clearest evidence in assessing lost collections of English performing material. Many such survive from this period, from the sale catalogues for Gottfried Finger’s library in 1705 and Thomas Britton’s in 1714 – two of the earliest such to survive – to that for Philip Hayes’s library produced after his death in 1797 or 1798. The catalogue to the

---


46 GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 34267B, fols. 12-24. The appearance of the cover indicates that the set was probably once part of the library of the Academy of Ancient Music.

Finger sale, which contains much more instrumental than concerted music, notes that most of the parts for his ‘Great Pieces for his Consort in York-Buildings’ were ‘Prick’d 3 times over’. Only one set for a substantial concerted work is listed, for his St Cecilia’s Day ode ‘[i]n 24 books stitch’d’. James Brydges, 1st Duke of Chandos, was the only eighteenth-century English nobleman to keep a similar-sized musical establishment to that of a small European court, although it existed only for the short period between 1715 and mid-1721. The catalogue of his library produced by Pepusch in 1720 lists 127 items of music: unfortunately it is not entirely clear which possessed sets of parts. A catalogue of 1759 produced by the Sharp brothers, William, James and Granville for their own collection, amassed for family and concert use, is considerably more substantial at 160 written pages. The section headed ‘Oratorio’s and other Performances with all the Instrumental Parts compleat’ is 20 pages long; a further section lists ‘Compleat Scores of Oratorio’s & other Performances, the Parts of which are not yet wrote out’. The bulk of the collection has yet to be traced, though Crosby notes that items from it are currently in York


Minster Library, Durham Cathedral and Chapter Library and Glasgow University Library, as well as in libraries in London, Cambridge and Oxford.\footnote{Crosby, ‘Private concerts’, 68. Those manuscripts now in Durham include the incomplete set of parts for Alexander’s Feast (HWV 75), GB-DRe Ms. M172.}

The fate of the composer Maurice Greene’s library is a typical example of one owned by an individual. It passed to William Boyce on Greene’s death in 1755 under the terms of his will; on Boyce’s own death in 1779, it was included in the three-day auction of the ‘Truly Valuable and Curious Library of Music Late in the Possession of Dr. William Boyce’, held on 14-16 April 1779. The printed catalogue for the Boyce sale has survived and has been published in an annotated transcription, giving the current location of all traceable items.\footnote{Robert J. Bruce and H. Diack Johnstone, ‘A Catalogue of the Truly Valuable and Curious Library of Music Late in the Possession of Dr. William Boyce (1779): Transcription and Commentary’, RMA Research Chronicle 43 (2010), 110-171.} The catalogue gives an incomplete impression of the scope of Boyce’s collection, since all his own autograph manuscripts and their corresponding performance sets were withdrawn from the sale, but gives useful – though again incomplete – information about Greene’s collection.\footnote{For a discussion of the implications of this and the fate of Boyce’s own performance sets, see Ch. 6 and Ch. 7.} All manuscripts listed that are either works by Greene, or copied in his hand, can be assumed to have originated from his library, though unfortunately it is impossible to tell how many of the other manuscripts and prints listed many have come from this source. 60 lots at least, therefore, originate from Greene’s collection and this is probably an underestimate. Most of these consist of multiple scores and sets of parts, including manuscript performing sets for 35 court odes and around 34 other concerted works by Greene.\footnote{Lots 56, 58-64, 66, 71, 124, 127-129, 138-150, 161-164, 171, 175-191, 194, 197, 230, 232, 244, 250, 252, 260, Sets for works not by Greene that probably originated from his library include Lots 152-153, 166 (Bruce and Johnstone, ‘A Catalogue’).}
The majority of Greene’s sets were bought by Philip Hayes (8 court odes and 15 other works), an unidentified member of the Kirkman family (9 odes and 2 other works) and Boyce’s pupil Marmaduke Overend (2 odes and either 13 or 14 other sets). The remaining 16 court odes and 3 other sets were sold between at least seven other people, including John Hawkins and three members of the Chapel Royal (Ralph Hudson, Thomas Sanders Dupuis and John Soaper). The sets bought by Philip Hayes were auctioned in turn on his death, and the majority bought by the Revd. Osborne Wight. Many of the scores later passed from Wight to the Bodleian Library; but the parts had by then disappeared. Of the other sets, a number have been traced by Bruce and Johnstone in sale catalogues of their successive owners into the nineteenth century, after which they vanish. Of the almost 70 performance sets apparently from Greene’s library that were listed in the Boyce sale, only two sets and one stray part can be currently traced. The surviving sets are the Te Deum sold as Lot 171 to Philip Hayes, which is currently in the Royal College of Music; and the ‘Set of parts of Dr. Green’s Anthem, perform’d at King’s College Cambridge’ sold as part of lot 128 to John Ashley, now in the Rowe Music Library; the stray part is the single treble part to the Te Deum of 1729 sold as part of Lot 141 and now in the Nanki Music Library, Tokyo. These, together with two sets which cannot be identified with any in the Boyce sale catalogue (one for Florimel and one


59 Bruce and Johnstone, ‘A Catalogue’, Lots 56-60 and 66 (pp. 131-133); Lots 143-4 and 149-50 (pp. 145-6); Lots 162-4 (p. 148); see also p. 151, footnote 36.

60 Bruce and Johnstone, ‘A Catalogue’, for example Lot 71, bought by John Hawkins (p. 134); Lot 160, bought by Boyce junior (p. 148); Lot 191 and 194, bought by Overend (pp. 152-3).

61 The surviving sets are GB-Lcm Ms. 224 and GB-Ckc MS 401. See Bruce and Johnstone, ‘A Catalogue’, entries for Lots 128, 141 and 171 (pp. 143, 145 and 150).
for the anthem ‘O Lord, who shall dwell’), are the only known survivors of Greene’s once sizeable library of performance parts.62

Many eighteenth-century musical societies must have amassed substantial libraries of performing parts, but most of these societies survived for less than a century before disbanding. Their libraries were usually sold at auction, passed to another musical society, or perhaps simply divided out amongst their members. Among the longest-lived must have been the Society of Singers of Shaw Chapel, Crompton and Shaw, Lancashire, which existed between 1741 and 1883.63 Some parts from its library were preserved in a cupboard in Holy Trinity Church, Crompton and Shaw, though these comprise only a small fraction of the library as listed in contemporary hand-lists; at least a few of the missing parts eventually found their way to New Bedford.64

The longest-lived of London’s musical societies was probably the Academy of Ancient Music, which was founded in 1726 and disbanded in 1792. A large part of its library has been traced to Westminster Abbey; however, this portion includes only scores and not sets of parts.65 Around ten sets or partial sets of parts are known to me, dispersed among the collections of The British Library, the Royal Academy of Music, the Royal College of Music and the Bodleian Library; at least two are

62 GB-LcM Ms 227; and GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 46, fols. 82-102. The only other set for one of Greene’s works I have seen is the set of string parts (2 violins and a string bass) for ‘Acquaint thyself with God’, GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 566-568: this was originally not an orchestral anthem and the parts clearly do not originate from the composer himself.

63 See Ch. 4.


known to be in private collections. It is likely that more will be identified in future. It is known that a specific post of librarian to the Academy existed and it is evident from the parts themselves that a fairly sophisticated library system was in operation. The sets are generally in wrappers of buff cartridge-paper, most of which bear a finding number; most also bear a tally-list of parts. Some also carry dates of examination that relate to a number of stock-takes, one of which was apparently performed in 1749, when the librarianship was taken over by Benjamin Cooke (Illus. 1.1). Any set of eighteenth-century parts in a buff cover which carries at least two out of finding-number, tally-list and date of examination, should be regarded as a possible stray from this library, particularly if the scribal hands include any of those identified as being linked to the Academy. All of these features are present in Illus. 1.1. However, it should be noted that although there is no definite record of other English music societies also using the tally-list system as a cataloguing aid, it must have been common given the existence of similar examples in collections on the continent.

---


67 If Benjamin Cooke’s sets ought to be included in the total (see Johnstone, ‘Westminster Abbey’, p. 365), this brings it up to sixteen.


70 For example, the Graupner sets in Darmstadt have similar covers: see for example D-DS Mus. Ms. 444/26 (set for Christoph Graupner’s ‘Es ist eine Stimme eines Predigers’), fol. 5r.; D-DS Mus. Ms. 429/25 (set for Christoph Graupner’s ‘Gott ist Zeuge über alle’, fol. 9r.; similar wrappers can be found in the Dübén Collection and the Utile Dulci Collection (see above), among others.
1.1: Cover of the performing set for Henry Purcell’s ‘Mask in Oedipus’, GB-Lam MS 27D, probably owned by the Academy of Ancient Music. Image copyright the Royal Academy of Music, London.

Identifying Excluded Categories: Imported Sets

Instrumentally-accompanied Italian motets were clearly popular, judging by the numbers of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century sets for such works surviving in collections throughout England. These parts are visually very different to English parts and it is easy to differentiate between the two: apart from the obvious differences of repertoire, composers and hands, they do not tend to conform to the usual size and format for English parts (see below). Most are octavo-sized in upright

---

format (Illus. 1.2) as opposed to quarto-sized, though a few quarto Italian sets do survive in English collections. Octavo size is unsuitable for anything other than relatively short works such as motets, as the amount of music that can be fitted on one page is half that which may be fitted on a quarto leaf. However, it makes the parts eminently transportable, and this is the likely explanation for their marked presence in English collections. The Grand Tour is the most probable route via which the majority reached England; it is possible that the octavo-format sets were specifically produced for the souvenir market. Clearly some were used once they reached England, but others bear no such signs and so are excluded from the present study.

1.2: Small-format alto voice part to an anonymous ‘Dixit Dominus’, GB-Lcm Ms. 1192. By permission of the Royal College of Music, London.

72 For example, the motet ‘Angelici chori venite’ attributed to Giovanni Paolo Colonna, GB-Lcm MS. 803.
Despite the heavy losses, two significant collections of English performing parts have survived, though both are small in comparison to the continental collections described above. The first is the collection of late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century performance sets used at academic acts and music meetings by the musicians of the Oxford Music School and now in the Bodleian Library. The second is the collection of William Boyce’s performing material, now also in the Music School collection at the Bodleian, of which a substantial proportion originated from the court performances of the bi-annual odes produced by Boyce in his capacity of Master of the King’s Music. Taken together, these amount to fewer than 100 sets of parts. In addition, smaller collections of performance materials survive that are linked to the composers William and Philip Hayes and Benjamin Cooke.

Surprisingly, only a little material survives that can be directly linked to either Henry Purcell or to Handel, the most important composers working in England during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. However, isolated sets survive from a number of other composers as follows: Johann Christoph Pepusch: 1; William Croft: 3; Valentine Nalson: 1; Maurice Greene: 4; William Hayes: 6 (plus one to a joint work with his son Philip); Samuel Howard: 1; Alcock senior: 3; Benjamin Cooke: 6; Philip Hayes: 6 (including the one joint work referred to above); Alcock junior: 1; John Abraham Fisher: 1. Apart from the Boyce court sets, the Oxford Music School sets and those of the Academy of Ancient Music and the Shaw

---

73 See Ch. 2 and Ch. 3.

74 See Ch. 5 and Ch. 6.

75 Most of the surviving Hayes sets are in the music collection of the Bodleian Library. Those of Cooke are in the library of the Royal College of Music.
Singers already mentioned, surviving performance sets linked to particular institutions or societies include sets used by the Foundling Hospital and the United Grand Lodge, as well as sets from other provincial music societies such as the Canterbury Catch Club. There are surviving performance parts for works from a large variety of genres: academic odes; court odes and anthems; orchestral anthems; oratorios; English theatre music; Italian opera. The entire range of surviving materials is, therefore, fairly representative of the musical output of the period surveyed, despite the inevitable large gaps. Some of these performing sets have been investigated individually in recent years. However, a large-scale survey of the materials as a whole has never been performed and should yield much of interest.

The present study initially aimed to compile a detailed and comprehensive catalogue of surviving English performance materials from the period 1660 to 1800 and to discuss the information gained from these sources. It soon became apparent that too much material survives for a comprehensive catalogue to be within the scope of this study. It was therefore necessary to limit the survey to certain major collections in England, together with some additional collections of specific importance in terms of scope, content or the institutions with which they are linked. A detailed catalogue of all sets examined that meet the criteria outlined above is still under construction and it is intended that this will be available online as soon as it is complete. The following libraries and archives were surveyed:

GB-Bu: Shaw-Hellier Collection, University of Birmingham

GB-Cfm: Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge

GB-Ckc: Rowe Music Library, King’s College

GB-Cu: Cambridge University Library

See Ch. 4 for a discussion of the sets linked to the Foundling Hospital, and the Shaw Singers.

Two sample entries are included in Appendix B.
Some collections or groups of items were then selected as subjects for more detailed case studies. The Oxford Music School performance sets dating from the stewardship of successive Heather Professors of Music, Edward Lowe and Richard Goodson senior, were obvious choices for case studies in Chapters 2 and 3, because of the significance of the collection in terms of its size, relatively early date and the importance of the institution to which it is linked. Chapter 4 focuses on the performing materials linked to Georg Frideric Handel, as well as other performing
sets for his music that are not directly linked to the composer. This choice of case-study was prompted by Handel’s stature as a composer and the lack of any complete survey of his remaining performance materials, as well as the lack of any survey of general eighteenth-century performance practice for Handel’s music based on surviving performing sets. This was the reason for the one exception made to the rule of not examining manuscripts outside England. The collection of Handel manuscripts currently in the Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliotek Hamburg was included in the study in addition to the English collections listed above, as it contains performance materials used by Handel while in England, which are therefore of significance. William Boyce’s court ode performing sets are discussed in Chapter 5 and his other sets are the subject of Chapter 6, because of this collection’s significance in terms of size, Boyce’s importance as a composer and his links to the court. As performer names are the most obvious and easily-recorded historical information transmitted by performing parts, those names which have been noted in the course of the study are listed in Appendix A.

It is inevitable that some institutions, collections and manuscripts of interest have been omitted. It was not possible to survey the majority of private collections within England, many of which are difficult to access or of which the researcher may be unaware. There are other obvious gaps in the survey: the large amount of English material that has reached collections in Scotland, Wales, Ireland or elsewhere in Europe via complex networks of connections between musicians, institutions and families, has (with the exception given above) not been examined, because of time constraints. This is likewise the case for the large number of manuscripts that have been presented or sold to institutional or private collections in the United States and Canada.
Performing parts for concerted music appear to have had no standard format during the seventeenth century; surviving examples can display considerable variation in size and layout. Most are loose-leaf and it was apparently unusual for them to be stitched into wrappers (Illus. 1.3). However, a standard format had become established in England by around 1740 at latest (Illus. 1.4-1.5). Eighteenth-century parts were usually quarto-sized, in upright orientation for instrumental parts (except for keyboard parts, and sometimes drum parts) but transverse for vocal parts. Keyboard parts could be either upright or transverse-orientated. Exceptions to this did occur, probably because spare paper ruled in the wrong format had to be used up. Some variation in size occurred in practice, because of the lack of standardisation of the paper-sizes at the time, and because pages were trimmed down before stitching into covers or binding. The majority of parts were copied as loose folios and then stitched into covers, though sometimes they were copied into pre-bound books. Heavyweight fine paper was most commonly used, usually in the ‘royal’ size, which gave two folio-sized leaves when folded, or four quarto leaves if folded a second time and cut. The paper-making process will not be described here, as it has been covered in other studies. This study has likewise not attempted to cover watermarks and paper-types because of the volume of manuscripts to be examined. However, dating of paper by other researchers has been taken into account where possible. It is

---

78 See Ch. 2.

hoped that the present study may eventually be expanded to include an examination of watermarks and paper-types in the sets of parts discussed here.

Original covers, where they survive, are consistent in appearance. The cheapest and most common type is of buff or pale-brown cartridge paper: this is the sort that John Matthews called ‘Cartridge whited brown Paper’ for which he paid a halfpenny a sheet in the early 1760s; each sheet would cover two quarto booklets. Sugar paper in blue or purple is another cheap option sometimes seen.

---

80 See Ch. 4. Mathews’ costs are recorded in GB-DRc Ms. A32, p. iii.
1.5: Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold how good and joyful’ (GB-Lcm Ms 826), eighteenth-century vocal parts: a) canto chorus part [18], b) alto solo part [22]. By permission of the Royal College of Music, London.
Decorated Paper Wrappers on Performing Parts

Though plain paper was the more popular choice, many eighteenth-century performing parts were covered with decorated paper (Buntpapier) wrappers which can be a useful dating aid. The type of marbled-paper known as ‘Dutch red’, though it was manufactured in Germany or sometimes France, was the most common choice in such cases (Illus. 1.6). This distinctive paper, with its combed motif in red interlaced with ochre, green and blue, was mass-imported from Germany via Holland for much of the eighteenth century because of the late development of marbling in England, though derivative designs were being produced within Britain by the end of the century. It is a measure of its popularity during the eighteenth century that reproduction papers in this style are currently hand-produced by at least two paper-marblers in Britain for restoration use. Its use on music manuscripts was widespread during this period; money was often saved by patching covers together out of smaller scraps, particularly on the reverse. Dutch red marbled-paper on performing parts was largely an eighteenth-century phenomenon: seventeenth-century parts were normally too short to require wrappers, and the paper was in any case more expensive in England at that time. The increase in marbled-paper manufacturing within Britain towards the end of the eighteenth century, coupled with


82 The paper makers Victoria Hall of Fakenham, Norfolk and Katherine Brett of Payhembury Marbled Papers both make these designs, sold via the London bookbinder Shepherds, among others.

83 See Ch. 2.
the invention of new marbling techniques and the growth in popularity of newer designs, seems to have caused the use of Dutch red paper on scores and performing parts to cease at some point during the second half of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{84}

1.6: Dutch red marbled-paper: a) continuo part for Handel’s \textit{Alexander’s Feast} originating from the Aylesford Collection, GB-Lfom 1280, image copyright The Gerald Coke Handel Foundation; b) viola part for Maurice Greene’s \textit{Florimel}, GB-Lcm Ms 227/IV, by permission of the Royal College of Music, London.

Other marbled-papers used during this period include a French curl pattern in green and red; and a Turkish spot in green, black and ochre that gained prominence in the later eighteenth century and is probably therefore of English origin. These types of paper can be seen on part-covers in the Royal Music Collection and were apparently among the types used by the binders employed by Frederic Nicolai when he put the collection in order.

The type of decorated paper known as ‘paste-paper’ can also be seen on the covers of performing parts. This was produced by covering a sheet of paper with coloured flour paste – usually Prussian blue, red or green – and moving the paste with comb or fingers to impart patterns. Paste-paper was first used in Germany and was particularly associated with the Moravian community at Herrenhut in Saxony, from whence its other name, ‘Herrenhut paper’, derives. It spread from there to the Moravian community of Fulneck, near Leeds, where the Single Sisters under Sr. Margaret Woodhouse opened a paper manufactory in 1766, tutored by Br. Andreas Schloezner who had learned the technique at Herrenhut. Though paste-paper may have been made in England before this, the scale of production at Fulneck seems to have been unique in England at that time; additionally, the Moravian method of

---

85 Similar papers are illustrated in Wolfe, *Marbled Paper*, Plate XXIV (‘French curl and spot patterns, 18th century’), Nos. 16-18 (eighteenth-century French curl patterns) and Plate XXVIII (‘Portuguese and English spot patterns’) Nos. 65-68 (English spot patterns with green predominating colour, 1770s to 1790s), after p. 186.


producing the colours was a closely-guarded secret. The wide distribution of the papers is confirmed by the shop sales ledger, which records that the paper was sent to stationers in towns across England; however, production decreased greatly in the 1780s and had apparently ceased entirely by 1799. It is currently not known whether any other English manufactories took up the method; none of the other Moravian communities in England appear to have produced such paper. The marked similarity between common English paste-paper designs and the eighteenth-century paste-papers in the Moravian Archive, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, suggests that the English papers may in fact all be Moravian-made. The presence of this type of paper on the covers of performing parts may therefore indicate that the parts probably date from the fifteen years or so during which production at Fulneck was at its peak, between 1766 and the early 1780s. However, more research is needed into paste-paper production in England to determine where, when and by whom it was manufactured, and in which designs; and whether the practice was already widespread before the Fulneck Moravians adopted it, or continued elsewhere after production at Fulneck had ceased.

There was considerable variation in the skill-level displayed in these papers, which would have been reflected in the cost. A combed paste-paper in Prussian blue was probably a fairly expensive choice of covering for the organ part and the score

---

89 The agreement between the Fulneck community’s shop and Schloezer included that Schloezer was ‘not to show any Person in England besides the Mystery nor to make in three years hence any coloured paper, but in Fulneck, nor to sell or use any Colour for Paper but for the Shop’. Shop Conference minutes, 5 June 1766, cited in Schmoller, A Yorkshire Source, p. 9.

90 Schmoller, A Yorkshire Source, pp. 16-20.

91 Schmoller, A Yorkshire Source, pp. 25-27.

in the performing set to John Alcock’s Funeral and Wedding Anthems (Illus. 1.7).93 The colour and style are similar to the paste-paper on the cover of one of the Fulneck congregation’s minute books reproduced by Schmoller and it is likely that this paper originated from there.94 These versions of the funeral and wedding anthems were prepared some years after the originals, seemingly for performance in Worcester in 1766, the year the Moravian Sisters opened their manufactory; the shop records confirm that paper was being sent to Worcester by 1767 at least.95 Identical blue combed paste-paper paper was used to cover the first principal voice part in the Worcester set to William Boyce’s Solomon, probably used in the Three Choirs Festival; perhaps the paper was used on this part because it was the most easily visible to the audience.96


---

95 Schmoller, A Yorkshire Source, p. 20.
Block-printed or stencilled wallpaper was also sometimes used as a decorative cover for performing parts. A partial set of parts to two Handel anthems, ‘O sing unto the Lord’ and ‘I will magnify thee’ held in the Bodleian is covered in what appears to be wallpaper in a dull olive green with a large floral design in gold, red, white and bright green (Illus. 1.8). However, probably the most expensive choice of covering available at the time was the embossed and gilded coloured paper manufactured in Germany and known as geprägtes Brokatpapier, ‘Dutch’ brocade paper or ‘Dutch’ gilt paper, although it was not manufactured in Holland. The paper is first stenciled with blocks of different colours where the motifs should appear, then embossed with motifs, usually flowers and fruits, in negative on brass or tin foil, so that the final design is of coloured flowers on a foil background (see Chapter 4, Illus. 4.1a). The foil is vulnerable to loss, exposing the coloured patches beneath (Illus. 4.1a-b). If the maker’s signature is visible on the edge of the paper, this can be a useful dating aid. This study appears to be the first to consider the information provided by eighteenth-century decorated paper on music manuscripts.

---


98 See Chapter 4.
One frequent feature of performing parts is the notation of the total number of bars at
the end of a movement or number, or at the end of a section at the double bar line.
This is an indication that the parts have been checked through after copying, usually
by the copyist: by checking the total number of bars in each section, the copyist
could see whether any bars had been omitted or duplicated. Possibly this was also a
method of calculating payment, though there is evidence that the usual method of
payment was per page.\textsuperscript{99} There is no evidence that bar numbers were used as a
rehearsal aid during this period.

\textsuperscript{99} See the discussions on cost in Ch. 4 and Ch. 7.
Most sets of performing parts from this period present a very clean appearance compared with modern sets: it is clear that marking-up of parts by the musicians for performance was not practised to the extent it currently is. The main reason for this was probably the high value of the sets at the time: as replacing them was expensive and time-consuming, they seem to have been generally well-treated and carefully kept. It was apparently normal practice for the copyist to transfer the bulk of the necessary instructions to all the parts, either at the copying or at the checking stage. This usually included dynamics, speed indications or changes of tempo, changes to the performance order and cues. Little annotation beyond this would have been necessary, because the musicians were playing music in a style and tradition they were steeped in, and because – probably – they were more used to memorising instructions than modern-day performers.\(^{100}\)

A relatively clean appearance is therefore not indicative that a set of parts was not used. However, some addenda by the performers may be present, though it should not be expected that these will look similar to modern marking-up: they will often be more carefully written and less obvious than their present-day counterparts. Large errors, such as missing bars, were usually corrected by the copyist at the checking stage. Small errors, such as correction of text underlay and individual wrong notes, were often corrected by the players. Letter names were frequently written beneath notes where the copyist’s placement of the note-heads was unclear. Sometimes this was done where, for example, an inexperienced bassoonist had difficulty reading the

---

\(^{100}\) For a discussion of the general role of memory in musical performance of this period, see Rose, ‘Memory and the Early Musician’. See also Rebecca Herissone, ‘His Mind be Filled with the Material: Arrangement, Improvisation and the Role of Memory’ in *Musical Creativity*, pp. 315-391, particularly pp. 360-388.
Dynamics were sometimes added by the player, though the abbreviations ‘f’ and ‘p’ appear to have been a nineteenth-century development, with ‘Pia:’ and ‘For:’ or ‘loud’ and ‘soft’ used in their place for most of the eighteenth century (Illus. 1.9 and 1.4). Occasionally ‘free’ ornamentation was notated by the performer on the part.

1.9: Alto part to Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold how good and Joyful, marked in pencil with ‘pia’ and ‘for’ (second line), GB-Lcm Ms 826 [22]. By permission of the Royal College of Music, London.

‘Presentation’ or ‘Library’ Sets Versus ‘Working’ Sets

The copying of ‘presentation’ or ‘library’ sets of parts, which were primarily sold or given as collectors’ objects rather than for use, was a form of manuscript publishing. The buying of such sets appears to have been yet another form of patronage. Within England, the large-scale production of ‘library’ or ‘presentation’ parts appears to have been limited to the works of a single composer, G. F. Handel; though some of the Italian sets discussed above might also be such. This function

101 See, for example, the bassoon part to Mozart’s arrangement of Handel’s Messiah, GB-Y M144/13.


103 For a discussion of ‘library’ sets to Handel’s music, see Ch. 4.
must be borne in mind when assessing them: they are not necessarily representative of performance practice, because functionality in performance was not their primary purpose. Their main value is as a record of the spread of repertoire; of different versions of works; of copyists’ hands; and of contemporary copying practices such as the production of oboe parts from the violin parts. As they are not strictly ‘performing materials’ they do not form part of this study; but as it is frequently necessary to distinguish between them and ‘working’ sets, they must be considered here.

Some difficulty in distinguishing between ‘working’ and ‘library’ sets might be expected, as ‘working’ sets of this period are generally not heavily marked. However, in practice the two types can usually be easily distinguished, because of three significant differences between them. ‘Library’ sets do not normally contain duplicate parts; any presence of duplicates is an indicator that the set was intended for use. They frequently contain major uncorrected errors, such as the copy of the organ part to Alexander’s Feast in which an entire line of music has been omitted by the copyist: the presence of such indicates that the set has not been checked through with the same care as a ‘working’ set, and hence was not intended for use. They will also usually contain no marking-up at all of the type described above. However, the presence of minor uncorrected errors, such as occasional wrong notes or text underlay, does not necessarily indicate that the set was not used, as such corrections might have been memorised by the musicians. The matter is complicated by the fact that J. C. Smith’s scriptorium, which was seemingly the principal publisher of manuscript library sets during the first half of the eighteenth century, also appears to

104 R.M. 19 a. 10, overture; described in Barry Cooper, ‘The Organ Parts to Handel’s “Alexander’s Feast”’ ML, 59/2 (April 1978), 159-179 (167).
have published ‘working’ manuscript sets.\textsuperscript{105} It is not known whether a distinction between the two types existed at the copying stage.

\textit{Counting Systems}

There are two types of counting system that regularly appear on sets of parts. One is simply a list, usually either on the wrapper for the whole set or on the keyboard part, which gives the parts copied and the number of duplicates for each. These lists divide into two types: those which functioned as instructions for the copyist, and those which functioned as a library record. One example of library-record-type lists – the tally-lists on the covers of the sets associated with the Academy of Ancient Music – has been described above (Illus. 1.1). Another example is the aforementioned set of parts to the wedding and funeral anthems by John Alcock, which bears such a list on the last leaf of the organ part.\textsuperscript{106}

26 Books, viz.\textsuperscript{1}:
2 Hoboys
6 Violins
2 Tenors
2 Bassoons
2 Violoncellos
1 Basso Ripieno
1 Organo
10 Vocal Parts, viz.\textsuperscript{1}:
4 Trebles
2 Contratenors
2 Tenors
2 Basses
10 Papers, viz.\textsuperscript{1}:
4 Trebles
2 Contratenors
2 Tenors

\textsuperscript{105} For a discussion of these sets, see Ch. 4.

\textsuperscript{106} GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 108 b., p. 25.
2 Basses

Both types of list are useful, as the completeness of the set can be easily assessed where they are present.

A second type of counting system consisted of a simple code on each individual part, which apparently told the copyist at a glance how many copies of each had already been produced. One such system, visible in the performing sets of William Boyce, is discussed in Chapter 5. Another such, visually very different, can be seen on several of the imported Italian sets described above: this system uses small dots to number the duplicates within each voice or instrument group (Illus. 1.2, 1.10b), sometimes divided by slashes similar to a modern division sign (÷, Illus. 1.10a). These can indicate whether a part in an antiphonal motet belongs to the first or second choir or orchestra, though occasionally they appear to be purely decorative.107 Sometimes this sign is used to count parts rather than duplicates, that is, in place of the usual ‘Violino Primo’, ‘Violino Secundo’ and so forth (Illus. 1.10a).

---

107 See, for example, the anonymous Miserere, GB-Lcm Ms 1165; ‘Ad gaudia mortales’, GB-Lcm MS. 1079; ‘Dixit dominus’, GB-Lcm Ms. 1192.
1.10: Counting marks on Italian sets:

a) GB-Lcm Ms. 803, fol. 6, here indicating a second violin part (G. P. Colonna, ‘Angelici chori venite’);
b) GB-Lcm Ms. 1192 (anonymous ‘Dixit dominus’), indicating the third copy of the tenor ripieno part. By permission of the Royal College of Music, London.

Evidence of Part-Sharing between Musicians

Evidence of part-sharing between musicians, as displayed by the parts themselves, is normally three-fold. Firstly, pairs of performer names on a part-wrapper, or on the top of the first folio, are normally an indication that the part was shared, particularly where the names are linked with ‘&’ or similar. In some cases, pairs of names may be an indication that the set was reused by successive performers. However, where a set of parts was reused, there is some evidence in eighteenth-century sets that obsolete names were often scored through, perhaps so as not to cause confusion.
Secondly, reference on the wrapper of a part to an instrument in its plural form, such as ‘Bassoni’ or ‘Violoncelli’, or to more than one type of instrument, such as ‘Harpsichord & Violoncello’, can likewise be taken to indicate that the part was shared between at least two players. Thirdly, the content of a part may provide evidence that it was used by more than one person. The temporary division of a bassoon part into two, or of a second violin part into second and third violins, is particularly strong evidence that the part was read by two people at least. Performance directions such as solo and tutti markings, or even specific instructions for a named performer to play a particular number as a solo, also indicate with varying degrees of certainty that the part was shared. The latter type are far more conclusive than the former, which were often ambiguous in their function. It appears that solo and tutti markings were often transferred from the source score as general information on overall context, rather than with the intent of instructing a player to cease playing or re-enter.108

As will be discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, surviving seventeenth-century parts include relatively little of these types of evidence of part-sharing. There is, however, some evidence in surviving court copying records that it was normal for musicians to play or sing from individual parts, at least at court.109 During the early-eighteenth century this convention, if it was such, appears to have altered. The precise period of this is difficult to pinpoint, because of the relative lack of surviving early-eighteenth-century performance sets. However, evidence in surviving performance sets of the 1740s onwards consistently indicates that instrumentalists of this date routinely

108 See Maunder, *Scoring of Baroque Concertos*, for a discussion of the different functions of solo and tutti markings in performance parts, and their implications regarding part-sharing.

109 See below, Chapter 2, p. 104.
shared, but singers did not, with the possible exception of boy trebles. This convention apparently did not alter during the remainder of the period covered by this study. It may be that any change in practice was motivated by practical necessity, because of the extra labour involved in copying as works became longer and ensembles, larger.

Future Research

Despite the gaps in this study, it breaks new ground, as one of this type has not yet been undertaken for any European country. It is intended that it should be regarded as a preliminary survey that may shed light on the following questions, among others: who ordered the production of sets of parts, by whom were they copied, what did they cost, how were they used and by whom, what did they contain, what do they tell us about performance practice, and what is the scope of the surviving English collections? It is hoped that the catalogue, when complete, will prove a resource on which future research can build; and that researchers in other countries will follow suit. Future research aims should include, among others, building a detailed catalogue of all surviving performing sets originating within Britain, including those that are now held abroad; and producing a database of copyists’ hands, paper types and watermarks from within these sets, as a dating aid for use with other manuscripts and to give further information on the copying industry of the time. A database of decorated papers on English music manuscripts might also be a useful dating aid: further research here should attempt to establish the full history of paste-papers in

---

110 See below, Ch. 3, 4 and 6. The relevant sets include the early sets of William Boyce and the set for Alexander’s Feast, GB-DRc MS E20, as well as some of the later Oxford sets discussed in Chapter 3.
England, in order to exploit fully the information given by these covers. The case-studies presented here could form a basis for research in, for example, how William Boyce’s surviving sets compare with others from the same period; or how the sets in the Oxford Music School and Boyce collections compare with sets from the surviving continental collections. Further potential areas of focus include surviving theatre parts; and performance sets linked to specific composers or from specific institutions not covered in depth here, such as the Academy of Ancient Music.
Concerted music, both sacred and secular, was slow to become fully established in
England. It had not gained the importance it had in other European countries by the
time of the Civil War, although three genres that can be loosely described as such –
the consort song, the related verse anthem and the vocal music in the court masque –
had developed.¹ This was partly because seventeenth-century England was
distinctive when compared with much of Europe, both before the Civil War and after
the Restoration. It was a relatively sizeable country in which power – and musical
patronage – was largely concentrated around a single royal court. It also ruled over
Wales, Scotland and Ireland, the three next nearest countries, thus controlling a
considerable area directly. It lacked the rivalry between small states and ruling
families that encouraged competitive patronage of the arts as a display of power and
was conducive to the growth of concerted music. Significantly, the challenge to the
stability of the country that resulted in the Civil War did not come in the shape of a
rival court. In addition, England had a strong native tradition of polyphony.²

¹ However, most of the music that falls within these genres would not fit the stricter definition of
contorted music adhered to in the present study (see Ch. 1, p.1). See Craig Monson, *Voices and Viols
1982).

² For a summary of the development of Baroque music in England, see Peter Aston, ‘The Rise of the
Baroque in England’ in ‘George Jeffreys and the English Baroque’ (unpublished doctoral dissertation,
University of York, 1970), pp. 1-50. See also ‘Purcell’s Musical World’ in Peter Holman, *Henry
Musical Ode in Britain, c.1670-1800’ (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford,
Merton College, 1992), pp. 7-14; and ‘Charles I, the Commonwealth, and the Restoration’
The Civil War disrupted court patronage of music almost entirely and the court and its musical institutions ceased to exist during the Interregnum. Music was removed from the church; the theatres were closed; and musical performance moved largely out of the public and into the private and domestic sphere. The Restoration of Charles II in 1660 reversed these changes, but the English musical scene, having undergone two major disruptions within two decades, had been indelibly altered. The prevailing musical style in both church and instrumental music had become old-fashioned compared to that of France, Holland and Italy, because of a combination of the strength of the pre-Commonwealth tradition and the lengthy hiatus in church, court or theatre performance. The predominant style in both church and instrumental music was still contrapuntal and the use of basso continuo was not yet firmly established, though it had long been so in Italy.\footnote{Peter Williams and David Ledbetter, ‘3. Development’ in ‘Continuo [Basso Continuo]’, GMO [accessed 22 June 2014]. Martin Peerson had used a figured basso continuo in his Motette or Graue Chamber Musique as early as 1630 (See Richard Rastall, ‘Peerson, Martin’ in GMO [accessed 27 June 2014]), but this was not the norm.}

The new court’s musical establishment was initially based on the structure of the old one, and its repertoire was rooted in pre-Commonwealth tradition, but the artistic taste of Charles II was to be the catalyst for change. Charles had spent more years abroad than any monarch since Henry VII (1457-1509) and his preferences had been influenced by his time in France and the Netherlands; according to Roger North, he disliked contrapuntal music, voicing a strong preference for music he could beat time to.\footnote{S. J. Gunn, ‘Henry VII (1457-1509), King of England and Lord of Ireland’, ODNB [accessed 27 June 2014]; Roger North's The Musickall Grammarian 1728, ed. by Mary Chan and Jamie C. Kassler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 262, cited in Holman, Four and Twenty Fiddlers, 281, 289-290. The king’s exile during the Interregnum also seems to have had a direct effect on Matthew Locke, who apparently shared part of it with him: a manuscript copy in Locke’s hand of a number of Italian motets is inscribed ‘A Collection of Songs when / I was in the Low= / =Countrys 1648’ (GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 31437, fols. 29-43). It has been suggested that Locke was with Charles at the Hague,
its old-fashioned fantasia suites and the correlative rise of the Twenty-four Violins with a repertoire based on dance music and dance suites. The Twenty-four Violins were the indirect successors of the substantial violin band which had existed at court since the reign of James I. Under Charles II, the band grew in size and importance, eclipsing the more old-fashioned ensembles at court. Its rise was a factor in the development of two new genres of concerted music which are of particular significance to the present study.

The first of these, the symphony anthem, grew out of the verse anthem. The first surviving works that could be described as such were the violin-accompanied anthems by Henry Cooke performed in Westminster Abbey during Charles’s coronation in 1661. However, it was the introduction of string-players into the anthems of the Chapel Royal, which had previously been accompanied by organ and sometimes consorts of wind-instruments, that allowed the genre to progress and music in the Chapel to modernise. According to Thomas Tudway, a child of the Chapel Royal during the 1660s, the impetus towards modernisation came directly from the king, who would have heard Italianate church music during his time abroad and probably found English church music old-fashioned. The significance of the possibly before accompanying the Duke of Newcastle to Antwerp (Holman, ‘Locke, Matthew’, GMO [accessed 04 July 2014]).

5 Holman, Four and Twenty Fiddlers, 275.
6 Holman, Four and Twenty Fiddlers, 282-304.
8 Holman, Four and Twenty Fiddlers, 400.

10 ‘His Majesty who was a brisk, & Airy Prince, coming to ye Crown in ye Flow’r, & vigour of his Age, was soon, if I may so say, tyr’d w’r y’ Grave & Solemn way, And Order’d y’ Composers of his Chappell, to add Symphonys &c w’r Instruments to their Anthems; and therupon Establis’d a select number of his private music, to play y’ Symphonys, & Retornelos, w’r he had appointed’; Thomas
symphony anthem to the present study lies in its status as the first violin-accompanied English church music and as the forerunner of the large-scale concerted church music of the late seventeenth century and afterwards; and in its influence on the development of the second new genre of concerted music to emerge, the musical ode. Its development coincided with the gradual adoption in England of basso continuo, which had been uncommon until this point, with organ parts in concerted music normally doubling the instruments. Effectively, this was the first English concerted music for three groups of forces: voices, instruments and continuo. Additionally, the switch from viols to violins had brought the ensemble a step closer to the modern orchestra.

The musical ode has been the subject of two extensive studies. Its immediate forerunners, as described by McGuinness, were the poetic ode and the court masque; to these Trowles adds the tradition of ceremonial music at university occasions in Oxford and the Restoration verse anthem. The genre has been defined by Trowles as an occasional work to a secular text, intended for concert-type performance (that is, not staged and not liturgical) and scored for at least one soloist and instrumental ensemble, containing at least one chorus and consisting of several movements. The musical ode’s development was at least partially precipitated by the Restoration: it

---


was particularly suited to the mood of the time and met a need for relatively large-scale, secular but unstaged celebratory works, although the large-scale nature of the genre was its last element to develop. One further result of the social changes of the Restoration period was a realisation that a commercial market for music performance existed independently of court or church. As described by Trowles, the rise of the public concert benefitted the musical ode, allowing it to reach a wider audience. Indeed the ode was, as Trowles points out, effectively the first English choral music specifically designed for concert-type performance.

The development of the musical ode is particularly significant to the present study for three reasons. Firstly, it was the first secular musical genre in England in which large-scale concerted music was the central element. In the Caroline masque chorus, its closest competitor in this respect, the poetry and setting equalled the music in importance; concerted music was one aspect of the masque, but was not the predominant element. The other early concerted genres in England, the verse or consort anthem and the consort song, were either not secular or were for smaller performing forces than the musical ode quickly began to demand. Secondly, the occasional nature of the ode meant that choir part-books, the traditional medium of performance material used for choral music, copied over long periods of time and continually re-used, were not suitable. A different type of performance material

---

14 Trowles, ‘The Musical Ode in Britain’, 7-10. The first court odes were small-scale and were probably performed in the privy chamber; the importance of the Oxford works in this respect will be discussed below. See the account from ‘The Loyal Protestant and True Domestic Intelligence’ of 4 June 1681, quoted in McGuinness, English Court Odes, 10.


17 But see Milsom, ‘The Culture of Partleaves’ for a discussion of the role of partleaves in performing choral music.
had to be produced from the outset and this material was normally loose-leaf, as appropriate to music that was usually only intended for one performance. Thirdly, it is from this context that the first significant English collection of performing parts for large-scale concerted music survives: the Oxford sets described below and now in the Bodleian and Christ Church Libraries.

According to Trowles, the works surviving in the Oxford collections suggest that the musical ode in fact originated in Oxford rather than at court, before transferring to the court where it developed further.\footnote{Trowles, ‘3. Odes for Oxford and Cambridge’ in ‘The Musical Ode in Britain’, 32-74 (32-33).} It is true that the surviving works appear at first to suggest this; however, this impression is based on what may be chance survival patterns of early odes and might therefore be incorrect. The evidence provided by the surviving performance materials has not yet been fully taken into account; assessing their role in understanding the early development of the musical ode and the creative practices surrounding it is among the aims of this chapter.

**Restoration Performance Sets of the Oxford Music School and Christ Church**

As mentioned in the previous chapter, several large collections of performance material survive in Europe from this period; however, there are no English collections comparable in size to these.\footnote{See Ch. 1, p.13.} Additionally, there are no surviving sets of parts to any of the concerted music of the English court of this period, apart from two sets to anthems by Locke and Purcell, neither of which was prepared for court
The only significant body of English performance sets of this date is that split across two collections in Oxford: the Music School collection in the Bodleian Library, and the collection of Christ Church. It includes parts to a number of academic odes of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, mostly performed in the course of the Oxford Act described below, and parts to a number of other concerted works composed for or played at the weekly meeting held at the Music School.

Most of these sets derive from three separate, though interlinked, sources. Those in the Music School collection, now held in the Bodleian, are the remainder of the collection owned and used by the University’s Music School of this date for ceremonial occasions and in the weekly Music School meeting. The meeting had been initiated by William Heather when he endowed the Heather Professorship of Music in 1627, in a set of articles very similar to those that would become the norm for musical societies later in the century. The Oxford Music School’s collection grew under the curatorship of successive Heather Professors Edward Lowe (c.1610-1682, Heather Professor from 1661) and Richard Goodson senior (c.1655-1718, Heather Professor from 1682), who together were responsible for copying a large

---

20 Matthew Locke, ‘O be joyful in the Lord, all ye lands’, GB-GB-Och Ms. Mus. 1188-9, fols. 1-14; and Henry Purcell, ‘My song shall be alway’, GB-Och Mus. 1188-9, fols. 42-5. Both of these sets appear to have been prepared for Oxford performances: see below and Ch. 3.


22 ‘Imprimis, that the Exercise of Musick be constantly kept every week, on Thursday in the afternoon, afternoons in Lent excepted. Secondly, I appoint Mr. Nicholson, the now Organist of Magd. Coll. to be the Master of Musick, and to take charge of the Instruments [...] Thirdly, I do appoint that the said Master bring with him two boys weekly, at the day and time aforesaid, and there to receive such company as will practise Musick, and to play Lessons of three Parts, if none other come. Lastly, I ordain that once every year the Instruments be viewed and the books: and that neither of these be lent abroad upon any pretence whatsoever, nor removed out of the Schoole and place appointed.’ Quoted in Anthony Wood, History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford, ed. by John Gutch, vol. 2 part 1 (Oxford: John Gutch, 1796), p. 358-9.
proportion of the loose-leaf parts in the collection.\textsuperscript{23} The first catalogue of the Music School’s holdings to mention the loose-leaf parts was a hand-list made by Richard Goodson senior on his appointment as professor on Lowe’s death in 1682.\textsuperscript{24} Unfortunately they were entered as ‘Several Act Songs in loose Papers with other Papers’ and ‘Several papers of Act Songs, & such like things’, which is of no help in dating individual sets.\textsuperscript{25}

At some point during the eighteenth century, a number of music manuscripts which seem to belong with the Music School collection were acquired by Christ Church. These included at least two sets of parts probably used by the Music School that date from Lowe’s professorship.\textsuperscript{26} Additionally, there are several examples of sets split between the two collections, in which usually scores are held in Christ Church while parts are held in the Music School collection.\textsuperscript{27} The bulk of the Christ Church collection can be divided into two portions: those manuscripts acquired via the Aldrich bequest, received by 1713; and those acquired via the Goodson bequest on the death of Richard Goodson junior in 1741.\textsuperscript{28} The Goodson bequest seemingly

\begin{itemize}
\item Robert Thompson, ‘Lowe, Edward’, and idem, ‘Goodson, Richard (i)’, \textit{GMO} [accessed 27 June 2014]. Parts dating from Goodson senior’s professorship will be considered in Ch. 3.
\item GB-Ob Mus. Sch.C.204*(R), given in full in Crum, ‘Early Lists’ (pp. 28-32).
\item Crum, ‘Early Lists’, pp. 30 and 32.
\item Matthew Locke’s anthem ‘O be joyful’ copied by Edward Lowe, GB-Och Ms. Mus. 1188-9, fols. 1-14; and Henry Aldrich’s pair of Act songs, ‘Conveniunt doctae sorores’ and ‘Hic sede Carolus’, GB-Och Mus 1127.
\item For example, the set to Henry Aldrich’s ‘Revixit io Carolus’ is at GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 133 and C. 137, while the score is at GB-Och Mus 619, fols. 12-15; the set to Sampson Estwick’s Act song pair ‘Io triumphe’ and ‘Julio festas’, plus the score to the first, is at GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.126, while the score to the second is at GB-Och Mus. 619, fols. 31-32; the set to Goodson senior’s Act song pair ‘Sacra musarum’ and ‘Iam resurgit’ is at GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 136, while the scores are at GB-Och Mus 618, fols 1-8.
\item Relatively few manuscripts have been acquired since. See John Milsom, ‘2. A Brief History of the Core Music Collection’ in ‘Introduction to the Online Catalogue’, \textit{CCLMC} <http://library.chch.ox.ac.uk/music/page.php?page=Introduction+to+the+Online+Catalogue> [accessed 08 April 2014].
\end{itemize}
comprised manuscripts believed to be the personal property of Goodson junior, as opposed to the property of the Music School, and included many manuscripts inherited by Goodson junior from his father. The Aldrich bequest consisted of the personal music collection of Henry Aldrich, Dean of Christ Church, a composer with a particular fondness for reworking Italian models, especially those of Carissimi. A number of the items from Aldrich’s collection were clearly acquired by Aldrich second-hand from the collections of others; thus, all items from this collection are not of identical provenance. It is thought that around 85% of the Christ Church holdings originated from the Aldrich or Goodson bequests, with the remainder being accounted for by the transfer of music from Christ Church Cathedral and some other acquisitions and bequests. However, there are no details of acquisitions prior to the Aldrich bequest.

There is therefore some difficulty in establishing whether Music-School-linked performance parts and scores in Christ Church entered via the Goodson or Aldrich bequests, or perhaps via some other route, as none of the surviving early lists are satisfactory in this respect. The earliest shelf-lists of the Aldrich bequest are the two known as ‘Archives 1717’ and ‘Dowding’, the first of which was begun in 1717 and added to over the following five decades; and the second of which dates from the first quarter of the eighteenth century and is essentially an expanded and corrected

29 Milsom, ‘A Brief History’, CCLMC.


31 Shay, ‘Aldrich, Henry’.

version of Archives 1717 as it was at that time.\textsuperscript{33} The first list of the Goodson bequest was begun in 1747 by William Clement but is not complete.\textsuperscript{34} As with the Music School collection, the loose-leaf sets of parts are the least well-catalogued of all the items, with the majority not appearing on any of the earliest lists.\textsuperscript{35} Being unbound, they lack the clues usually provided by the bindings, one of the main identifiers of the items from the Aldrich bequest.\textsuperscript{36} For these reasons their early history is hard to establish. However, as most items in Christ Church that can be linked to the Music School are scores, the explanation for their presence may be that they remained the personal property of the composer, although the corresponding sets of parts generally did not. The scores of works by Aldrich therefore probably entered via the Aldrich bequest, and those of Goodson via the Goodson bequest. It is not known via which route those by Sampson Estwick, the other most-represented composer among the performing sets, entered the Christ Church collection.\textsuperscript{37}

\textbf{Music and the Oxford Act}

The Oxford Act was an elaborate public degree ceremony with oration and music, held over several days, which ceased to be celebrated regularly in that form in 

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{33} Milsom, ‘General Introduction’, ‘Aldrich Bequest’, ‘Archives 1717’ and ‘Dowding’ in ‘The Music Collection at Christ Church’, CCLMC [accessed 08 April 2014].
\item \textsuperscript{34} Milsom, ‘General Introduction’, and ‘Clement 1747’ in ‘The Music Collection at Christ Church’, CCLMC [accessed 08 April 2014].
\item \textsuperscript{35} Milsom, ‘General Introduction’, and ‘Portfolios’ in ‘The Music Collection at Christ Church’, CCLMC [accessed 08 April 2014].
\item \textsuperscript{36} Milsom, ‘Aldrich Binding’ in ‘The Music Collection at Christ Church’, CCLMC [accessed 08 April 2014].
\item \textsuperscript{37} See, for example, the entries for ‘Mus. 1142b (f. 51)’, ‘Mus 619’ and ‘Mus 991’ in CCLMC [accessed 28 June 2014].
\end{itemize}
1703.  

Two further such Acts were held in the eighteenth century – in 1713 and 1733 – before the custom lapsed entirely and the Act was eventually replaced with a shortened form, the Encaenia, which survives today. It was not invariably the case that the Act was celebrated annually during this period, although it was supposed to be: in the years 1660 to 1670, for example, it only took place in 1661, 1663, 1664 and 1669. However, other convocations at which degrees were awarded still took place in the intervening years. During the period between 1660 and 1703, the main Act began on a Saturday in July, but from 1669, when the Sheldonian Theatre was opened, two events were introduced on the Friday immediately before: the ‘Encaenia or Philological Exercises’, and an annual music lecture originally held in the Music School itself. Music seems to have been performed at both these events. It is clear from the performing parts, as well as from the eyewitness accounts in John Evelyn’s diary, that music also formed a part of the proceedings on the Saturday; a further performance might also take place on the following Monday, on which the main part of the Act took place, any degrees in music were considered and the performances of the candidates’ music heard. Music in the course of an Act might, therefore, take


39 Johnstone, ‘Music and Drama’ (pp. 200-201); idem, ‘Handel at Oxford in 1733’, EM 31 (2003), 83-99 (89).


place on a Friday (from 1669), Saturday or Monday; the normal weekly Music School meeting and performance took place on a Thursday. The days of the week occasionally noted on the performance parts can therefore be helpful in determining for what occasion a work was composed, but are not conclusive.

The Act was originally held in St Mary’s Church, though Evelyn was probably not alone in finding the consecrated setting unsuitable for the event. The opening of the Sheldonian Theatre in 1669 provided a more suitable venue, and all Acts from that year were held in the theatre. Accounts of the position of the musicians in the theatre at that time are confusing. From the antiquary and diarist Anthony Wood’s descriptions, the Vice-Chancellor’s seat was placed on the theatre floor in the middle of the semi-circle, with the doctors, noblemen and inceptors of various types in the seating area behind him. The masters were further back still, in the centre of the semi-circle but behind the balustrade; the Cambridge men and strangers were also behind the balustrade, to the left and right of the masters. In the upper gallery, the gentlemen commoners and bachelors sat in the middle, with commoners on either side. Ladies sat at the front in the galleries on either side of the door, with the musicians in the gallery above them. Wood’s account of a visit to the Theatre in 1683 by the future James II (then Duke of York), his wife and the eighteen-year-old future Anne I, implies that the musicians were in the upper gallery on this occasion also (‘the vocall musick from the said gallery dropt in to the great delight of the

---

44 Evelyn commented on the opening of the Sheldonian that Acts were ‘formerly kept in St Mary’s Church, which might be thought indecent, that being a place set apart for the immediate worship of God, and was the inducement for building this noble pile’. Evelyn, ‘9 July 1669’, Diary II.

45 Wood, Life and Times, III, 51 (21 May 1683) describes the positioning of the ‘place of state’ for the Duke of York’s visit, in the usual position of the vice-chancellor’s throne; a lengthy description of the layout and position of various groups of people during the Act and at other times is given in History and Antiquities, II/2, p. 797.
Evelyn’s descriptions are more ambiguous: his account of the 1669 Act at the theatre’s opening describes the organ as placed in ‘the corridor above’, and states that the other vocal and instrumental musicians also performed ‘above in the balustrade corridor opposite to the Vice-Chancellor’s seat’. The references to the ‘balustrade corridor’ seem to indicate the balustrade corridor along the lower level, but the references to ‘above’ and ‘opposite to the Vice-Chancellor’s seat’ seem to agree with Wood’s description of the musicians in the upper south gallery directly above the door. It is likely that this is what Evelyn witnessed, as the deep-set windows in the south gallery and the columns separating them also give something of the appearance of a balustrade when seen from across the room. No organ was permanently installed in the theatre until 1671, but a borrowed instrument was apparently temporarily installed for the opening ceremony. From the descriptions cited above, it seems likely that the current position of the organ, in the south gallery above the door, was also the position of the borrowed organ at the opening and that of the permanent organ from 1671.

From Evelyn’s and Wood’s accounts it seems that each Act required a significant amount of music, including more than one substantial ode-type work plus other shorter instrumental and vocal works. The term ‘ode’ was not yet applied to any of these works, with ‘song’ or even simply ‘musick’ being the accepted descriptor: the ode as a musical form was still in its infancy. The first Oxford performing set to use the term ‘Ode’ dates from the early 1690s; however, usage of the word at this time appears to have been in reference to the source of the text rather than a descriptor of

the musical genre. Regardless of terminology, many of the Act works fit Trowles’s definition of an ‘ode’, although others are too small in scale or have texts which do not meet his criteria. The texts of the ode-like works are usually Latin panegyrics similar in type and in quality to the English texts of the court odes, with the exception that Oxford and the University are the subjects together with the reigning monarch. The texts of those vocal works more accurately described as songs than odes cover a wider range of topics, including love and the power of music, although the principal subject-matter is still often taken from Classical literature. There are several concerted settings of psalm texts which fit broadly into the symphony anthem genre; and also a number of sets of instrumental dances, the precise status and function of which will be discussed in the course of this chapter. A few of the surviving works were degree submissions: the statute required a five-part vocal work for a BMus and a six- or eight-part work for a doctorate. Unfortunately, it seems that the surviving music is only a small fraction of that performed at each Act; although it is hard to be sure, because there is no seventeenth-century Act for which a complete musical programme survives. The dating of individual works is still a matter of uncertainty in many cases; it is probable that closer study of the paper would provide more clues to this.


51 See the assessment of the texts in Trowles, ‘The Musical Ode’, 40-41; also McGuinness, ‘The Texts’ in English Court Odes, pp. 63-76.

52 For example, the text of Henry Bowman’s Act song ‘My Lesbia, let us live and love’, is a translation of Catullus’s ‘Vivamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus’ (GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.120).

Previous Research on the Oxford Music School Sets

Shay and Thompson’s study of Purcell manuscripts is of general relevance to the Oxford Music School sets, although they are not its subject.\textsuperscript{54} A preliminary study and catalogue of the Oxford performing parts for concerted music and their relevance in performance practice has been compiled by Peter Holman.\textsuperscript{55} Apart from this and Trowles’s study, no significant research has focussed on the Oxford Music School sets until fairly recently; as a body they have not yet been assessed in depth.\textsuperscript{56} The most recent examination of some of the sets is contained in Rebecca Herissone’s study on musical creativity and related articles, the findings of which are also of relevance to the present study.\textsuperscript{57} Herissone identifies signs of performance use on some manuscript scores: among theatre works, for example, the presence of stage directions in some manuscripts might indicate that they were used to direct from.\textsuperscript{58} Scores in the ‘stratigraphic’ form described by Shay and Thomson, in which the music was copied straight across a double leaf with the staves on both pages extended to join in the middle, might have been intended for performance use by a keyboard player, more particularly when the folio is copied on one side only.\textsuperscript{59} This

\textsuperscript{54} Cited in Ch. 1, note 2.


\textsuperscript{56} Trowles, The Musical Ode.


\textsuperscript{58} Herissone, Musical Creativity, p. 77.

\textsuperscript{59} Herissone, Musical Creativity, p. 79; Shay and Thompson, Purcell Manuscripts, p. 19.
format was a common one for organ parts, and one that was even used in publication.\textsuperscript{60}

Herissone’s conclusions in respect of originality – that the concept was still becoming established in relation to musical creativity during the Restoration period – and on the existence of different models of collaborative authorship, are of particular importance to the practices revealed in the Oxford Music School sets.\textsuperscript{61} On the subject of performing materials, Herissone notes that they ‘are usually considered to be much less informative of creative activity than composers’ scores, and they can be problematic sources because they often survive incomplete. However, for music that was suitable for repeated performance and that was transmitted widely among musicians performing parts can provide valuable details about ways in which pieces were revisited and reworked over time’.\textsuperscript{62} This chapter will argue that single-occasion performing parts, even to works that were neither reused nor widely transmitted, can inform our understanding of specific types of creativity, despite the limitations identified by Herissone. Specifically, they reveal information on the practice of collaborative composition and the existence of types of early odes and symphony anthems that have not previously been recognised as they were not notated in score.

\textsuperscript{60} For example, the organ part to Mikolaj Zieleński’s \textit{Offertoria totius anni} and \textit{Communiones totius anni} (Venice, 1611; see Miroslav Perz, ‘Zieleński, Mikolaj’ GMO [accessed 04 July 2014]) was published in stratigraphic format (Peter Holman, private communication, 17 Feb. 2014).

\textsuperscript{61} Herissone, \textit{Musical Creativity}, pp. 3-60, particularly ‘Authorship and Originality’, pp. 41-59.

\textsuperscript{62} Herissone, \textit{Musical Creativity}, p. 79.
The performing sets for the Oxford Act music of the 1660s to the 1690s are not similar in appearance to those of the eighteenth century; the conventions that later developed, and are described in Chapter 1, do not apply to sets from this period. In earlier sets in particular, there is little evidence of standardisation in format. In addition, there is a marked difference in the neatness of the copying compared to later sets, with many parts being rougher in appearance than was later the norm. Particularly in sets from the 1660s and 1670s, many surviving string and chorus voice parts are merely slips cut from larger quarto leaves. Compared with eighteenth-century performing sets for concerted music, they look small, scrappy and untidy. There was no need to fold or stitch them into booklet format, because they were too short for this to be necessary. This is not surprising given that early concerted works tended to be relatively short in length, requiring smaller performing forces and less participation of accompanying string instruments than was later the norm. Violin participation was initially limited to the symphonies, ritornelli, and later the choruses; bowed basses apparently played only while the upper strings played, while continuo for vocal sections was played by the keyboard instrument or theorbo, according to surviving parts. As choruses tended to be relatively short, this naturally often resulted in short string and chorus parts.

63 See ‘Preliminary Findings: Format and Paper Types in Performing Parts’ and ‘Decorated Paper Wrappers on Performing Parts’, Ch. 1, pp. 30-46; also the discussion of the Aylesford Collection in Ch. 4 and the Boyce parts in Ch. 5-6.

64 This is paralleled by the difference in appearance observed by Herissone between a Restoration ‘fowle originall’ and a more modern ‘fair copy’: although the ‘fowle originall’ might have shared many functions with the fair copy, for example as an exemplar for part-copying, it was not anticipated that it would be beautifully written so long as it was legible. This has contributed to the misclassification of many as rough drafts (Herissone, Musical Creativity, pp. 61-79).
Longer instrumental parts were copied on upright-format quarto leaves, as were longer voice parts such as solo parts. Transverse quarto format does not seem to have been used at this time, although it later became standard for vocal parts; there is only one surviving example of a transverse-quarto-format part from this period.\(^{65}\)

Few specially-prepared keyboard parts survive from this period. However, it seems likely that full scores often functioned as keyboard parts: they were short enough to be copied on to a small number of sheets, and many were copied stratigraphically across large folio leaves. It is possible that the generally untidy appearance of seventeenth-century performing parts contributed to their loss, as within a few generations of their production they might have looked too insignificant to keep.

---

*The Oxford Sets of the 1660s*

Dating sets of parts from this period is difficult because of the confused and fragmented nature of the sources. Not all the works survive in score and the parts are often incomplete. There is one further basic and significant problem: it is difficult to distinguish clearly between concerted music and music that is purely instrumental or purely vocal and thus does not fall within the scope of this study. Although this is a question which ought to be easy to answer, it is sometimes impossible to tell whether violin parts once existed to a piece for which only voice parts survive. Additionally, there seems to have been no firm distinction during this decade between a series of unrelated short works and a larger work made up of a series of small-scale pieces that are in some way integrated. The second may count

---

\(^{65}\) A second treble part to Sampson Estwick’s ‘Io triumpe’, GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.126, fol. 9, probably the result of scrap paper being used up.
as concerted music, even if the voices and instruments never play and sing together, arguably even if it was not regarded as a single entity at the time; but the first does not. However, the practice of deliberately stringing together existing smaller pieces to form a coherent larger work is one which is revealed by the performing sets described below. Such works are here termed ‘building-block’ works.

The problem of judging when what may have been an accident of programme-planning becomes a building-block work is specific to the sets of the 1660s. By the following decade, forms such as the ode and the symphony anthem were well-enough established that no ‘borderline’ works survive from this point. In cases where there is no direct participation of instruments and voices together, the main criterion for inclusion in this study is the existence of some sort of overall scheme or structure that unites several instrumental and vocal numbers that individually would not class as concerted. The decision to include or exclude each work has been taken on a case-by-case basis. As the musical ode was codified by degrees, it is inevitable that some works during the period of its evolution will be difficult to classify; the same sequence of numbers may be considered as large-scale works in some respects and a series of small-scale works in others. Where there are indications that a series of numbers would not have been intended by a contemporary composer as one single work – such as the mixing of Latin and English text – this has not been regarded as grounds to exclude, provided the above criterion has been met.

Precisely when composers began to view such sequences of numbers as entities in their own right is a matter for further research. Attempting to judge how a contemporary musician might have viewed any given group of numbers presently involves such a subjective judgement that it is unsuitable as a criterion on which to include or exclude in a study such as the present. However, the practice described
here bears similarities to the method of collaborative composition used earlier in the century to produce music for court masques, as described by Peter Walls, in which multiple individuals were involved in composing and arranging the instrumental and vocal sections.\(^{66}\) It is probably also related to the practice visible in the Restoration odes and anthems examined by Herissone, such as those by Henry Cooke for the Chapel Royal, preserved in GB-Bu 5001, in which instrumental sections were composed separately, seemingly after the vocal sections had been completed.\(^ {67}\)

There are some differences between the two practices: the works examined by Herissone all appear to be newly composed rather than formed of pre-existing movements and tend to be all or mostly all by one composer. In addition, full scores of these works were produced, although instrumental sections were apparently added in afterwards, once they had been completed. Clearly these works were conceived as whole works and not strings of unrelated smaller pieces.

The Oxford collections include six sets or partial sets that meet the above criterion and can be dated to the 1660s with a fair degree of certainty, plus a further four that probably belong within this decade, summarised as follows:\(^ {68}\)

---


\(^{67}\) Herissone, *Musical Creativity*, pp. 120-145.

\(^{68}\) Further borderline cases include the partial set for John Blundevile’s ‘How well doth this harmonious meeting prove’ (GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. C.44/29, fols. 181-182). The cover of the score refers to ‘Mr Blundevills. songe & ayres.’ but there is nothing to indicate that the airs are intended to be played as part of the song, which appears to be accompanied by continuo only, as opposed to being kept together with them. If the rubric refers to the set of airs that survives at fols 18-22 of Ms. Mus. Sch. C.44, these are in any case in a different key to the song (G minor as opposed to A major). This setting of the song is not linked to Pelham Humfrey’s setting of the same text that survives in GB-Och Mus 43 and Mus 350. However, it has been published under Humfrey’s name in *Choice Ayres & Songs to Sing to the Theorbo-Lute or Bass-Viol [...] The Second Book* (London: John Playford, 1679). I am grateful to Bryan White for this information.


3. GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. C.138, fols. 5-20, and C.139: music for the Act of 11 July 1664, in which Christopher Gibbons was awarded his doctorate (various hands including Lowe’s).  

4. GB-Och Mus. 1188-9, fols. 1-14: score (autograph) and parts (Edward Lowe) to Matthew Locke, ‘O be joyfull in the Lord’, ‘A Vers Anthem for fflower / Voyces, & Instruments at / Pleasure’, score probably dating from 1664 or earlier, parts probably from 1665-6.  


6. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.44, fols.1-17: Matthew Locke, ‘Ad te levavi’, Fantasia and Courant (parts by Locke and Lowe). An inscription in Lowe’s hand states, ‘This songe & Phantasye was made by Mr Mathew Locke / to

---

69 I have not succeeded in identifying the composer or tracing the origin of the text.  

70 See Janet E. Beat, ‘Two Problems in Carissimi’s Oratorio Jephte’, The Music Review 34 (1973), 339-345. The vocal parts for Jephte kept together with these are Italian imports that are not in fact part of the same set. They give the final chorus in a shorter version (Beat’s Version B) so that they could not have been used with the instrumental set. They are not in the hand of Lowe as Beat states. Not all sources for Jephte contain instrumental parts; there is no evidence that this vocal set ever possessed any and so it is excluded here.  


72 Available in Locke, Anthems and Motets, pp. 36-38.
carry on the meetinge at ye musick Schoole. Thursday. ye 16th Novem: / 1665.73

7. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.124: Matthew Locke and Benjamin Rogers, two unidentified Act songs (incomplete parts by Lowe).74

8. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. c.142: ‘Come with our voices let us war’, an anonymous song for an Act that probably took place in the 1660s (instrumental parts copied by Lowe).75

9. GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. C.44/11, fols. 78-94; C.44/30, fol. 183; C.102b, fols.61-62: William King’s ‘Cantate Domino’ and associated music, for an Act or convocation probably held in the mid-1660s.

10. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.141: Edward Lowe, ‘Nunc est canendum’ (autograph), probably for the opening of the Sheldonian Theatre in July 1669.76

It is interesting that what may be the earliest sets of parts for concerted music in the Oxford collections are for Italian, not English, music: those for the final chorus of Carissimi’s Jephte and the anonymous motet ‘Quam dulcis es amabile Jesu’.77 As described in Chapter 1, sets of manuscript parts for Italian concerted music are commonplace in collections across the country; however, most are Italian imports,

73 Oversize fols. 2, 4-5 and 16 are kept in MS. Mus. Sch. A. 641. ‘Ad te levavi’ only is available in Locke, Anthems and Motets, pp. 1-6. The Fantasia and Courant is published separately in Matthew Locke, Chamber Music II, ed. by Michael Tilmouth, MB 32 (London: Stainer and Bell, 1972), p. 100. See also Holman, ‘Original Sets of Parts’, p. 265.

74 Holman, ‘Original Sets of Parts’, p. 266.

75 Holman, ‘Original Sets of Parts’, p. 270.

76 Holman, ‘Original Sets of Parts’, p. 269.

77 Held in GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 204 along with a number of other sets to Italian motets that do not meet the criteria for inclusion here. The dating of these is uncertain. Other manuscripts in Mus. Sch. C. 204 clearly date from before the Restoration period, but it is unclear if the grouping of these sets together is merely due to chance.
probably bought as souvenirs, which bear no signs of performance use. These parts do not fit that pattern. The set for ‘Quam dulcis es’ is an Italian import for which duplicates have been copied by Lowe, presumably for performance, to give a total of two first and two second violin parts, two bass parts and a continuo part. The string parts copied by Lowe for the chorus ‘Plorate filii Israel’, from Carissimi’s Jephte, consist of a stringed bass part plus first and second violin parts that double the top chorus lines. There is no direct evidence that Carissimi ever wrote string parts for Jephte; none of the various score copies of the work surviving in Oxford include any, possibly indicating that the parts derive from Lowe himself. However, a manuscript collection in Christ Church of scores to various works by Carissimi and other Italians, copied by Goodson senior and Aldrich, contains a copy of Carissimi’s Judicium Salomonis with violin parts, to which the annotation ‘But the symphonies are to be left out / being not Carissimi’s but some musty Dutchman’s’ has been added by Aldrich in an uncharacteristic fit of respect for the integrity of the composer. Holman has suggested that the ‘Dutchman’ was Samuel Friedrich Capricornus, to whom this oratorio was mistakenly attributed in print; perhaps the Jephte parts derive from a similar source.

The performance set for the Act of 1664, in which Christopher Gibbons was awarded his doctorate, is the earliest Music School set that can be firmly dated. It is also the set most difficult to class as ‘concerted’ or ‘not concerted’. Taken out of context, all the individual works which formed the musical portion of that Act fall

79 Beat, ‘Two Problems in Carissimi’s Oratorio’.

80 GB-Och Mus. 13, p. 203.

clearly into the ‘not concerted’ category. At least seven of the numbers performed were instrumental dances: two galliards, a sarabande and four allemandes. There are cues for two other dances, which were not written out, in some of the parts. The vocal music consisted of a four-section ‘Laudate dominum’ for voices and continuo; Gibbons’s ‘Not unto us’ for eight voices and continuo composed in compliance with the DMus requirements; and a setting of the ‘Gloria patri’ which has not been located but is referred to in the parts. Clearly none of these pieces are concerted, unless the unidentified ‘Gloria patri’ used instruments as well as voices. However, it is clear from the cues in the parts that the numbers were ordered to give a coherent whole, as follows (there is some inconsistency between parts regarding the placement of nos. 4 and 8, for which cues but no music exist):

1. ‘1’; allemand in 2/2
2. ‘2 Galliard’
3. ‘3 Saraband’
4. Courant (cue but no music)
5. Laudate Dominum in four sections
6. ‘4. Almaine’
7. ‘5. Almaine’
8. Galliard (cue in some parts, but no music)
9. ‘Act Songe 8 partes’ (‘Not unto us’)
10. ‘6. Almonde’
11. Unheaded galliard
12. Gloria Patri (cue but no music)

The fact that numbers are assigned to some, but not all, of the dances in the parts probably indicates that the numbered dances were taken from an existing set rather than composed for the occasion, with the unnumbered dances added in when the sequence was arranged. If Gibbons himself was responsible for ordering the sequence – although possibly Lowe was responsible for doing this, using works that Gibbons had composed – clearly he did not regard it as one whole, coherent work: if

---

82 The ‘Gloria patri’ cannot be the setting by Locke for which parts are kept together with these (GB-Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 138, fols. 1-4.), as it was apparently composed on 9 November 1665, according to Lowe’s attestation on the score (GB- Ms. Mus. Sch. C.44/21, fol. 146r.).
he had, mixing Latin and English text would have been a surprising choice. Despite this, the sequence clearly functioned as such to some extent. The order was planned to balance the effect of the whole, beginning with four contrasting dances and continuing with alternating groups of numbers for voices and instruments. There is no evidence, such as cues for speeches, that the performance of the music was interrupted and it seems likely that it was performed straight through. A note in Lowe’s hand on two of the parts reads ‘Thes thinges followinge are D’ Gibbons. & were perform’d / at his Act. to bringe in his songes’, implying that the instrumental dances did indeed function as a type of overture. There is therefore some argument for treating these numbers as one entity for the purposes of this study. However, the use of texts from three sources and in two languages deprives it of the coherence necessary to term it the first building-block anthem, though it is a step in this direction. It is worth emphasising that the only evidence of the ‘performance version’ of this music comes from the parts.

The surviving performing set for Gibbons’s Act sequence includes ten voice parts for the eight-part ‘Not unto us’. One of the trebles is named as ‘Steeuen Crispin’, presumably the Stephen Crespion who later became a well-known bass singer. The presence of two duplicates implies that duplicates once existed for every part, indicating a choir of at least twelve men and four boys. There are no surviving vocal parts for the ‘Laudate dominum’ or the ‘Gloria patri’ and no figured bass parts for any of the music. An unfigured instrumental bass part, labelled ‘Dr Gibbons Act Songe / with yᵉ Symphoyes’ and headed ‘for the base uiols’ survives for ‘Not unto us’ and indicates that the viols played throughout, doubling the lower of the two bass voice-parts. The other instrumental parts consist of two first and two second treble

parts for the dances, clearly for violins; and three unfigured instrumental bass parts, of which two contain the dances and one contains the dances plus the ‘Laudate dominum’, indicating a minimum ensemble size of four violins and three bass viols. There is no evidence within this set as to whether any of the parts were actually shared between two or more musicians.

The set of parts for William King’s ‘Cantate domino’ and its associated instrumental numbers has many features in common with Gibbons’s set: it intersperses the purely vocal movements of King’s ‘Cantate domino’ setting with a number of instrumental dances, forming a building-block symphony anthem in which the instruments and voices never combine directly. No full score of the combined work survives, although separate scores exist for the instrumental and vocal sections. Again the dances were clearly an existing set, as the order in which they appear in one surviving bass part is not the order in which they are played during the course of ‘Cantate domino’.\(^8^4\) Again the instructions in the parts are the sole source for the actual order of performance, as follows:

1. Almaine
2. Verse, ‘Cantate Domino’ (solo treble)
3. Chorus, ‘Laudate Nomen’ (Tr, CT, B)
4. 2\(^{nd}\) Almaine ‘after the first Chorus’
5. Verse, 2 voices (Ct and B) ‘Quia beneplacitam’
6. Chorus: ‘Exultabant’ (Tr, CT, B)
7. Courante
8. Verse, solo bass, then bass and treble duet, ‘Laudate Dominum’
9. Chorus ‘Omnis spiritus’ (Tr, CT, B)

\(^8^4\) The order preserved in a separate source for the instrumental dances, the set of part-books GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. E 447, fols. 33v-35v; E 448, fols. 29v.-31v.; E 449, fols. 31v.-33v., is different again; these did not necessarily form part of the original performance material and may have been copied at a different time. One (E447, fol. 33v.) is headed ‘Almane before the Songue M' W: K’, further confirming the link between the instrumental suite and the vocal music. While this may indicate that the books were indeed used in the first performance, one of the surviving formerly loose-leaf bass parts also bears this rubric (GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.102 b, fols. 61-62). It may therefore be that the part-books were copied at a later stage from the (now mostly lost) loose-leaf parts and the rubric transferred as a heading. This does not explain the different order of the dances in the part-books when compared with the score and the two surviving bass parts.
10. Gloria Patri (Tr; Ct; B; ends with the direction, ‘Play after this the 4th, 5th & 6th things / to the Instruments’)
11. Air ‘after ye Songe’
12. Courante
13. Sarabande

The dances effectively function as symphony and ritornelli, their regular placement between the vocal sections balancing the structure. In this respect there is closer correspondence between early odes and symphony anthems from Oxford than between London examples of these genres. King’s sequence has stronger claims to consideration as a single work than Gibbons’s Act music, as the vocal sections are all from one psalm text in one language. On this basis it may be later than Gibbons’s Act music, but is probably earlier than ‘Nunc est canendum’, discussed below. The performance parts for the latter appear to have been copied with a concept of the work as a whole, whereas the parts for ‘Cantate domino’, like those for Gibbons’s Act music, seem to have been taken from existing vocal and instrumental sets to which instructions were added as to what movements were to be played in which order.

The parts for Lowe’s ‘Nunc est canendum’, one of his three surviving odes, seem likely to belong to 1669. The references on the parts to ‘Fryday’ and ‘the Theatre’ fix 1669 as the earliest possible date, as this was the year the Sheldonian Theatre opened on Friday 9 July and the ‘Philological Exercises’ were moved to the Friday before the main Act opened. The parts indicate that Stephen Crespion sang the bass solos and Richard Goodson senior was among the trebles; the work must therefore date from after the beginning of Crespion’s career as a bass, but before Goodson’s

---

85 See Holman, Henry Purcell, pp. 150-1 on the differences between early odes and symphony anthems by London composers.
86 Sketches survive in Lowe’s hand, confirming his authorship, GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.141, fols. 10a-b.
loss of his treble voice. Holman has suggested that the work was in fact written for the opening of the Sheldonian Theatre in 1669, at which time Crespion would have been around twenty and Goodson around thirteen.  

According to Wood and Evelyn, a great deal of music was performed at the opening ceremony, ‘mostly composed by the curious fancy of a Doctor of that Faculty then proceeded’. Clearly not all the music performed was by Rogers, and possibly the other works performed included ‘Nunc est canendum’. This hypothesis is tentatively supported by a surviving wrapper, which has evidently been reused at least once; however, three of the inscriptions it bears in Lowe’s hand may relate to music for the 1669 Act:

[Recto, left:] papers of my songe in ye Theatre. & ye Dialougs. of D’ Wilson

[Recto, right:] e us’d at ye Theatre in the Act / Act Saturday. 9th July / 1669

[Verso, right:] My owne Songe / Latin songe; English Dialogue & ayres for saturday / All for that time Except ye papers of Monk-

The third of these inscriptions at least was apparently written before the performance, and probably refers to the fact that the ‘Monk’ sonata was used on the Friday, not the Saturday; the deletion of the first part might indicate that Lowe’s ‘owne Songe’ was taken out so as not to mix it up with the parts for the following day. The second inscription, on the other side of the folio, which refers to the performance in the past tense, probably relates to the storing of the sets afterwards. The date of 1669 is

---

87 See above, notes 24 and 80.
88 Wood, History and Antiquities, II/2, p. 803. See also Evelyn, ‘9th July, 1669’ and ‘10th July, 1669’ Diary II, pp. 46-48
89 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. A. 641, unfoliated cover found with GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.204; evidence of reuse includes an inscription reading ‘Latin Sacred Music / in parts’ which seems to refer to the parts in C.204.
further supported by Lowe’s Act ode of 1671, ‘Eia eruditam’, discussed below, which appears to show evidence of progression in his structuring of the work and in the fact that the instrumental sections are in three parts, not two.

No complete score for ‘Nunc est canendum’ survives, but again the order of performance can be deduced from the parts. The work was fairly symmetrical in format: it opened with an almaine, followed by a verse-chorus pair with the verse for solo bass. A sarabande was then played – three times over, according to the parts – to mark the mid-point of the work. Another solo bass verse-chorus pair followed, mirroring the first. The violins doubled the top two lines in the two choruses, which used identical music; the dances were in two parts only. The performance concluded with the sonata for three violins and bass by Lambert Pietkin, apparently called the ‘Monke sonata’ by the Oxford performers; Holman has pointed out that the range of the third part suggests it is actually a viola part, but the seeming lack of violas in Oxford made it necessary to transfer the part to violin.\(^{90}\) Again, a decision to treat Pietkin’s sonata as part of a greater whole is justified by the care evidently taken to balance the numbers within the overall context, and by the implications of performance directions such as ‘at the End of the Last Chorus then / Monke, for 3 violins. to close all’ (see also Illustration 2.1). This was, therefore, another building-block work, this time to a secular text, making it the first surviving building-block ode.

Why Pietkin’s sonata was referred to as the ‘Monke’ sonata is unclear. Holman has pointed out that Pietkin was in holy orders, though apparently as a priest, not a...

\(^{90}\) Peter Holman, review of ‘Lambert Pietkin: Two Sonatas à 4 for Three Trebles (Violins, Viols, Winds, Bass Viol and Continuo, ed. Virginia Brookes, PRB Baroque Series, no. 49 (Albany, CA 2007)’, \textit{The Viol}, September 2007, p. 44. The Oxford source is the only source for this sonata. There are no viola parts in the Oxford sets of this period; see the discussion below.
monk; Virginia Brookes has suggested that the reference is to General Monck.\textsuperscript{91} Some support for this second hypothesis is provided by the diaries and papers of Anthony Wood, which make some reference to Monck, usually spelled ‘Monk’ or ‘Monke’. Wood recounts taking part in a public music meeting on 24 May 1660 with Edward Lowe and others, to celebrate the Restoration, after which ‘Mr. Low[e] and some of the performers, besides others that did not performe, retired to the Crowne Taverne where they dranke a health to the king, the two dukes, Monke &c.’. The last decade of Monck’s life was an eventful one and he seems to have been popular in Oxford. In the years between the Restoration and his death in 1670, his biggest success was remaining in and maintaining control of plague-struck London when the court had fled.\textsuperscript{92} He certainly visited Oxford at least once in November 1665 while the court sheltered there; it is possible that Pietkin’s sonata was played at some event either honouring Monck, or at which he was present.\textsuperscript{93} Whatever the explanation, the association was clearly one that was already understood by all the performers at the time of ‘Nunc est canendum’ in 1669 or later.

Sixteen parts survive for ‘Nunc est canendum’, including six chorus voice parts: two each of treble, counter-tenor and bass. Another potential extra bass chorus part is headed ‘Any body: to singe or play’ and gives the bass line for the almaine, sarabande and chorus.\textsuperscript{94} In fact, it was probably used for playing from, as the text to the chorus was never filled in, but it does reveal a fairly flexible attitude to vocal and instrumental balance. The adult parts give rare evidence of part-sharing between

\textsuperscript{91} Holman, review of ‘Lambert Pietkin: \textit{Two Sonatas à 4 for Three Trebles}’. See also James Muse Anthony, ‘Pietkin, Lambert’, \textit{GMO} [accessed 30 June 2014].


\textsuperscript{93} Ashley, \textit{General Monck}, p. 223.

\textsuperscript{94} GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.141, fol. 9.
adult singers: one of the counter-tenor parts is inscribed ‘Mr. Akers. & Mr. Horsey’.
The boys’ chorus parts are written in the format that later became standard for solo parts, two-stave with treble and bass-line, although the adults’ parts are not; possibly the boys required the extra help given by the bass line. Each part bears the name of only one boy (‘Larke’, and ‘Goodson’), though this does not necessarily indicate the trebles did not share; perhaps only the senior boy on each part was named. The solo bass part used by Stephen Crespion survives: it is a double quarto leaf that gives both the bass solos and the choruses in vocal score (though only the bass line is texted), indicating that Crespion sang the choruses as well as the solo sections.

95 I am indebted to Peter Holman for this suggestion.
Six instrumental parts survive apart from the bass part mentioned. The first is a folded folio on which a single-stave, figured bass line for the whole work is copied stratigraphically, with vocal cues and including the Monke Sonata, headed in Lowe’s hand ‘Playinge p for my selfe. for ye Last Songe / in the Theatre’. This again confirms that the Monke Sonata was viewed as an integral component of the whole work. In this part, the bass line for the sonata is a simplified version of that given in the separately-surviving set of sonata parts; presumably the part was intended for the
organ. Three identical violin parts for the instrumental dances, bearing the names of ‘M’ Hull’ or perhaps ‘Hall’, ‘M’ Gilbert’ and ‘M’. Withye’, and two unfigured bass parts, carrying the names of ‘M’ Flaxney (Illustration 2.1) and ‘M’ Haslewood’, also survive. The first of these is probably either Edward Hull, lay clerk at Christ Church, or Anthony Hall, the keeper of the Mermaid Tavern where the ‘Musick Meeting’ took place.96 ‘Withye’ is clearly Francis Withy, while the bass players are probably the same William Flaxney and John Haslewood described by Anthony Wood; both Withy and Flaxney were also singing-men at Christ Church.97 The three violin parts for the dances lack music for the choruses, which are cued in and given on two additional sheets: a third such is probably lost. None of the string parts include the Monke Sonata, for which Hull, Gilbert, Withy and Flaxney were directed to other parts, probably those that survive elsewhere in the Music School collection; in Illustration 2.1, the sonata does not in fact follow overleaf as the direction at the foot of the page implies.98 Haslewood, whom Anthony Wood described as a very bad viol player indeed (although he thought Flaxney a good one), apparently did not take part in the Monke sonata.99

The set of parts GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.124 contains instrumental sections by Matthew Locke and Benjamin Rogers of two unidentified Act works, which may perhaps have been part of Rogers’ music for the opening of the Sheldonian Theatre already referred to. Possibly they are the airs referred to in Lowe’s inscription,


97 One further bass part seems to have been partially copied and discarded. On Withy see Robert Thompson, ‘Withy (3): Francis Withy’, GMO [accessed 13 July 2014]; for Flaxney and Haslewood see Wood, Life and Times I, pp. 205-6.


99 Haslewood ‘was very conceited of his skill (tho he had but little of it)’; his over-eagerness to display this led to his nickname of ‘Handlewood’, according to Wood, Life and Times, I, pp. 205-6.
'Latin songe; English Dialogue & ayres for saturday', on the wrapper referred to above: both a Latin and an English song are referred to in the parts, though it is hard to be sure from the surviving bass line whether the English song might class as a "Dialogue". The music consists of four dances, in the order 'Pavan', 'Ayre', 'Corant', 'Chicona', labelled 'Begin with thes. before ye Speech', all from Part 2, Set 3 of Locke’s Broken Consort. Three more dances, an air, courante and sarabande all by Benjamin Rogers, are labelled 'The 3 followinge before the Latin Songe'; this is fairly short with two verse-chorus pairs. A final two dances, an air and a galliard, again from Locke’s Broken Consort, are labelled ‘Thes two. before ye English songe’; this consists of one verse and chorus only. The set is therefore further confirmation that the instrumental portions of building-block works might be taken from pre-existing instrumental suites. However, as a speech came between the first group of dances and the rest, clearly this sequence should not be treated as one building-block work but as two or three separate groups; the instructions do not clarify whether the English song and its preceding dances ran continuously from the Latin song. The songs have not been identified and survive only in a continuo part that gives no indication of the texts or voice combinations. Only one complete copy and one partial copy of the bass of the dances, plus two each of first and second treble parts, survive. The rubric ‘to play on ye Base viol with ye singeing’ on the continuo part for the vocal sections suggests that violin parts to these sections may be missing, as other sets indicate that bowed basses only accompanied sung sections.

100 Incipits 11-14, p. 15 of ‘Matthew Locke (1622-1677)’, VdGSTI.
101 ‘Another Sute of Retrograde Airs’, VdGS Nos. 77-79, pp. 5-6 of ‘Benjamin Rogers (1614-98)’, VdGSTI.
102 Incipits 5-6, p. 14 of ‘Matthew Locke (1622-1677)’, VdGSTI.
where upper strings were also playing. It may be, however, that this indicates a gradual change in practice.

The remaining three sets for concerted works by Matthew Locke all probably date from the court’s time at Oxford during the plague outbreak of 1665-6, as two bear endorsements by Lowe giving the date and circumstances of composition and use. The score of the Gloria is inscribed ‘This Prelude for two violins & a Base viol: was made prickt, & Sunge, at ye musick Schoole, between ye Howers of 12, & 3 afternoone the 9th of November: by Mr Lock / who did it to add to his Songe - Jubelate. & Sunge the Base then himselfe: & M Blagrave ye Countertenor/’. In 1665, 9 November was a Thursday, on which day the Music School meetings took place. Lowe’s endorsement on the bass part of ‘Ad te levavi, ‘This songe & Phantasye was made by Mr Mathew Locke / to carry on the meetinge at ye musick schoole. Thursday. ye 16th Novem: / 1665’, indicates it was performed the Thursday following. The third work (the Chapel Royal anthem, ‘O be joyful in the Lord’) had been composed at least a year earlier, though the parts in this set are in Lowe’s hand, probably indicating Oxford use during 1665-6.

The most interesting of Locke’s sets is that for ‘Ad te levavi’, a motet with instrumental ritornelli and accompaniment for two treble and two bass viols that seems to have been followed in performance by an instrumental fantasia and courant played by the same forces as accompanied the motet. Lowe’s rubric on the second

---

103 Ms. C.44, fol. 146 r.; see Herissone, *Musical Creativity*, Appendix p. 65. The ‘Jubelate’ is not the English setting discussed here, but probably the Latin setting for the same forces, counter-tenor and bass voices and violins, that survives as GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 31437 (see Locke, *Anthems and Motets*, ed. by Le Huray MB 38).

104 The text appears attributed to Locke in John Clifford, *The Divine Services and Anthems Usually Sung in His Majesties Chappell: And in all Cathedrals and Collegiate Chaires in England and Ireland* (London, 2nd ed. 1664), pp. 399-400.
treble instrumental part, ‘Two trebles of the Fancye. & of the Symphoyes to ye’ Songe / Ad te Levavi Oculos meos. / & the two Bases likewise’ seems to indicate that the surviving set of four parts (first and second trebles and two bass parts) is complete. These give both ‘Ad te levavi’ and the instrumental pieces. There are no directions indicating whether the Fantasia and Courante were to follow the vocal work directly as, effectively, part of the same work, or whether they were played separately and copied into these parts only for the sake of convenience. However, the pairing of the instrumental movements with ‘Ad te levavi’ in the string parts and in the inscriptions on them, as well as the unity implied by the use of the same instrumental forces in both works, seems to indicate that they belong together. There is, therefore, an argument that the Fantasia and Courante should be considered as effectively part of ‘Ad te levavi’ in a similar manner to the instrumental numbers which ended ‘Cantate Domino’ and ‘Nunc est Canendum’, although Musica Britannica opted to publish them in separate volumes.  

The bass parts in the instrumental set are unfigured, and do not play throughout ‘Ad te levavi’, only in the symphonies and chorus, with the first bass also playing during the ritornelli. Two other parts also survive: one is a quarto upright-format bass part to ‘Ad te levavi’, but not the instrumental movements, which Holman has suggested is probably intended for the theorbo, as it plays throughout. The other is a short-score to ‘Ad te levavi’ that seems to have been intended for the organ player; it is written in Shay and Thompson’s ‘stratigraphic’ format, on one side of the folio only, and gives the bass part and an outline of the treble with vocal cues, likewise throughout. The parts therefore suggest the verses were accompanied with

105 See above, note 71.

keyboard and theorbo while the bass viols played only when the upper strings were playing. The set is fairly representative of other early Restoration sets, including the others to Locke’s music listed here.

The Oxford Sets of c.1670-1682

At least eleven performance sets survive in the Music School collection that apparently date from between 1670 and Edward Lowe’s death in July 1682. Of these, at least four appear to date from after 1679 but must date from before July 1682, as Lowe was the principal or sole copyist. They display some differences when compared with the sets of the 1660s: there are fewer parts copied on partial leaves and an increasing number of whole-leaf and double-leaf parts in upright quarto format. Only one transverse-format vocal part survives from this period; vocal parts were still normally upright-format, like instrumental parts. By the end of the decade, parts tended to be more neatly copied, and had begun to approach the physical appearance of eighteenth-century performance parts. The convention that solo vocal parts were written out with bass line was not established at this point, but the practice occasionally occurred, particularly in solo treble parts. The surviving sets can be summarised as follows:


5. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 129: Edward Lowe, ‘Carminum praeses’ (original version, autograph); probably 1670s.


8. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.120: Henry Bowman, ‘My Lesbia, let us live and love’ (1680; not performed).


---


109 Bowman, *Songs, for One, Two & Three Voices*, pp. 69-74.


111 Herissone, “‘To Entitle Himself to ye Composition’”. 
12. GB-Och Mus 1203A-D: John Blow, Service in E minor (Te Deum, Jubilate, Kyrie, Creed; date uncertain but after Blow’s doctorate of 1677).

The earliest dated performance set of the 1670s is Edward Lowe’s ‘Eia eruditam’: a copy of the text is inscribed in Lowe’s hand, ‘Thes are the Wordes of the Songe I composed for the Theatre with Instrumentall musick, which was performed the 7th of July beinge Fryday. 1671’. The work is in thirteen sections, structured quasi-symmetrically around a central sarabande in a manner reminiscent of ‘Nunc est canendum’. An almaine functions as the symphony and the closing number is an instrumental gavotte. All the instrumental movements are in three parts (two violins and bass); the ten vocal numbers include two verses and a chorus accompanied by two-part violins. It is longer, more complex and more structured than ‘Nunc est canendum’ and there is greater integration of the instruments with the voices. In all respects, it seems to represent a step forward when compared with ‘Nunc est canendum’, which again supports the suggested earlier date for that work. Again there is no complete full score of ‘Eia eruditam’ giving the work as it ran in performance, although separate, non-integrated scores exist for the instrumental and vocal sections: the structure here outlined is drawn entirely from the surviving instrumental parts.

The vocal parts are in a confusing state and may be a conflation of two sets of parts, the second of which was never copied complete. The surviving solo bass part

---

112 Two further sets that may belong to the same Act, Henry Bowman’s ‘Non usitata’, GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.146, and [?]John Wilson’s ‘Woman is nothing’, GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.147, have been excluded because of lack of evidence as to whether violin parts existed. The single surviving part for John Wilson’s Act song for 1674, ‘The south wind blowes’ (GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. E. 451 no. 62, pp. 199-200) is a similar case.

113 See the discussion in Herissone, Musical Creativity, pp. 188-195.
is again inscribed with Stephen Crespion’s name; as well as the bass solos and chorus, it includes the first violin line of the symphony, sarabande, gavotte and final chorus. Probably this indicates that a violinist shared the part with Crespion, not that Crespion also played the violin, as the violins were by now accompanying the chorus and some of the verses. Again the two unfigured instrumental bass parts, labelled ‘For Mr Haslewood’ and ‘For Mr Flaxney’, indicate that the solo vocal sections would have been performed with keyboard continuo only, without a bowed bass. It seems likely that the score copies of the various sections functioned as keyboard parts for those numbers, though none is figured. This appears to be the earliest surviving set of specially copied and fully integrated parts to an Oxford ode, with each part giving the dances and the concerted sections largely in order on one folio. This seems to represent a step forward in the Oxford composers’ concept of the ode as an integrated work.

Lowe’s ‘Carminum praeses’, for which two parts survive in GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 129, was revised first by Goodson then by Aldrich over the course of the next three decades.\textsuperscript{114} No complete score survives of the first version in its entirety, but it can be reconstructed with help from the two surviving parts: a treble voice part and a joint instrumental and vocal part giving the solo tenor, sung by Richard Goodson, and the first violin part. This is similar to the joint solo bass voice and violin part used by Stephen Crespion in ‘Eia eruditam’, and may likewise indicate that on this occasion the principal vocal soloist standing next to the principal violinist. The structure of the work again appears more advanced than that of ‘Nunc est canendum’, although the date of its composition is not known.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{114} Herissone, “‘To Entitle Himself to ye Composition’”.

\textsuperscript{115} It does not necessarily belong to the year of the dedication of the Sheldonian Theatre, as Herissone suggests on the basis of the text: a glance through the texts published for 1677 shows that Gilbert
The performance set for John Blow’s ‘Awake, my lyre’ probably dates from 1676. Holman has pointed out that the score must date from before December 1677, when Blow gained his doctorate, as the ascription is to ‘Mr’ and not ‘Dr’ John Blow; and also that the inscription ‘For Gibbons’ on the cantus secundus part might indicate the work was written in Christopher Gibbons’ memory. Gibbons had died on 20/30 October 1676, seven weeks after the surrender of the fortress of Philippsburg on 01/11 September to Charles of Lorraine’s army during the course of the Franco-Dutch war. This was the event apparently commemorated by the other work copied into the same performing set, the anonymous three-part song ‘Philippsburg’, which being non-concerted does not form part of this study.

The set consists of four carefully-copied quarto upright-format parts, giving both works, in cream paper covers: cantus primus, cantus secundus and bassus voice parts and an unfigured basso continuo part. In addition, two extra loose-leaf vocal parts survive (both tenor, although one is an unfinished copy), plus three loose-leaf instrumental parts (first and second violin and bass viol), all giving ‘Awake my lyre’ only. Duplicate copies survive of the second page only of the violin and bass viol parts, probably intended to facilitate the page turn; their existence implies the parts were used by single players. However, extra copies of the violin and viol parts

---

Sheldon, the theatre’s founder, was frequently the subject of praise during this period (*Theatri Oxoniensis Encaenia, sive Comitia Philologica, Julii 6, Anno 1677, celebrata*, Oxford: University of Oxford, 1677).


117 See Christopher D. S. Field, ‘Gibbons, Christopher’ in *GMO* [accessed 5 July 2014]. Dates are given according to both Julian and Gregorian calendars, as the first was used in England and the second throughout most of the rest of Europe at this time.

118 ‘Philippsburg’ is an interesting demonstration of the popular support in England for the Dutch side in the Franco-Dutch War, despite the fact that Charles II was backing the opposing side. I am indebted to John Childs for information on the Siege of Philippsburg (1676) and the Franco-Dutch War, and to Stephen Ryle for help with the translation.
survive in a set of roughly contemporary part-books. These seem to derive directly from the loose-leaf set and may have been used together with them in performance, although their exact date is uncertain. Again, both surviving bass viol parts give music only for the symphony, chorus and ritornelli; only the basso continuo part in the cream-covered set plays throughout. There is no evidence that any of the parts were shared. The set therefore implies a small ensemble of two to four violins and one or two bass violins, depending on whether the copies in the part-books were also used, plus a continuo instrument and the four voices. These parts are unusual for the period in the care taken in their production, particularly in the fact that the main set is in wrappers. It may have been a type of ‘presentation’ set; if so, this would support the theory that the work was composed in memory of Christopher Gibbons. This does not mean the parts were not used in performance: that they were so used is clear from the small amount of marking up visible, such as the ‘dal segno’ in red ink in the loose-leaf bass viol part and the direction ‘Rest here 24 times. & then the / two od rests & goe on’ on the loose-leaf second violin part.

The set of parts for Sampson Estwick’s ode-pair ‘Io triumpe’ and ‘Julio festas’ probably dates from 1677, the year in which Estwick took his B.A, and may be the earliest surviving ode-pair among the Oxford sets. ‘Io triumpe’ was apparently a collaborative effort, with Estwick responsible for the majority; the overture is by Richard Goodson senior and the repeated chorus is probably by Henry Aldrich, if the information given by Philip Hayes is correct. Altered rubrics on the vocal parts indicate that the original order of the two songs was ‘Julio festas’ first and ‘Io triumpe’ second, although this was apparently reversed before the entire set had

---

119 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 14 and C. 17-18. Examination of the paper and the other repertoire contained in the set might clarify its date.

been copied and before the first performance. Again this is evidence of care taken in planning the impact of the performance as a whole; possibly the two works should be viewed as two parts of one larger work rather than two separate, shorter works, despite the lack of an integrated text. The surviving instrumental parts are incomplete and so give little information about the performing forces, though organ parts for both odes survive. Six voice parts survive for both works – unusually, one is a transverse quarto leaf – five of which contain solo sections for one work or the other. The sixth is a ripieno counter-tenor part for both works, implying that such parts probably once existed for the other voices. The implied ensemble size is therefore around ten singers, consisting of soloists and ripienists for counter-tenor, tenor and bass parts, plus around four boys.

Another surviving ode-pair by John Blow and Henry Aldrich, the parts for which are split into two sets, dates from 1679. (A further set for an ode-pair by Goodson senior, ‘Sacra musarum’ and ‘Iam resurgit’, possibly dates from slightly later given that both odes are apparently by Goodson throughout). One of the pair, Blow’s ‘Diva quo tendis’, retains its original wrapper, inscribed as follows:

Mr Estwick / 2. papers / the score & partes. Instrumentall & vocal / of a peice of a Songe composed by D Blow / designed for the Act. 1678. but that Act / being put off. it was not finisht: the next / yeare 1679. it was transcribd & performed / as a 2d Songe in the Theatre. on fryday the / 11 of July: with the addition onely of a prelude / of M’ Banisters in the same Key. to bringe the / Songe in[.]

It is clear from this that ‘Diva quo tendis’, the ‘peice of a Songe [...] not finisht’, was originally intended to be longer. In its unfinished form, however, it was long enough

---

121 It should be stated that ‘ripieno’ is not the original terminology used on this part, or on any of the English parts discussed here. Its use is preferred to the historically-correct ‘chorus’ throughout this discussion because of the implication, nowadays inherent in that term, that the chorus does not include the principal soloists. See the conclusions of this chapter for a further discussion of this point.
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and suitable to be put to use as a ‘2d Songe’. As the parts were headed as such, it seems they were not copied until 1679. The wrapper gives no information as to the identity of the first song, but a set of parts labelled as ‘1st Songe’ and ‘The First Musick’ survives for Henry Aldrich’s ‘Iam satis somno’. The Christ Church score of this is inscribed ‘For the Act. 1679. Ayre-’ and the part labelled ‘1st Songe Singinge Base’ includes the bass part for ‘Diva quo tendis’, which is headed ‘2d Songe’, thus firmly linking the two sets together. Again these sets should probably be considered as one single set, given that some sheets contain parts to both works and that again care has clearly been taken in constructing the entire sequence.

The vocal parts for ‘Diva quo tendis’ consist of one each of first and second trebles, principal counter-tenor, tenor and bass; plus two ripieno parts for the bass. Ripieno parts for tenor and counter-tenor are referred to in addenda on the parts but have been lost. The surviving instrumental parts consist of three string parts for ‘First Treble’, ‘2d Treble’ and ‘Base Viol’; they indicate that the strings played for the repeat of the chorus ‘Diva quo tendis’ but not the first time it was heard. The fourth part, headed ‘Organ part of ye 2d Songe’, is a folio leaf copied stratigraphically. The part is unfigured, primarily in two-stave format and marked up with cues for use in performance, such as ‘lead treble in y Ritornella’ on the second bar of the second system, indicating that direction took place from within the ensemble to a certain extent, with one part or another being regarded as ‘in the lead’ at any given point. The parts suggest an ensemble of at least eleven singers – three on the bass line and two each on the other four parts – plus a minimum instrumental group of two violins, a bass viol and organ. In addition to these, the score includes a viola part, not present in the set; this was not standard scoring in Oxford at the time. Its inclusion may have been a result of Blow’s background as a court composer, and
an indicator of the influence court practice had on Oxford. Given the apparent good survival rate for these parts overall, possibly the viola part’s absence indicates it was in fact never copied, particularly as no viola was required for ‘Iam satis somno’, the first work in the ode-pair.

The set for ‘Iam satis somno’ appears to have been reused. Clearly the score was used in performance, as it contains two inserted slips giving the bass line for the repeats of the ritornello, which were not written out.\textsuperscript{124} Only two other instrumental parts survive: a violin part and a damaged organ part similar to that for ‘Diva quo tendis’, with the exception that it is partially figured. Possibly the score was used in its place for a second performance because the organ part had been damaged. A total of nine vocal parts survive; however, these seem to relate to more than one performance. The work in its original form, as shown in the score, seems to have run as follows:

1. Symphony  
2. Ritornello  
3. Chorus, ‘Iam satis somno’  
4. Ritornello (repeat)  
5. Solo bass, ‘Occidit nostrum’/’Quid mihi narras’  
6. Chorus ‘Stat bonis vita’  
7. Ritornello (repeat)  
8. Chorus ‘Ite ventosum’  
9. Three instrumental dances

The original set of parts was prepared reflecting this order and apparently consisted of two of each part, of which all but one tenor part survive. As the bass part also containing the chorus of ‘Diva quo tendis’ gives the music in this form, and is unaltered, it seems likely that this form of ‘Iam satis somno’ was the one used in the 1679 Act, for which the work was probably composed. At some point, probably in

\textsuperscript{124} GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 125, fols. 8* and 9*
the early eighteenth-century, the work was revised, although it apparently retained its title ‘The First Musick’. The new version ran as follows:

1. Symphony
2. Ritornello
3. Bass solo then chorus, ‘Iam satis somno’
4. Ritornello repeat
5. Verse, counter-tenor and bass, ‘Nunc iuvat’
6. Chorus, ‘Nulla turbabant’
7. Ritto as / Before
8. Chorus ‘Ite ventosum’
9. Three instrumental dances

The inserted movements ‘Nunc iuvat’ and ‘Nulla turbabant’, which replaced ‘Occidit nostrum’/’Quid mihi narras’ and the chorus ‘Stat bonis vita’ respectively, may have been by Sampson Estwick rather than Henry Aldrich, as the score of the insertions that survives in Christ Church is in his hand. At least five of the original vocal parts were then adapted with paste-downs cancelling the old sections and giving the new ones; an inserted leaf in one of the counter-tenor parts gave the new duet verse. Two parts were copied entirely anew. The new set probably consisted again of two trebles, two tenors, two counter-tenors and two basses, although one counter-tenor is now missing. The text of the inserted movements makes reference to ‘Anna’, which does not necessarily indicate revision after Anne’s accession to the throne in 1702: she had visited Oxford in 1683 with her parents as described above and all three were entertained with verses and music in the Sheldonian Theatre. However, the lack of reference to her parents suggests that a revision after her accession is more likely.


\[126\] Wood, Life and Times III, 51-52. Some of the verses spoken on this occasion were published in Examen Poeticum: Being the Third Part of Miscellany Poems (London: Jacob Tonson, 1706), pp. 98-107.
The set of parts for Aldrich’s ‘Revixit io Carolus’, adapted from Carissimi, must be considered together with the set for ‘Io Britannum’. The latter is in fact the same work with slightly altered text, for which the same performing set was evidently reused. The opening line of ‘Revixit io Carolus’ translates as ‘Hurrah! Charles lives anew’ or ‘Hurrah! Charles is risen again’, implying that the text commemorated a particular occasion. This might have been the recovery of Charles II from serious illness in September 1679, the twentieth anniversary of the Restoration in May 1680, or even the king’s visit to Oxford for the one-week parliament of 1681. Although Wood makes no mention of music in his description of Oxford’s welcome of the king on this occasion, it is inconceivable that the occasion would have passed without the performance of an ode.

The ode was a fairly short one, though it is clearly incomplete as it stands. There is no surviving symphony; probably this was composed and scored separately. The text alterations that turned ‘Revixit io Carolus’ into ‘Io Britannum’ seem to have been undertaken considerably later, probably between 1694 and 1702: the new text makes mention of William III, but not of his wife, the queen regnant Mary II, who died in 1694. The surviving vocal parts from the original set consist of two solo treble and two ripieno treble parts, plus a solo bass. The solo parts have been subjected to the text alterations that turned the first ode into the second. This was

---
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mostly effected simply by scoring out ‘Carolus’ and ‘Carole’ and substituting
‘Gulielmus’ and ‘Gulielme’; however, the text of the opening chorus, ‘Revixit io
Carolus’ was clearly unsuitable even with this alteration, so that an entire new text
had to be provided. The chorus sections in the solo parts were covered with paste-
downs giving the new text, but the original two ripieno treble parts, which only
included this chorus, were completely unusable; probably new ripieno parts were
copied that do not now survive. Again, the treble solo parts include the bass line,
although the solo bass part does not.

2.2: Henry Aldrich, ‘Revixit io Carolus’, ripieno violin part (hand of Edward
Lowe), GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 137, fol. 5r. By permission of The Bodleian
Libraries, University of Oxford.

Nine instrumental parts survive for ‘Revixit io Carolus’, including principal first
and second violin parts, one ripieno first violin (Illustration 2.2) and three ripieno
second violins (of which one was, however, not copied complete) for the chorus.\(^{130}\) All of these appear to belong to the work’s original performance. The survival of the extra second-violin ripieno parts implies that further such parts were copied for the first violin. Instructions on the violin parts, such as ‘Then a verse alone for a Base with two Single violins’ and ‘all theses rests while the Base Singer with two Single violins. after that. all the violins joyne, as over leafe’, indicate the use of reduced scoring in some verses that is not marked in the score.\(^{131}\) The directions for ‘Single violins’ and ‘more violins’ on the principal first violin part perhaps indicate that the part was shared, but might be merely a warning to a single player that he was the soloist at this point.\(^{132}\) One bass viol part survives, again carrying Flaxney’s name. This gives the choruses and the central ‘Galiard Symphony’ but again lacks music for the verses, indicating that the practice of the stringed basses playing only with the upper strings was still the norm in the late 1670s or early 1680s. The final surviving instrumental part is a roughly-copied single-stave, figured bass. The set indicates a bigger-than-normal ensemble for the work’s first performance, consisting of around six to twelve violins, depending on whether parts were shared, plus at least two bass viols and the organ: effectively the first recorded English orchestra outside of London. This supports the theory that the work was written for an important occasion such as the king’s visit to Oxford in 1681.

Aldrich’s ode-pair ‘Convenient doctae sorores’ and ‘Hic sede Carolus’, is, like Goodson’s ode-pair ‘Sacra musarum’ and ‘Iam resurgit’, among the first surviving

---

\(^{130}\) An additional partial copy of the principal second violin part survives, which may have been a discarded copy. One further additional violin part, that seems likely to belong to another work entirely, also survives in this set.

\(^{131}\) GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 137, fol. 5r.

\(^{132}\) GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 137, fol. 9r.
substantial ode-pairs by one single composer. The parts survive with their original wrapper, labelled as follows:

Two Act Songs in Partes / Performed in Oxford Theatre / July 7th. 1682. / NB a Small Slip of paper unpasted – belonging to the beginning / of the first treble violin – by way of alteration[.]

Edward Lowe was the principal copyist; the parts must therefore have been among the last he copied before his death on 11 July 1682. The reference to the alteration of the parts suggests that this was done for the first performance and is therefore not evidence of reuse. No score has survived to either work. As with earlier work-pairs, the two odes are for the same scoring (six-part voices consisting of first and second trebles, first and second counter-tenors, tenor and bass; two-part violins and bass viol). Again it seems clear that the two works are actually closer to one larger work in two parts: it is significant that the same overture seems to open both the first and the second song, giving a degree of overall unity to this ode-pair that was previously lacking, and further advancing the ode’s development as a genre. Again the performance is closed with an instrumental set, in this case a suite of five dances, indicated in the organ part with the instruction ‘The follownge Suite imediately [sic.] to close all’. This method of ending a work was already being replaced with the final chorus by the end of the 1670s; the works from the early 1680s that end in this manner probably mark the end of this convention, as there seem to be no surviving sets from after Lowe’s death that end a substantial concerted work with instrumental music.

Seven vocal parts survive for each song, for each of the six voices plus a ripieno copy for the bass, suggesting again that perhaps ripieno parts for the other voices are now missing. The surviving instrumental parts consist of two
first and two second violins, bass viol and organ. There is no evidence as to whether these parts were shared.

Conclusions

As regards this study, the most significant overall musical change during this period was the growth in importance of concerted music; the most significant new musical genres were the symphony anthem and the musical ode. It is significant in this context that two of the earliest sets of concerted performing parts that survive from Oxford, for Carissimi’s Jephte and the anonymous motet ‘Quam dulcis es’, are not English but Italian in origin. This confirms that Italian performing sets were already being imported and Italian works were performed and not merely studied in Oxford during this period. That the violin parts for Jephte may be of English origin suggests a willingness to adapt Italian music to local taste and performing conditions.

The overall tendency during this period was towards increasingly long and complex works, although the performing forces used in Oxford were relatively small and remained so for the whole of the twenty-two-year period surveyed here. Evidence for a standard ‘concertato’ ensemble of four- to six-part voices plus one or two extra ripienists per part for the chorus sections can be seen in the number and type of vocal parts copied, although it should be noted that some voice-types at times only participated in the chorus sections. This has more in common with contemporary Italian practice, or with the slightly later practice of J. S. Bach, for example, than with the much later practice of soloists singing only the solo sections, while the choir sang the choruses. It is therefore probably more accurate to regard the singers as dividing into ‘concertists’ who sang throughout, which might include
multi-voice verses, plus ‘ripienists’ who joined in the full-chorus sections, rather than as ‘soloists’ versus a ‘chorus. However, it should be noted that the former terminology is not visible in English performing parts of this period; the latter is in fact historically more accurate. There is some evidence, in the parts for ‘Nunc est canendum’, that the singers shared parts at times. It may be that there was always at least one ripienist sharing each solo part, though it cannot be stated, on the current evidence, that this was standard practice. It appears from the surviving parts that a singer shared with a violinist at least twice during this period, in performances of Lowe’s ‘Eia eruditam’ and ‘Carminum praeses’. This perhaps suggests that the performers stood in a line along the gallery in the Sheldonian Theatre, with instrumentalists on one side and singers on the other and the singer and instrumentalist closest to the middle sharing parts.

Regarding the instrumental parts, the sets show considerable variation and many are obviously incomplete. Eight of the 22 sets examined in total contain one each of first and second violin (or viol) parts, while five contain two first and two second violin parts. A difference in size is apparent between the sets produced in the 1660s for use in the Music School weekly meeting, such as those for the three works by Matthew Locke, and those produced in the same decade for use during the Acts. The former tend to include only one of each violin or viol part, although duplicates of the bass part sometimes survive. The latter normally include two of each violin part, although the violin parts for King’s ‘Cantate Domino’ are missing entirely. However, the fact that only a small sample of sets survives from this decade makes it difficult to draw firm conclusions. Among the later sets, that for ‘Revixit io Carolus’ seems to have included six violin parts at least and appears to be effectively the first surviving evidence of an orchestra-type ensemble outside London and the court.
However, it is anomalous among the surviving sets of the 1670s and 1680s. The number of surviving bass parts varies between one and four in the sets of the 1660s and between one and three in the sets from c.1670-1682, with one or two being most common during this period. The sample examined is too small to draw conclusions on whether this indicates a decrease in the size of the bass section during the 1670s. Regarding other instruments, the surviving sets show little evidence of the use of violas in concerted music in Oxford during this period, and no evidence of the use of wind instruments.

There is little evidence of part-sharing between instrumentalists during this period: all instances of performer names on instrumental parts are of a single performer, although admittedly the sample size is small. It may be that normal practice was for instrumentalists not to share, as is implied by the court records of payment for music copying.\footnote{These indicate that individual copies were being produced for each instrumentalist at court: see, for example, Holman, \textit{Four and Twenty Fiddlers}, pp. 327-330, 400.} The two known instances of part-sharing between a singer and a violinist suggest, however, that part-sharing between instrumentalists did take place on these occasions at least. It would otherwise have made more sense for the violinist who shared the singer Stephen Crespion’s part in ‘Eia Eruditam’ to have read from the first violin part headed ‘For M’ James’, unless James was already sharing his part with another. There is some evidence, in the form of solo and tutti markings, that instrumentalists may have shared by the time of ‘Revixit io Carolus’ in around 1681, although this is far from conclusive.

The period was one of significant experimentation, and the great change that music was undergoing is visible in the surviving loose-leaf performance materials. In the early sets, the detailed nature of the instructions on the parts (‘after this the 1st verse for M’ Crispion, & that done, then the chorus followinge’, Illustration 2.1; see
also Illustration 2.2) indicates the performers’ relative unfamiliarity with an English musical genre in which strings of numbers followed one another without pause. These directions in the Oxford parts contrast strongly with the succinct directions for tacet sections in the two imported Italian sets examined; it was apparently not enough to simply write the music out in order with short cues for tacet numbers. The Oxford sets demonstrate that the physical appearance of parts for concerted music became increasingly standardised throughout this period; the formulaic appearance of most eighteenth-century parts was the culmination of this process.\textsuperscript{134} Although the process was not fully complete by the time of Lowe’s death in 1682, in the 22 years since the Restoration, parts for concerted music had evolved from being nothing like eighteenth-century parts in appearance, to being similar in most respects. Clearly conventions of layout of parts for concerted music were still developing, precisely because it was a developing genre. The only two such conventions still to be established by 1682 were the use of transverse quarto format for vocal parts and the provision of the bass line for all solo parts. It is likely that the establishment of these standards was a response to the practical problem of mass-production of increasingly lengthy performance parts, which was speeded up by the adoption of a formula for producing them.

One important trend in Oxford revealed by the parts is the production of building-block odes and anthems from smaller component instrumental and vocal works, a practice that principally belonged in the 1660s. This phase of the ode’s development in Oxford has not previously been fully recognised, partly because the scores to the component works appear to have been valued as sources above the parts. Typically the voices and instruments do not combine directly in such works, with instrumental

\textsuperscript{134} See Ch. 1 for a description of eighteenth-century parts.
numbers being positioned between the vocal numbers. The vocal sections in the works examined may have been composed specifically for the occasion on which the work was performed, but the instrumental numbers were usually pre-existing works. This appears to be a different facet of the London practice of Cooke, Henry Purcell, Blow and others, described by Herissone, of composing instrumental and vocal sections separately in multi-sectional works, with priority given to the vocal sections.¹³⁵

Among the Oxford sets, two such building-block works survive in full: William King’s anthem ‘Cantate domino’ (probably from the 1660s) and Edward Lowe’s ode ‘Nunc est canendum’ (probably 1669), although Christopher Gibbons’s anthem-sequence of 1664 is a borderline case. A further work or works by Matthew Locke and Benjamin Rogers, possibly from 1669, survives incomplete as dances and bass-line only, the vocal sections and texts used never having been identified.¹³⁶ These works never existed in full score in their entirety, although separate scores of component sections sometimes survive. These can give a misleading impression of the real nature of the work in performance if they are considered separately from the parts, which are the only sources for the works as they functioned in performance. The performance parts appear to have been formed of new vocal parts plus cannibalized sets of instrumental parts to the component works. Instructions were added to the instrumental parts as to the performance running-order; the presence of such re-purposed parts is likely to be an indicator that the work dates from the 1660s, as no such set is currently known to survive from after 1669. It is likely that a number of performing sets from this period that appear to give purely instrumental

¹³⁵ Herissone, Musical Creativity, pp. 120-145.
dance music, or purely vocal music with bass line, have been wrongly excluded from this study in the absence of evidence as to the context of their use in performance.

Up to three substantial vocal numbers could form the principal components of building-block works. Gibbons’s Act music of 1664, for example, included his settings of ‘Not unto us’, ‘Laudate dominum’ and the ‘Gloria patri’. There is some evidence, such as the use of both English and Latin texts in Christopher Gibbons’s Act sequence, that such works were not initially regarded as entities in their own right. Despite this, it is clear that even Gibbons’s anthem sequence, the earliest examined here, functioned as such to some extent: the ordering of the work’s component numbers indicates that the resultant sequence was carefully planned in terms of structure, balance, and the effect of the whole. In such sequences, a dance, or a set of up to four dances, was used ‘to bringe in [the] songes’; this may have been a local practice. Although the dances were not sophisticated, this foreshadowed the development of the multi-movement, rather than multi-sectional, symphony that included dance-movements. Complete dances were also used between song sections, or pairs of sections, and effectively functioned as ritornelli. Holman has already noted the prevalence of dance-like writing in Restoration verse anthems and even more so in early odes, linking this to a perception that dance music was the violin’s natural idiom. However, the use of entire dances in this way was a modern concept in England of the 1660s and in this respect these works were groundbreaking, foreshadowing the extensive use of dance movements in Purcell’s odes of the 1680s and 1690s.

The component numbers used in building-block works were not necessarily the work of one single composer: Lowe’s ‘Nunc est canendum’, for example, ends with

---


the ‘Monke Sonata’ by Lambert Pietkin, and the unknown work or works by Locke and Rogers, referred to above, used instrumental movements by both. However, these works are not directly comparable to collaborative efforts such as the ‘Club Anthem’ of 1664 by John Blow, Pelham Humfrey and William Turner. In the case of ‘Nunc est canendum’, at least, there was apparently no actual collaboration by Pietkin, who is not known to have had direct contact with the Oxford musicians. This is not to suggest that there was any attempt to pass off Pietkin’s work as that of Lowe. The work was apparently well-known by the Oxford musicians and is ascribed to Pietkin in the parts. There is clear evidence in these sets that creation of original new works by a single individual in adherence to some sort of artistic vision was not a concept that was recognised at the time; this accords well with Herissone’s findings in that respect.\textsuperscript{139} In the case of ‘Nunc est canendum’, all that was important was how the Monke Sonata sounded in the context of the whole.

By the end of the 1660s, Oxford odes had departed from their origins as strings of individual pieces and had become fully-integrated, lengthy works. The practice of producing building-block apparently ceased there at this point. Edward Lowe’s ‘Eia eruditam’ of 1671 appears to be the first Oxford ode that was written – so far as it is possible to tell – entirely for one occasion by one composer. The set of parts for this work is the earliest dated set that was apparently specially produced, with all movements copied in order, rather than cannibalised from existing sets. However, integrated scores of entire works did not start to appear until the second half of the 1670s; there is no surviving complete score of ‘Eia eruditam’, but only separate scores of the instrumental and vocal sections. The eventual appearance of integrated full scores in Oxford is a measure of how the conception of the works had changed.

\textsuperscript{139} Herissone, \textit{Musical Creativity}, pp. 41-60.
The score versions of Oxford works of the 1660s and 1670s in particular should be regarded, therefore, as probably incomplete and even potentially misleading: any understanding of such works based only on score sources risks being substantially flawed. This trend of integration apparent in both parts and scores is also apparent in the music, which initially had not always included any actual concerted numbers, instead interspersing vocal and instrumental numbers without combining the forces directly. At least one fully concerted number quickly became essential. Increased integration of voices and instruments gradually followed: strings, which had originally played only in the dances and ritornelli, began to join the voices first in the choruses, then during verses also.

Many of the Oxford performing sets indicate that a vocal work often ended in performance with a set of dances or other instrumental work. Again, this is a detail of performance that the surviving scores do not show; however, the parts demonstrate clearly the function of these instrumental numbers in performance. King’s ‘Cantate domino’ ended with a set of three dances; Lowe’s ‘Nunc est canendum’ with the Monke Sonata for three violins by Lambert Pietkin; Lowe’s ‘Eia eruditam’ with a gavotte, and Locke’s ‘Ad te levavi’ with a Fantasia and Courante. In later years full suites became increasingly common: Lowe’s ‘Carminum praeses’ ended with a group of four dances, and Aldrich’s ode-pair ‘Conveniunt doctae sorores’ and ‘Hic sede Carolus’ ended with a group of five as late as 1682. Again this practice has not always been adequately recognised: Trowles, for example, has a tendency not to count the closing instrumental numbers in his catalogue entries of ode movements or his analysis of the works. The practice was fairly common

140 See Trowles, ‘The Musical Ode’, II, entries for ‘Nunc est canendum’ (p. 15), ‘Eia eruditam’ (p. 15), ‘Carminum praeses’ (third version listed, pp. 14-15), ‘Hic sede Carolus’ (p. 12). See also the entry for Aldrich’s lost setting of John Fell’s ‘In laudem musices’ (‘Musa quae sacra’ , p. 11) compared with Fell’s published text which gives details of Aldrich’s setting and lists four instrumental movements at
during Lowe’s tenure as Heather Professor and may have been linked to the contemporary practice of ending a theatre work with an instrumental suite.\textsuperscript{141} It seems to have died out at around the time of Lowe’s death in 1682, being gradually replaced by violin-accompanied final choruses. However, it is difficult to assess whether the practice may in fact have persisted a little longer, because of the lack of surviving sets of parts, the principal witness to its existence, for the five years following Lowe’s death. There are no examples of it among the sets from Richard Goodson’s time as Heather Professor. In ‘Carminum praeses’, the single such set from Lowe’s period that was revised and re-used by Goodson, the position of the dances was altered so that they no longer ended the work.

One trend that apparently began in the late 1670s was the fashion for pairing two substantial odes together. This was, in effect, an extension of the building-block principle: at first the two odes were probably intended only to provide contrast in performance. The first surviving such work appears to be Sampson Estwick’s pair ‘Io triumphe’/‘Julio festas’, probably of 1677, which included music by Goodson and Aldrich. That some effort was made to ensure they balanced each other is indicated by Aldrich’s and Blow’s ode-pair ‘Iam satis somno’/‘Diva quo tendis’ of 1679, the order of which was reversed before the first performance. The first ode-pairs by one single composer throughout, such as Goodson’s ‘Sacra musarum’/‘Iam resurgit’, and Aldrich’s ‘Conveniunt doctae sorores’/‘Hic sede Carolus’, probably date from the early 1680s. By the time of Lowe’s death in 1682 they had begun – rather rapidly – to show signs of increasing integration, such as the use of the same symphony to open both odes in Aldrich’s pair ‘Conveniunt doctae sorores’/‘Hic sede

\textsuperscript{141} I am grateful to Peter Holman for this suggestion.
Carolus’. This was a direct forerunner of the two-part odes of the eighteenth century, and another method by which works became longer and more ambitious in scope. This overall tendency, visible in the 1670s and early 1680s, was probably a direct result of the opening of the Sheldonian Theatre in 1669. The previous venue for Act music, St Mary’s Church, had been considerably smaller; the new setting was better suited to larger-scale music making. It may not be an exaggeration to say that the opening of the Sheldonian Theatre was influential in the development of concert music.

It is clear that understanding the performance materials is central to understanding early odes, and that the Oxford sets have much information to give in this respect. It follows that the lack of performance materials for early court odes is a significant problem in understanding the early development of the ode at court. This is a matter that the present study has served to highlight rather than to resolve: while some of the conventions of performance practice revealed or confirmed in the Oxford parts may also be relevant to court concerted music, others may not, as local performance conditions seem to have been significant in determining performance practice. One particular loss with the court performance materials of this period is the loss of any evidence of building-block court odes. The existence of these seems possible on the evidence of the Oxford parts and would have been a natural step given the collective composition practised in assembling the music for court masques.142 The discovery of any such that perhaps never existed in score form, but that date from earlier than the earliest known court odes, might alter the chronology of the ode’s known development.

The existence of the practice of building-block composition in the provinces during the 1690s, at least fifteen years after it apparently went out of fashion in Oxford, is demonstrated by the survival of a single surviving bass part apparently owned by Basil Ferrar (1667-1718) of Stamford in Lincolnshire. This gives a version of Purcell’s Cecilian ode ‘Welcome to all the Pleasures’ that is unknown elsewhere and was probably performed by the Stamford Music Club in 1696. In this version, Purcell’s ode is spliced together with a number of movements from Corelli’s trio sonatas Opp. 2-4. Whether the practice had spread from London or Oxford some decades earlier, or developed independently, and how widespread it was, is not known. White has made a convincing case that Basil Ferrar himself was the arranger of the work, but there is currently no evidence that Ferrar had Oxford links or attended any of the Acts. However, it may be that he did not chance upon this method of arrangement by accident, but had heard similar approaches taken elsewhere, perhaps in London or Cambridge if not in Oxford.

Despite the lack of any loose-leaf or single-occasion London parts from before c.1730 that might provide evidence, it is likely that the building-block method was widely used in ode composition, given that it was used in other musical genres at this time. For example, there are obvious parallels with the theatre practice of collaborative composition, which in turn influenced the development of both ballad operas and the pasticcio techniques popular in the eighteenth century. It is likely that the Oxford parts and Basil Ferrar’s bass part are the only remnants of a common

143 GB-Cfm MU.MS.685.

144 The majority are identified in Bryan White, ‘Mixing “Britain’s Orpheus” with “Corelli’s Heights”: a Cecilian Entertainment in Stamford’ (unpublished conference paper, 14th Biennial Conference on Baroque Music, Belfast, July 2010).
and widespread practice in ode performance, that was itself only one facet of a wider phenomenon. In particular, this creative method may have been practised by lesser composers and arrangers in clubs and societies similar to the Stamford Music Club, as a means by which they could produce works of substantial length with relatively little effort. However, most of the evidence of the seventeenth-century manifestation of this phenomenon is likely to be lacking, because of the loss of the majority of loose-leaf parts of this period.

Further work remains to be done in several areas. A detailed examination of paper types might enable more accurate dating of those sets which are currently of uncertain date, and hence a better chronology of the early works which were important in the ode’s development. A revised chronology of the development of the ode, and also the symphony anthem, should take into account the existence of building-block works and should aim to compare Oxford and court practice as far as can be determined. An examination of instrumental part-books, which were largely excluded from this study, for signs that they were used in such performances would be of value. A search for surviving loose-leaf performing materials of this period from other parts of England would be particularly useful as the Oxford materials demonstrate that such arrangements were commonly made directly in part format and never recorded in a score. These might give more information about the spread and significance of the practice of creating building-block works, as well as on the methods of doing so.
3: Sets of Parts from Oxford during the Professorship of

Richard Goodson (1682-1718)

The tenure of Richard Goodson senior as Heather Professor of Music began in July 1682, on the death of Edward Lowe, and lasted officially until Goodson’s own death in 1718, although his son and successor Richard Goodson junior had taken over his duties several years earlier.¹ Like Lowe, Goodson was a prolific copyist and the Music School’s collection continued to grow under his curatorship. The main sources of sets of parts from Goodson’s era are the same collections in which the sets from Lowe’s era have survived and which have been described in the previous chapter: the Music School collection in the Bodleian Library and the collection of Christ Church, Oxford, particularly the manuscripts deriving from the Aldrich and Goodson bequests. As described in the previous chapter, Goodson took stock of the Music School holdings at the beginning of his tenure in a surviving catalogue, which unfortunately does not give detailed listings of the sets of loose-leaf parts contained in the collection, and so is of no use as a dating aid.²

It is difficult to assess the sets of parts from the early years of Goodson’s tenure because of the lack of any surviving dated sets from the 1680s. Such as survive undated are difficult to date. Despite this, the performing parts from this period are particularly rich in information on two subjects. Like the sets from Lowe’s professorship, they give evidence of performance practice, such as ensemble size and composition, and the changes this underwent during the last two decades of the

¹ Robert Thompson, ‘Goodson, Richard (i)’, GMO [accessed 6 July 2014].
² GB-Ob Mus. Sch. C. 204*(R).
seventeenth century. In addition, they are evidence of the reworking during Goodson’s professorship of a number of odes from Lowe’s professorship for which performance sets were created by cannibalising the earlier sets. The survival of such sets does not necessarily indicate a policy change on Goodson’s appointment: the death of Charles II less than three years after Lowe’s death meant that any reuse of works became more obvious because textual references to the monarch in the performing materials had to be altered. From this, it is clear that the majority of surviving reworked sets date from the joint reign of William III and Mary II (1689-1702), or from the reign of Anne (1702-1714). As the reworked versions do not always survive in score, the performing sets give valuable evidence of the form these versions took and of the creative practices used in the recompositon of these odes.

**Oxford Performing Sets of the 1680s: the Dialogues Attributed to Francis Pigott**

Although no dated sets survive from this decade, the Christ Church collection contains two partial sets for masque-like compositions that are ascribed to Francis Pigott (1665-1704). The first of these works, the ‘Dialogue between ye Angels and Shepherds at Christs Birth:’ bears no attribution in the score and parts. The tentative identification of Pigott as the composer rests on the identification of the hand – which Milsom suggests may be Pigott’s autograph – with a copyist whose hand appears in other manuscripts in the Christ Church collection, in which a series

---

3 See Peter Holman, ‘Pigott, Francis’, GMO [accessed 6 July 2014].

4 GB-Och Mus. 1118, 1121 (parts) and 865A, fols. 1-6 (score).
of other dialogues ascribed to ‘Mr Pigot’ and ‘Mr Picket’ survive in parts.⁵ These dialogues combine to form a more substantial work, a type of masque in two halves, ‘Grumpolio and the Witch’ and the ‘Dialogue between Time, Fortune, Cupid and Hymen’."⁶ In fact, however, there is reason to believe that the hand may not be Pigott’s, as some samples of it contain what may be a signature, ‘WSp’, at the end of several pieces.⁷ This is unlikely to be a composer attribution, as it is not consistent with the scribe’s usual method of attributing works (‘Mr. Oldridge’ and so on). The fact that the scribe refers to Pigott in the third person appears to confirm this. The attribution of the ‘Dialogue Between the Angels and Shepherds’ to Pigott may therefore be unsafe.

The ‘Dialogue between the Angels and Shepherds’ is a series of instrumental and vocal numbers including solo songs and three-part choruses, as well as instrumental numbers for recorders, which also accompany at least one of the shepherds’ songs. It may be a type of masque: it is unclear from the surviving materials whether the performance was staged. This may have been the case if Pigott were indeed the composer, and if the work dated from his time in the Chapel Royal.⁸ If so, Pigott would have been under eighteen when he composed it. Perhaps it should more probably be considered as a work in the tradition of the academic dialogues held during the Acts, which were not staged.

---

⁵ See the entry for Mus. 865(A), John Milsom, CCLMC <http://library.chch.ox.ac.uk/music/page.php?set=Mus.+865%28A%29> [accessed 6 July 2014].

⁶ GB-Och Mus. 1211 and Mus 90-91.

⁷ See GB-Och Mus 90-91.

⁸ A work bearing some similarities to this survives in Durham (Thomas Drake, ‘Messiah, A Christ-Mass Song for Voices and Instruments’, GB-DRe MS D1), but this dates from at least two decades later (the first quarter of the eighteenth century); see Brian Crosby, A Catalogue of Durham Cathedral Music Manuscripts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 51.
The surviving score contains only the vocal numbers. The actual running order of
the work, plus the music for the instrumental numbers and accompaniment, is
revealed by the two surviving instrumental parts, as follows:

1. 1st Angel (treble): ‘Yee mighty heavens’
2. Chorus: ‘Hallelujah’
3. ‘Then a tune of flutes’.
4. Song (1st Shepherd, treble, with flutes) ‘See shepherds’
5. 1st Angel, ‘Shepherds be not afraide’
6. 2nd Angel (bass): ‘This day the worlds Creator’
7. Chorus of Angels, 2 parts (actually 3, ‘Glorie be to God’)
8. Flutes tune
9. 2nd Shepherd (bass), ‘Great is ye vision’
10. 1st Angel, ‘Angels and men’
11. Chorus of Angels and Shepherds, ‘Glory, power and praises’
12. Flutes tune

The two surviving parts were written into otherwise-blank part-books for second
recorder and bass – the first recorder part is missing – and are therefore borderline
cases for inclusion in this study. However, it seems probable that they either
functioned as single-occasion parts, or else are copied directly from the original
performing parts. Two other short works are copied in the books: a set of three
dance tunes by Lully, and the instrumental interludes to another concerted work
which does not survive in full, headed ‘To be playd between every vers of ye Song
of Acme & Septimus’; this is not either version of John Blow’s setting. The music
takes up only six leaves in each book: the remaining 42 and 41 leaves (for second
treble and bass respectively) are blank. This might support the identification of
Pigott as the composer and owner of the books, which could have been left behind
when he left Oxford. The title pages of the books read ‘Boocks for ye Recorder /
Second Treble’ and ‘Boocks for ye Recorder / Basus’ respectively; however, the

9 ‘Septimus and Acme: A Dialogue Set by Dr. John Blow’, The Theatre of Music Vol. I (London:
John Playford, 1685), pp. 68-73; idem, 2nd version, Amphion Anglicus (London: John Blow and Henry
Playford, 1700), pp. 171-177.
range of the bass part given for the ‘Dialogue between the Angels and the Shepherds’ is too great for a bass recorder. It may in fact be a stringed bass part for instrumental numbers played on recorders, rather than a part to be played on a bass recorder. The scoring for a pair of recorders and bass suggests a date in the early 1680s at the earliest, and also perhaps a link to the court. The Baroque recorder had apparently arrived in London with a group of French players, including James Paisible, around 1673. However, the first use of recorders in concerted music in England appears to have been around 1680, with works such as Purcell’s ‘Hark! Behold the Heavenly Quire’ from Theodosius (1680) and John Blow’s anthem ‘Lord who shall dwell’ (c.1681) being early examples. There are no other surviving recorder parts for concerted music among the Oxford sets.

The second concerted work attributed to Pigott for which parts survive, a group of dialogues beginning with ‘M’ Pickets Dialogue Between Grumpolio & y’ Witch [of Endor]’, is a substantial staged work in two halves. It may be a court masque brought by Pigott to Oxford on his leaving the Chapel Royal in 1683; alternatively, it might have been a country house masque performed in Oxford in the 1680s. The directions on the one surviving original part confirm that it was staged; the content of the second half of the text, a ‘Dialogue between Time, Fortune, Cupid and Hymen’ suggests that it might have been performed to celebrate a marriage. The first half consists of a series of short dialogues between Saul, the Witch of Endor and a

---


12 GB-Och Mus. 1211 (original performance part) and Mus 90-91 (copies of performance parts written into part-books). Milsom lists it as two works in the catalogue entry for ‘Mus.90-1’, but the performance directions clarify that it is effectively only one (CCLMC, <http://library.chch.ox.ac.uk/music/page.php?set=Mus.+90—1>, [accessed 6 July 2014]).
character called Grumpolio, interspersed with instrumental numbers and choruses, at least one of which is fully concerted. The performance directions in the parts, which refer to ‘Mr Pigot’ as the composer of the dialogues, imply that perhaps another composer was responsible for the dances; the work might therefore be another composite. The ‘Dialogue between Time, Fortune, Cupid and Hymen’ that forms the second half is also interspersed with choruses and ends with a concerted chorus. That it continues directly from the first half is indicated by a stage direction on the tenor voice part: ‘after the dance Cupid comes in upon which Saul Grumpo and the Witch and all the dancers goe off’ (Illustration 3.1). The imagery in the text of both halves and the references to dancers in the stage directions suggest a fairly lavish setting. Unfortunately there are no examples of court masque performing sets from this period with which to compare it.

The solo tenor part, GB-Och Mus. 1211, retains its original cream cartridge-paper wrapper and is the only source to give stage directions (see Illustration 3.1). It is apparently the only remnant of the original set. The other three surviving vocal parts are not loose-leaf, but have been copied by the same copyist into a set of already-existing part-books and are confusing and incomplete. One is a duplicate of the solo tenor part, another is an incomplete tenor chorus part, copied in the same book as the first, and the third seems to give the bass solos for the Ghost of Samuel and Grumpolio in the first half and Fortune in the second half. These have probably been
copied directly from the original set as file copies; they were clearly not intended for performance use, as the two tenor parts were copied in the one book. The part-books into which they were copied contain a mixture of theatre music and some instrumental numbers by Oxford composers, copied in various hands in two different sequences and with blank leaves filled in some time later by Richard Goodson junior. The masque parts are copied in the reverse sequence, after a group of parts in the same hand to various songs from Charles Davenant’s *Circe*, which cannot have been copied before 1677, the year of the first production, at the earliest.\(^{13}\) These are not the settings by Purcell: the bass line to ‘Young Phaon strove the bliss to taste’ fits the treble line that survives for John Banister’s setting.\(^{14}\) The masque copies in the part-books must therefore likewise date from 1677 or afterwards.

If ‘Grumpolio and the Witch’ and its associated dialogues are correctly ascribed to Pigott, they are likely to date from the relatively short period of his career which was spent in Oxford, unless they were composed before he left the Chapel Royal and brought with him from London. Pigott was discharged from the Chapel Royal on the breaking of his voice at Michaelmas, 1683, aged seventeen; posts as in Oxford soon followed, first as organist at St John’s College then at Magdalen College from 1686. He apparently returned to London in 1688, where his appointment as organist of the Temple Church and his marriage are both recorded in that year. He clearly retained contact with the Chapel Royal, as he was eventually appointed one of the organists in 1697. It is not recorded that he returned to Oxford before his death in 1704 and

\(^{13}\) See Julian Hoppit, ‘Davenant, Charles (1656-1714), Government Official and Political Economist’ in *ODNB* [accessed 17 July 2014].

\(^{14}\) *Wit and Mirth: or, Pills to Purge Melancholy [...] The Second Part*, (London: Henry Playford, 1700), p. 249.
the fact that his MusB of 1698 was taken at Cambridge may indicate that he did not retain contacts there.\textsuperscript{15} The work is therefore likely to date from before 1689.

As the instrumental parts are all missing, as well as all the chorus parts except one, which survives only in an incomplete copy, it is difficult to reconstruct the running order; slight inconsistencies between the parts copied in the part-books suggest that the original set might have been used more than once. As only vocal parts survive, no symphony is extant; other instrumental numbers survive only as cues in the vocal parts and cannot now be identified (see Illustration 3.1). However, the 35 numbers for which music or cues survive appear to have run approximately as follows:

1. Chorus, ‘Perplext with wars’
2. Ritornello
3. Song, Grumpolio & the witch (bass, treble; possibly ‘The prince of darkness greets you well’, Mus 91, fol. 27r.)
4. Ritornello
5. Dance
7. Ritornello
8. Dance
9. Chorus, ‘Wea’l scorne for to envy’ (Mus 91, fols. 24-25r.)
10. Soli/chorus, ‘Triumphant musick earth & sea’, solo verses as follows: tenor (‘No sooner did y’e dolphin save’); tenor (‘The winds as husht’); treble (‘Men like Tritons dancing’); bass (‘Neptune himself’), all interspersed with the chorus and ritornelli.
11. Dialogue between Saul and the witch, ‘Haile thou that hast ye keays’ (tenor, counter-tenor)
12. Chorus, ‘For that’s my father’
13. Ritornello
14. Dance
15. Dialogue: Saul/Ghost of Samuel (‘Grumpo’ in some parts), ‘Thus then I bow / Curs’d be that power’
16. Chorus ‘Thus then I bow’
18. Three-part chorus without strings, ‘Let tirants’
19. Ritornello
20. ‘Generall chorus’, four parts with voices and violins, ‘If both be just’
21. Dance
22. ‘Dialogue between Time, Fortune, Cupid and Hymen’: Song (Cupid) with chorus without violins after every verse (different text for each, first begins

\textsuperscript{15} Holman, ‘Pigott, Francis’, \textit{GMO}. 
'Hell accurst can onely prove’

23. Dance
24. Song (Hymen: tenor), ‘The war must be soft’
25. Song (Fortune: bass), ‘If fate had not decreed’, with chorus after every verse (different text for each, first begins ‘Fortune’s a plague’)
26. Ritornello
27. Verse (Time)
28. Dance
29. Verses for Love, Fortune, Time, Hymen (‘And thus joyned’)
30. Two-part chorus without violins, Love and Hymen (‘Love and Hymen come to pay’)
31. Two-part chorus, Time and Fortune (Time and fortune both agree’)
32. General chorus with violins, ‘All those blessings’
33. Two-part chorus, Love and Hymen (‘Love and Hymen come to pay’)
34. Two-part chorus, Time and Fortune
35. General chorus with violins, ‘All those blessings’

Confusingly, the character of Grumpolio seems to be identified with the Ghost of Samuel in the surviving parts. Possibly they were not regarded as the same character, but two different characters sung by the same bass singer. Saul was sung by a tenor and the witch probably by a high counter-tenor, as some of the songs are in the treble clef. The singer of Cupid was clearly not involved in the solos of the first half, as he or she entered on the exit of the majority of the characters from that half, as indicated by the above-quoted stage direction (see Illustration 3.1). However, the tenor solo part indicates that the tenor soloist sang the solos in No. 10 as well as Saul’s part in the first half and the part of Hymen in the second half, presumably changing costume during the fairly long song for Cupid and the dance that followed it.

**Performance Sets for Act Music of the 1690s**

Several dated sets survive from the 1690s, as well as several undated sets or partial sets that can be assumed to fall within this period. Although the precise chronology is sometimes a matter of guesswork, but they can be summarised as follows:
1. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 132 and GB-Och Mus. 1142B, fol. 58: ode-pair, probably for the Act of 1692, the first unidentified; the second is Sampson Estwick’s Ode to the Queen ‘O Maria, O diva’.

2. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.121: (?)Henry Aldrich or Sampson Estwick, Britannia (Act ode for 1693, ‘Dum mosa torpet’).16


5. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 130: Richard Goodson, ‘O cura divum’ (date uncertain; may be after 1700).

6. GB-Och Mus. 1188-9, fols. 42-5: Henry Purcell, ‘My song shall be alway’, partial autograph set of parts probably copied for Oxford use during the 1690s.18


8. GB-Och Mus. 1142B, fols. 54-55: single bass part to an anonymous unidentified ode, late seventeenth century.

---

16 Identified as an arrangement of Carissimi; on that basis, the composer may be Aldrich. See Trowles, ‘The Musical Ode’, II, p. 13. However, the score is in the hand of Charles Husbands junior with addenda by Estwick: see John Milsom, ‘Mus. 619 (ff.20-27)’, CCLMC <http://library.chch.ox.ac.uk/music/page.php?set=Mus.+619+%28ff.+20--27%29> [accessed 17 July 2014].


18 See the discussion in Shay and Thompson, Purcell Manuscripts, pp. 153 and 157.
In addition, at least two sets survive that are of earlier origin but appear to have been reworked during this decade:

   (‘Revixit io Carolus’ of c.1681 with minor alterations, probably c.1694-1702).\(^ {19} \)

10. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 129: Richard Goodson, reworking of Edward Lowe, ‘Carminum praeses’; possibly 1695.\(^ {20} \)

The set for the pair of Act songs in GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 132 was probably composed and first performed in or soon after 1692, as Edward Hannes’s text for the second song, ‘O Maria O diva’, was published in Oxford that year.\(^ {21} \) Estwick’s setting cannot date from after the death of Mary II in December 1694 and must date from at least a couple of years beforehand, as the parts show signs of having been reused at least once in an altered version or versions, which are again likely to date from within Mary’s lifetime. The reuse of the parts therefore probably took place not long after the original performance. It may be that the work was used to mark one or more of Mary’s periods of regency in 1692, 1693 and 1694.\(^ {22} \)

The first ode in the pair, to an unknown text, survives only in instrumental bass parts; in one of the subsequent performances it was apparently extended by the addition of a final chorus. The second ode, ‘O Maria O diva’, was apparently originally in six numbers. The vocal parts indicate that two extra numbers were later

---

\(^ {19} \) See the discussion in Ch.2, pp. 89-91.

\(^ {20} \) See Herissone, ““To Entitle Himself to ye Composition””.


\(^ {22} \) W. A. Speck, ‘Mary II (1662-1694), Queen of England, Scotland and Ireland’, ODNB [accessed 20 December 2014].
added at the end: one bass verse (‘Alter sonabit tu bona’), plus a further repeat of the chorus, ‘O Maria O diva’, which had already been heard twice. These alterations evidently took place after the initial copying of the parts, although possibly before the first performance. The final alteration was the removal of the three-voice verse ‘O Diva defende’, which simplified the structure so that the work consisted of a symphony followed by three verse-chorus pairs. On the evidence of the vocal parts, this may have been done after the first alteration. The original version survives in two treble chorus parts and one solo tenor part. The second version, with the additional verse and chorus, survives in a solo bass and a tenor chorus part, the second of which appears to have been reused in the third performance version by simply deleting the tacet cue for the verse ‘O Diva defende’ to produce this final version. One further bass chorus part gives this version, and was evidently copied after the final change was made as the cue for the cut verse is not present.

Unfortunately, there are only three surviving instrumental parts for ‘O Maria O diva’: a second violin and a bass, plus a viola part that has been separated from the other two.23 The part is headed ‘Symp: Second Song Tenor:’ and gives the work’s symphony in the hand of Charles Husbands junior, along with three further movements, apparently two ritornelli and a chorus, in a different hand.24 According to the score, the viola played only in the symphony and did not take part in the rest of the work; the three further movements given in the viola part do not correspond with any in the score.25 However, from the heading (‘Second Song’) it seems that this part belongs with the others. It is currently unclear what the three further

23 Now in a modern guardbook in the Christ Church collection, GB-Och Mus 1142B, fol. 58.
25 GB-Och Mus. 619, fols. 28-30.
movements are or their precise connection with the rest of the work; possibly this is merely a case of spare paper being used up on a later occasion. This is one of the earliest viola parts for a concerted work to survive in Oxford, with only one other known to survive from this decade: the partial-autograph viola part for Henry Purcell’s symphony anthem ‘My song shall be alway’.

Sets of parts from this decade continue to show differences between ‘score’ versions of a work and that transmitted in the parts. For example, the parts for Goodson senior’s ‘Quis efficace carmine Pindarus’ show that the overture was played twice through and that the violins reduced to one per part when directly accompanying the voices, neither of which details are marked in the score. The single surviving violin part for Henry Aldrich’s anthem ‘I will exalt thee’ gives a symphony that does not appear in the score; it also clarifies that the first triple-time section is repeated after the first verse, and that the violins double the upper voices in the final verse and the chorus; again these details are not marked in the score.26

John Blow’s ode-pair ‘Gesta Britannica’ is interesting as it shows further development of the ode-pair as a form. The two halves of the ode are still called ‘First Song’ and ‘Second Song’, though the whole may by now have been acknowledged as one single entity. The two halves are unified by the repetition of the same eight-part multi-section chorus at the end of each song, as well as by identical scoring (SSATB soloists, eight-part chorus, violins and continuo). It is clear from the direction ‘Grand chorus repeated from the first song’ that the two odes were performed together. This is, therefore, not merely a case of a chorus from one work being recycled in another; the two songs should clearly be considered as two

26 GB-Och Mus. 1142B, fols. 62-3 (violin 1) and GB-Och Mus. 19, pp. 157-162 (full score).
parts of one work, rather than as two separate works.\textsuperscript{27} The set provides some evidence of the use of more than one continuo instrument, as the scores of both songs are figured, although there are also separately surviving continuo parts for both. Possibly the scores were used by the organist and the additional continuo parts by a theorbo player.

The second version of ‘Carminum praeses’ was apparently prepared by Richard Goodson from Edward Lowe’s original (see Chapter 2) for a performance at some point during the reign of William III, probably for his visit to Oxford in 1695.\textsuperscript{28} The set is particularly interesting because the reworked parts display the changes that were necessary – apart from altering the text – to make an outdated work conform to current fashions some twenty years after it was first written. The instrumental sections had lessened in importance and had to be trimmed by cutting some of the repeats and excising some dances altogether, so that they were in sets of three instead of four or five. A chorus, ‘O populi venite’, was added after the first verse, and the set of five tunes originally placed after the first verse was cut to only three. The most significant change was the addition of another chorus after the set of dances that originally ended the work: Goodson deleted the original final chorus, ‘Grata pax longum’, cut the following set of four dances down to three, and reordered them. A reprise of the chorus ‘O populi venite’ was then added after the dances, becoming the new final number; this seems to confirm that the custom of ending works with a group of instrumental numbers was not practised by this point.

Of the instrumental parts, the joint solo tenor/first violin part that was used in both Lowe’s and Goodson’s performances shows a reduction of repeated sections in

\textsuperscript{27} They are listed as separate works in \textit{GMO}: see Bruce Wood, ‘Blow, John’, \textit{GMO} [accessed 7 July 2014].

\textsuperscript{28} Herissone, “‘To Entitle Himself to ye Composition’”. 
the dances retained in Goodson’s version: sections that had been played three times over were cut to twice.\textsuperscript{29} Four new instrumental parts (first and second violins and two single-stave, unfigured bass parts) were copied for this occasion and bear the names ‘Mr Trapp’ and ‘Mr Soans’ on the first part and ‘Mr Wheeler’ and ‘Mr Banester’ on the second, indicating that instrumental part-sharing was practised in Oxford by the 1690s.\textsuperscript{30} The last-named of these players was probably the violinist John Banister junior.\textsuperscript{31}

\textit{The Oxford Sets of 1700-1714}

The Oxford Act apparently lapsed between 1703 and 1713.\textsuperscript{32} Despite this, ten partial performing sets that probably date from the first decade of the eighteenth century, and that meet the criteria for inclusion here, survive in the Oxford collections. They include two imported Italian sets for partial Mass settings ascribed to Giovanni Battista Borri, an Italian composer about whom little is known, that survive in Christ Church.\textsuperscript{33} These sets transmit a Kyrie and Gloria in F from a ‘Messa a 4 con V.V. e Rip’; and a five-part Credo, which is not necessarily part of the same Mass setting but seems to have been used together with it.\textsuperscript{34} As with the Italian set for ‘Quam dulcis es amabile Jesu’ (see Chapter 2), they display signs of Oxford use rather than

\textsuperscript{29} GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 129, fols. 9-12. See the discussion of this part, Chapter 2, p. 88.

\textsuperscript{30} GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 129, fols.13r. and 17r.

\textsuperscript{31} Peter Holman and David Lasocki, ‘Banister: (3) John Banister (ii)’, \textit{GMO} [accessed 17 July 2014].

\textsuperscript{32} Johnstone, ‘Music and Drama’, pp. 200-201.

\textsuperscript{33} Sandra Mangsen, ‘Borri, Giovanni Battista’, \textit{GMO} [accessed 30 July 2014].

\textsuperscript{34} GB-Och Mus 1085-1108 (Kyrie and Gloria); GB-Och Mus 1162-71 (Credo).
being unused souvenirs. These Italian sets are part of a bigger group of late-seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century performing sets for Italian motets in Christ Church that were apparently used in performance by the Music School, Goodson and Aldrich, but which are excluded from the present study because they are either for solo voice and instrumental ensemble, or for multiple voices with no instrumental accompaniment other than basso continuo.  

Twelve vocal and twelve instrumental parts survive for the Kyrie and Gloria, and six vocal and four instrumental for the Credo. These parts, which are all by the same unidentified Italian copyist and apparently entered Christ Church via the Aldrich bequest, are the earliest surviving sources for these works. Many are marked with the names of Oxford performers. In addition to being used in performance, they served as models for further part-copying: a second set of parts for the Kyrie, Gloria and Credo was copied by Thomas Ford in 1720, apparently for the Music School. Duplicates copied by Ford deriving from these are now in Durham Cathedral and Chapter Library, having presumably reached Durham with the Oxford musician Richard Fawcett who later became Prebendar of Durham Cathedral. Around 1730, Richard Goodson junior copied four duplicate parts for the Kyrie and Gloria into a set of nine part-books (GB-Och Mus. 68-75) containing an assortment of works by various composers, and one other into Mus 529, part of a set of five part-

---

35 See, for example, GB-Och Mus. 1154 C- F*, GB-Och Mus 688-90.


37 GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D 232 nos. 1-9; nos. 10-12 were later added by Goodson. See Milson, ‘Mus. 1162-71’.

books; these seemingly also derived from Ford’s set.\textsuperscript{39} Two score copies, that may have been owned by the Academy of Ancient Music, survive containing both works; Johnstone has also identified an earlier score of the Kyrie and Gloria alone that was probably prepared in Oxford around 1700, directly from the Christ Church parts, and that may have been used with them.\textsuperscript{40} The original two sets of parts held by Christ Church were therefore the source for a fairly widespread transmission of the work in the eighteenth century, in Oxford and London at least. It is not known that the work was ever performed in Durham – the set there was far from complete – but the original sets appear to have been used in Oxford in the early decades of the eighteenth century (discussed below); the duplicate parts copied by Goodson may be linked to Oxford performances in the first half of the eighteenth century; the Academy of Ancient Music may have performed the work in London; and it is possible that the Concerts of Ancient Music also performed the work there in the late eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{41}

The history of the two Borri sets in Christ Church is explained in a note inside the folder for Thomas Ford’s part-book set in the Music School collection:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{39} Burrows, ‘Sources for Oxford Handel Performances’, 180.

\textsuperscript{40} Respectively GB-Lwa MS CG 28 (b) and (c); GB-Lcm MS 1063, and GB-Lcm MS 1059, fols. 39-57. According to Johnstone, this last includes performer names that match many of those in the Christ Church parts. See Johnstone, ‘Westminster Abbey’, pp. 339-40, 359 and 369.

\textsuperscript{41} See Milsom, ‘Mus. 1162-71’, and note 39 above.

\textsuperscript{42} GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 232, inside front board of folder.
From this it appears they were donated to Aldrich by John Freind, perhaps because of Aldrich’s interest in Italian models. Freind was a physician and Professor of Chemistry at Oxford who travelled to Spain in 1705 as physician to the Earl of Peterborough during the War of the Spanish Succession.\(^{43}\) He visited Rome on his return journey in 1707 and probably acquired the Borri sets there; Ford’s note is rare evidence of how many of these imported sets might have reached England. The twelve vocal parts for the Kyrie and Gloria consist of ‘concerto’ parts plus first and second ripieni for each voice and seem to comprise the entire set. Many of these bear performers’ names, some deleted or overwritten, from which it is clear that the set was used more than once in Oxford. Some carry two names side by side, which may be an indication that the part was shared. It might also be the result of reuse; however, later sets seem to indicate that obsolete performer names were often deleted, probably to avoid confusion. Milsom suggests the names indicate a performance around 1710; if so, the presence of Sampson Estwick’s name indicates that he continued to be involved in Oxford performances long after his departure from the city in the 1690s.\(^{44}\)

There are likewise twelve instrumental parts, consisting of two each of first and second violins, one viola and, surprisingly, seven organ parts. As this use of multiple organs was characteristic of Rome, this suggests that Freind did indeed acquire the set there.\(^{45}\) One of those, which is headed ‘Leuto, o Organo’ and bears the name ‘M Francesco’ was probably used by the lutenist. The other organ parts

\(^{43}\) Anita Guerrini, ‘Freind, John (1675-1728)’, *ODNB* [accessed 8 July 2014]; John B. Hattendorf, ‘Mordaunt, Charles, Third Earl of Peterborough and First Earl of Monmouth (1658?-1735)’, *ODNB* [accessed 8 July 2014].

\(^{44}\) Milsom, ‘Mus. 1085-1108’; see also Robert Thompson, ‘Estwick, Sampson’, *GMO* [accessed 21 December 2012]. I thank Alan Howard for this point.

\(^{45}\) I am grateful to Peter Holman for this suggestion.
divide into three for the concertists and three for the ripienists, with each chorus possessing an ‘Organo Grosso’ and a principal and ripieno organ. The principal organist for the concertists was Richard Goodson, presumably the elder, whose name is on the part. Given the lack of names on the other organ parts, it is possible that they were simply never used in Oxford: there is no evidence that performances with six or seven organs took place there, and it is doubtful whether this number of instruments could have been accommodated in any of the venues used by Oxford musicians at the time. This appears to be confirmed by the contents of Ford’s set, discussed below. None of the other instrumentalists are named apart from Court and Lowen who shared the Violino Primo Concerto part. The set of parts to the Credo is considerably smaller than that to the Kyrie and Gloria and clearly incomplete: the survival of one ripieno vocal part and an ‘Organo P.’ implies the loss of other ripieno parts and a second organ part at least.

The set copied by Ford transmits his own eight-part version of the Kyrie, Gloria and Credo. Ford removed all ripieno parts and reduced the bass section to two parts, violone and one organ, producing a version of the Kyrie and Gloria for canto, alto, tenor and bass voices, first and second violins, viola and bass. In the Credo, the viola is replaced with a second canto part written into the viola book, so that the movement remains in five voice parts while still only requiring eight participants. The fact that Ford produced this version suggests that the seven organ parts of the original set did not reflect standard Oxford practice.

The partial set copied by Ford that Fawcett took with him to Durham apparently consists of duplicates of Ford’s first set, though the inscription in the Music School set makes clear that the nine books of that set (the bass part is in two books, violone
and organ) are complete as they stand. 46 Three more books, containing duplicates of the two violin and the violone parts, were copied by Richard Goodson junior a little later to add to Ford’s Music School set. The set’s subsequent history is evidence of the confusion as to ownership of some of the Music School manuscripts. The twelve books appear as No. 19 in William Clement’s attempt of 1747 at a catalogue of Goodson’s bequest to Christ Church. It seems that the set, although rightly the property of the Music School, had been in Goodson junior’s possession on his death in 1741, and had passed with the rest of his library to Christ Church. On the mistake being discovered, the entry was deleted and the set returned to the Music School. 47

As the Act had largely lapsed during this period, apart from the celebrations in 1703 and 1713, most of the eight sets that remain to be examined must have been used at other formal or celebratory occasions. The latest of these sets apparently date from the period 1713-1714; none are known to survive from the remaining four years of Goodson senior’s tenure. These sets can be summarised as follows:


2. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.143; GB-Och Mus 1142 b, ff. 46-9 and. f. 64; GB-Och Mus. 1141a, fols. 8-9; GB-Och Mus. 1141b, fols. 90-93; GB-Och Mus. 1142b, fol. 64: Richard Goodson junior, ‘Festo quid potius die’, early eighteenth-century.

46 GB-Dre MS E31/1-4, four part-books (alto voice, tenor voice, second violin and ‘Tenore viola di melia e soprano’ containing the viola of the Kyrie and Gloria and the soprano voice of the Credo); see Burrows, ‘Sources for Oxford Handel Performances’, 180.

47 Milsom, ‘Mus. 1162-71’. Clement’s amendment reads ‘Restored to the Music School having been left by Mr. Ford’.
3. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.125: (?) Sampson Estwick, recomposition of Henry Aldrich’s ‘Iam satis somno’ (date of revision uncertain, but probably 1702-1714 because of reference to Anne).  


5. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.128: Henry Aldrich, ‘Carminum praeses’, 26 April 1706, adapted from Goodson’s earlier version of Lowe’s original.  


The score of Goodson senior’s ode ‘O qui potenti’ was separated from the parts and entered the Christ Church collection with the Goodson bequest. It carries a note in the hand of Goodson senior, stating that it was composed ‘for the Theatre / In Oxon’; a later hand has clarified that this was ‘on account of some early successes / in Queen Ann’s reign’. As with other scores of Act music, it may have been used in performance by the organist. The rest of the set is surprising: although it is fairly large, there are fewer instrumental parts than vocal parts, implying – unusually – a

---

48 See Ch.2, pp. 86-89; the score to Estwick’s insertions is probably early eighteenth-century. See John Milsom, ‘Mus. 1142b (f.51)’, CCLMC <http://library.chch.ox.ac.uk/music/page.php?set=Mus.+1142b+%28f.+51%29> [accessed 7 July 2014].  

49 Herissone, ‘Richard Goodson the Elder’s Ode’.  

50 Herissone, ‘To Entitle Himself to ye Composition’. See also the discussion on Goodson’s version above, and Lowe’s version in Ch.2.
smaller instrumental than vocal ensemble, even when possible part-sharing among
the instrumentalists is allowed for. There are ten surviving vocal parts: four trebles
(two first, one second and one third) and two each of counter-tenor, tenor and bass
parts. The singer of the tenor solos apparently also sang the bass part in the choruses.
There are only four instrumental parts: first and second violins, viola and an
unfigured bass part. The inside cover of the score is annotated by Richard Goodson
junior with ‘A List of ye single parts wrote out – / of ye Song herein contain’d’, and
according to this list, the parts as they survive are complete. However, it is likely
that the list dates not from the work’s composition, but from Goodson junior’s
inheritance of his father’s effects in 1718, at which point he made an abortive
attempt to catalogue the Music School holdings.51 There is, however, nothing in
either the instrumental or the vocal parts to suggest that originally more existed, and
it would have been unusual for duplicate parts to have been deliberately culled as
early as 1718, at which point they might have still been needed for reuse.

The set for ‘Festo quid potius die’ is apparently the only surviving set for a work
by Richard Goodson junior. It is also an extreme example of the confusion between
the Music School and Christ Church collections. Twelve of the parts (eight vocal
and four instrumental) are in the Music School collection, while two duplicate
instrumental parts, a fragment of a vocal part, one full score and one composing
score are in Christ Church. The solo treble part is split across the two collections,
with most of it surviving in the Music School collection although one solo verse is in
Christ Church.52 The surviving vocal parts are one solo and one ripieno part for each
of treble, counter-tenor, tenor and bass parts, although the two treble parts are

52 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 143, fols. i-1 and GB-Och Mus. 1142b, fol. 64.
labelled as ‘First Treble’ (the solo part) and ‘Second Trebble’ (the ripieno). The instrumental parts consist of first and second violins, ‘Second Tenor’ and ripieno bass. The first viola part does not survive, but the score confirms that the two viola parts were independent; this is apparently the only surviving Oxford set in the scoring two violins, two violas and bass. There is no written-out continuo bass part, but it is likely that the full score fulfilled this function. Several of the parts bear corrections, but it is unclear whether these were made before the first performance or for a subsequent performance. The Music School bass part includes rare performance markings, ‘Loud’ and ‘Soft’, added in ink to the penultimate chorus.

Goodson senior’s ode ‘Janus did ever’, composed ‘for the Theatre / - - Oxon - - / After The Victory at Blenheim’, according to a note on the score in the hand of Goodson junior, may have been performed on New Year’s Day, 1705. The set of parts is a fairly substantial one and has been carefully produced and kept. The ten instrumental parts give the music to an unidentified three-movement overture in B minor as well as to ‘Janus did ever’; the overture cannot belong to the main work – which in any case already has an instrumental prelude – as it is in B minor as opposed to C major, as Herissone has noted. However, given its presence in the parts, it was probably included in the same performance, possibly before the reading of the congratulatory verse that apparently preceded the ode.


54 Ibid., p.168, note 12.

55 The verses published as Plausus musarum Oxoniensium; sive Gratulatio academicae ob res prospere terra marique gestas. In comitiis philologiciis habitis in Theatro Sheldoniano calendis Januarii 1704 [=1705 n.s.] were probably read on the occasion. Herissone, ‘Richard Goodson the Elder’s Ode’, p. 168.
The surviving set consists of two first violin parts, two second violin parts, one ripieno bass and one continuo bass, plus a viola part and an extra ripieno bass for the overture only, which might imply the loss of an extra such bass part for the ode. The eight surviving vocal parts (counter-tenor and bass solo parts; and three treble and one each of counter-tenor, tenor and bass chorus parts) clearly do not represent the complete set, as there should be at least one additional tenor part giving the tenor solo in the opening verse. The parts therefore imply a chorus of six adults (one soloist and one ripienist per part) and three to six boys, depending on whether the boys shared parts, against a band of at least four violins and three bass players, plus the organ at which Goodson probably read from the surviving score. It may be that the boys did not share on this occasion, as six trebles against two each on the other parts would be badly balanced, unless further ripieno parts for the other voices have been lost. The parts show no signs of reuse and indeed are unlikely to have been further used, as the text would have been unsuitable for any occasion other than that for which it was written. Other odes, such as ‘Revixit io Carolus’, could be altered to suit a new occasion by rewriting the text of one section and then substituting the name of one king for another throughout the rest of the text; but even this would have been impossible in the case of ‘Janus did ever’. This is, therefore, the first set surviving from this period which is almost certainly a genuine single-occasion set.

Aldrich’s version of ‘Carminum praeses’, adapted from Goodson’s adaptation of Lowe’s original, was apparently performed in April 1706 to mark the bicentenary of the founding of the University of Frankfurt on the Oder.\(^56\) The large performing set also contains parts for a ‘First Musick’ which does not appear to be integrated into the ode in any way. Again, this may have been played at the start of the ceremony to

\(^{56}\) GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.128.
bring in the readings, with the ode being performed afterwards. None of the earlier performing parts were reused for this version: all seem to have been copied new. Two of the instrumental parts are on smaller paper than the others; both of these are also the only ones to lack the movements headed ‘The First Musick’. This may indicate that the copying of the parts was done in two stages, perhaps with a basic set being copied before the ‘First Musick’ had been written, rather than indicating reuse of the set. This theory is supported by the fact that the full score is copied on the same smaller-format paper as the two small-format parts; also, reuse in a different context would have necessitated deletion of the references to the University of Frankfurt on the Oder, which has not occurred.

There are no verses for solo voice in this ode; the verses interspersed between the choruses are set for four (Tr, CT, T, B) and two voices (T, B). The surviving vocal set consists of two concertists’ parts per voice, each giving the entire ode with no indication that any of the singers should omit verses; plus ripieno parts for countertenor and tenor voices, giving only the choruses.57 Again it seems likely that ripieno parts for the bass and treble voices are missing from the set. This suggests the verses were sung by a small group consisting of two voices per part (possibly four in the case of the trebles if parts were shared), with ripienists joining in the choruses. The instrumental set consists of three first and two second violin parts and three unfigured bass parts; probably Goodson played the continuo on the organ from the full score. The parts bear slight pencil marking-up, such as repeat marks and highlighting of the start of the first chorus. They have also been checked through and the total bar numbers noted at the end of each section in the manner that became fairly standard in the checking of sets of parts for large works later in the century.

57 As in the previous chapter, it should be noted that the terms ‘concerto’ and ‘ripieno’ are not original to the parts.
The vocal parts in particular suggest a slightly bigger ensemble than had previously been usual. This may have been part of a general trend at the start of the eighteenth century towards larger ensembles in concerted music. However, in the absence of a significant-sized sample of performing sets from this period, it is hard to be sure.

The set of parts for Goodson senior’s ‘Rejoice in the Lord’ is actually two sets conflated. A note on the score by Philip Hayes states that the anthem was ‘Probably compos’d for the Public / Act in 1713 and Perform’d at S† Mary’s / Church / or still earlier, upon the / Accession of King William.’ Hayes’s earlier estimate would give a date of 1689 for the anthem’s composition. A further note by Goodson junior, the copyist of most of the parts, reads as follows: ‘June – 15 – 1734 / This Anthem, having / been for a considerable / Time Lain by, was / in y‘ Single Parts / wanting, excepting / Instrumental Parts / 4 / Tenor Part & / Treble’. It is clear that the parts have indeed been copied in two batches, with the instrumental parts – one each of first and second violins, ‘Tenor Viol:’ and bass – plus tenor and treble voice parts being the original set as stated in Goodson’s note, and two counter-tenors, one tenor and one bass vocal parts having been copied later. Corrections on paste-downs or pinned slips are present in parts from both batches, implying the work underwent alteration at least once after the copying of the new batch of parts. The set demonstrates that reuse of repertoire that was at least two decades old – even if Hayes’s hypothesis about the earlier origin of the work is unlikely – was still occurring in Oxford as late as the mid-1730s.

The final two Oxford performing sets surviving from this period are those for William Morley’s ‘Let the shrill trumpet’s loud alarms’ and John Isham’s ‘O

---

58 GB-Och Mus. 1219(I), fol. 1r.; see John Milsom, ‘Mus. 1219(I-T)’, CCLMC [accessed 9 July 2014].
tuneful God’. Both Morley and Isham supplicated for the degree of B.Mus. in the
week following the Act of 1713, but without having prepared degree exercises,
which they were then obliged to submit within twelve months. The works had to
be performed in public, but there was no Act the following year; in fact, no public
Act was celebrated again until 1733, the last such. The performance of both works
therefore probably took place in the Music School, perhaps on the same occasion.
Morley’s set is rather small, and it may be that he lacked the financial resources to
pay a large group of performers. There are only five vocal parts, of which the first
treble, counter-tenor, tenor and bass are solo parts, while the second treble joins only
in the final chorus, thereby meeting the statutory requirement for a five-part chorus.
There are six instrumental parts, of which five are autograph and probably form the
original set: first and second violins, viola, ‘Bass Violin’ and a figured ‘Through
Base’. The bass violin part is the first such surviving among the Oxford sets;
however, it does not play throughout. The sixth instrumental part is another, non-
autograph copy of the first violin, the paper of which does not match the other five
parts.

If the instrumental parts were shared, the set implies an ensemble of two first and
two second violins, one or two violas, one or two stringed bass instruments and a
keyboard, against three adult singers and two to four boys, if the boys’ parts were
doubled in the chorus. Confusingly, a section in the autograph first violin part is
marked ‘two violins’, but there is no corresponding instruction in non-autograph
copy of the first violin part, or in the second violin part. It is therefore unclear
whether Morley intended that the section should be played by a smaller group of

60 Johnstone, ‘Music and Drama’, p. 212.
strings than the rest of the work, consisting of two per part, or whether it indicates that solo first and second violins should play at this point. Whichever is correct, it is a detail of scoring that the score does not give. In the first case, the instruction would additionally suggest that more than two players might have played from the one part, and that the number of string players in the ensemble was greater than the surviving set seems to indicate.

Isham’s set is rather bigger than Morley’s and this, together with the fact that he paid copyists to produce his set, implies that he had greater financial resources. The vocal parts, which seem to be complete, consist of two first and two second treble chorus parts, solo and chorus counter-tenor parts, two tenor chorus parts and solo and chorus bass parts, implying a group of six adult singers and at least four boys. The instrumental parts, which seem to be likewise complete, consist of two each of first and second violins, one viola part and two basses, neither of which is figured, implying a group of up to eight violins, two violas and four basses. Both bass parts contain the whole work: evidently the practice of having a bowed bass play throughout was beginning to occur in Oxford. However, it was probably still not the norm, as the bass violin to Morley’s work does not play throughout. It is likely that a score would have functioned as the organ part, perhaps the surviving presentation score in the hand of thirteen-year-old James Kent.\(^6\) Isham’s autograph score is missing and must have remained in his possession. An indication of how direction functioned in performance is given by the two first violin parts, both of which are marked ‘lead’ at the start of the Adagio in the Overture; this probably indicates that the part was in the lead at this point, not that one particular individual was to lead.

---

Conclusions

The Oxford performing sets surviving from Goodson’s period show many similarities with those from Lowe’s period. They do not seem to show much alteration either in ensemble size or in conventions of part-copying, which apparently remained stable for the period of Goodson’s leadership after a period of change during Lowe’s professorship. However, as many of the surviving sets from the Goodson years are incomplete, with instrumental parts being particularly affected, any increase in ensemble size might be hard to spot. One set of parts, for Aldrich’s version of ‘Carminum praeses’, does indicate a larger vocal group than had previously been the norm. The set provides interesting evidence of verses being sung by a group of concertists singing two-per-line (each with individual copies of the part) and ripienists joining in the chorus sections. There appears to be no evidence for this practice elsewhere among the Oxford sets, so perhaps it was not widespread.

The sets examined here continue to show differences between the ‘score’ version of a work and that transmitted in the parts. However, the differences are less marked than was the case during the period 1660-1684, being mainly confined to instances of repeated ritornelli, reduced scoring or violin doubling of voice-parts shown in the parts but not present in the score version. For example, Goodson’s set for ‘Quis efficace carmine Pindarus’ shows that the overture was played twice through and that there was a reduction in the numbers of accompanying violins during vocal sections. The parts for Aldrich’s ‘I will exalt thee’ show violin doubling of the voices and an extra repeat of a ritornello, neither of which are present in the score. The parts also give evidence that the reworking of old odes for use on a subsequent occasion was frequently practised; the reworked versions often do not survive in
score. As the works were occasional, reworking often involved altering the text, the simplest means by which such reuse can be tracked. The text changes in the parts confirm that such recomposition was, in the case of these odes, driven largely by performance requirements. That so many performances apparently took place of what should have been quite outdated music, using instrumentation that was considerably less adventurous than contemporary London practice had become, is perhaps an indicator of how musically conservative Oxford was.

The most obvious departure from the Oxford practice of Lowe’s lifetime is demonstrated by the survival of viola parts. Two survive that probably date from the 1690s and seven from the period c.1700-1714, compared with none at all from the period of Lowe’s professorship. Examination of the scores also shows the inclusion of violas in John Blow’s ‘Gesta Britannica’ and Goodson’s ‘O cura divum’, although the viola parts to these are now missing; it is probably significant that Blow, a court composer, was among the early users of the viola in Oxford. Only a few sets contain parts for other new types of instrument. The earliest of these is the partial set of parts for the ‘Dialogue between the Angels and Shepherds at Christ’s Birth’, possibly by Francis Pigott, from which one recorder part survives of the original two. If Pigott was the composer, it is possible that this set originated in London and that this is the reason for the up-to-date scoring, which was apparently not the norm in Oxford at the time. William Morley’s ode ‘Let the shrill trumpet’s loud alarms’ did not include trumpets – perhaps Morley could not afford them – but is the only work among the Oxford performing sets for which a part labelled ‘Bass Violin’ survives. A further departure from previous practice occurs in the set for John Isham’s ‘O tuneful God’, which includes parts for bowed bass instruments that play throughout.

---

62 See also Ch. 2 for a discussion of the viola part in Blow’s ‘Diva quo tendis’.
All innovations in instrumentation visible in the parts appear therefore to have been practised first by the London composers Blow, Pigott, Isham and Morley. These may be instances of London composers bringing more modern practices to Oxford. Alternatively, it may be that the surviving parts provide a misleading view which further research on the scoring of Oxford works of this period could rectify. For example, Goodson’s early-eighteenth-century ode in praise of Queen Anne, ‘With eager hast’, which is not discussed here, includes an oboe in the scoring, although the actual part is lost.\textsuperscript{63} Further work remains to be carried out comparing the surviving performing sets with the scoring of works for which no sets now survive, to determine whether the surviving performing sets are representative of Oxford works in general during this period.

There is evidence of part-sharing between instrumentalists in the parts produced for Goodson’s version of ‘Carminum praeses’ and probably also in the Italian set for Borri’s Kyrie and Gloria. However, there is no evidence of part-sharing between the singers in any of these sets, although an isolated example of a bass part apparently intended for sharing by a singer and an instrumentalist, in the manner of the joint voice and violin parts that survive from Lowe’s period, survives in a partial set that does not meet the criteria for inclusion here.\textsuperscript{64} Practice in this respect seems to have become similar to that visible in later English sets (see Chapters 4-6) and to Bach’s performing practice as described by Parrott: instrumentalists may have shared parts, but singers did not.\textsuperscript{65} The performers’ marking-up in Isham’s ‘O tuneful God’

\textsuperscript{63} A partial score and a single part for Goodson’s ‘With eager hast’ survives as GB-Och Mus 1142A, fols. 32-33 and GB-Och Mus 1142B, fols. 56-57. The work is apparently for two voices with instrumental accompaniment, and so does not meet the criteria for inclusion here.

\textsuperscript{64} Richard Goodson’s ‘With eager hast’ (see note 62 above).

\textsuperscript{65} Parrot, \textit{The Essential Bach Choir}. See also William Boyce’s practice described in Chs. 5-6.
demonstrates that ensemble-leading took place within the ensemble in the manner consistently apparent from the later sets discussed in Chapters 4-6.
4: Eighteenth-Century Performing Materials for the Concerted Works of G. F. Handel

Handel’s Own Performing Materials

The surviving performing materials linked to Handel pose so many problems that a complete survey of them has yet to appear in print.¹ Handel’s autograph and archive scores, which entered the Royal Music Library after being presented to George III by John Christopher Smith junior, are well preserved and have suffered relatively few losses.² However, little survives of Handel’s actual performing material. The sets of parts that must once have existed for all the operas, oratorios and other major concerted works are currently untraced; not one complete set is known to survive. The few isolated exceptions, such as the harpsichord scores that survive in Hamburg, are individual parts rather than entire sets. This is surprising considering Handel’s stature as a composer both during his lifetime and after it, and the care taken by his heirs and successors to preserve the manuscripts associated with him, whether autograph or produced by John Christopher Smith senior and his copyists.³


³ What is known of the history of the autographs in the Royal Music Collection is described in Burrows, The Royal Music Library and Its Handel Collection.
contrast, the performing sets of Handel’s contemporary William Boyce, who preserved his collection with comparable care, have a high survival rate.\(^4\)

Handel’s performing parts are not specifically mentioned in his will or in the wills of his heirs, although they were probably included among the ‘Musick Books’ left to J. C. Smith senior.\(^5\) These manuscripts passed to Smith junior on his father’s death in 1763; if the performance parts were among them but later handed on or sold, no record of this has yet been found.\(^6\) The sets of opera parts probably remained the property of the theatres involved and are likely to have been destroyed in the fires of 1789 (the King’s Theatre) and 1808 (Covent Garden).\(^7\) The opera scores that functioned as the basis for the theatre performances – the so-called ‘conducting scores’ or Direktionspartituren – remained Handel’s property and did pass to Smith. Having been sold by later generations of his family, they survive as a largely intact body in the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Carl von Ossietzky, Hamburg, together with similar scores to many of the oratorios and other works and several harpsichord scores to some of the operas.\(^8\) The sets of oratorio parts probably passed to Smith even if the opera sets did not; however, they have vanished just as completely as the opera sets.

The totals known to me of surviving performing sets for the concerted music of several of Handel’s contemporaries and near-contemporaries are given in Chapter 1.\(^9\)

---

\(^4\) See Chs. 5 and 6.


\(^6\) Clausen, Händels Direktionspartituren, p. 16.

\(^7\) See Ch. 1.

\(^8\) Clausen, ‘The Hamburg Collection’.

These figures indicate that where a large collection is dispersed, a few complete sets may be expected to survive even if most are lost. The fact that not one of Handel’s sets survives implies that they were kept together and have been lost together. Among Handel’s near-contemporaries, Thomas Arne is the only composer whose performing sets have vanished completely; his case is not comparable to Handel’s, as he apparently took no particular care to preserve his collection and his manuscripts were not treated with the same reverence after his death.\textsuperscript{10}

The few surviving performing materials linked directly to Handel divide into two groups. The first group comprises surviving individual parts or fragments, such as the ‘harpsichord’ scores in Hamburg and the well-known continuo part for \textit{Alexander’s Feast}. The second group comprises the ‘conducting scores’ (those which form the bulk of the Hamburg collection, and the few other such scores that survive elsewhere), if they were used in performance, which is not certain. A third group of performing materials linked indirectly to Handel does survive: sets copied by scribes linked to J. C. Smith senior. As this study excludes music that is not concerted, sets of parts for Handel’s instrumental music, as well as choral part-books, are not included in the following discussion.

\textit{The Hamburg ‘Conducting’ Scores and Keyboard Scores}

The Hamburg scores and ‘keyboard scores’, which comprise the biggest single body of (probably) performing material used by Handel, raise several interesting questions. The collection apparently contains most of the remainder of the ‘Musick Books’ left

\textsuperscript{10} Peter Holman, private communication. One performing part of Arne’s, used by Mr Mattocks in \textit{The Fairy Prince}, survives as GB-Bu MS 5008, fols. 65-73.
by Handel to J. C. Smith senior in his will, after the autograph scores had passed
from J. C. Smith junior to George III. It consists of 72 scores currently described as
‘conducting scores’, also termed ‘Direktionspartituren’ or ‘Handexemplare’; as well
as fifteen opera scores currently termed ‘keyboard scores’. The term ‘continuo
scores’ is preferred here, as it leaves the question open as to whether Burrows’s
suggestion – that at least one might have been used by a lute player – is correct; there
is little evidence either way in the case of most of the scores.11 No continuo scores
survive for the oratorios, although one for the first act of Floridante, copied by
Smith the elder, survives separately in the Royal Music Collection.12 The majority
of the works represented in the Hamburg collection are operas, of which there are 42,
including six arrangements of operas by other composers and five pasticcios, several
of which are taken from Handel’s own works. Additionally, there are 24 oratorios
and serenatas, two odes and one anthem.13 They span the period from around 1720
until Handel’s death, though some of them continued to be used after this by John
Christopher Smith. These scores have already been the subject of research on, for
example, paper types, water marks and the performance history they transmit.14

It is an oft-repeated claim that Handel probably used the ‘conducting scores’ to
direct with from the first harpsichord, or organ in the case of the oratorios. It has
been suggested that the surviving continuo scores for the operas were used at the
second harpsichord, or alternatively as rehearsal scores for the singers and

Use of the Organ in Handel’s English Oratorios’, Handel Studies: A Gedenkschrift for Howard
12 GB-Lbl R.M.19c.10; see Clausen, ‘The Hamburg Collection’, p.18.
13 See the list in Clausen, ‘The Hamburg Collection’, pp. 24-7.
14 See Clausen, ‘The Hamburg Collection’; also the critical reports in all volumes of the HHA, for
which these manuscripts are among the principal sources.
continuo. However, some problems with Clausen’s classification system have never been resolved, together with the question of whether or not it was usual during this period for a full score to form part of the performing set. This is a difficult question to answer, but it must be remembered that direction did not necessarily take place from the full score in the eighteenth century, although this is now normal practice.

The usual practice, visible in most surviving sets of eighteenth-century performing parts for concerted music, is that a keyboard player played from a specially-prepared keyboard part. This is the case, for example, in all William Boyce’s surviving performing sets, as well as those of William and Philip Hayes. Such keyboard parts are generally uniform in appearance: the predominant format is transverse quarto. Choruses and instrumental movements appear as single-stave figured bass-line; recitatives are always given as a two-stave part at least (voice and figured bass, sometimes with extra staves for instruments in accompanied recitatives). Arias sometimes appear as single-stave figured bass-line, although two-stave (voice and bass) is more usual; duets or trios generally have as many upper staves as they have voices, though again they are sometimes written as single-stave bass line. However, these keyboard parts are not written-out, but remain essentially figured basses even when in short-score format. The identity of such parts as keyboard parts is generally obvious even if they are not clearly labelled, which they usually are.

There is a substantial problem in relating this ‘standard format’ for keyboard parts to Handel’s surviving continuo scores: it is based on a sample that, although large, is drawn from concerted genres that largely do not include theatre music. While many

---

eighteenth-century performing sets survive for oratorios, odes and anthems, there are few surviving sets for theatre music; still fewer of these contain keyboard parts. In the twenty or so partial sets of eighteenth-century theatre parts that I am aware of, only four contain keyboard parts. These four are the stray keyboard part to Henry Purcell’s music in Theodosius; that for Maurice Greene’s Florimel that still possesses its set of parts; that for Boyce’s arrangement of Richard Leveridge’s music in Macbeth, again with a set of parts; and a stray keyboard part for Arne’s Comus, not now part of a set. It is likely that more remain unidentified. All these keyboard or continuo parts – even the late-seventeenth-century part for Theodosius – do follow the general format and pattern of eighteenth-century keyboard parts for non-dramatic concerted works, such as the sets of Boyce and William and Philip Hayes. The Florimel and Comus parts are two-stave throughout; the Macbeth continuo part is a single-stave part that differs only from the two other basso parts in the set in that it is partially figured. The part for Theodosius is largely in two-stave and three-stave format, giving voice(s) plus bass-line, though one section of score has been pasted to the bottom of a leaf.

The Hamburg continuo parts largely do not fit this pattern and have been divided by Clausen into four distinct types. Type-one continuo scores are largely in full-score format, although some inserted sections give the bass line only, making them

16 This does not include ‘presentation’ keyboard parts for Handel’s operas that have a provenance linking them to, for example, the Aylesford Collection, or parts for dramatic works that were clearly performed in concert, such as those linked to the Academy of Ancient Music for Purcell’s Dido and Aeneas (GB-Lam MS 25A). Three keyboard parts for masque sets by William Boyce, William Hayes and Philip Hayes have likewise been excluded as there is no evidence that they were staged: Boyce’s Peleus and Thetis (GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.113 c); William Hayes’s Peleus and Thetis (GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 125); and Philip Hayes’s Telemachus (GB-Ob Mus. D.137).

17 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. C.27, fols. 33-36 (Theodosius); GB-Lcm Ms 227/I (Florimel); GB-Lam Ms. 114 (Comus); GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 47860, fols. 12-14 (Macbeth; this set does not appear to have any link to Boyce himself).

18 Clausen, Händels Direktionspartituren, pp. 62-3 and 78.
unsuitable either as an archive score or for copying parts from. Type-two continuo scores are laid out as full scores, but with only the bass and melody lines filled in and the rest left blank. Given that they show signs of use, they could not have functioned as anything other than a keyboard part, though the waste of paper and the necessity for frequent page turns is surprising. Type-three continuo scores would be better described as ‘continuo parts’, as they approach the format of the standard keyboard part described above, giving the bass plus vocal lines in the arias and recitatives and the bass line only in choruses and symphonies. Type four (of which only one complete continuo part survives, plus a number of inserts added to type-one scores) is similar to type three, but gives only the bass line in the arias also; only the recitatives remain two-stave. One further score is classified by Clausen as ‘exceptional’, as it contains voice, bass and an obbligato line.19

Clausen observes that the ‘exceptional’ continuo part, to the pasticcio Venceslao, was used during the 1730-1 season; the type-one scores were copied up until the 1732-3 season; type three scores were produced during the following season (1733-4); and the single complete surviving type four score, plus the type four inserts, were produced in the season after that.20 The surviving type-two scores were the latest produced, dating from the 1737-8 season.21 This is surprising, as apparently Handel used continuo parts that approached the ‘standard’ format in 1733-5, before reverting to a type that would have been more costly to produce and more inconvenient to use. Clausen has suggested it may have been intended that the blank staves in the type-two scores would be filled in later, as there is evidence that some

19 Clausen, Händels Direktionspartituren, p.246.
type-one parts were initially copied in this manner.\textsuperscript{22} However, this does not explain the change in practice from a more to a less practical type of score.

The Hamburg continuo scores give little information as to whether they were used for the first or second keyboard in the ensemble, or for a theorbo or lute-player. The only continuo score to contain directions on the roles of first and second harpsichords is that for Sosarme, in the duet ‘Tu caro sei il dolce mio tesoro’. The first harpsichord and its continuo group accompany Elmira (‘Cembalo 1\textsuperscript{mo} con i Suoi Bassi: / piano’); the second harpsichord and its group, which apparently included the theorbo, accompany the lower voice, Sosarme (‘Cembalo 2do Colla Teorba / e [corrected to ‘e i’] Suoi Bassi’).\textsuperscript{23} The voices sing alternate phrases initially, accompanied by their respective continuo groups. When the voices combine, the continuo groups merge. However, both the full score and the harpsichord score give the complete bass line with instructions as to the division of labour, but no indication as to which group used which score. The continuo score for Ariodante, which is mostly in bass-line format, contains directions such as ‘Senza Lute’ and ‘Pizzicati’ as well as the direction ‘Senza Cembalo’, as Burrows notes, suggesting it might have been used by a lute player, or a lute and harpsichord together.\textsuperscript{24}

Although there is clear historical evidence for the use of two keyboards in large-scale performances during the eighteenth century – two harpsichords in Italian opera, and harpsichord plus organ in oratorio – surviving performing sets of containing two keyboard-parts are relatively rare. I have only seen a few such; closer inspection reveals that many are not genuine examples. In some cases, the existence of extra

\textsuperscript{22} Clausen, ‘The Hamburg Collection’, p.19.

\textsuperscript{23} D-Hs MA/185 (harpsichord score), fol.135 and D-Hs MA/1054 (full score), fols. 148v.-149r.

\textsuperscript{24} D- Hs MA/1006a, fols. 59v., 76r., 80r. See Burrows, ‘Who Does What, When?’, p.113.
keyboard parts for some numbers of a work probably indicates they were performed as concert pieces.\textsuperscript{25} In the case of the sets in the Shaw-Hellier Collection for Handel’s \textit{Alexander’s Feast} and the ‘Dettingen’ Te Deum, both of which contain an organ and a harpsichord part, the sets’ status as ‘working’ rather than ‘library’ is doubtful (see below); although there is independent confirmation that these sets are representative of Handel’s performing set in respect of the keyboard parts included.\textsuperscript{26} However, the set for William Hayes’s \textit{Peleus and Thetis} contains an unlabelled keyboard part and an organ part; the same composer’s ‘Ode to the Memory of Mr Handel’ has a cembalo part for the entire work and an organ part, reused from Hayes’s earlier ‘Installation Ode’, for the last chorus only.\textsuperscript{27} It is noticeable that in none of these examples do two harpsichord parts survive together; each contains one organ and one harpsichord part.

Sets in which the existence of a lost second keyboard part is implied are more common. In most such cases, the surviving keyboard part is again for organ and lacks a number of movements in which the organ does not play, indicating that the harpsichordist must have played either from a lost keyboard part, or directly from the score.\textsuperscript{28} The survival of several such sets implies that either the harpsichord part was more at risk of being lost, perhaps because it had more rehearsal use, or simply that it was normal for the organist to be given a specially-prepared part while the

\textsuperscript{25} For example, GB-Ob Mss. Mus. D.77 and D.137-9 (Philip Hayes, \textit{Telemachus}); GB-Ob Mss. Mus D.70 and D.81, D.113-115 (William Hayes, Commemoration Ode).

\textsuperscript{26} GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 162-193 (Handel, ‘Dettingen’ Te Deum) and 194-224 (Handel, \textit{Alexander’s Feast}); see below.

\textsuperscript{27} GB-Ob Mss. Mus. D. 79-80 and Mus. D. 125-6 (\textit{Peleus and Thetis}); GB-Ob Ms. Mus. C.20 and D.118-119 (‘Ode to the Memory of Mr Handel’).

harpsichordist played from the score. This second hypothesis is supported by two surviving sets by the scribe John Mathews, the first for Handel’s *Joshua* and the second for his Dettingen Te Deum and the anthem ‘The King shall rejoice’ (discussed below). 29 Both of Mathews’ sets lack keyboard parts; his lists of copied parts, contained in the scores, confirm that none ever existed. In both cases, however, the quarto-sized transverse-format score would be suitable for use at a keyboard.

The lack of sets anywhere containing two harpsichord parts is not surprising, as the use of two harpsichords was a practice associated with Italian opera, for which no performing sets survive within England. However, it is in any case possible that where two harpsichords were used, one or both played from scores. This hypothesis is supported by a number of the Hamburg ‘conducting scores’, which show evidence of use at a harpsichord. As most of the Hamburg ‘conducting scores’ are quarto-sized transverse format, they would have functioned well on a harpsichord stand. Binding each act separately may have been the norm: a number of the scores in the Hamburg collection are still in eighteenth-century bindings in this format, which again is well-suited to use on a harpsichord stand. 30 Additionally, the ‘conducting’ score of *Poro* contains an inserted slip carrying the instruction ‘Segue Subito’, which would serve no useful purpose except in performance. 31 At least four of the ‘conducting’ scores (*Ariodante; Il Parnasso in Festa; Il pastor fido;* and *Lucio Papirio*) share features such as reduced-score or bass-line-only sections with Clausen’s ‘harpsichord scores’, although corresponding continuo scores survive for

---

29 GB-DRec Mss. A24 and D8 (*Joshua*) and GB-DRec Mss. A32 and D7 (‘Dettingen’ Te Deum and ‘The King shall rejoice’).

30 For example, the score of *Floridante* (D-Hs MA/1018). The harpsichord score of the same opera (GB-Lbl R.M.19.c.10) gives only Act 1, presumably because two further volumes are missing. The score of *Parthenope*, MA 1039, is also in this format. Some scores have been rebound into one volume, so that it is impossible to tell whether they were originally bound in one or three.

31 D-Hs MA/1042, fol. 125v.
three of these works. Clausen himself acknowledges difficulty of classification in the case of *Lucio Papirio*, for which only one score exists (D-Hs MA/1029): he classifies this as a ‘conducting score’ despite the fact that a number of arias are written in reduced score.\(^3\) The ‘conducting’ score of *Il pastor fido* (D-Hs MA/1041) appears to better fit Clausen’s criteria for a type-one continuo score with type-four inserts, as there are significant sections in it that are bass-line only. Clausen’s classification in this case was apparently based on the survival of another continuo score to the work in the Hamburg collection (D-Hs MA/1057), making the distinction largely one of terminology in this case. The ‘conducting score’ of *Ariodante* (D-Hs MA/1006) is a full score containing one chorus given as bass-line only, while the continuo score (D-Hs MA/1006a) is type-one with type-four inserts. The ‘conducting score’ of *Il Parnasso in Festa* (D-Hs MA/1038) is a full score that is bass-line only for the first three folios, while the ‘harpsichord score’ (D-Hs MA/1038a) is a type-three continuo part.

Many of the Hamburg continuo scores and parts likewise include annotations apparently relating to performance. Caution is necessary when assessing pencil markings on these manuscripts, as Friedrich Chrysander used this medium to mark up some of the scores during the nineteenth century, as did a previous owner, Victor Schoelcher (1804-1893), as well as the composer and scholar Michael Rophino Lacy (1795-1867), to whom Schoelcher lent some of the scores.\(^3\) However, which annotations belong to the eighteenth and which to the nineteenth centuries is usually fairly clear from the style of handwriting and type of annotation. The continuo part for *Venceslao* (D-Hs MA/189), for example, has figuring as well as accidentals and

---

\(^3\) Clausen, ‘The Hamburg Collection’, p. 21.

\(^3\) Clausen, *Händels Direktionspartituren*, pp. 20-21; for the extent and type of Chrysander’s annotations, see pp. 23-24 and 36-37.
pauses added in pencil in an eighteenth-century hand. Similar pencil annotations can be seen in the part to *Serse* (D-Hs MA/1052). The continuo score for *Ormisd* (D-Hs MA/1036) is annotated with pencil pauses, accidentals and extra figuring, again in an eighteenth-century hand. Page-turning instructions cannot normally be regarded as a definite indicator of performance use, as their use on blank lines at the foot of a page was to some extent a convention of copying. However, a scrap of paper bearing the instruction ‘volti’ has been inserted into this keyboard score, which must relate to real performance use.\(^3^4\) The part also bears the instruction ‘senza cemb.’ fairly frequently. The harpsichord score for *Il Parnasso in festa* (D-Hs MA/1038a) may have been shared with another instrumentalist, or with more than one: it contains instructions such as ‘Cemb: e Violonc: Solo’ (fols. 3v. and 6); ‘Senza Bassoons’ and ‘Con Bassoons’ (fols. 7v.–8r.) and ‘Senza contrabass’ (fol. 15v.). Similarly, the keyboard score of the 1730 version of *Rinaldo* (D-Hs MA1046) also shows signs of possible part-sharing: a cello solo is written into the bass-line in tenor clef on fol. 75. The part reverts to bass clef with the instruction ‘Tutti’ at the end of the solo. However, it is possible that inclusions such as these were for the harpsichordist’s information only.

Given the lack of a clear difference between some types of ‘conducting’ score and some types of ‘keyboard’ score, it might perhaps be better to describe the Hamburg scores as ‘directing scores’ (or possibly ‘principal continuo scores’), ‘continuo scores’ (or ‘secondary continuo scores’); and ‘continuo parts’ (for those in standard part-format, rather than score-format). The term ‘conducting’ has too many associations with current practice; ‘conducting score’ is thus more problematic than

\(^3^4\) D-Hs MA/1036, fol. 45.
the German equivalents ‘Handexemplar’ or ‘Direktionspartitur’. Any opera scores in large folio format are excluded from this classification as they are unlikely to have been suitable for use at a harpsichord, although oratorio scores in this format might have been used at an organ.

**Other Sets, Stray Parts or Fragments Directly Linked to Handel**

Apart from the Hamburg continuo scores and parts and the single such score elsewhere, a small number of other sets, individual parts or fragments of parts for Handel’s concerted music that can be linked directly to the composer have survived as follows:

1. GB-Lcm Ms 900: the ‘N° 1 Violoncello’ and/or ‘Harpsicord’ part to *Alexander’s Feast* in the hand of J. C. Smith (HWV 75).

2. GB-Lcm Ms 2254, fols. 15-21: a tenor part to the Foundling Hospital Anthem ‘Blessed is he that considereth the poor’ (HWV 268), labelled ‘M’ Beard’, with the name of Thomas Lowe deleted; in the hands of J. C. Smith and Larsen’s S6.

---

35 For a discussion of these terms, see Clausen, ‘The Hamburg Collection’, p. 10.

36 The early Italian sets now in US-NHub and US-NYpm, described in Watkins Shaw, ‘Handel: Some Contemporary Performance Parts’, are omitted as they were not used in England; in any case most of these works do not fit this study’s definition of concerted music.

3. GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 27745: two-stave organ reduction of the orchestral accompaniment to the “Dettingen” Te Deum and ‘Utrecht’ Jubilate (HWV 283 and 279), unknown hand, with an alleged provenance reaching back to Handel.

4. GB-Cfm MU.MS.256, pp. 41-43: autograph (possibly rehearsal) copy of the aria ‘O caro mio tesor’ from Amadigi di Gaula (HWV 11).

5. GB-Cfm MU.MS.256, pp. 67-72: extract from Giulio Cesare (HWV 17) in the hand of J. C. Smith, possibly intended as a vocal part; possibly only a score fragment (gives recitative beginning ‘Reina! infasti eventi / che fia che tardi’ and the aria ‘La speranza all’alma mia’).


7. GB-Cfm MU.MS.262, pp. 55-58: partially-written, discarded section from a second violin part (copyist from J. C. Smith’s circle) for Serse (HWV 40), containing four lines of the symphony to Act 1, Scene 2, followed by two text cues.

8. GB-Cfm MU.MS.263, pp. 77-78: single transverse quarto leaf (hand of J.C. Smith), giving the second horn part for two marches in Judas Maccabeus (HWV 63).

9. GB-Cfm MU.MS.265, pp. 13-14: fragment (hand of J. C. Smith) from a bass vocal part (Cosroe) containing music that was cut before performance from the end of Act 2 and start of Act 3 of Siroe (HWV 24).
10. GB-Cfm MU.MS.265, pp. 53-60: described in the catalogue as ‘Continuo part for a section of either Israel in Egypt, Athalia or Esther (or another oratorio)’, in the hand of J. C. Smith. 38

11. GB-Cfm MU.MS.265, pp. 61-66: fragment of a continuo part (hand of J. C. Smith) that might belong together with No.8, containing music adapted from various sources possibly for a revival of Israel in Egypt (HWV 54). 39


13. GB-Ob, MS Tenbury 347, fol.140v: fragment of a two-stave part, soprano and continuo, possibly from the performing material for Imeneo (HWV 41). 40

The joint cello and harpsichord part for Alexander’s Feast is one of only two surviving performing parts, apart from the Hamburg harpsichord scores, that have seemingly been used in Handel’s own performances in England. (The companion organ part for the same work, discussed below, survives only in copy). It is also the only surviving keyboard part from Handel’s own performances of his oratorios. It is in quarto-sized upright format and retains its original cartridge paper wrapper, inscribed ‘Alexanders Feast. / No 1 Violoncello’. Inside, the title page is inscribed ‘Harpsicord. Mr Walsh’ in pencil, overwritten with ‘Sig³. Pasqualini’ (in ink)

38 ‘[Israel in Egypt or Athalia or Esther] [additional section] [George Frideric Handel] [manuscript]’, UCLS <http://search.lib.cam.ac.uk/?itemid=|depfacfmdbh470555> [accessed 15 July 2014].

39 ‘[Israel in Egypt] [additional section] [George Frideric Handel] [manuscript]’, UCLS <http://search.lib.cam.ac.uk/?itemid=|depfacfmdbh470557> [accessed 15 July 2014].

40 Not viewed.
followed by ‘M. Walsh / M. Walsh and Caprâle’ (in pencil). Pasqualini de Marzis and Andrea Caporale were both cellists; the inscription implies that Walsh was a harpsichordist, although none is known of that name. It is further implied that the harpsichordist and the original principal cellist (Caporale) shared a part, with Pasqualini later replacing Caporale. The part is largely in the hand of J. C. Smith and is sometimes single-stave figured bass-line, sometimes two-stave or (once) three-stave short score. It is therefore unlike most of the Hamburg keyboard scores, but does resemble the majority of eighteenth-century keyboard parts to non-dramatic works.

The part is figured throughout, although the overture carries the contradictory instruction ‘don’t figure it’ in pencil, perhaps indicating that the part’s function changed over time. The names of several performers have been marked in over the relevant numbers at several points – ‘Mr. Beard’, ‘Sig[r].a. Strada’, ‘Mrs Young’, and ‘Mr Erhard’ – all of whom took part in the first performance. The contents, together with the names, confirm that it dated originally from the first performances of the work in Covent Garden in 1736, and was reused – and reworked – for subsequent versions until the 1750s. The history of these reworkings has been well-documented elsewhere; the most important of them as displayed in this copy is the inclusion of the music for the Dublin performances of 1742, including the bass


42 Fol. 1v.

43 The performer names are confirmed in Walsh’s score: G. F. Handel, Alexander’s Feast (London: John Walsh, 1737).

line to one aria that is otherwise lost, ‘Your voices tune’. The copy is otherwise interesting in the amount of marking-up it shows, including on fol. 13v. the pencil instruction ‘In time’ above the final cadence of ‘He sung Darius’. Some of the instructions relate to other bass instruments, such as ‘Bass. Soli / Senza Bassi’ on fol. 10v. The air ‘Softly sweet in Lydian measures’ on fol.14v. is given in three staves, for the singer Strada, a ‘violoncello solo’, and ‘Contra Basso e cembalo’, suggesting that the part was shared between the harpsichordist and the cellist.

The importance of this part, apart from its usefulness in charting the work’s performance history, lies in its status as the sole surviving example of an instrumental part used by Handel in his performances; it is the only surviving object that can demonstrate what one of Handel’s instrumental parts looked like. There is likewise only one surviving example of Handel’s vocal parts: the transverse-quarto tenor part for the Foundling Hospital Anthem, used by Thomas Lowe and then by John Beard, in the hand of Larsen’s S6 with additions by J. C. Smith. It is probably the part used in the first performance of 1749 in the Hospital’s chapel; the alterations and the addition of Beard’s name indicate it was also used at a subsequent performance, perhaps the second in 1753. These two parts are useful in assessing parts of which the original function, performance or library, is in doubt, or where the provenance is doubtful or unknown, as they are examples with which other parts can be compared. The parts’ importance in this respect is also their main weakness, as there are no others by which to measure them. However, they conform in format and


46 As copies, the organ parts (see below) to Alexander’s Feast are inferior in this respect.


48 See the discussion in Burrows, ‘Handel and the Foundling Hospital’, pp. 275-283.

49 See below.
appearance to equivalent parts in other eighteenth-century sets, such as those for the works of Boyce and William and Philip Hayes, and the sets linked to the Academy of Ancient Music.  

The organ part to the ‘Dettingen’ Te Deum and the Utrecht Jubilate may have been used by Handel himself, if the provenance described on the fly-leaf by George Allenby, a nineteenth-century owner, is to be believed:

Handells Manuscript / Te Deum came into my Possess’n / at the Death of my Brother in law / Joseph Harrington Esq’ a particular / Friend of the late Dr Dupuis M. D’ / & Pupil of Handel. after [sic] his [Handel’s] Death / it came into the possession of Dr Bernard / Gates one of his pupils who bequeathed / it to Dr Dupuis & by whom it was left & / became y’ property of his Son Charles / Dupuis who gave it to his Friend & Trustee / Joseph Harrington Esq’ soon after the / Death of his much lamented Father in the / year 1797 & has been in my property ever / since.

On Allenby’s death the manuscript was bought by a Daniel Carnley and soon afterwards was acquired by Sir George Smart, after which it entered the British Museum. It is clearly not an organ part that was used in a performance of the work with orchestral accompaniment; but rather a two-stave organ reduction of that accompaniment, probably intended for a choir-and-organ performance. It is quite heavily marked up, with text cues in red ink and registration indications in pencil; much of this, such as the instruction for the trumpet stop on fol. 7, probably dates from after Handel’s lifetime. A similar short-score organ part in the hand of a London copyist survives for the Anthem for the Foundling Hospital (HWV 268),

---

30 See Ch. 5.
31 GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 27745.
32 According to a sale record in the volume and a note on fol. 3 by Smart.
which Burrows suggests dates from within Handel’s lifetime and is probably therefore linked to performances at the hospital.\textsuperscript{53}

All the other parts listed above are fragments that have survive largely by chance. The majority were either discarded and the paper reused, such as in the case of the second violin part for \textit{Serse}, the horn part for the marches in \textit{Judas Maccabaeus}, and the fragment of Cosmo’s part from \textit{Siroe}. In the case of the last-mentioned example, the music concerned was cut and the leaf discarded; in the cases of the violin and horn parts, Handel himself then reused the paper. It is doubtful whether some of the other items on the list were ever intended as working parts: the autograph copies, for example, of the aria ‘O caro mio tesor’ from \textit{Amadigi} and the harp part for ‘Hark, he strikes the golden lyre’ from \textit{Alexander Balus} might have been intended as rough copies from which Smith could prepare fair copies. Because these fragments of parts, if they are such, have survived out of context and incomplete, their value in terms of judging Handel’s performance practice is limited.

\textit{Sets, Partial Sets or Individual Parts with Indirect Links to Handel}

A number of further sets, partial sets or individual parts which can be linked to Handel at one remove survive as follows:

1. GB-Lfon 2558: set of parts for \textit{Messiah}, left by Handel in his will to the Foundling Hospital; probably copied directly from Handel’s own set.

\textsuperscript{53} Burrows, ‘Handel and the Foundling Hospital’, p.278. See below, ‘Sets, Partial Sets or Individual Parts with Indirect Links to Handel’, no. 13 in list.
2. GB-Lfom FM 754: Anthem for the Foundling Hospital (HWV 268);
   instrumental parts only, from the Hospital’s own set, possibly used in the
   performances of 1753 and 1759.54

3. GB-Lfom FM 754: Anthem, ‘O sing unto the Lord a new song’ (HWV 249b);
   incomplete set of instrumental parts owned by the Foundling Hospital.55

4. GB-Lfom FM 754: Anthem ‘O be joyful in the Lord’ (HWV 246);
   instrumental parts only, owned by the Foundling Hospital.56

5. GB-Lfom 1254: two parts for the Chandos Anthems (HWV 246-249b, 250a,
   251b-256a, ) and Te Deum (HWV 281) from the library of James Brydges,
   Duke of Chandos, bound as books.57

6. GB-Drc MS E.20i: parts for Alexander’s Feast (HWV 75) including one in the
   hands of Larsen’s S1 and J. C. Smith.58

7. GB-Drc MS E20(iv): parts for the cantata Cecilia volgi un sguardo (HWV 89),
   one in the hand of S1.59

8. GB-Drc MS E23: parts (one in the hand of S4) for excerpts from the Ode for St
   Cecilia’s Day (HWV 76).60

---

54 Burrows, ‘Handel and the Foundling Hospital’, pp. 275-278.
57 No. 7-12 in the catalogue prepared by J. C. Pepusch, ‘23 August 1720 (and later) Musical
   Instruments and Music Belonging to the Duke of Chandos’, in Donald Burrows, Helen Coffey,  John
   Greenacombe and Anthony Hicks, George Frideric Handel: Collected Documents, Volume 1 1609-
   Collins Baker and Muriel I. Baker, The Life and Circumstances of James Brydges, First Duke of
58 Burrows and Ward Jones, ‘An Inventory’, No. 148 (i).
60 Burrows and Ward Jones, ‘An Inventory’, No. 150.
9. GB-Drc MS E26(ii): score (hand of S2) and two parts (one by S1) for *Aci, Galatea e Polifemo* (HWV 49b).\(^{61}\)

10. GB-Drc MS E26(v): partial score (hand of S4) and two parts for *As pants the hart* (HWV 251 c/e).\(^{62}\)

11. GB-Drc MS E35(i): set for the anthem ‘The ways of Zion shall mourn’ (HWV 264), adapted for use in *Israel in Egypt*, two of which (canto secondo and viola) are in the hand of S1.\(^{63}\)

12. GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 104: incomplete set for three anthems, ‘O sing unto the Lord’ (HWV 249b), ‘I will magnify thee’ (HWV 250a) and ‘As pants the hart’ (HWV 251b) in the hand of Richard Goodson junior, used in Oxford; further parts are copied into a set of part-books in Christ Church.\(^{64}\)

13. GB-Lcm Ms. 2273: written-out organ part to the Foundling Hospital Anthem dating from within Handel’s lifetime and therefore probably linked to the Foundling Hospital.\(^{65}\)

Annette Landgraf has suggested that the two parts in the hand of S1 for ‘The ways of Zion shall mourn’ are remnants of the original performing materials, apparently because of the identity of the scribe and because they have been adapted for use in

---


\(^{65}\) Only viewed in part. See Burrows, ‘Handel and the Foundling Hospital’ (p. 278).
The parts belong to a group of manuscripts used by Richard Fawcett and his associates in Oxford and taken with him to Durham in 1754. Those in Goodson’s hand for three of the Chandos Anthems are linked to the same performers, although as Goodson’s personal property they remained in Oxford. In the above list, five other sets in Durham Cathedral Library contain individual parts copied by Smith and the scribes S1, S2 and S4; the Durham collection also contains several other manuscript scores and parts for instrumental music by Handel in the hands of the scribes S1 and S2. All these manuscripts apparently arrived in Durham with Richard Fawcett, and their survival confirms the link between Fawcett, the Oxford musicians and Smith’s circle of scribes. Fawcett apparently purchased parts from Smith for use in Oxford and then supplemented them with duplicates of his own. These parts are therefore linked indirectly to Handel, but are unlikely to include remnants from his own sets. It is apparent from the existence of these sets that some sets from Smith’s scriptorium were bought for performance use rather than as ‘library’ sets. There may have been no difference between those sold for one purpose and those sold for the other; as in the case of ‘library’ sets, Fawcett’s purchases clearly contained no duplicates, as he provided these himself.

The set for Messiah willed to the Foundling Hospital cannot have been used by Handel himself, but was probably copied directly from his set when the instructions

---


69 See Burrows and Ward Jones, ‘An Inventory’, Nos. 151 (ix), 152 (vi), 153 (vi), 156 (i).


71 See below and Ch. 1.
in his will were carried out. The parts have remained the property of the Hospital, now the Thomas Coram Foundation for Children, ever since. They are marked with at least two layers of pencil addenda. The most recent appear to date from the late nineteenth century; given that one addendum is signed ‘HDW’, Henry Davon Wetton (d.1928), the Hospital’s organist from 1892-c.1926, was clearly responsible for some at least.\textsuperscript{72} Some of the addenda may relate to the preparation of a new score by A. H. Mann for a performance in Cambridge in 1894 using the oboe and bassoon parts in this set, that had been newly rediscovered around that time.\textsuperscript{73} The parts also bear performance markings that are obviously eighteenth-century in character; these must relate to performances at the Foundling Hospital. Some addenda may be corrections from the checking stage of the copying process. Some, such as the note ‘Not to be Playd’ against one number in a second violin part, clearly relate to a particular performance.

The parts are in their original covers with original numbering and seem to be largely complete; there are 30 in total, consisting of 13 vocal and 17 instrumental parts (the trumpets and kettle drum parts are in a single cover, so that the total of the numbered parts is 28). However, at least one soprano part is missing from this set, as the soprano solo music is not complete. The soloists are named as Robert Wass, John Beard, Caterina Galli and Christina Passarini: this was the same group as sang at the Foundling Hospital performance in 1754, together with the soprano Giulia Frasi, whose part was probably the missing one. It is likely that the Foundling

\textsuperscript{72} ‘Henry Davan Wetton’ (Obituary) in \textit{MT} 1031/70 (1929), 79.

\textsuperscript{73} See the review of the performance, ‘‘The Messiah” at Cambridge’, \textit{MTSCC} 617/35 (1894), 464. The anonymous reviewer missed the clarinets and was confident that ‘no musician would wish to see Mozart’s beautiful and appropriate work done away with’, but conceded that Handel’s music ‘as it left his pen’ should be heard ‘at least occasionally’ and that ‘the general effect was more satisfying than might have been expected’. A copy of the programme survives as GB-LEbc MS 459/31. See also Henry Davan Wetton, ‘The Missing Wind Parts, “Messiah”’ (correspondence) \textit{MTSCC} 618/35 (1894), 557.
Hospital set was copied directly from that used for the 1754 performance. If the instrumentalists and the boy trebles shared parts, but the adult singers did not, as was apparently normal by this date, the parts suggest an orchestra of around 33, comprising six first and six second violins, four violas, four cellos and basses, four bassoons, two first and two second oboes plus two trumpets and a timpanist, and a chorus of around 20 including five soloists (at least two first and one second adult sopranos plus four to six boys; and three each of alto, tenor and bass singers).

This set of parts is particularly useful, as the numbers it suggests can be checked against actual numbers: the surviving accounts for the Foundling Hospital performances give lists of performers for the years 1754, 1758-60 and several years thereafter until 1777.74 The above estimate corresponds well with the numbers in the accounts of the 1754 performance in respect of both the totals of instrumentalists (38) and vocalists (24), and the breakdown of individual instruments and voices, which was as follows:

Soloists: 5
Boys: 6
Adult chorus singers: 13
Violins: 14
Violas: 6
Cellos: 3
Double Basses: 2
Oboes: 4
Bassoons: 4
Trumpets, horns and kettle drum: 5 (probably 2:2:1).75

---


75 Burrows, ‘Lists of Musicians’, p. 89.
Much work has already been done on the sets of parts originally in the Aylesford Collection. Most of these were copied by J. C. Smith’s scribes for Handel’s friend Charles Jennens (1700-73), probably in the 1740s and early 1750s. Jennens’s collection passed to his cousin Heneage Finch, 3rd Earl of Aylesford, in 1773, merging with the Earl’s own collection; it was later sold by the family in batches between 1873 and around 1937. Jennens’s and the Earl’s sets are not similar: the Earl’s consist of overtures and selections of arias, sometimes arranged for flute, although his collection did also contain some sets for complete works that were apparently for domestic use. Jennens’s sets are more of a monument edition. They consist of complete sets for the oratorios, plus sets for the operas that are less complete, generally lacking the secco recitatives and the overtures. Although Jennens’s parts were probably intended only as library copies, they are the biggest surviving body of eighteenth-century parts for Handel’s music and the biggest surviving body of English parts for concerted music by any composer from the first half of the eighteenth century. However, the collection is not entirely unique: a similar but much smaller collection of parts for Handel’s music was amassed during the 1750s and 60s by Samuel Hellier (1736-84, see below). Hellier’s collection differed from Jennens in that his was copied at one further remove from Handel, by scribes of the Oxford circle, and was apparently intended for performance use.

---

There is no evidence that the majority of Jennens’s parts were either used or intended for use, though the Earl of Aylesford’s probably were.\textsuperscript{80} Jennens’s sets – those I have seen – display no sign of use apart from the keyboard figuring in his hand, probably added in the course of personal study.\textsuperscript{81} The existence of the collection raises two questions: were many more such sets of ‘library’ parts copied to order, or otherwise for sale, by Smith’s scribes? And, how are they to be distinguished from ‘real’ performing parts? The presence of large numbers of ‘library’ sets is a complicating factor in assessing performing parts for Handel’s music that is largely absent when assessing parts for works by other composers.

Although the Aylesford collection is now dispersed, most of it has been traced, though some individual parts are still missing. Most are now in the Newman Flower Collection in Manchester; other sets survive in the British Library and the Gerald Coke Collection.\textsuperscript{82} Their appearance is generally consistent. Jennens’s sets for complete works are usually bound together in volumes according to part-type; the Earl of Aylesford’s sets are usually stitched into covers of Dutch red marbled-paper, buff cartridge paper or sometimes blue sugar paper. All contain the hands of copyists linked to J. C. Smith and the copying is of a high standard in terms of appearance. As described in Chapter 1, they can contain significant uncorrected errors; Jennens’s also lack duplicate parts, though the Earl’s sets sometimes contain some. It is clear that duplicates are not missing from Jennens’s portion of the collection but were always lacking, as Jennens’ own numbering system survives on many of the volumes and indicates that they have not been lost; also, there is clear

\textsuperscript{80} Roberts, ‘The Aylesford Collection’, p. 46.

\textsuperscript{81} Roberts, ‘The Aylesford Collection’, p. 42. The Aylesford sets now in GB-Mp were in storage for the duration of this project because of library renovation and hence could not be viewed.

consistency between the sets now in the Newman Flower Collection and those in other locations.

As stated in Chapter 1, any sets of parts for Handel’s music which bear a ‘presentation’ appearance, contain scribal hands linked to J. C. Smith, are without duplicates, lack marking-up and contain significant uncorrected errors are more likely to be library sets than genuine performing parts. The use of Dutch red marbled-paper on wrappers is also common in sets of parts linked to Smith’s scriptorium; the combination of this with the above traits is a further indication that the set originated from there.83 A number of sets that match these criteria and are probably library parts do survive, such as those in the Coke Collection for instrumental arrangements of arias from *Siroe* (GB-Lfom 804) and *Tolomeo* (GB-Lfom 572), and the sets of arias from *Scipione, Alessandro, Admeto* and *Riccardo Primo* (GB-Lfom 1283). These correspond in appearance and contents to sets from the Aylesford Collection and may be unidentified strays. The first two sets are stitched into booklets in Dutch red marbled-paper, and are similar in appearance to the Earl of Aylesford’s ‘booklet’ sets, such as the selection of arias from *Atalanta* (GB-Lfom 805). The sets of arias from *Scipione, Alessandro, Admeto* and *Riccardo* are bound into books according to part, in a similar manner to Jennens’s sets; the contents are similar to the Aylesford miscellanies such as that preserved as GB-Lbl R.M.18.c.3. Perhaps, as Roberts suggests in the case of the now-lost set to *Arianna*, they were gifts from Jennens to the Earl of Aylesford.84 The set of aria parts from *Radamisto* (GB-Lfom 337), and the set for the overture for *Orlando* (Lfom 816) may also be from the Aylesford Collection, although the *Orlando* overture includes

---

83 Though some sets originating from the Aylesford Collection are covered in plain buff cartridge paper.

duplicate parts. Another possibility is that Smith’s scribes copied and sold presentation parts more widely than is now recorded.

The three instrumental parts for *Il trionfo della Tempo e della Verita* (GB-Lbl R.M.19.e.5) and the various instrumental and vocal parts for *L’Allegro, il Penseroso ed il moderato* (GB-Lbl RM.19.e.10 and RM.19.b.1), *Semele* (GB-Lbl RM.19.e.10 and RM.19.b.3) and *Esther* (GB-Lbl RM.19.e.10 and RM.19.b.2), are more problematic. Again these correspond well in appearance to sets from the Aylesford Collection, contain no signs of performance use, and are mostly in hands linked to the Smith circle. J. S. Smith’s own hand appears in GB-Lbl RM.19.e.10, as does that of the copyist S5. Redmond Simpson, otherwise known as S6, was the principal copyist of the parts for *Esther, Semele* and *L’Allegro, il Penseroso ed il moderato*, now in GB-Lbl RM.19.e.10, RM.19.b.1 and RM.19.b.3.

Some of these manuscripts are bound up together in volumes by part, so that RM.19.e.10, for example, contains the instrumental parts for *L’Allegro, Semele* and for *Esther* (in a hybrid version that does not correspond directly to any of Handel’s), in the same manner as many of Jennens’s sets. However, the bindings are of the standard type for the Royal Music Collection, and it is therefore possible that the sets did not enter the collection bound in these groupings. The corresponding vocal parts for all three of these works, kept at GB-Lbl RM.19.b.1-3, are bound in boards or stitched in booklets covered in Dutch red marbled-paper, often with handwritten white paper labels, and are therefore similar in appearance to other manuscripts from


86 See Larsen, *Handel’s Messiah*, p. 270 for information on the copyist S6. I disagree with Larsen’s assertion that the copyists S5 and S6 may have been the same person, and with Donald Burrows’s claim that S6 was the oboist William Teede (see Donald Burrows, ‘Handel and the Foundling Hospital’, *ML* 58/3 (1977), 269-284 (pp. 281-282)). S6’s hand matches that in the set of parts for Leveridge’s ‘Music in *Macbeth*’, signed ‘E. R. Simpson scripsit’, that survives in GB-Lbl RM.21.c.43-45; the signature matches those of Redmond Simpson, kettle drummer to the Royal Horse Guards and oboist, that survive in the court records in GB-Lna LC 2/30-31 and LC 5/27-29.
Smith’s scriptorium. Interestingly, the Aylesford collection as it now survives is lacking parts for Semele, but does contain parts for Esther and L’Allegro, though the Esther parts are for the 1732 version rather than that presented here. Roberts points out that parts for Semele probably never existed in Jennens’s collection, as his numbering system leaves no gaps for them where they might be expected; additionally, it seems that no parts were copied for the Aylesford Collection after the early 1750s. The sets in the Royal Music Collection may, therefore, be presentation sets that were copied by Smith’s scriptorium for sale elsewhere.

Library parts are of value as examples of how a contemporary copyist – particularly one close to Handel – might prepare oboe or bassoon parts without direct instructions from the composer. This value is somewhat limited by the obvious mistakes visible in some of these parts: for example, the Aylesford viola part to Orlando consists almost entirely of rests in the aria ‘Se ‘l cor mai ti dirà’, although according to the score it should double the bass line. Shaw and Dean have both noted that in the Aylesford parts, as with the Foundling Hospital Messiah parts, having both oboes double the first violin is common, even when the second oboe might easily double the second violin. Likewise, the bassoons generally double the bass line in choruses and in the tutti sections in arias, even where no oboes are present. As these practices are not always confirmed by sets from after 1750, it may be that they were standard in the first half of the eighteenth century, when the Aylesford parts were copied, but not during the second half of the century. Unfortunately, there is no significant body of performing parts from before 1750

---


with which to compare the Aylesford sets, and their value is limited by the fact that seemingly most were not copied directly from ‘working’ sets and were not intended for performance use.\footnote{See the discussion below on John Mathews’ sets surviving in Durham.}

Two of the surviving copies of Handel’s organ part for \textit{Alexander’s Feast} were previously part of the Aylesford Collection.\footnote{GB-Lbl R.M 19.a.1, fols.90-110v and GB-Lbl R.M 19.a.1. See Barry Cooper, ‘The Organ Parts to Handel’s “Alexander’s Feast”’, \textit{ML} 59/2 (1978), 159-179.} (The third surviving copy was produced for Samuel Hellier by William Walond senior in Oxford in the 1750s; see below).\footnote{GB-Bu SH 202. See Burrows and Ward Jones, ‘An Inventory’ (p. 93, No.124).} Their importance goes beyond that of most library copies and lies in the fact that they are not continuo parts, but written-out parts presenting exactly what the organ should play, including directions for registration. They appear to be secondary and tertiary copies of the original working part used at some point in Handel’s own performances of \textit{Alexander’s Feast}; their precise contents and the implications of these have been extensively discussed in print.\footnote{See, for example, Cooper, ‘The Organ Parts’; Burrows, ‘The Composition and First Performance’, \textit{idem}, ‘Who Does What, When?’; Barry Cooper, ‘The Sources of “Alexander’s Feast”’ (correspondence), \textit{ML} 65/3 (1984), 324; Donald Burrows, ‘The Sources of “Alexander’s Feast”’ (correspondence), \textit{ML} 66/1 (1985), 87-88; Holman, ‘The Conductor at the Organ’, pp. 256-257; Patrick Rogers, \textit{Continuo Realization in Handel’s Vocal Music} (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1990), pp. 56-61.} The British Library copies both contain the uncorrected errors that are a feature of ‘library’ parts: R.M. 19.a.10 has been copied directly from R.M. 19.a.1 and transfers all the errors from that copy; additionally, an entire line of music is omitted from the overture.\footnote{See Cooper, ‘The Organ Parts’, p. 167.} The Shaw-Hellier copy was produced around twenty years later, possibly from the first of the other two.\footnote{Burrows, ‘Who Does What, When?’, p. 119.}
Burrows has suggested that these organ parts should be approached with caution. Direct evidence that they do represent Handel’s performance practice is lacking: they clearly never functioned as performing parts and the presence of major errors casts their accuracy into doubt. Some of the speed and registration instructions may have been copied on to the wrong movements.\(^{96}\) The Shaw-Hellier copy provides a particular example of the risks of misinterpretation by the copyist: Walond interpreted the instruction ‘Full’ in the chorus ‘The listening crowd’ as relating to the registration rather than the continued full realisation of the chords, and transferred it on to the copy as ‘Draw the Trumpet &c.’ at an unlikely moment.\(^{97}\) Additionally, it is impossible to know whether all the directions were added to the original part for the one performance.\(^{98}\) There are few references to the organ in the score of the work; and the organ copies do not correspond to what can be seen of Handel’s continuo practice in other sources.\(^{99}\) However, the practice they reveal does correspond with organ accompaniment practice in the oratorio performance tradition carried into the nineteenth century by Joah Bates, who reportedly had heard Handel play.\(^{100}\) Bates is said to have accompanied recitatives and most arias on the harpsichord, and choruses and some specific types of aria on the organ. In the choruses, he reportedly doubled the voices in contrapuntal passages but filled out the harmony in homophonic sections.\(^{101}\) This agrees well with the practice of the *Alexander’s Feast* organ copies.

---


\(^{100}\) Holman, ‘The Conductor at the Organ’, pp. 254-255.

\(^{101}\) Holman, ‘The Conductor at the Organ’, p. 255.
Holman has suggested that the original from which these parts were copied was produced because of the unprecedented situation of 1737, when Handel experienced what was probably the first of a series of minor strokes which paralysed his right arm and left him temporarily unable to play.\textsuperscript{102} Probably he had not previously needed to write out the organ part, as he would have played it himself; but having someone else play it necessitated writing out a fairly detailed and descriptive part. In 1737 there were performances of *Alexander’s Feast* on 16, 18 and 30 March, 5 April, and 25 June.\textsuperscript{103} It is not clear precisely when the stroke took place; there is no direct evidence for the date of 13 April sometimes given. Handel was clearly well in mid-March, as a newspaper report of 17 March recounting the performance of the day before noted that ‘his Royal Highness [the Prince of Wales] commanded Mr. Handel’s Concerto on the Organ to be repeated’.\textsuperscript{104} The earliest reference to his ill-health appears to be in a letter from the Earl of Shaftesbury to James Harris of 26 April:

> I was near an hour with Handel yesterday[,] he is in no danger upon the whole though I fear [,] or am rather too certain[,] he will loose a great part of his execution so as to prevent his ever playing any more concertos on the organ. He submitts to discipline very patiently & I really believe will be orderly for the time to come[,] that this unhappy seisure may possibly at last be the occasion of prolonging his life. Handel is in excellent spirits & is exceeding thankfull his desorder[,] which is rhumatick palsie[,] did not attack him till he had done writing. ‘Tis his right arm that is struck which was taken ill in a minute.\textsuperscript{105}


\textsuperscript{104} Deutsch, *Documentary Biography*, p. 429.

The ‘writing’ Handel was glad to have finished was probably the new version of *Il Trionfo del Tempo* (HWV 46b), which Deutsch claims was finished on 14 March, suggesting that he fell ill at the end of March or the start of April. The Earl was optimistic in his letter of 30 April to Harris and claimed that Handel was recovering fast, but a newspaper report of 14 May stated that ‘[t]he ingenious Mr. Handel is very much indispos’d, and it’s thought with a Paraletick Disorder, he having at present no Use of his Right Hand’. The Earl of Shaftesbury’s next report, of 12 May, was that ‘Mr Handel is better though not well enough to play the harpsichord himself which young Smith is to do for him’. Although contemporary reports of Handel’s recovery are sparse, with most descriptions of the event written some decades later, it seems that he was not fully recovered until October of the same year. It seems therefore certain that he did not play in the last performance of Alexander’s Feast in 1737 and may – depending on the date he fell ill – have also missed the April or some of the March performances.

There is dispute over precisely what date the contents suggest, although the part clearly dates from before the published edition of 1738. Burrows has shown that the contents seem to correspond to the original 1736 version of the work, with the exception of two anomalies: the inclusion of twelve bars which had been cut from the second section of ‘Revenge, Timotheus cries’ (No.22), seemingly before the first performance, and the inclusion of a cue for ‘Aria tacet’ which comes after the

---


‘Concerto in Alexander’ before the start of Part II. However, it seems that Handel’s original version of Alexander’s Feast was the version used unaltered until early 1739, except for the replacement of the harp concerto Op. 4., No. 6. It is therefore possible that the organ part does not date from the first performances but was prepared in 1737 following Handel’s stroke; however, there remains the problem of the two anomalies mentioned above. If the twelve bars excised from No. 22 in 1736 were replaced in 1737, this replacement was not marked into the ‘conducting’ score which J. C. Smith had prepared from the autograph score and would not be consistent with the overall pattern of Handel’s amendments, which were aimed at curbing prolixity. No satisfactory explanation has yet been found for the aria cue before Part II. Barry Cooper’s solution, that it refers to the aria ‘Sei del ciel’ inserted in 1737 for Domenico Annibali, certainly fixes the date neatly to the run of performances that took place in 1737 at around the time of Handel’s stroke, as Annibali was only in England for the eight months between October 1736 and June 1737. However, Burrows has pointed out that ‘Sei del ciel’ was inserted part-way through and not after the cantata ‘Cecilia volgi un sguardo’, making nonsense of the cue ‘Cantata e Duetto tacet / Aria Tacet’. This problem remains, however, whatever date is assigned to the organ part.


The Performing Sets in the Shaw-Hellier Collection

The parts in the Shaw-Hellier Collection were produced for Samuel Hellier (1736-84) in Oxford in the 1750s and 60s, for provincial performances using musicians on his estate at Wombourne in Staffordshire.\(^{114}\) They were copied by the Oxford circle of scribes centred on William Walond senior (1719-68); at least four scribes assisted Walond with Hellier’s sets.\(^{115}\) They must have had some contact with J. C. Smith’s circle, at least at one remove, because the set for *Alexander’s Feast* contains a further copy of Handel’s organ part, as described above. A similar part for the Dettingen *Te Deum* also survives in this collection; this is a mixture of single-stave tastosolo bass-line, figured bass and two-stave written-out chorus doubling, similar to that in the *Alexander’s Feast* part, indicating that this part may also be copied from Handel’s own.\(^{116}\)

At some point during the eighteenth century, seemingly while still in Hellier’s possession, groups of parts to different works were bound up together into part-books according to instrument-type. There were clearly too few of some types of parts to warrant a volume of their own and so they were bound into whichever other instrument-book seemed most appropriate; as a result, some parts intended for use together were bound into one volume. It is not known when this occurred, but a number of the parts would no longer have functioned in performance afterwards. For example, the 32 part-books in SH162-193 give primarily the instrumental and vocal parts for the Dettingen *Te Deum* and *L’Allegro, il Penseroso ed il Moderato*,


\(^{115}\) Burrows and Ward Jones, ‘An Inventory’, pp. 63 and 91-94. The others are designated Anon DDD, Anon FFF, Anon KKK, Anon LLL (probably the same scribe as the previous) and Anon MMM.

\(^{116}\) GB-Bu SH 171.
but also include parts to ‘Zadok the Priest’; a trio by John Worgan; ‘Rule Britannia’; and well-known marches from Saul (the ‘Dead’ March) and Judas Maccabaeus.

The horn and trumpet for the Dead March are both bound in one volume, as are the flute and ‘tympano’; though possibly the players might have memorised their parts. That the same happens in the parts for L’Allegro is not necessarily a problem, because the horn is never used in the same number as the trumpet; likewise, the flute and the drum are not used together. However, having the chorus soprano part in the same volume as the solo soprano part (which also included the choruses) would have made one of these impossible to use. Any performances, therefore, probably took place before the volumes were bound up.

As with the parts in the Aylesford Collection, many of the sets in the Shaw-Hellier Collection show few or no signs of performance use; they are in remarkably clean and good condition. However, the sets contain substantial numbers of duplicates, indicating at least an intention to use them in performance. Hellier’s letters to his agent and organist John Rogers contain references in 1767 and 1768 to rehearsals of a Te Deum (it is unclear whether this is the Dettingen Te Deum or Purcell’s setting, as parts for both survive in the collection) and of Messiah.\textsuperscript{117} A performance of Judas Maccabaeus, at least, must also have taken place, as the set of parts (GB-Bu SH194-224) is significantly marked up, including correction of wrong notes and text underlay; added dynamics and solo and tutti markings; and the deletion of two numbers.

The set for Judas is dated 17 June 1761 at the end of the cembalo part, probably by the copyist. It is a large set, containing 28 parts in its current state: 21 instrumental and 7 vocal. These are bound in books together with the equally large

\textsuperscript{117} Young, ‘The Shaw-Hellier Collection’, pp. 161-162.
set for *Alexander’s Feast*, the parts of which appear unused. Both the principal cello and the ‘Contra Basso’ part include the whole bass line for *Alexander’s Feast*, including all recitatives, although the third bass part – a ripieno bass – does not include the secco recitatives. This seems to imply that the bass line of the recitatives was reinforced by a sixteen-foot stringed bass, as well as being played on the harpsichord and principal cello. Possibly this was simply a copyist’s mistake, but the copyist was the experienced William Walond senior, for all but a few pages.\textsuperscript{118}

Also, as several of the parts include the names of the singers John Beard, Caterina Galli and Elisabetta de Gambarini, all of whom took part in the first performance of the work in 1747, these parts may have been copied from the original set.

An inscription on the title page of the traversa prima part for *Alexander’s Feast* indicates that the joint set for this work and *Judas* is complete, except for a missing second bass vocal part. There is no direct evidence of part sharing in these sets between either instrumentalists or singers. Confusingly, the solos for both the Israelitish Man and the Israelitish Woman are written into the Canto Primo book, though apparently it was anticipated that the Canto Secondo singer would sing the lower part in the duets between these two characters. If instrumental parts were shared, this would indicate an orchestra of around twelve violins, only two violas, two each of cellos and double basses plus a couple of ripienists (it is unclear whether on cello or bass), plus two each of flutes, oboes, bassoons, horns, trumpets and timpani. Some of the wind players may have doubled parts, although the flute parts are not written into the same books as the oboes. Against this would be only eight singers, or perhaps sixteen if part-sharing was the norm for vocalists in Wombourne,

\textsuperscript{118} GB-Bu SH 213; see Burrows and Ward Jones, ‘An Inventory’, No. 124.
which it was apparently not in the capital. Holman has suggested that the singers would have stood in front, which would have alleviated any balance problems.  

Hellier’s parts to the Handel coronation anthems (GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 127-161) are bound in boards covered with Dutch brocade paper (Illus. 4.1a), though most of the foil is worn away. On some of these examples the wording ‘AUG BEY ... IOHNN . MICH’ can be made out on the edge of the paper (Illus. 4.1c), probably indicating the maker Johann Michael Munck junior of Augsburg, one of the best-known of the Augsburg paper-makers, who was active until around 1761. The paper on one volume is signed ‘AUG. BEY. SIMON . HAICHELE . COM . BRI . S.C.M. N° 36. S. H.’ Simon Haichele was another Augsburg paper-maker of importance who was active between 1740 and 1750; however, it is known that some of his plates were taken over by Johann Michael Munck after his death. The use of these papers probably therefore indicates a binding date in the late 1750s or early 1760s.

---


121 GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 138, 139; Haemmerle, Buntpapier, p. 126.

122 GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 156.

123 Haemmerle, Buntpapier, pp. 108, 120.
4.1: Embossed brocade paper covers by Augsburg makers, a) with some of the gilding intact (GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 131); b) made by patching two pieces together (GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 130); c) partial signature probably of Johnn Michael Munck of Augsburg seen under ultra-violet light (GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 138). By permission of the Cadbury Research Library: Special Collections, University of Birmingham.
The score of these anthems is covered with a well-preserved example of the red paste-paper similar to examples in the records of the Moravian community (Illus. 4.2; see Chapter 1). As the paper corresponds so closely to the Moravian examples in colour and design, it is possible that these papers also originated from Fulneck; if so, the volume must have been bound after 1766.

4.2: GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 68: red paste-paper cover, pattern produced with a narrow comb and fingers, probably after 1766 (by permission of the Cadbury Research Library: Special Collections, University of Birmingham).

Other Eighteenth-Century Performing Materials for Handel’s Works

Handel’s popularity is evident in the number of surviving eighteenth-century performing sets for his concerted music that have no link to the composer himself. Among surviving eighteenth-century sets that were not part of composers’

---

124 GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 68.
collections of their own music, he is the most-represented composer. Such Handel sets are of value for the light they shed on contemporary performance practice, particularly in the provinces. They also give information on the spread and popularity of repertoire and details of actual performances, such as the names of participating musicians. The practice they indicate is generally consistent, in that soloists’ parts also give the choruses; there is no sign of part-sharing by singers, but frequent signs of sharing by instrumentalists.

A set of eleven vocal and twenty instrumental parts for *Esther*, now in Durham Cathedral, contains the names of a number of London singers, but does not seem to originate from there.\(^{125}\) Those named are Giulia Frasi, Isabella Scott (known as Isabella Young before her marriage in 1757), Thomas and Joseph Baildon, John Beard, Robert Wass, and a singer whose name began with ‘Den..’, for whom Robert Denham is a possible candidate.\(^{126}\) These names apparently relate to use of the parts, rather than having been transferred from the copyist’s source; they are written on the covers, rather than appearing in the song titles, and the singers are not in any case those from the work’s first performance. The version transmitted is the earlier Cannons version of 1720; yet the parts date from several decades after this.\(^{127}\)

It has been noted by Crosby that the possible time-frame for this performance is quite small, as Isabella Young only became Mrs Scott in 1757 and Thomas Baildon died in 1762.\(^{128}\) However, the parts do show signs of having been used more than once. Newspaper advertisements exist for performances of *Esther* in Oxford and in

\(^{125}\) GB-DRe MS D15.

\(^{126}\) Olive Baldwin and Thelma Wilson, ‘Young (6): Isabella Young (ii)’, *GMO* [accessed 22 July 2014].


the course of the Three Choirs Festival and other festivals in the provinces, using some of these performers. For example, Beard and Frasi appeared with other singers in an Oxford performance on 3 July 1759; and Beard appeared in Bristol Cathedral on 6 August 1760 in a charity performance ‘conducted by Dr. Hayes’. Beard and Frasi seem to have both appeared later that same year in Gloucester as part of the Three Choirs Festival on 10 September, again conducted by Philip Hayes; the other principal singers are listed as Champness, Wass, Price and ‘others’. A similar performance took place, again involving Frasi and Beard, in the Three Choirs Festival of 1761 in Worcester, on 2 September. However, no advertisements seem to have appeared in the London press for a performance with this combination of singers. There is no record of how the set was acquired by Durham Cathedral.

The instrumental parts consist of four each of first and second violins, of which one part from each is designated ‘Obligato’ and the others ‘Grosso’; two violas; obligato and repieno violoncellos; two double basses, oboes and horns; one obligato bassoon; and an organ. This agrees broadly with the list of instruments given in one of the advertisements for the Three Choirs Festival, which announced that the concerts would be ‘by an excellent Band from London, Oxford, Salisbury, Worcester, and other Places; consisting of Three Trumpets, Two French Horns, one Pair of Kettle Drums, Four Hautboys, Four Bassoons, Two Double Basses, Violins, Violoncellos, Tenor Viols, and Chorus of Voices in Proportion’. The parts are


130 Classified Ads., London Chronicle (London), 4-6 September 1760, Issue 577. The oratorio included ‘an additional Song, Duet and Chorus’ but evidently not the coronation anthems.

131 Classified Ads., Whitehall Evening Post or London Intelligencer (London), 8-11 August 1761, Issue 2403.

132 Classified Ads., London Chronicle (London), 4-6 September 1760, Issue 577. It seems from the wording ‘The whole by an excellent band’ that this refers to all the concerts and not just the closing
clearly not complete, as the organ part is silent throughout a large proportion of the work, playing as usual only in the symphony, choruses and one aria, ‘Jehovah crown’d with glory bright’, but no harpsichord part survives. There are signs of part-sharing in the bassoon part at least, which contains a split line in some places. The parts show signs of reuse, possibly more than once: two arias, ‘Praise the Lord’ and ‘O Jordan sacred tide’, are transposed down a tone. They contain some marking-up by the performers, such as the pencil addendum in the first horn part, for F horn, at the head of no. 19: ‘18 is in G♭ go on directly but first touch the cord of F’.

The two viola parts in this set may not derive from Handel, and as such are dismissed by Howard Serwer as unreliable and non-authentic. However, viewed from another perspective, they are authentic and interesting examples of how a contemporary might supply such parts when violas were available but no parts were provided by the composer. 133 Both violas double the bass in the overture and in the tutti sections of the arias, being silent when the voice sings. In the aria ‘O beauteous queen’ the viola is silent in the middle section before the da capo repeat. During choruses, the viola lines are more complex. In ‘Shall we the God of Israel’ the first viola doubles the first tenor until the last six bars, in which the tenor is silent and the first viola therefore doubles the bass; the second viola generally doubles the second tenor but switches to double the alto in bars 5-8 and the first tenor in bar 9. The first viola part in ‘Shall we of servitude complain’ is similar to that in ‘Shall we the God of Israel’, although this time it doubles the alto line. In ‘Ye sons of Israel mourn’,

concert, Messiah. A similar advertisement was printed for the Festival of 1757; Hayes’s accounts for that year confirm that his ensemble consisted of 63, consisting of 26 singers and 37 instrumentalists. See Simon Heighes, The Lives and Works of William and Philip Hayes (New York: Garland, 1995), p. 270.

the first viola part does not double one line throughout, but switches continually between the first and second tenor parts: it doubles tenor two in bar 3, tenor one in bar 4, tenor two in bar 5, tenor one in bars 6-15, then the bass in bars 16-17. In ‘Save us o lord’ the first viola doubles the first tenor apart from bar 4, where it switches to the second tenor, and bars 12-14, where it doubles the instrumental bass.

Notwithstanding Serwer’s opinion, the viola parts may in fact be ‘authentic’, as Handel’s own viola part is given for three out of the four numbers for which he composed one: ‘Jehovah crowned’/’He comes to end our woes’; ‘Turn not o queen’; and ‘The lord our enemy has slain’. Only in the chorus ‘Virtue truth and innocence’ is Handel’s own viola part ignored in favour of viola parts that are constructed similarly to the chorus viola parts described above. It has long been acknowledged that viola participation in Esther is problematic: for the majority of the work the instrument is absent even from the numbers reused from the Brockes Passion that did originally contain viola, before suddenly appearing towards the end.134 This probably reflects the composition of the orchestra at Cannons, for which the work was written: the ensemble contained no violas in 1717-18, the probable date of the first version of Esther. The work was apparently first revised during 1720, by which time violas were present at Cannons.135 It is unlikely that Handel would have expected the viola player, once present, to sit silent for the majority of the oratorio before participating in four numbers in the last two scenes. It is more probable that he expected the copyist to extrapolate a viola part for the numbers which lacked an independent viola line, much in the manner of copyist extrapolation of oboe or bassoon parts. The anomaly of ‘Virtue, truth and innocence’ might have been


caused by a copyist’s mistake. The parts are therefore probably as authentic as the oboe and bassoon parts surviving in the Foundling Hospital set for Messiah.

The joint set of parts and companion scores for ‘The King shall rejoice’ and the Dettingen Te Deum, held in Durham Cathedral, is of particular interest because of the information it offers on the cost of copying. The set, containing ten vocal and fifteen instrumental parts in good condition, was copied by the professional scribe John Mathews, who included detailed lists in the score giving the breakdown of the production costs. A date on the canto primo part indicates that the set was used for performance in 1781, although Crosby notes that the binder’s mark suggests the score was bound during Mathews’ time in Salisbury. The set must therefore date from before 1764 and has probably been used in more than one performance. All ten of the vocal parts listed have survived, but two of the instrumental parts (one violoncello and one first violin) are missing. Interestingly, the set contains first and second parts labelled ‘Clarinett, e Corno’; a note on each explains that these are transposed duplicates of the trumpet parts, to be played on D horns or D clarinets if trumpets cannot be obtained. At first sight there seems to be some evidence in the treble parts that some of the more difficult sections were sung by a smaller group of singers: instructions such as ‘Chorus – 2 Trebles’ appear against several choruses. On closer examination, however, these appear to refer only to whether there are two treble lines in any given movement, or only one.

According to the list, a separate keyboard part never existed; the evidence is inconclusive as to whether the score or the principal violoncello part may have functioned as such. The principal cello part for ‘The King shall rejoice’ is unfigured,

136 GB-DRc Mss A32 and D7.
137 Crosby, A Catalogue, p. 22.
but the same part for the Te Deum is more heavily figured than the score. The score of ‘The King shall rejoice’, however, gives an organ line for the thirteen bars at the start of ‘Thou shalt give him everlasting felicity’ for which the principal violoncello part gives only rests. The most likely solution is that an organist played from the score for both works, but another keyboard instrument, perhaps a harpsichord, shared the principal violoncello part with the cellist, in the Te Deum at least.

The detailed list of costs given in the score for materials and copying the set (Illustration 4.3) serves as a useful benchmark against which to measure the cost of other sets. According to the list, the breakdown of costs for the entire set was as follows: it comprised one score of 154 pages, and 10 vocal and 17 instrument parts stitched into booklets, containing a further 327 written pages. This required 121½ sheets of Royal music paper bought at 1¼ d. per sheet for a total cost of 12s. 8d. (each sheet was quartered to give four leaves). The 481 written pages were copied at a cost of 1½ d. each, giving a total copying cost of £3. 0s. 1½ d. About the binding, Mathews is slightly less exact (‘The Binding of this Score Book costing as I recollect about of 3/- or 3/6, but suppose it only 3/-’). He gives the following information about the covers of the individual parts:

For Thirteen Sheets and a half of Cartridge whited brown Paper (to make covers to the abovementioned single part Books allowing ½ a Sheet to each Book) which cost me one halfpenny each Sheet -----------------------------

0:0:6¾

The total cost of the entire set for paper, copying, covers for the parts and the binding of the score was, therefore, £3. 16s. 4 ¼ d. It is difficult to translate this into a current value because of the alteration in the relative value of goods in the intervening time. To put it in context, however, this was roughly the equivalent of
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138 GB-DRc Mus. MS A32, fol. iii.
eleven weeks’ wages for an unskilled labourer at the time.\footnote{Calculation based on the average weekly wages for an agricultural worker in the Salisbury area (within 110 miles of London) estimated by Arthur Young in his \textit{A Six Weeks Tour Through the Southern Counties} (2d. edn, 1772), quoted in Elizabeth W. Gilboy, \textit{Wages in Eighteenth Century England} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934), p. 39.} If this is representative of the cost of a set of manuscript parts in 1764, they were luxury goods by the standards of the time. Luxury goods were more expensive, comparatively speaking, than they are today; the same money would buy around only 4 yards of rich brocaded satin or 2 to 3 square yards of carpet depending on quality, or around 0.874 oz (just under 25g) of fine gold, calculated from the estimated London market price in 1763.\footnote{\textit{Liza Picard, ‘Appendix: Cost of Living, Currency and Prices’ in Dr Johnson’s London} (London: Phoenix Press, 2003), p. 296; L. H. Officer and S. H. Williamson, ‘The Price of Gold, 1257 - Present.’, \textit{MeasuringWorth}, 2014, \texttt{http://www.measuringworth.com/gold/} [accessed 12 June 2014].} 25g of fine gold is currently selling for just over £600.\footnote{\£604.85 - \£637.48 for 25g calculated on 11 June 2014, via prices available via \texttt{https://www.bullionvault.com/gold-price-chart.do} and Gerrards Limited (calculated from price for 20g) \texttt{http://www.gerrardsonline.co.uk/sell_sovereign_krugerands_fine_gold_bars_rates.htm} [accessed 11 June 2014].}

Other sources of information indicate that the cost of copying was normally even higher. A second score by Mathews containing similar data, the copy of \textit{Messiah} held in Marsh’s Library, Dublin, gives the cost of copying at ‘6 pence pp Leaf for Paper & writing’, compared to that of the Durham score and parts which equates to just over 3 ¼ d. per leaf.\footnote{IRL-Dm Z 1.2.26, cited in W. Shaw, ‘John Mathews’s Manuscript of “Messiah”’, \textit{ML} 39/2 (April 1958), 101-117 (102).} J. C. Smith’s scripторium apparently charged 3d. per copied page (that is, 6d. per leaf) earlier in the century.\footnote{GB-Lbl Add. MS. 31067 (score to \textit{La Didone}), front flyleaf and fols. 150v-151r.} The account books of the Shaw Singers, a small society giving performances of Handel oratorios in Lancashire that operated outside the mainstream in the psalmody tradition, demonstrate that it was paying around 9d. per copied quarto leaf in the mid-1770s, a higher rate than
Mathews’ in the same decade.\textsuperscript{144} Regarding Mathews’ figures, it must be borne in mind that his calculations clearly did not reflect actual costs: he performed all the copying himself, and the scores and parts concerned formed part of his personal library. (The Durham sets appear to have been sold by him before he left that city, but this clearly took place some time after their original production). The calculations on both scores appear to have been added retrospectively some years after copying, possibly in the course of attempts by Mathews to assess the value of his library. This might suggest that Mathews’ calculations of worth were at his own ‘cost’ rates for the purposes of replacement, and might not reflect the amount he charged to customers. Whether this is correct is difficult to determine from the little information that survives on Mathews’ commercial activity as a copyist. One further surviving score copied by him, of Hercules (HWV 60), contains a note recording that Thomas Bever paid £19. 9s. in 1771 for the score and its corresponding parts, and for a companion set for Saul.\textsuperscript{145} It is not recorded whether Bever dealt directly with Mathews or whether the sets had passed through other hands first; or what the rate of pay equated to per leaf. It is difficult to calculate this, because no information survives about the missing set for Saul. However, the total number of leaves in the set for Hercules is recorded in the surviving score as 1052 pages (526 leaves). At 6d. per leaf, this would account for £13. 3s. of the £19. 9s. paid by Bever, but at Mathews’ earlier rate of 3d. per leaf (1½ d. per page), this would equate to only £4. 7s. 8d. of the total.

Another score and set of parts – thirteen vocal and seventeen instrumental – copied by Mathews, for Handel’s Joshua, also survives in Durham Cathedral, 

\textsuperscript{144} GB-Mp L201/4/1/1.
\textsuperscript{145} GB-Lfrom 1266 (score for Hercules), note on endpaper.
although it lacks any information on the set’s production costs and value.\textsuperscript{146} Again it seems likely that this set dates from the 1760s, though it is not known where it was used. The parts again show signs of use, such as the direction ‘Lead off’ in some of the vocal parts; and signs of sharing in the bassoon part, which contains both first and second bassoon lines. Similarly, the ‘Violino Primo Ripieno’ part also contains the third violin part for some numbers, and the viola part divides into ‘alto viola’ and ‘tenor viola’.

Again the \textit{Joshua} set contains no keyboard part and it is unclear whether the score or the principal violoncello part may have fulfilled this function. The principal violoncello part might have done so, given that it contains the entire work, including figured recitatives, although the other movements are not figured. However, directions in the score such as ‘Bassoons e Violoncello piano – Senza Contra Basso’ likewise suggest that it might have so functioned, and that a double bass player might have shared it with the keyboard player.\textsuperscript{147} These were apparently not instructions for part-copying, as the score lacks other such instructions that should have been similarly necessary regarding the cello parts. In the aria ‘O first in wisdom’, for example, solo and tutti sections are not marked in the score although the parts show that the second cello was silent during the vocal sections. It is unclear whether Mathews used his own judgement in determining how parts were to be copied in such situations, as appears to have been normal for eighteenth-century copyists, or whether he had access to another set of parts as source. Interestingly, an organ part for ‘See the conquering hero comes’ is copied into the viola part; the viola is instructed to be silent for this number.

\textsuperscript{146} GB-DRc Mss A24 and D8.

\textsuperscript{147} GB-DRc Ms A24, p. 78, No. 16.
Mathews’ score of Hercules contains a detailed list of the parts in the set bought by Bever, although none now survive. The missing set apparently conformed in numbers of parts (although not in numbers of pages) to Mathews’ other surviving sets, having consisted of ten vocal and fifteen instrumental parts. Again no keyboard part of any type was listed. All three of these sets suggest an ensemble of thirteen to seventeen singers (three to four each of first and second trebles or sopranos; and two or three each of alto, tenor and bass, including the soloists) against around 26 instrumentalists (four first and four second violins, two or three violas, four cellos, one double bass reading from the score, four oboes of which two doubled on flute, two bassoons and two trumpets and horns, plus timpani). Again, the instruments outnumber the voices.

148 GB-Lfom 1266.
4.3: A list of parts produced for the joint set for the ‘Dettingen’ Te Deum and ‘The King Shall Rejoice’, hand of John Mathews, 1764 (GB-D Rc Ms. Mus. A32, fol. iii). By permission of the Chapter of Durham Cathedral; image copyright.
A particularly interesting set of parts for a work called ‘Handel’s Miserere’ is now in the Royal Music Library, although it is not known how the set entered this collection.¹⁴⁹ The work is in fact an arrangement of the Chandos Anthem ‘Have mercy upon me’ (HWV 248) with interpolated numbers; the text is in English, despite the implication of the title. The only performance of this work I have been able to trace took place in the course of a ‘Concerto Spirituale […] The whole composed by Mr. Handel’ as part of the Lent season of oratorios at the Theatre Royal in the Haymarket on 3 March, 1773.¹⁵⁰ According to the advertisement, it was ‘Never before performed in public’. Part I of the concert consisted of an overture; the ‘Dettingen’ Te Deum; and a violin solo by Joseph Agus. The second part consisted of the ‘Miserere Mei Deus, &c. (The Fifty-first Psalm) Composed for the Duke of Chandos’; followed by a clarinet concerto by either John or William Mahon. Part III consisted of the anthem ‘Sing unto God (HWV 263) ‘Performed at the Chapel-royal, for the Nuptials of their late Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales’. The title of the ‘Miserere’ is possibly explained by the fact that two performances entitled ‘Concerto Spirituale’ at Covent Garden the previous year had included Miserere settings by Pergolesi and Galuppi.¹⁵¹ That the parts surviving in the Royal Music Library were indeed used in this performance is suggested by the names of the singers they contain, ‘Mrs Smith’ and ‘Miss Harper’. Although the newspaper advertisement does not record the names of the soloists, the *Macaroni, and Theatrical Magazine* confirms that Miss Harper and Mrs Smith were part of the team performing at the Haymarket for the Lent of 1773, along with Galli, Vernon

¹⁴⁹ GB-Lbl R.M. 19.b.4 and R.M. 19.e.3.


and Meredith. Unfortunately, as the article noted, ‘Covent-garden has met with but indifferent success, the Hay-market with scarcely any’, on account of the fact that both were competing against Elizabeth Linley at Drury Lane.

The instrumental parts may have been reused, as a solo that was originally intended for clarinet – presumably to be played by Mahon – was reallocated to one of the first oboists. However, the vocal parts do not seem to have been reused; possibly the alterations in the instrumental parts were made for the first performance after the parts had been copied. If the ‘Miserere’ was never repeated, perhaps the failure of the 1773 season at the Haymarket was responsible for this. The set is probably incomplete, as it seems to lack the proper number of bass parts. The vocal parts consist of one each for Mrs Smith and Miss Harper plus principal alto, tenor and bass parts, which would correspond to the team of soloists listed above. In addition, one each of chorus soprano, alto, tenor and bass parts survive, indicating that the theatre chorus may have been quite small. The instrumental parts consist of four parts each for first and second violins, numbered one to four in each case; single unnumbered viola and bass parts; two parts each for horns, trumpets and oboes; one bassoon part for the first and second bassoons; and a timpani part. The set lacks a continuo part and presumably several additional bass parts, although it is impossible to tell how many were originally present, as the surviving bass part is not numbered. That the instrumental parts were shared is confirmed by the presence in the first oboe book of both first and second flute parts. The most interesting feature of the set is the soprano part used by Mrs Smith, in which three cadenzas (one of which was then discarded) have been notated in pencil, probably by Mrs Smith herself (Ex.4.4-

152 ‘State of the Oratorios’, Macaroni, and Theatrical Magazine (London, March 1772). ‘Mr Smith’ is clearly a misprint for ‘Mrs Smith’ in this article.
These are rare and stylish examples of a type of ornamentation that was rarely written down.

4.4: ‘Behold I was shapen in wickedness’ from ‘Mr. Handel’s Miserere’, a) final phrase, original version (voice and bass without strings); b) Mrs Smith’s notated cadenza (GB-Lbl R.M.19.b.4, fol. 76r.).

4.5: ‘Thou shalt open my lips O Lord’ from ‘Mr. Handel’s Miserere’, a) final phrase, original version (voice and bass without strings); b) Mrs Smith’s discarded cadenza; c) Mrs Smith’s replacement cadenza (R.M.19.b.4, fol. 83r.).
A large set of instrumental parts containing a re-worked version of the ‘Dettingen’ Te Deum survives in the Rowe Music Library, having been acquired by A. H. Mann in 1896 from a Dublin bookshop. In the version presented, the Te Deum is preceded by an ‘Overture’ in Bb, identified by Johnstone as version of three movements from the ‘Concerto in Alexander’s Feast’ (HWV 318).\textsuperscript{154} Mann’s assumption that this represents a version prepared by Handel himself, incorporating new revisions made by the composer, is clearly false, resting on a mistaken belief that the paper must date from Handel’s lifetime and that the recomposition of a work could in any case only have been carried out by the composer.\textsuperscript{155} The set is incomplete – none of the associated vocal parts survive and some of the instrumental parts are missing – but the numbering system on the wrappers indicates to some extent where the gaps lie. In its original state, it probably consisted of around twenty-two parts: four each of first and second violins, at least two violas and three basses plus two each of oboes, bassoons, trumpets and horns, and a timpani part. If parts were shared, this would indicate an orchestra of almost forty players. A list on the inside of the Violino Primo No. 2 part, evidently made while copying was still in progress (it includes the entry ‘other Instruments wanted’), gives numbers for the missing vocal parts: four cantos, six altos, seven tenors and seven basses. This

\textsuperscript{154} GB-Ckc MS 105; see H. Diack Johnstone, ‘Handel Revamped’, \textit{The Handel Institute Newsletter} 25/1 (Spring 2014).

\textsuperscript{155} His method of dating of the set, described in the preface to his full score (GB-Ckc MS 104), was based on the belief that all paper with the LVG watermark must belong within that period. The style of the alterations does not support the view that they stem from the composer (Johnstone, ‘Handel Revamped’).
indicates a singing group of around 28 (if the top line consisted of boys sharing parts, as implied by the relative numbers); again, therefore, the orchestra was bigger than the choir.

Johnstone has put forward a strong argument that J. C. Smith junior was the arranger of the work. This probably took place in the 1760s or 1770s, after Handel’s death but before the autograph manuscripts, seemingly the only possible source for one of the interpolated numbers, entered the Royal Music Library.\textsuperscript{156} It is not known for what event the set was produced: nothing in the set links it to Ireland apart from its discovery in that country. However, it bears noticeable similarities to the set for Handel’s so-called ‘Miserere’ described above. Both are pasticcios of Handel’s originals with interpolated numbers, in a style indicating a date in the latter part of the eighteenth century. The sets indicate similar-sized and similarly-composed ensembles. The parts bear similar numbering systems, with each violin part being labelled ‘Miserere &c: by Handel / Violino Secondo / N°. 2’, ‘Dettengen / Anthem. / Violino Secondo / N°. 4’ or similar. Interestingly, the advertisements for the ‘Concerto Spirituale’, in which the ‘Miserere’ was performed, do in fact state that Part I consisted of an overture followed by the Dettingen Te Deum. It may be that both sets were used on this occasion, in which case, they give interesting information on size of the orchestra of the Theatre Royal in the Haymarket for the 1772-3 season. The existence of these sets perhaps indicates that J. C. Smith junior was arranging pasticcios for the Haymarket Theatre Royal during this season, despite the fact that his own oratorio season at Drury Lane was in competition with them.

\textit{Alexander’s Feast} was the only one of Handel’s oratorios published in its entirety during the composer’s lifetime. This has led, as Burrows has pointed out, to a

\textsuperscript{156} Johnstone, ‘Handel Revamped’.
relative lack of manuscript sources for the work, particularly in Handel’s later
versions, as the printed score fulfilled the usual distributive function of manuscript
copies.\footnote{Burrows, Handel and Alexander’s Feast*, p. 254, note 11.} The existence of a published score must have been a factor in the work’s
popularity, along with its subject matter, which made it suitable for Caecilian
celebrations. In turn this probably explains the survival of a larger number of
eighteenth-century performing sets for \textit{Alexander’s Feast} than for any of Handel’s
other works.

The earliest surviving such set is probably the fragmented set held in Durham
Cathedral and originating from Richard Fawcett. Crosby dates it tentatively at
around 1738; however, it has clearly been used more than once.\footnote{GB-DRc Ms. E 20. See Crosby, \textit{A Catalogue}, pp. 67-8.} There are
probably parts missing from the vocal set, which now contains two canto primo parts,
one canto secondo, one contratenor, two first tenors, one second tenor and a bass part.
The contratenor part carries the name of Powell, a well-known Oxford singer, and a
cue in one of the instrumental parts seems to indicate that Philip Hayes was the tenor
soloist.\footnote{E20 (ii)/4.} The instrumental parts are in a confusing state, but include eleven whole
parts and ten further fragments, incompletely copied parts or parts to individual arias.
The Oxford performances apparently included at least four concertos, although these
might not all have been performed in every performance. Some of the parts for these
are written into the main parts, while others are contained in separate sets in the
Durham collection. For example, a set of fifteen parts for the Concerto Grosso in C,
in a folder labelled ‘Concerto for Violins in Alexander’s Feast’ in Richard Fawcett’s hand, seems to belong with the main set.\footnote{GB-DRc MS E20 (iii).}

The instrumental parts include a number of names of performers, though it is clear from the deletions that these refer to more than one performance. The Michael Festing named as principal violinist at one performance may have been the son of the violinist Michael Christian Festing.\footnote{Elizabeth M. Lamb and Melanie Groundsell, ‘Festing, Michael Christian’, \textit{GMO} [accessed 23 July 2014].} Two oboists are named as ‘Parke’ and ‘Lowe’; ‘Parke’ is probably John Parke, though clearly this must relate to a performance long after 1738. Lowe at least also doubled on the transverse flute.\footnote{Roger Fiske et al, ‘Parke [Park], English family of musicians’, \textit{GMO} [accessed 23 July 2014]. The elder Parke was born in 1745 and the younger, William, in 1761.} At least one of the bassoonists seems to have doubled on the oboe, since one partial bassoon and violoncello part instructs the player to take the oboe for the tenor accompagnato ‘Give the vengeance due’.\footnote{E20 (ii)/8.} The recorder parts for ‘Thus long ago’ were played on transverse flutes.

Another small set of parts for \textit{Alexander’s Feast}, clearly copied directly from the 1738 print, survives in the collection of Durham Cathedral.\footnote{GB-DRc Ms. M172.} All bear the stamp of the Lord Crewe’s Charity, a still-existing charitable trust set up in 1721 for the benefit of needy clergy in accordance with the will of Nathaniel Lord Crewe, Bishop of Durham.\footnote{See ‘Lord Crewe’s Charity’, <http://www.lordcrewescharity.org.uk/> [accessed 23 July 2014].} All are also inscribed ‘John Sharp / Trin: Coll:’, indicating that they were originally the property of John Sharp (1723-1792), apparently acquired while
Sharp was in Cambridge between 1740 and 1744.\textsuperscript{166} Sharp, who later became Archdeacon of Northumberland and a canon of Durham Cathedral, was a member of the musical Sharp family.\textsuperscript{167} He became a trustee of the Lord Crewe’s Charity in 1758; the charity later acquired part of the Sharp family library, which included some music manuscripts, among which was presumably the set under discussion.\textsuperscript{168} As the Sharps are known to have admired Handel’s music and to have been involved in concerts in Durham, the set may have been used either in concert or at home by the family, which apparently contained enough musical members to mount a small-scale oratorio performance without much outside help.\textsuperscript{169} In its current state, the set contains five vocal parts, two oboes, one second violin, one viola and one violoncello part; but an inventory taken on Sharp’s death in 1792 confirms that three volumes have gone missing.\textsuperscript{170} Some of the surviving parts are heavily damaged, but they seem to show some signs of performance use.

The surviving performing sets and records of the Shaw Society of Singers or Shaw Club, a small group operating between 1741 and 1883 in Crompton and Shaw, Lancashire, indicate that this society was performing Handel oratorios from the 1760s with instrumental forces that were small even by eighteenth-century standards.\textsuperscript{171} This is not surprising: as already stated, the society was not initially part of the mainstream performing tradition, but instead grew out of the psalmody

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{166} See Françoise Deconinck-Brossard, ‘Sharp, John (1723-1792), Church of England Clergyman and Charity Administrator’, \textit{ODNB} [accessed 23 July 2014].
\textsuperscript{167} See Deconinck-Brossard, ‘Sharp, John (1723-1792)’.
\textsuperscript{168} See Crosby, ‘Private Concerts’, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{169} Crosby, ‘Private Concerts’.
\textsuperscript{170} Gloucester Record Office, D3549, Box 52, cited in Crosby, \textit{A Catalogue}, p. 86.
\textsuperscript{171} The Society’s library survives as the ‘Shaw Club Collection’ in GB-Mcm; the copying records are in GB-Mp L201/4/1/1.
\end{flushright}
movement. The society’s surviving library includes partial sets for 14 of Handel’s concerted works, most of which are oratorios. All parts were copied either from the published full score – the society often appeared as ‘Shaw Chapple’ in the subscription lists for these – or from the published sets of ‘Favourite Songs’ from the oratorios. The standard set of parts copied was violin 1, violin 2 and bassoon, together with a vocal set of single copies of treble, contra-tenor, tenor and bass. No lower string parts were initially copied. Later the sets were supplemented with viola, drum or trumpet parts; a drum part for Joshua was copied in 1776, and trumpet parts for Messiah, Jephtha and the ‘Dettingen’ Te Deum were added to the main sets in mid-1777. Cello parts were never routinely copied, although the accounts demonstrate that the society possessed a violoncello from 1779 at least, and there are some signs in later sets that a cellist shared the bassoon part. None of the surviving sets include any duplicates at all; that this was their original state is confirmed by inventories and copying records. Before 1799, only a few exceptions occurred to this copying pattern, the principal such being late in 1782. A larger-than-normal set of parts was copied for Israel in Egypt, consisting of the double the usual number of vocal parts and all the usual instrumental parts plus viola, trumpets, oboes and timpani. Presumably these were intended for a specific occasion in 1783, but no records of this survive.

The surviving parts contain interesting information on performing conditions in Shaw. For example, the obbligato cello part in the aria ‘Softly sweet in Lydian

---


173 Dates are taken from the society’s copying records in GB-Mp L201/4/1/1.

174 For example, the bassoon parts in GB-Mcm SC13 and GB-Mcm SC 8 show such signs.

175 GB-Mp L201/4/1/1 and the inventory in GB-Mcm SC 2.
measures’ in *Alexander’s Feast* is given transposed in the Violino Secundo part, where it is headed ‘Violoncello transpos’d’; the part also contains a similar movement labelled ‘Bassoon transpos’d’.\(^{176}\) It is evident from this that neither the bassoonist nor the cellist was capable of playing an obbligato line, although the society had acquired a violoncello by the time these parts were copied in 1780. The Shaw Club performers probably shared parts, perhaps between more than two players or singers. Several of the surviving instrumental parts show signs of sharing, and the single parts copied for each vocal line are difficult to reconcile with the fairly large number of singers known to have been active in the group at any one time. It is possible that the singers took it in turns to borrow and memorise the parts, or that multiple singers shared one copy in a manner that was apparently not common in London. A detailed and convincing oil painting of a group of the society’s members rehearsing or performing, by the local caricaturist ‘Tim Bobbin’ (John Collier, 1708-1786), appears to provide some evidence of this practice.\(^{177}\) In the scene depicted, seven men and one boy stand singing in what must be the west gallery, all crowded around one large folio volume held by two of the men. The boy, who holds a flageolet, is not singing and may be there to give the note. It should, however, be noted that the performance depicted is clearly not of a concerted work.

Several of the society’s scores and parts carry performance markings; however, marking-up is usually minor and careful, giving an indication of the value the sets had for the group and the care with which they were treated. Care must be taken in assessing all performance instructions in these parts, as Edmund Cheetham, the

---

\(^{176}\) GB-Mcm SC 7, pp. 18 and 27.

\(^{177}\) ‘Choir’, by John Collier (‘Tim Bobbin’), Rochdale Arts and Heritage Service, Touchstones Rochdale. The painting was acquired in April 1907 with another watercolour drawing of a singing group, both of which are said to depict the Shaw Singers (card catalogue entry 97, April 1907). The painting is available to view online at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/arts/yourpaintings/paintings/choir-89964> [accessed 26 December 2014].
society’s principal scribe, was an extremely literal copyist who tended to transfer instructions irrelevant to the society’s performances from the printed sources. For example, the reference to a ‘cembalo’ in the bassoon part for Saul is transferred from the printed score, and is therefore not necessarily evidence that the group performed the work with a harpsichord. The surviving accounts make no references to the purchase, transport or upkeep of a harpsichord, suggesting that the group did not own one. However, the cues added in red ink in the Violin Secondo part to the Dettingen Te Deum are clearly genuine performance markings, as are the pencil addenda to the index of the printed score of Joshua, which appear to give revised movement numbers for the performance of a shortened version. There are similar manuscript addenda in the printed score of Judas, indicating that the score was used to plan out a version with interpolated numbers from other works, as was practiced elsewhere in the country during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. One instruction, for example, reads ‘Bass. Recit. From Capparsalama &c then Chorus of Youths from Oratorio of Joshua’. The overall impression given by the Shaw Singers’ surviving sets is of flexibility; a willingness to interpret music to suit circumstances and resources; and the lack of any belief that the composer’s version was at all sacrosanct; coupled with a great deal of care taken in putting on performances with the small resources they had.

---

178 GB-Mcm SC 15 and 10 respectively.

179 GB-Mcm SC 12. See, for example, Chapters 2 and 3.

180 GB-Mcm SC 12, score p. 61. I have not managed to trace a recitative from any work beginning with these words.
Conclusion

The survival pattern of the performing materials linked to Handel himself is anomalous when compared with other contemporary English composers, suggesting that neither the opera or oratorio sets were dispersed, but kept and lost together. As the surviving materials are few, the information they can provide is limited. Many are too fragmentary to be of use, or else are of limited use because of their circumstances of survival: several part-fragments clearly survived because they were discarded before use in performance, and the paper reused. The surviving continuo scores are in a non-standard format and vary considerably from other surviving eighteenth-century keyboard parts, a difference that probably results from the theatrical context of their use. The lack of theatre performing sets, and of theatre continuo parts in particular, is problematic in assessing whether this hypothesis is correct. Internal evidence suggests that at least some of Handel’s continuo scores were used at the first harpsichord, with the secondary continuo scores perhaps being used at a second harpsichord, or by a lute player. It is likely that other such theatre continuo scores survive: identifying these should be a priority for future research.

The surviving sets of parts that seem to originate from J. C. Smith’s scriptorium are of several different types. Some, such as those copied for Heneage Finch, later 3rd Earl of Aylesford, are sets for opera arias or overtures suitable for home use. Those from Jennens’s collection appear to be ‘library’ sets that served no practical function, although they give valuable information on copying practices. The sets bought by Richard Fawcett were probably similar to those bought by Jennens, but as Fawcett intended them for performance use, he supplemented them with duplicates that he copied himself. It is unclear whether Fawcett’s sets were specially copied to
order, or pre-copied and offered for sale. However, it seems that, in addition to copying Handel’s own performance parts, Smith’s scriptorium was offering for sale several different types of parts that fulfilled different functions. Some surviving parts from these collections, such as the organ parts for *Alexander’s Feast* and the Dettingen Te Deum, are probably direct copies of Handel’s own organ parts and give interesting information on Handel’s organ practice. Surviving copying records from Smith’s scriptorium, as well as John Mathews and the Shaw Singers, give information on the production of sets at this time, indicating that it was paid at a rate that befitted skilled labour, as might be expected.

In terms of performance practice, the most useful surviving sets are those which are linked only indirectly, or not at all, to the composer himself. These give some information on practices which are contemporary with the composer, or date from relatively shortly after his death. They display a common willingness to adapt Handel’s music to suit the performance resources available or to rearrange works to include different numbers; and an assumption that Handel’s versions were not sacrosanct and must be made to adapt to circumstances and preferences. Most of the sets examined here are from the second half of the eighteenth century, yet they show some similarities to the much earlier sets of the Oxford Music School. Although the ensembles indicated are by now much bigger, it was evidently still normal for the singers to be outnumbered by the instrumentalists; for the soloists to participate in choruses; for instrumentalists, but not singers, to share parts; and for direction to take place from within the ensemble, with participants playing close attention to whichever part was in the lead at the time. In these respects, they are also similar to Boyce’s sets (see Chapters 5 and 6), which consistently confirm all these practices, as do the other eighteenth-century sets not specifically examined here, such as those
belonging to William and Philip Hayes. Further research is needed to assess some aspects of these performing materials, such as the continuo figuring, what this reveals about contemporary practice and how practice in the provinces differed from that in London.

The surviving Handel sets of the Shaw Singers of Lancashire are an exception to many of these practices. They should be regarded as deriving from an entirely separate tradition to all other sets examined here, and serve as a reminder that there was more than one tradition of performance practice operating in England at the time. They give an indication of the spread of concerted performances – particularly the oratorios of Handel – across Lancashire, and the interaction of Handelian tradition with the psalmody movement. The practices they reveal – smaller forces, a skeleton ensemble of instruments that was probably outnumbered by the singers, and perhaps a greater degree of part-sharing or a heavier reliance on memorisation by performers – should not be taken as applying to general performance practice outside the west gallery or psalmody tradition. The Shaw Singers’ surviving parts are particularly significant in view of the concurrent survival of the society’s account books and inventories, which enables the information in the parts to be interpreted in light of copying records, records of instrument purchase and upkeep and the hiring out of music, and inventories of the original contents of all sets, none of which have survived complete. This enables a more rounded consideration of the evidence given by the parts, in a manner that is rarely possible.
The surviving performance sets of William Boyce are a unique resource among eighteenth-century English music manuscripts, because of the unparalleled scale and scope of the collection, the stature of the composer who produced them, and the fact that most were used at the successive courts of George II and George III. Boyce was one of the two most significant English composers of the eighteenth century, together with Thomas Arne. Though his entire collection of performance parts does not survive, the extant collection still consists of 57 performance sets spanning 43 years, from c.1736 to 1779. The unique nature of Boyce’s performing parts is best appreciated by comparing them with the survival rates of his English contemporaries’ performance sets for concerted music, of which the totals known to me (excluding stray parts) are listed in Chapter 1.\textsuperscript{1} If Handel is anomalous in one direction, Boyce is anomalous in the other: the eighteenth-century composers from whom the next-greatest numbers of concerted performing sets survive are William and Philip Hayes and Benjamin Cooke, with six sets each. There is no comparable collection of eighteenth-century performance parts by a single composer or for a single institution within England that approaches Boyce’s sets in terms of the scale of the surviving collection and the variety of works included.

One substantial part of Boyce’s output was the works composed in fulfilment of his duties as Composer to the Chapel Royal and Master of the King’s Music. The latter of these posts required him to set two odes by the poet laureate (Colley Cibber from the start of Boyce’s tenure until 1758, and William Whitehead from 1758 until after Boyce’s death) every year, one celebrating the New Year and the second

\textsuperscript{1} See p. 25.
marking the King’s birthday.² It was apparently Boyce’s practice to collect the performance parts afterwards and store them, together with the autograph full scores, numbered in series. This chapter will deal only with the sets to these works: Boyce’s remaining sets will be discussed in Chapter 6.

Each court ode was apparently only performed two or three times in its complete form. A rehearsal usually took place at the Turk’s Head Tavern in Greek Street or Gerrard Street, ‘to a crowded audience’, according to one newspaper report.³ From the mid-1760s at least, this rehearsal may have taken place in private, as it was followed by a separate public rehearsal, usually in Hickford’s Room in Brewer Street, but occasionally at The Crown and Anchor in the Strand.⁴ The main performance then took place at St James’s Palace, usually in the Great Council Chamber or a room adjoining it.⁵ Boyce published the symphonies and overtures from some of the odes in two collections, *Eight Symphonies* (1760) and *Twelve Overtures* (1770); those selected thus gained a new existence as concert works.⁶ However, it appears that most of the music in these works was never recycled or re-performed. Despite this, it seems that Boyce himself must have placed some value on these works, given

---


³ ‘News’, *Lloyd’s Evening Post* (London), June 1, 1763 - June 3, 1763, Issue 919, referring to the rehearsal of the birthday ode ‘Common Births’ on 2 Jun, 1763.

⁴ ‘This day [2 June 1766] the new Ode for his Majesty’s Birth-Day was rehearsed at the Turk’s-Head Tavern in Gerrard-street: To-morrow it will be publicly rehearsed at Hickford’s Great Room in Brewer-street; and on Wednesday it will be performed in the Grand Council Room at St James’s’ (‘News’, *Lloyd’s Evening Post* (London), May 30, 1766 - June 2, 1766, Issue 1388). See also ‘News’, *Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser* (London), June 3, 1776, Issue 2195.


⁶ Both collections were published in London, the first by John Walsh and the second by Boyce himself. Boyce hardly ever reused ode movements; the few instances of reuse are described in Ford, ‘The Court Odes’, p.45, note 8.
the care he took in preserving them together with the performance parts. Again, the survival of these sets of parts is unique. There are no surviving sets of parts to any of the court odes written by other Masters of the Music, or by other court composers such as John Blow and Henry Purcell, between 1660 and 1800.7

Boyce’s court odes form an unbroken series of 43, from 1755 to 1779. They are a multi-faceted resource offering significant information on many topics, some of which go beyond the scope of the present study. The scores provide a chronological documentation of Boyce’s handwriting and its alterations from 1755 until his death. The sets of parts are a repository of scribal hands linked to Boyce and by extension to the court during this period. They provide information on the copying practices these scribes employed. They also contain the names of some musicians who took part in the performances, several of whom were not members of the Chapel Royal or of the King’s Band of Music, and so do not appear in other court records. Finally, they provide a great deal of information on contemporary performance practice, including on leadership practice and the composition of the ensemble, which is of a wider relevance than merely to the works of Boyce alone. This chapter will deal with each of these aspects in turn.

Previous Research on the Court Ode Sets

None of the music considered in this chapter has been published in modern times, except for the selection of fourteen overtures from the odes edited by Gerald Finzi

---

7 The fate of Greene’s court ode sets is described in Chapter 1. It is not known what became of the performing sets for the court odes by Blow, Purcell, Nicholas Staggins, John Eccles, John Stanley and William Parsons.
and published in the *Musica Britannica* series in 1957.\(^8\) This perhaps accounts for the lack of attention paid to the court ode performance sets in previous research on performance practice. Rosamond McGuinness’s groundbreaking 1971 study of the English court ode remains the standard work on the subject but does not discuss Boyce’s performance sets.\(^9\) Tony Trowles’s thesis on the musical ode in Britain was intended to complement McGuinness’s work by focussing on the ode outside the court, and so did not examine the court odes.\(^10\) Charles Cudworth and Gerald Finzi attempted to establish the size of Boyce’s orchestra, but their conclusions were undermined by a failure to assess adequately the performance sets.\(^11\) The parts and the information they contain have been considered by Neil Jenkins in relation to one performer only, the tenor John Beard.\(^12\) Peggy Ellen Daub’s thesis on music at the court of George II gives the performance parts brief consideration and is a useful source of general information on the organisation of the court music during this period.\(^13\) The most thorough and significant study of Boyce’s court odes is contained in Frederic Ford’s thesis, which contains some examination and analysis of the performance sets, although its main focus was the works themselves rather than the performance materials.\(^14\) A preliminary study of the specific relevance of

---


\(^9\) McGuinness, *English Court Odes*. See also the same author’s ‘A Fine Song on Occasion of the Day Was Sung’, *ML* 50/2 (1969), 290-5, which describes the context of the odes’ performance, but again does not consider the performing materials.


\(^13\) Peggy Ellen Daub, ‘Music at the Court of George II (r.1727-1760)’, unpublished doctoral dissertation (Cornell University, 1985).

\(^14\) Referenced above, note 2.
the sets to performance practice as well as the historical and biographical information they contain, was published by the present author in 2006. This study seeks to expand on these findings and on those of Ford.

The History of the Court Ode Sets

On Boyce’s death in 1779, his property, including his library and all his manuscripts, passed to his widow Hannah and their two children, Elizabeth and William junior, in equal shares. Much of Boyce’s library was then put up for sale on 14-16 April 1779, as described in Chapter 1. Although this must have included the greater part of Boyce’s collection, a large amount was clearly kept back. It is remarkable just how little of Boyce’s own music was included: only 16 of the 264 lots in the printed sale catalogue included music by Boyce (although many lots included more than one item), and all such was printed, not manuscript. No lots included sets of manuscript parts to Boyce’s music. The only manuscripts listed in the catalogue as being ‘in Dr. Boyce’s handwriting’ were for other composers’ works (lots 152 and 153). It seems that the family had either already sold or else initially kept all the autograph manuscripts, manuscript copies and sets of parts for Boyce’s own works. Bruce and Johnstone have suggested they may have been privately sold prior to the publication

16 GB-Lpro, Prob II/1049.3603, quoted in full in Bartlett and Bruce, Tercentenary Sourcebook, pp. 211-13.
17 See pp. 19-21 above and the annotated transcription of the catalogue given by Bruce and Johnstone (cited above, p. 19, note 54).
of the auction catalogue, since they were mentioned in the first advertisement of the sale.¹⁹

However, if the Boyce court odes were bought by Hayes for the Music School before the main sale, it is surprising that no action was taken at the same time to save Maurice Greene’s court ode sets as an intact body. The move to secure Boyce’s court odes for the Music School might even have been a reaction to the fate of Greene’s court ode manuscripts and their performance sets at the Boyce auction: as described in Chapter 1, they were not sold together but divided into sixteen lots and split between at least seven buyers. It therefore seems more likely that the Boyce sets were withdrawn from sale by the family, perhaps for sentimental reasons, and sold later to Philip Hayes. As the court ode sets then entered the Oxford Music School’s collection, where they still remain, probably Hayes was acting on behalf of the Music School rather than on his own behalf. The few of Greene’s court ode sets that Hayes had managed to purchase did not enter the Music School’s collection with Boyce’s sets, but shared the fate of the rest of Hayes’s library, which was sold after his death as described in Chapter 1.

The Autograph Scores

A full score in Boyce’s autograph survives with each set of court ode parts. Apart from relatively rare minor alterations, they show little sign of working by the composer. They seem altogether too confidently produced and too free of mistakes or alterations to have been composing scores. It appears from this that Boyce’s practice was to write a fair copy of each ode when he had finished composing it,

although no rough drafts appear to survive. Apparently, therefore, the model of Restoration creativity described by Herissone, in which fair copies were not necessarily required because ‘fowle originals’ could be used for most purposes, is inapplicable to Boyce’s practice and probably also to that of his contemporaries.²⁰

As Boyce’s autograph scores are transverse-quarto format and lightweight, this raises the possibility that they were used in performance, perhaps at a harpsichord, although not all are figured. However, a specially-prepared keyboard part survives for most of the odes; it seems that Boyce’s practice was sometimes to write the bass figuring directly on to the keyboard part, while at other times he figured the score and left the copyist to transfer the figures. There is no evidence in the scores and parts, or in contemporary descriptions, that a second harpsichord was used. It is therefore unlikely that the scores were used at a keyboard; they were probably intended primarily as file copies and to facilitate the preparation of parts, though they might have been used to beat time from. There are no accounts of Boyce doing this during court ode performances: however, he is known to have ‘mark[ed] the measure to the orchestra with a roll of parchment, or paper, in hand’ at the annual concerts of the Sons of the Clergy during the 1770s, according to Samuel Wesley.²¹ According to Hawkins, writing in 1788, Boyce did this ‘standing at a kind of desk among the performers’, which he claims was also the practice of Maurice Greene; presumably the desk held a score.²² However, the ensemble used in the concerts of the Sons of the Clergy was considerably bigger than that used for the essentially private court

²⁰ Herissone, Restoration Creativity.


ode performances. It is not necessarily the case that Boyce would have beaten time during a performance with a smaller ensemble, though he did so with big ones. An engraving does, however, survive depicting the composer Thomas Arne beating time in a performance of 1762 for an ensemble that is slightly smaller than the probable size of the court ode ensemble (see below).

Bruce and Johnstone note that the scores of Greene’s surviving court odes are covered with Dutch brocade paper. This, they suggest, might have been intended to give a colourful display to the court audience. If correct, this would indicate that the scores were used in performance. However, the most visible parts would have been those held by the singers; the score, if used, would probably have been placed either on a table for the time-beater, or on a harpsichord stand, and hence not visible. Boyce’s choice of binding for his autograph scores was the slightly cheaper Dutch red marbled-paper.

Other Score Copies

An interesting set of score copies of four of the court odes survives bound in a guard-book in the Royal College of Music. The odes included are Nos. 7, 8, 9 and 10, composed respectively for the king’s birthday, 1758; the New Year and the king’s birthday, 1759; and the Jubilee at Stratford, 1761.

---

23 The account of the rehearsal for the 1735 Festival (News, London Evening Post (London), 11-13 February 1735, Issue 1129) reported over 130 instrumentalists and 30 singers. See also the discussion of Boyce’s one surviving set from the Festival in Chapter 6.

24 ‘Mr Garrick reciting the Ode in honor of Shakespeare at the Jubilee at Stratford; with the Musical Performers, &c.’ (London, Town and Country Magazine 1, 1769), reproduced in Holman, ‘The Conductor at the Organ’, p. 245. There are 48 performers depicted; the number in the court ode performances is estimated below at around 55.


26 GB-Lcm MS. 95.
birthday of 1759; and the New Year of 1760. The scores were already bound together by 9 February 1760, as an inscription of this date on the inside of the front board states, ‘This book according to my promise, after my decease, is the Property of / & is to be return’d to D’ Boyce, or Heirs, unless He or They give permis: :sion to my Executor to keep it. James Trebeck’, followed by an addendum reading ‘Reed. of’ and an illegible name. The volume bears the stamp of the library of the Concerts of Ancient Music, from which it probably entered the library of the Sacred Harmonic Society and then the Royal College of Music. The scores are in transverse quarto format, in the hand of the skilled professional scribe Edmund Thomas Warren (Illus. 5.1). Warren, who also acted as copyist to Boyce in the preparation of other sets in 1760-1 (see Chapter 6), signed and dated the last page of the fourth ode, ‘E:T: Warren Scrip: / 1760’. It is not clear whether the scores were copied together in early 1760; or whether each was copied at the time of its first composition. The pages are numbered continuously throughout the volume in Warren’s hand, which might imply that all four odes were copied in 1760. However the numbering may have been added when the scores were prepared for binding.

There are several implications of the volume’s existence and the content of the inscriptions it contains. Warren must have been engaged by Boyce to copy the scores, as the scores were Boyce’s property after copying. Boyce did not anticipate needing them after February 1760, as he gave James Trebeck lifetime possession of them, though he thought them of enough value that he wished to retain ownership. Yet he had gone to the trouble and expense of engaging a copyist who could produce

27 I am not yet certain of the identity of James Trebeck, but he may have been the vicar of Chiswick of that name, who joined the Chapel Royal as Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majesty in 1781 (see R. O. Bucholz, ‘The Chapel Royal: Chaplains, 1660-1837’ in OHMB 11, pp. 251-278), and died reportedly aged 80 in 1808, leaving a set of ‘four Volumes of Handells Airs’ in his will (GB-Lna PROB 11/1483/169). See Sylvanus Urban, ‘Obituary, with Anecdotes, of Remarkable Persons’, The Gentlemen’s Magazine: and Historical Chronicle. For the Year 1808, LXXVIII/2, p. 749.
scores that exceeded his own standards in terms of legibility and practicality of lay-out. The scores would be visually optimal for directing from, and it may be that Boyce beat time from them. If other such scores survive, they were not included in the sale of 1779, and may have been dispersed by Boyce in a similar manner to these four. The duplicate scores for the birthday odes of 1755 and 1756, that survive in the Bodleian, may have been copied by one of the copyists working with Philip Hayes in the 1770s, based on the appearance of the hand and the date on the first ode, ‘1775’, which is clearly a mistake for ‘1755’.28


The Composer’s Hand

The autograph scores give a biannual sample of Boyce’s hand from 1755 until his death in 1779; the accurately dated progression that they establish is part of this

---

28 GB-Ob MS. Mus. D. 11. The hand shares features with several of those illustrated in Burrows and Ward Jones, ‘An Inventory’, but the manuscript is not included in that inventory. The second ode is dated correctly.
collection’s value. During the first years of his tenure as Master of the King’s Music in 1755-8, Boyce was still using the C and G clefs visible in Illus. 5.2. These appear to have been his preferred forms in his earlier career, although he later altered both. The switch to a plainer style of C clef is first visible in addenda to the parts for the birthday ode ‘When Othbert Left’ in 1758. Boyce initially often preferred a slightly more angled form (Illus. 5.3-4), but his use of the clef quickly became consistent. The court ode manuscripts show his adoption of a different treble clef, of the type still in use today (Illus. 5.4), shortly afterwards in 1759. Initially he was not consistent in its use, reverting at times to his earlier style. By 1760 he had switched to the new treble clef almost entirely, but still on occasion used his old clef when he wished to differentiate between groups of staves in a system; however, his use of this was again inconsistent. There was thereafter relatively little variation in his hand for the remainder of his life (Illus. 5.5).


As a result of the samples provided in the court ode scores, Boyce’s hand is normally easy to identify where it appears in the sets of parts. His involvement in the part-copying process can therefore be easily assessed and his hand distinguished from those of his copyists and, on occasion, the players.

**Appearance of the Sets of Parts**

The parts were copied by one or more scribes, seemingly from Boyce’s fair copy of the score. Boyce himself was closely involved in the preparation of the parts and checked each set once it was complete: many parts bear addenda, such as tempo markings and other directions, in his hand. On occasion, perhaps when time was short and he lacked assistance, Boyce copied parts himself. The surviving vocal parts are almost all in transverse quarto format; the orchestral parts are in upright quarto format, with the exception of drum parts, which are upright or transverse. The solo vocal parts and most of the orchestral parts were stitched into cheap paper covers, which have survived in many cases. They are often of stiff buff cartridge
paper, although blue sugar paper or purple card is sometimes used. The chorus vocal parts are often single sheets. It seems – unless many of their covers have gone missing – that they normally remained as loose leaves, because stitching them into covers was rarely thought worthwhile. Drum parts are invariably also single leaves, as are the trumpet, horn and sometimes the oboe parts. These parts were therefore at higher risk of loss than those in covers. Although Bruce and Johnstone suggest that the appearance of Greene’s court ode scores may have been regarded as important because of their assumed visibility during performance, it is clear that the external appearance of Boyce’s performance parts was of little importance. Even the singers’ parts, which would have been visible, are loose-leaf or covered only in plain paper. It is unfortunate that none of Greene’s parts survive for comparison.

Cost of Copying the Parts

Some copying records survive from the Chapel Royal during Boyce’s involvement with the court and its various institutions, but no comparable records survive from this period for other court-related music copying. The system evident in court records, from the Restoration until well after Boyce’s death, was that the Master of the Music’s position was that of manager with responsibility for sub-contracting and finances for all aspects of performances, including the copying of music. These performances included the bi-annual ode, balls and odes to celebrate other royal birthdays, and extraordinary events such as the Installation of the Knights of the

---


30 Other duties that fell within this remit were contracting with supernumerary musicians, transporting instruments by hired boat to Windsor, and on occasion erecting the music gallery for special performances, as demonstrated by surviving copy warrants for payment.
Garter at Windsor or royal funerals. Individuals sub-contracted to perform work such as copying seem to have billed the Master of the Music for their services. The Master of the Music then submitted a bill on his own behalf to the Lord Chamberlain, who issued a warrant for payment which the Treasurer of the Chamber then fulfilled. It is unclear whether the Master had normally already paid the relevant individuals, or whether payment awaited receipt of the money from the Treasurer. The latter is more likely, as large amounts of money might be involved, and repayment frequently followed late.

The copy warrants for the payment of music bills survive in the Lord Chamberlain’s records, but the bills to which they refer do not appear to survive.\(^{31}\) Unfortunately, the warrants usually lump together the several sums from bills that were probably itemized originally. As the court was frequently behind in payment, money owed was often paid several years late in lump sums, making it even harder to assess precisely what the payment covered. Finally, as the system was one of sub-contracting, payment to most of the individuals concerned took place via Boyce. Individual music copyists were not named in the records unless the copying was for the Chapel Royal, for which the court contracted directly with Thomas Barrow. Payment records relating to the Chapel Royal can be cross-checked against the entries in the cheque books of the Chapel Royal, but no cheque books exist for the King’s Music.\(^{32}\) Amounts can be cross-checked against the declared accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, but the copy warrants are more informative.

\(^{31}\) The relevant copy warrants are in GB-Lna LC 5/24-25 and LC 5/167-168.

It appears from the copy warrants that there were two types of payment authorised by the Lord Chamberlain’s office. The first type equates to actual cost as given in itemised bills. Many records of this type of payment for court music copying survive in the Lord Chamberlain’s copy warrants, and in the declared accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, from the last quarter of the seventeenth and first decades of the eighteenth centuries. For example, Nicholas Staggins, then Master of the Music, was paid £59. 6s. in 1692 ‘for fair writing and pricking several compositions, for ruled paper, pens and ink, and for the prickers’ diet, and chamber rent, and for other service done by him in the years 1690 and 1691’; and a further £52. 2s. 6d. ‘for fair writing and pricking of compositions for the Coronation Day and the Queen’s Birthday, and for paper, pens and ink and for other service done by him in 1689’. Further sums paid to the subsequent Master of the Music, John Eccles, are listed in Table 5.1.

---

33 Both in GB-Lna LC 5/151, p. 120, quoted in RECM 2 (1685-1714), p. 46.
Table 5.1: Sums paid by warrant from the Lord Chancellor to John Eccles, 1705 – 1711, for music copied 1700 – 1711.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Copying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC 5/154, p. 91.⁴⁴ (RECM 2, p.83)</td>
<td>July 7 1705</td>
<td>£53. 16s.</td>
<td>‘pricking and fair writing compositions on her Majesty’s Birthdays and New Years’ Days for 1702, 1703 and 1704’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC 5/154, p.151. (RECM 2, p.87)</td>
<td>March 1 1705/6</td>
<td>£19. 18s. 6d.</td>
<td>‘pricking and fair writing compositions for her Majesty’s Birthday and New Year’s Day, 1706’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC 5/154, p.218. (RECM 2, p.89)</td>
<td>February 17 1706/7</td>
<td>£23. 8s.</td>
<td>‘pricking and fair writing compositions for New Year’s Day and her Majesty’s Birthday, 1706-7’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 351/560 and A01/408/144⁵⁵ (RECM 2, p. 146).</td>
<td>1707/8</td>
<td>£11. 13s. for New Year only (see below for the birthday)</td>
<td>‘To Mr. John Eccles, for pricking and fairly writing several Compositions for New Year's Day and the Birthday in 1707, by 2 warrants: £23. 10s. 0d.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC 5/154, p.318 (RECM 2 p.93).</td>
<td>February 02 1707/8</td>
<td>£11. 17s.</td>
<td>‘pricking and fair writing compositions for her Majesty’s Birthday, 1707-8’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC 5/154, p.329 (RECM 2 p.94).</td>
<td>April 20 1708</td>
<td>£27. 5s. 6d.</td>
<td>‘pricking and fair writing compositions on his late Majesty’s Birthdays and on New Year’s Days 1700 and 1701’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC 5/155, fol. 59. (RECM 2 p.106).</td>
<td>March 7 1710/11</td>
<td>£22. 7s.</td>
<td>‘pricking and fair writing compositions on New Year’s Day and her Majesty’s Birthday, 1710-11’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As none of the sets of parts mentioned in these records have survived for comparison, it is impossible to calculate a ‘per page’ rate. However, it is clear that copying was expensive during this period: a rough calculation from the amounts in Table 5.1 for John Eccles’s tenure seems to give an average cost of around £7 - £11 for a set of parts.

³⁴ This record is confirmed in the accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, RECM 2, p. 144.

³⁵ The copy warrant does not survive, only the entry in the declared accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, from which the amount is extrapolated; it is not clear if this includes office fees.
At some point in the early eighteenth century, a different system of payment for court odes was introduced: a fixed amount that did not correspond directly to the actual cost. This had happened by 1746, although I have not yet identified exactly when it occurred; it may have been part of the financial reform of 1718, four years after the accession of George I. It was, in any case, probably part of the series of long-running and unsuccessful attempts to control court spending that began with the Restoration and ended only with the accession of Queen Victoria in 1837.

It appears that this type of payment, which became widely used in court finances in general, was initially calculated to allow a small profit to the person responsible for the contracting, in recompense for the time and trouble of arranging the work. However, as such payments did not keep pace with inflation, they tended to be considerably devalued over a period of time. Confirmation that this system continued in the royal household until well after Boyce’s death, with considerable disadvantage to those involved, is provided by a letter of 25 January 1800 from Eliza Parsons, who was responsible for providing the liveries for the Chapel Royal children.

Parsons explained that the amounts allowed for providing the children’s clothing had originally been calculated to give £20 profit as payment to the individual charged with contracting for the whole. However, the fee had not risen with inflation, so that the profit had been swallowed up over time by the increase in cost of both fabrics and labour. Eventually the cost had risen so significantly that she ‘had been in the years 1795 & 1796 Money out of Pocket by every Article’

---

38 GB-Lna LC 9/387 Part 2, unnumbered loose letter. It is not known what post Elizabeth Parsons held (she is not listed in OHMB 11), or if she was related to Sir William Parsons, then Master of the King’s Music. She was not his wife, whose name was Charlotte Sophia (see L. M. Middleton., rev. David J. Golby, ‘Parsons, Sir William (1745/6-1817), Musician and Composer’, ODNB [accessed 27 July 2014]).
which forced her to petition in the 1790s and again in 1800 for an increase in payment.\textsuperscript{39}

Records from the time of Greene’s tenure as Master of the Music show that he received a set fee of £25 per ode to cover copying, and presumably paper and ink, as well as the cost of extra performers for the ode and the hire of a room to practice in.\textsuperscript{40} It is interesting to note that during Greene’s and Boyce’s tenure, the performing sets were apparently the property of the Master of the Music, not the property of the royal household, although they were copied at the household’s expense. Receiving used goods was a common perquisite of royal service, the extent of which is difficult to assess and the reform of which did not begin until 1782, three years after Boyce’s death.\textsuperscript{41} Holman has noted that court documents were often regarded as the property of the officials concerned, leading to the survival of many in collections outside the National Archives; it seems that ‘single use’ sets of music manuscripts were a similar case.\textsuperscript{42} It is not known to what extent other performing sets used by the King’s Band were regarded as the property of individual musicians. However, this may explain the lack of a surviving court library used by the band for the balls and other functions at which it played regularly. For most of Boyce’s tenure, it was the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{39} Parsons wish that the Lord Chamberlain would ‘be pleased to consider the Immense rise of every thing within the last Twenty years and how little even on the best terms, that I can get by the employment which can never amount to Twenty Pounds a year profit, and the long arrears whitsh [sic.] I am obliged to pay weekly to the persons I employ’, illustrates the difficulties faced by court servants working under this system.

\textsuperscript{40} See, for example, GB-Lna LC 5/25, pp.8-9; also the many ‘List[s] of Warrants for Allowances, Bills, Disbursements / and Lodgings for One Quarter from the [date]’ held in GB-Lna LC 9/387 Part I (all unpaginated loose leaves).


\textsuperscript{42} Peter Holman, private communication.
\end{footnotesize}
responsibility of Carl Friedrich Weideman to provide music for the balls, and he may have retained ownership of the parts.\textsuperscript{43}

Greene received further set fees of £25. 1s. on each occasion for extra performers at the balls for the birthdays of the king, the Prince and the Princess of Wales. However, extraordinary events were still apparently paid via the ‘actual cost’ method. In 1749 he received £60. 6s. ‘for the Te Deum / on his M.\textsuperscript{ty}’s Return from abroad’, followed by £91. 13s. in 1752 for the ‘Installation Kn\textsuperscript{th} of / the Garter 4 June’.

Likewise, Handel received £52. 0s. 6d. ‘for the Te Deum / on ye Thanksgiving Day 1749’; all of these seem to reflect actual costs and probably include copying charges.\textsuperscript{44} Boyce was paid similarly on a number of occasions, of which the following warrant is typical:

\begin{quote}
D:’ W:\textsuperscript{m} Boyce / Disbursements for / the Installacon at / Windsor, 1757 – 83: 19: 0
9: 14: 0
93: 13: 0
\end{quote}

These are &c.\textsuperscript{a} to Dr William Boyce- / Master of His Majesty’s Music the Sum of Ninety three / Pounds thirteen Shillings, Office Fees incl. for / preparing and Copying of Music, per Order, for the / Installacon [sic.] at Windsor the 29\textsuperscript{b} of March 1757., [sic.] / Also for Travelling Charges for himself and several of / the Band, as well as for the hire of extraordinary / performers and a large Boat to carry the Musical / Instruments there and back, as appears by the / annexet Bill. And &c.\textsuperscript{a} Given &c.\textsuperscript{a} this 4.\textsuperscript{b} Day. / of July 1757. in the Thirty first Year of His M[ajes]ty’s / Reign. / To ye. Hon.;\textsuperscript{b}t Ch.:’ Townshend, &c.\textsuperscript{a} / Devonshire.\textsuperscript{45}

A difference is evident between ‘set amount’ and ‘actual amount’ payments in that ‘set amount’ payments were all-inclusive, but for ‘actual amount’ payments, the

\textsuperscript{43} Weideman’s position is described as ‘Conductor of the Music at the Balls at Court’ in court records; see GB-Lna LC 5/25, p. 28.

\textsuperscript{44} All from the ‘List[s] of Warrants for Allowances, Bills, Disbursements / and Lodgings for One Quarter from the [date]’ held in GB-Lna LC 9/387 Part 2 (all unpaginated loose leaves).

\textsuperscript{45} GB-Lna LC 5/24 p. 358.
office fees payable had to be calculated and added, as in the above example. The following warrant is typical of the ‘set amount’ type:

D: W: Mr Boyce for / fair writing Compos: for New Y: Day / 1756. / £25.- / [...].

These are &c. to D: W: Mr Boyce, Master of His Majesty’s Music, the Sum of Twenty five Pounds for fair writing Compositions for New Years Day 1756. and for the hire of Ext. Performers & a Room to Practice in. And for so doing this shall be your Warrant, Given &c. this 4th Day of July 1757. in the Thirty first Year of His Majesty’s Reign. Devonshire. / To the Hon:ble Charles Townshend &c. 46

Although the fee for the ode remained fixed at £25 until after Boyce’s death in 1779, by which time it must have been devalued, the fee for the supernumerary performers at balls had risen to £29. 5s. by 1750, enabling the charges for these performers to be calculated approximately. According to some warrants, this was intended to pay for 14 supernumerary performers; it is likely that this was originally an actual number, though it probably soon became only nominal. 47 The figures suggest, therefore, that more supernumeraries were employed for the balls than for the odes, and that the fee for an individual player must have been calculated at under £2, when office fees are taken into account. The fee had risen again by 1754 to £34. 10s. and by 1762 to £39. 6s. The explanation for the last rise of £4. 16s. is contained in two warrants to Boyce in payment for performers for balls of 1762: the extra was ‘for Additional Performers on the Tabor and Pipe Double Bass and Hautboy’. 48 The fee works out best if there are four additional performers, perhaps two oboists, one bass player and one on tabor and pipe, each paid around £1. 4s., but again office fees must be

46 GB-Lna LC 5/24 p. 359.

47 For example, GB-Lna LC5/24, p. 331.

48 GB-Lna LC 5/168 p.175. In the year of the coronation the extra payment for the king’s birthday ball was £7 for ‘Additional Performers on the Clarinets the Tabor and Pipe’, making £41. 10s., but this was apparently a one-off occurrence, perhaps because of the particular celebrations in this year (GB-Lna LC 5/168, p. 77).
allowed for. Within a couple of years, the extra fee for these performers was simply
subsumed in the total, which was now set permanently at the higher rate.

Even with this information, it is difficult to calculate what proportion of the ‘set’
payment was intended to cover the cost of copying the ode parts, and what ‘per page’
rate this equates to. However, it is likely that most of the fee was taken up with the
hire of extra performers at between £1 and £2 each, plus the hire of the room, the
office fees, and some sort of profit for Boyce. A calculation of copying costs for
Boyce’s odes based on the prices discussed in Chapter 4 would give only around £3.

By the mid-1760s, Boyce’s odes had become slightly longer, which would have increased the copying
cost proportionally although the fee for the ode remained the same.

Scribal Hands in the Court Odes

The activities of eighteenth-century music copyists working in the London area were
extensive and diverse, and the copying of the court odes formed only a small
proportion of this. However, as the series is chronologically complete and accurately
dated for the twenty-four years from 1755 to 1779, it has been thought worth
attempting a classification and chronology of copyists, with a view to identifying as
many of the hands as possible. This work is still ongoing, but Table 5.2 (see end of
chapter) gives an inventory of the hands in the first 13 odes, from 1755 to 1762.

49 Calculation based on the score and parts of the Birthday Ode, 1756 (‘When Caesar’s natal day’,
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 299a-c), assuming the 120 written leaves were copied at around 6d. per leaf
(£3), as was apparently charged during the eighteenth century by both J. S. Smith and John Mathews.
Other costs were added according to Mathews’ prices in the early 1760s: according to these, Royal
music paper would have cost 1¼ d. for every four leaves (3s. 1½ d.); 8 sheets of cartridge paper for
covers would have cost ½ d. per sheet (4d.) and binding the score would have cost around 3s. 6d. In
actual fact, court prices may have been higher.
This should assist future cross-matching with scribal hands in other collections, which might in turn give valuable information on the music-copying industry of this period, such as which scribes were working for multiple institutions.

The two principal potential errors in identifying scribal hands – conflating two scribes, and identifying one scribe, perhaps working at different periods, as two separate people – have been particularly problematic with this series of manuscripts. A number of Boyce’s scribes appear to have been rather young when they first started copying for him – possibly they were children of the Chapel Royal – and rapid evolution in the styles of their hands is sometimes visible. Additionally, there is evidence that where copyists worked closely together over long periods, a ‘house style’ distinct from other contemporary groups of copyists might evolve, with copyists intentionally or unintentionally taking on features of each other’s hands.

This is the case, for example, with the hands associated with J. C. Smith’s scriptorium, which bear strong similarities with one another both in text and music.50 John Awbery, one of the scribes associated with William and Philip Hayes, gradually altered his hand over time until it became virtually identical with that of William Hayes.51 Many of the copyists’ hands of that circle share features with the Hayeses’ hands, which were themselves very similar.52

Similarities within a group of scribes were not necessarily due to a ‘generic’ copyist style being in vogue at the time. For example, the scribes associated with J. C. Smith do not seem to have used the forms of c-clef or g-clef visible in Illus. 5.3, though these were still in widespread use during that period. It seems that copyists

working in groups were generally easily influenced in matters of style, with a
tendency to copy literally what was in front of them; perhaps they put a degree of
value on conformity to group standards. This tendency can be seen in the hands of
Boyce’s copyists, several of whom appear to have adopted features of the hands of
Boyce and James Nares, Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal, as well as of
each other’s hands.\textsuperscript{53} If some of the scribes were boys of the Chapel, their style was
probably also influenced by their training there. To minimise inaccuracy in
classification, scribes have been assigned a number; where the hand of an individual
evolves or alters, each distinct version is sub-classified by lower-case alphabet letters
in sequence. All numbers are given the prefix ‘B’, in an attempt not to duplicate
classification systems used elsewhere to categorise other groups of scribes.

Around 25 individual scribal hands are visible in the parts to the 43 odes. Many
provided only occasional help; a handful, however, were principal copyists, some of
whom maintained an association with Boyce over long periods. Only one has yet
been positively identified, that of John Buswell, a Gentleman (and former Child) of
the Chapel Royal from 1754 who was also a lay clerk at Westminster Abbey and
whose hand appears in the part-books there.\textsuperscript{54} Buswell’s hand is professional and
distinctive, and it is clear that he copied extensively for Westminster Abbey, yet he
only copied for Boyce in 1757 and 1758 (Illus. 5.6-5.7). This was the period at
which Boyce’s association with his previous two principal copyists, B1 and B2, had
come to an end: both had copied for him since 1755 at least. His next principal
抄手, B5, apparently did not start to work for him until New Year 1759: the

\textsuperscript{53} The similarity of one scribe’s hand with that of Boyce has caused confusion elsewhere: the hand
that copied most of the parts to Boyce’s third version of the anthem ‘The King shall rejoice’, for the
Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, is not that of the composer (GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. C. 119 a-c).
\textsuperscript{54} Bucholz, ‘The Chapel Royal: Gentlemen’ and ‘The Chapel Royal: The Children and Their Masters’,
\textit{OHRMB} 11, pp. 279-287 and 291-297 respectively. Receipts signed by Buswell for sums paid for
copying survive in Westminster Abbey, such as GB-Lwa 48352.
association would last until 1765. This suggests that B5 may have been a Child of the Chapel Royal, who copied for Boyce until his departure when his voice broke; possibly the same was true of B1 and B2. It may be that the employment of Buswell took place during an interim period when there was no suitable boy available. The use of a boy as principal copyist may have occurred again in the early 1770s: the sketches of snails and snakes that decorate some parts of this date, and the elaborate coat-sleeves worn by the pointing hands that indicate instructions to the musicians, suggest that this copyist was also a juvenile.\footnote{See, for example, the parts for the birthday ode ‘Discord, hence!’ (1770), GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 324 b, fols. 9r. (snake), 23v. (eyeball) and 29r. (snails) and D. 324 c, fols. 15v. (arm with circulatory system), fols. 26v., 56v. and 75v. (various pointing hands with elaborate cuffs).}

Thomas Barrow, principal copyist for the Chapel Royal and the only named music copyist in the court records of this period, does not appear to have acted as principal copyist for the court odes, despite the fact that he was a close colleague and a personal friend to Boyce.\(^{56}\)

Classification of Evolving Hands: the Copyist B5

The rapid evolution of a hand, and the adoption and rejection of different forms of clef, accidentals or capital letters, is a particular problem where the scribe was still young and his hand still developing. The hand of the scribe B5, who was probably a child at the time he began to copy for Boyce, provides a good case-study. B5 apparently first copied for Boyce in the autumn of 1758. His hand at this period was

---

\(^{56}\) Barrow copied for the Chapel Royal from around 1747 until after Boyce’s death. He witnessed Boyce’s will in 1775; see Bartlett and Bruce, *Tercentenary Sourcebook*, pp. 211-213.
quite regular and distinctive, with the text tending to slant forwards, but notes, particularly single crotchets, slightly backwards. Crotchet rests were a 'z'-shape and very regular; sharps were shaped like the Roman numeral II set slightly slanted. Signs of immaturity are visible in the rounded text and carefully-drawn clefs, which lack fluency. B5’s hand at this stage is designated ‘B5a’ (Illus. 5.8-5.9).


By the following New Year, B5’s hand was slightly more mature-looking and the bass clef has reversed to a backwards-C type that was large but fairly plain. This variant of the hand is designated ‘B5b’ (Illus. 5.10):


By the time of the king’s birthday in the autumn of 1759, B5’s bass clef was progressively moving towards a more elaborate, almost heart-shaped backwards-C. His use of this form was initially not consistent and he sometimes preferred the plainer form. It is interesting to note the similarity between his bass and C clefs at this stage (Illus. 5.10-5.11) and John Buswell’s (Illus. 5.6-5.7). His text had become more mature-looking and often messier; the upper-case letters, particularly ‘A’s and ‘S’s, had become more distinctive. The form of the upper-case ‘S’ visible during this period remained B5’s preferred form from this point and is one of the reliable identifiers of this hand. In all other respects, such as rests, accidentals, note-heads and note-stems, the hand is recognisably the same as its earlier incarnations. It had
not altered significantly a few months later, when B5 copied the parts for the New Year ode of 1760. This is the variant of the hand designated ‘B5c’ (Illus. 5.11).


In 1760 there was no birthday ode because of the death of George II, but B5 was heavily involved in the copying of the parts for the king’s funeral in November 1761.57 He was by now so far advanced that he was also trusted with producing the score copy preserved in the British Library as Egerton MS 2964, which was apparently copied at the same time.58 He was again the principal copyist for the Ode for the New Year of 1761, less than two months later.

B5’s hand at this stage displays some differences when compared with the hand of January 1760. There is less consistency in the overall appearance of the text, probably because his copying had become faster as he gained in fluency and confidence. His style of sharps had completely altered and now conformed to the style still in use today; also, where the cross-bars of the sharps had previously

57 See Ch. 6.
58 For a discussion of this score, see Ch. 6.
slanted up to the left, they now slanted up to the right. There are subtle differences in his c-clef when compared with his earlier form. His bass clef was at times inconsistent, with the plainer form sometimes preferred over the more elaborate heart-shaped one. He may have preferred the simpler form when copying particularly quickly, but used the more elaborate form when free to take more time, or when appearance – as with the score of the funeral music – was deemed particularly important. However, detailed examination indicates that this is still the hand of B5 rather than a second, similar hand: too many elements remain consistent, such as the overall appearance of the notes; the note-heads; the style of quavers and semi-quavers, whether with upwards or downwards stems; the tendency for notes to point slightly backwards while the text slants forwards; the crotchet and quaver rests; and the flat signs. A direct comparison of common text words also reveals the hand to be the same. Additionally, the differences in the hand of this period are never consistent and simultaneous, instead occurring separately, always in conjunction with enough consistent elements to confirm that it is still the same hand. This is now designated ‘B5d’ (Illus. 5.12).

B5’s hand underwent only one further change during his time as copyist to Boyce: by the time of the coronation in September 1761, he had ceased to use the form of c-clef he had consistently used for the past four years, and now preferred a form similar to that of B9, a copyist who worked with him on the large sets of parts to the funeral, wedding and coronation music of 1760-61 (Illus. 5.14).\(^5^9\) Having decided to use this c-clef, B5 apparently made the change relatively quickly with only a minimum of inconsistency, as he had done previously with other alterations in his hand. This incarnation of the hand is designated ‘B5e’ (Illus. 5.13).


\(^5^9\) See Ch. 6.
There is a significant difference between the hand shown in Illus 5.7-5.9 and that in Illus. 5.13. The first examples show the hand of a competent child; the latter examples are of a stylish and experienced copyist. This alteration had taken place in the space of just four years. It is rare for a collection to provide the opportunity to observe the same copyists at regular and precisely dated intervals over a period of years. Further work on the Boyce copyists should be helpful in dating manuscripts in other collections in which these hands appear. The hand of B5 is a good example of this, as manuscripts copied by this scribe in his ‘B5d’ period, for example, must date from after New Year, 1760, when he was still in his previous phase, but before the September of 1761, by which time he had altered his c-clef.

Performance Addenda

There are two types of addenda visible in the parts to the odes. The first affects only the odes from which the symphony or overture was published in the two collections issued by Boyce in 1760 and 1770, and relates to their publication. One copy of each instrumental part for the symphony or overture was annotated by the composer for the engraver to work from. This usually involved the addition of a title and the number assigned to each symphony or overture in the publication. The English instrument name at the head of each part, such as ‘Hautboy’ or ‘Drum’, was deleted and replaced with the equivalent Italian term, an indication of the difference between the terminology used by professional musicians and that expected by the music-buying public (Illus. 5.15). Often an instruction would be added indicating how

---

60 Boyce, Eight Symphonies (1760); idem, Twelve Overtures (1770).
much music Boyce expected the engraver to fit on one plate and what layout he preferred, as well as directions for an alternative layout, in case his first instructions should prove impossible to fulfil. For example, Ode No. 12, ‘‘Twas at the nectar’d Feast’ (1761) includes on the oboe parts the instruction ‘To begin upon yᵉ half plate of ye 14ᵗʰ, and if there is not room to get in the whole overture in yᵉ 14ᵗʰ, & 15ᵗʰ plates, you must stop at this mark [a crossed circle] to turn over’. ⁶¹ Similarly, No. 18, ‘Sacred to thee’, has ‘Down to this place in one Plate’ in Boyce’s hand on one of the oboe parts. ⁶² As the annotated parts were clearly returned to Boyce by the engraver after use, the manuscript sets were clearly still unbound in 1770, the date of the second publication.

5.15: Manuscript drum part, William Boyce, Overture VII (Symphony of Ode No. 12, ‘‘Twas at the Nectar’d Feast’, GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 309 c, fol. 7r.), Hand of B5 (1761), annotated for engraving by the composer (1769-70); by permission of The Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford.

⁶¹ Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 309 c; fols. 8r. and 13r.
The second type of addenda visible on the parts is that necessary to ensure a smooth performance, and is of particular interest due to the light it can shed on performance practice at the time. The majority of these annotations are in the hand of Boyce himself, having been apparently added at the checking stage; most of the necessary reminders were therefore already on the copies by the time they reached the musicians. Relatively little annotation by the performers is visible on the parts. As described in Chapter 1, this was consistent with normal eighteenth-century practice.

Boyce’s addenda, and those of the performers where present, can be very informative. Some interesting instructions relate to contemporary ensemble practice. For example, the chorus ‘To distant regions round’ in Ode No. 1, ‘Pierian Sisters’, is marked ‘Boys lead’ on one of the treble chorus parts. A similar instruction appears in the vocal parts to Ode No. 17, ‘To wedded love’: one of the first treble parts is marked ‘Lead away’ in the copyist’s hand, while all the other chorus parts are marked by the copyist at the corresponding point, ‘Note, the Boys lead – begin one bar after them’. In the bassoon part of Ode No. 42, ‘Arm’d with her native force’, an entry after a pause in the third movement of the overture is also marked ‘Lead away’. These instructions are similar to those seen occasionally in the Oxford Music School sets (see Chapter 3), and are evidence that a similar type of ensemble practice of leading within the ensemble was used by Boyce. It is evident that this type of instruction was given to all playing or singing a given part and referred to the

---

63 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 298b, fol. 24r.
64 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 314b.
65 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 339 c, fol. 74r.
part’s status as leader at that point, not to an individual player leading from within a part.

The fact that these instructions appear fairly frequently suggests that Boyce’s leading, whether performed from the keyboard or as a time-beater, was limited to giving the beat. In any case, it may be that the singers were in front of Boyce and unable to see him. The engraving of the performance of Garrick’s and Arne’s Shakespeare Ode depicts Thomas Arne directing the ensemble, with a roll of paper, from the middle of the group, behind the singers and the front two rows of instrumentalists. If the depiction is accurate, at least a third of the 48 performers pictured would not have been able to see the time-beater. It may in fact be inaccurate: the artist may have used a considerable amount of freedom in producing the illustration. However, Hawkins’ description of Boyce’s time-beating refers to him standing ‘among the performers’, not in front of them. It is worth noting that no time-beater was used at all in the Handel Commemoration performances of 1784; the performers were reliant on the leader of the orchestra, and the conductor at the organ, for direction. However, both the plan and the illustration of the performance layout, as published by Charles Burney, show that part of the chorus and all of the soloists were placed at the front of the ensemble, where they could see neither the leader nor the organist. Direction from either of these individuals was evidently

66 See above, note 24.


69 ‘A Plan of the Orchestra and Disposition of the Band’ and ‘A VIEW of the Orchestra and Performers in Westminster Abbey’ in Charles Burney, An Account of the Musical Performances in
not regarded as so important that they had to be visible to all. The directions present in the court ode parts are evidence as to how performers coped as part of a fairly large ensemble that lacked anything approaching modern direction, particularly when they were perhaps not even able to see those charged with keeping the ensemble together. That most of these directions were provided by the copyist demonstrates that they were an integral part of contemporary performance practice.

A typical example of Boyce’s own addenda can be seen in Illus. 5.16, showing two levels of marking-up. The direction ‘Change to C Horns immediately’, in Boyce’s hand, clearly refers to the court performance in 1764; a similar such instruction two pages later instructs the players to switch back to F horns. This set of parts was later marked up for a second time by Boyce in 1769 or 1770 for inclusion in his Twelve Overtures (1770); the ‘x’ superimposed on the first addendum is one of a number of instructions to the engraver and apparently indicated that the music he was to include ended here.


The marking-up added by the musicians themselves was primarily restricted to the dynamic markings ‘For:’ and ‘Pia:’ or similar; clarification of unclear notes by

adding the letter name; and pauses. Ode No. 25, ‘Patron of Arts’ (1769), also contains a rare worked-out duet cadenza for the tenor and counter-tenor duet ‘Each sacred seat’, pencilled into both solo parts by a hand that shows some similarities to that of Philip or William Hayes (ILLUS. 5.17 c). A more elaborate attempt at the same cadenza was rejected and scored through (ILLUS. 5.17 b). Written-out ornamentation can be also seen in the solo contra-tenor part to Ode No. 28, ‘Again returns the circling year’.

5.17 a: Last bars of the duet ‘Each sacred seat’ (voice and continuo parts only), William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, ‘Patron of Arts’, 1769 (GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 322 b., fols. 18r. and 32r.): original version.

For example, GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 330 c, fol. 25, has dynamics added, probably in the hand of Abraham Brown the violinist, whose name is on the part.

Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 322 b, fols. 18r. and 32r.

Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 325 b, fols. 12v. and 15r.,

I am grateful to Christopher Roberts for preparing these examples.
5.17 b: Duet cadenza, version 1 (rejected), ‘Each sacred seat’ (voice and continuo parts only), William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, ‘Patron of Arts’, 1769 (GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 322 b., fols. 18r. and 32r.).

5.17 c: Duet cadenza, version 2, ‘Each sacred seat’ (voice and continuo parts only), Ode for the King’s Birthday, ‘Patron of Arts’, 1769 (GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 322 b., fols. 18r. and 32r.).
Number of Parts Copied

Several researchers have attempted to give figures for the number of performers who may have taken part in Boyce’s court odes. Ford estimates an orchestra of 28-32 and chorus of 20-25; Daub, an orchestra of 20-30; Cudworth, an orchestra of 30 and chorus of 32; and Finzi, 20-23 string players. The latter two did not leave clear information on the source of the ‘orchestra lists’ they based their conclusions on, although Cudworth claims particular authority for his stated figures as coming from Boyce himself. However, from the date (1761) and numbers of instrumentalists and vocalists he gives, his source was probably the list attached to the organ part for the anthem ‘The King shall Rejoice’, in the version for the wedding of George III and Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz (see Chapter 6). Finzi gives no dates for the ‘tables of his orchestra’ given by Boyce on ‘several occasions’, but as the only lists that could be so described appear in the sets for the funeral music of 1760 and the wedding music of 1761, and as the numbers Finzi gives agree well with these, it is likely that they were his source. Cudworth’s and Finzi’s numbers are therefore unsafe, partly because of their assumption that the orchestra for the king’s funeral, the royal wedding and the coronation of 1760-1 would have been the same size and composition as the orchestra for the court odes; and partly because in any case both apparently mistook a list of parts for a list of players. Ford’s analysis is useful, as


75 Cudworth, ‘Masters of the Music’, p. 676. The list is at GB-Ob Mus. Sch. C. 117 b, fol. 97r.

76 Finzi gives averages of 6 first violins, 6 second violins, 2 to 3 violas and 3 to 4 each of cellos and double basses (‘Preface: Boyce’s Orchestra’, p. xxii).

77 See Ch. 6 for a discussion of the funeral and wedding ‘orchestra lists’.
he has compared the scoring of each ode with the surviving parts. However, it
should be noted that a few of the parts he claims are missing are actually present,
such as the cello and bass parts in Ode No. 10 and the double bass and trumpet parts
from Ode No. 43. Analysis preformed by Ford has not been repeated, but has been
expanded in light of the copyists’ coding system (see below), which gives still
greater accuracy in checking missing parts and has not previously been noted by any
of those authors. The surviving parts for each ode are summarised in Table 5.4.

It is generally accepted that the sets of parts are substantially complete. The
evidence for this is four-fold: firstly, the majority of sets contain consistent numbers
of each type of part. Secondly, one set survives in which the parts were probably
never distributed to the musicians, as the ode concerned (for New Year, 1758) was
cancelled before performance because of the death of Princess Caroline on
December 28, 1757. The usual public rehearsal apparently did not take place for
the same reason; this set is therefore likely to be complete as it stands. It appears
from the set that copying was not quite complete when the cancellation took place,
as the bass parts are unlabelled and the harpsichord part is unfigured; but the usual
complement of parts is present and agrees with the numbers in the other sets.
Thirdly, Ford’s analysis of the parts compared to the scoring of each ode has
identified only a handful of missing parts. Fourthly, analysis of the copyists’
numbering system, introduced in the late 1750s, suggests that only a few parts have
gone missing overall and tends to confirm Ford’s analysis.

78 Ford, ‘Court Odes of William Boyce’, pp. 206-211.
79 Located at the end of this chapter.
80 GB-Ob Mss Mus. Sch. D. 303 a-c.
82 See Ch. 1 for an explanation of numbering systems in eighteenth-century performing sets.
The copyists’ numbering or coding system was used continuously from 1764, although one copyist, John Buswell, was using a form of it in the late 1750s. As the parts are not bound in an order corresponding to the numbering system, it is clear that the numbering must predate the binding; the ink and hands also suggest that it dates from the initial copying and is not part of some later filing system. Its function seems to have been to tell the copyist or the composer at a glance how many parts of each type had been copied. Additionally, it probably aided in the ordering of copied sheets into booklets, as each sheet was coded with the name and number of the part to which it belonged. This would have reduced instances of two identical sheets being stitched into one booklet while another lacked a page. The coding method was simple: violins were coded ‘1 1V’ or similar (corresponding to ‘first copy, first violin’), ‘2 1V’ (‘second copy, first violin’), ‘3 1V’ (‘third copy, first violin’) ‘1 2V’ (‘first copy, second violin’) and so forth, on every leaf. Bass parts were usually coded ‘1B’ to ‘4B’, with no account taken of the type of bass instrument; this included the cello, double bass and harpsichord parts but not the bassoon. Where a single copy of a part was produced, these were usually coded with a simplification of the part name without an extra number, such as ‘T’ or ‘TV’ for viola, ‘Bass’ for bassoon, ‘1HB’ or ‘1H’ for first oboe.

The main limitations of the coding system are that it clearly had nothing to do with numbering actual players and is of no value in determining part-sharing. Its main advantage is that it makes gaps in the surviving parts easier to spot: for example, where two first violin parts labelled ‘1 1V’ and ‘3 1V’ survive, it is obvious that the part labelled ‘2 1V’ is missing. Additionally, where a code contains no copy-number, it is clear that the part is the sole example in the set: this is consistently the case for the viola, bassoon, drum, first and second oboe, first and
second trumpet and first and second horn parts, indicating that one of each of these was the norm in these sets. As no lists survive of the totals for each type of part where multiples were copied, the system is not entirely conclusive in determining the completeness of sets. However, the 26 sets containing coded or numbered violin parts consist of 23 with three each of first and second violins, and three with only two each of these instruments. In the latter sets, a violin part coded ‘3’ survives in each, indicating that they also once consisted of three of each. There are no examples of a first or second violin part numbered ‘4’ in any set, indicating that three of each was Boyce’s standard set size. It is similarly clear from the bass numbering system that there was a standard bass set of four parts from 1764 at least (although the sets of the 1750s show greater variation). This consisted of one cello, two double basses and one harpsichord part; how these parts were actually shared is discussed below. The bassoon part was coded separately, as described above.

Among the instrumental parts, only the oboe parts give difficulty in determining the original number or standard set. Table 5.3 summarises all parts that have been identified as missing through Ford’s analysis, the copyists’ numbering system, or both. It will be seen that 19 of the 43 odes are missing at least one part; however, in 12 of these examples the only missing part is the oboe obbligato for numbers that require it, although the orchestral oboe parts for these odes survive. Strangely, the copyists’ codes on these oboe parts – where they exist – lack copy numbers, suggesting that no further oboe parts were in fact copied. Two oboe parts that should play during No. 4 in Ode No. 23, ‘Let the Voice of Music Breathe’ are the only missing parts in that set, although the ‘basic’ oboe parts survive and include the flute parts for that number, along with all the rest of the oboe music. Three further sets

83 The lost solo oboe parts are identified and discussed in Ford, ‘Court Odes of William Boyce’, pp. 212-14.
have oboe obbligato parts plus other parts missing, and an additional three have other
parts but no oboes missing. It is clear that oboe obbligato parts have a higher rate of
loss than other types of part.

A likely solution to the apparent contradiction between the lost obbligato parts
and the coding system, which indicates that the sets have the correct number of oboe
parts as they stand, is that the obbligato parts were copied on loose sheets of paper,
not in full-length booklets. This was probably also the case with the two missing
oboe parts from No. 4 of ‘Let the Voice of Music Breathe’; the likely solution here is
that four oboists were reading from the two oboe parts, of which two swapped to
flutes in No. 4 and played the music written in the booklets, while the other two
played from oboe parts written on now-lost loose single sheets. Table 5.3 shows that
14 of the 17 odes with missing parts are in fact missing only parts that would have
been loose single sheets. One surviving oboe obbligato part, from Ode No. 3, ‘Hail,
Hail, Auspicious Day’, supports this theory: it is bound in front of the rest of the part,
forms an independent gathering, as if copied separately, and is marked with the
player’s name (‘Mrs. Thos. Vincent’) along with a cue and instructions as to what
comes before it. The fact that other single-sheet parts such as the drum parts have
a high rate of survival suggests that perhaps the oboist was routinely given the part in
advance for practice and failed to return it afterwards.

84 Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 300 c, fols. 2-3.
### Table 5.3: Missing parts in the court ode sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ode No.</th>
<th>First Line</th>
<th>Ms. Mus. Sch.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>Missing Parts Number/Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>‘Rejoice ye Britons’</td>
<td>D. 302a-c</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1: solo oboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>‘Again the Sun’s’</td>
<td>D. 307a-c</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>1: solo counter-tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>‘Go Flora’</td>
<td>D. 311a-c</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1: solo oboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>‘Common Births’</td>
<td>D. 313a-c</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1: solo oboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>‘Sacred to Thee’</td>
<td>D. 315a-c</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>1: counter-tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>‘When First the Rude’</td>
<td>D. 317a-c</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>1: solo oboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>‘Hail to the Man’</td>
<td>D. 318a-c</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1: solo oboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>‘Friend to the Poor’</td>
<td>D. 319a-c</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2: horns in F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>‘Let the voice’</td>
<td>D. 320a-c</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>2: oboes for No.4 only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>‘Prepare your Songs’</td>
<td>D. 321a-c</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>1: solo oboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>‘Patrons of Arts’</td>
<td>D. 322a-c</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1: solo oboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>‘Discord Hence!’</td>
<td>D. 324a-c</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1: solo oboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>‘Wrapt in Stole’</td>
<td>D. 329a-c</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>1: solo oboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>‘Ye Powers, Who Rule’</td>
<td>D. 333a-c</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3: solo oboe; 1 violin1; probably 1 violin 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>‘On the White Rocks’</td>
<td>D. 334a-c</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>1: solo oboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>‘Driven Out’</td>
<td>D. 337a-c</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Probably 12: solo oboe; viola; harpsichord; 2 violins; trumpets and drums; probably 1 copy each of voice parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>‘When Rival’</td>
<td>D. 338a-c</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>1: solo oboe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The vocal sets display more variation in size and composition than the instrumental sets. It is clear that Boyce’s choice of solo voices depended largely on which suitable solo voices were available in the Chapel Royal in any given year. The exception to this was his use of the tenor John Beard, who was not a Chapel Royal member and took part in an extraordinary capacity, as soloist until the late 1760s.\textsuperscript{85} Numbers of surviving copies for each chorus part vary between one and five, with three to five apparently standard; totals for the whole set are between 13 and 20 with the exception of the final ode, from which many parts have been lost. However, it is generally more difficult to determine how many vocal parts may be missing because of the greater variation in numbers, and because the copyists’ numbering system was rarely applied to the vocal set.

Taking into account Ford’s analysis of missing parts and the information provided by the numbering system, it is clear that Boyce’s ‘standard’ set of instrumental parts for the court odes was 16 or 17 in total. These consisted of three first violins, three second violins, one viola, two to three stringed basses (violoncellos and double

\textsuperscript{85} Although not a Chapel member, Beard was appointed to the honorary post of ‘Vocal Performer in Extraordinary to His Majesty’ in 1764 (see Jenkins, \textit{John Beard}, p. 169).
basses, from 1763 in the ratio 1:2), one harpsichord, two oboes and one bassoon, plus two parts for brass instruments. Where these were trumpets, the set invariably also included a drum part; in 12 of the 43 sets, horns were used instead and one set (1761) included parts for both horns and trumpets. Flute parts were always written into the oboe parts. A ‘standard’ vocal set probably consisted of around 17 parts of which around four were solo parts and the others were divided roughly equally between the four voices, although more copies were often produced of the bass part than of the other three.

Part-Sharing and Actual Number of Performers

Of the 43 odes, 29 show clear signs of part-sharing between instrumentalists, involving all instrument types with the exception of the viola, trumpets, horns and drum. This evidence is of four types. There are three instances of part-covers bearing the names of two performers, such as ‘Thompson & Gibbs’ which appears twice on the covers of violin parts. There are many more instances of the survival of instrumental part-covers marked with two instrument names, such as ‘Double Bass & Violoncello’, which occurs twelve times. There are at least ten similar cases of the harpsichord sharing with a cellist according to the part-cover, and a further three instances of a harpsichord part labelled ‘Harpsichord, &c.’ which probably indicates the same. Ford comments that ‘it is hard to imagine this as a practical arrangement for performance’, but the evidence of the part-covers suggests it was routine.86 The only string instrument for which there is no evidence of sharing is the viola; however,

if the violinists, cellists and double bass players were sharing, it is likely that the viola players also did.

Further evidence of part-sharing relates only to the bassoons and oboes. Although only one bassoon part was copied per set, at least five odes contain references in the score or parts to ‘bassoni’ in the plural, or even instances of a divided line in the bassoon part. Performance instructions on the oboe parts clarify that two oboists were sharing each oboe part on a number of occasions at least; in fact, this was probably standard practice. On at least four occasions, a reduced scoring of one oboist per part was required, with instructions given in the parts as to who was to play what. On other occasions, as described above, it is likely that one oboist temporarily read from a separate sheet to play an obbligato line, while at least two others played the ‘orchestral’ lines from the parts. It is clear from this that instrumentalists routinely shared, and that the actual number of players might be almost twice the number of parts copied. Taking part-sharing into account, the ensemble might therefore have consisted of 12 violins, divided equally into firsts and seconds; two or three violas; three cellos and three basses (of which two cellos and two basses shared in pairs; the remaining cellist and bass player shared the third copy), plus four oboes, two bassoons and the harpsichord. Only the trumpet, horn and drum parts were probably played by single players. This gives a total of around 30 instrumentalists.

Ode No. 25, ‘Patron of Arts!’ of 1769, contains what appears to be a pencilled orchestra list in Boyce’s hand on one of the violin parts, as follows:87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenor [violin]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass[oons]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauboy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 322c, fol. 68.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trumpets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violins</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Bass</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violoncello</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems likely that this is indeed an orchestra list and not a list of parts copied, because of the big discrepancy between the number of violins listed and the number of parts that consistently survive in the court ode sets. It is not clear, however, whether this refers to the court odes at all – the inclusion of an organ on the list instead of the harpsichord would suggest that it does not. None of the odes contains an organ part, although Ford does observe one mention of an organ in a performance direction (‘Senza organo’) in the score for Ode No. 23, ‘Let the voice of music breathe’ (1768). Possibly the list was scribbled on the nearest blank leaf at the time and refers to a performance of a religious work. As it must date from 1769 or after, it cannot relate to the large-scale funeral, wedding and coronation performances of 1760-61; however, it might relate to one of the Sons of the Clergy concerts. There is no evidence that the list is a record of actual numbers in a performance as opposed to a total pool of instrumentalists. Apart from the reference to the organ, however, the numbers would be fairly consistent with the sets of parts if the violins and violas shared three-to-a-part. It is interesting that it appears to confirm a disproportionately small number of violas (by modern standards) against a large number of violins.

There is little evidence that singers shared parts. What evidence there is relates only to the trebles and occurs in only one of the forty-three sets: the two solo treble

---


89 Although reports of the 1730s refer to over 100 instrumentalists, reports of the 1760s indicate that the concerts might have become smaller (see Ch. 6).
parts for Ode No. 27, ‘Discord, hence’, are written into one book.\textsuperscript{90} This suggests that the trebles may have shared, although it was standard practice by this date for both lines in a duet, together with the bass line, to be written into the parts for both singers.\textsuperscript{91} A more reliable indicator that the boys shared parts is the number of treble parts copied, which never exceeded four even when solo and chorus parts are counted together. There were ten boys in the Chapel Royal throughout this period; it is likely that all available boys would have sung in the ode performances, as boys, unlike adults, were in waiting all the time rather than only half the time. Even allowing for sickness and breaking voices, this suggests that parts must have been shared.

The number of adult singers who took part each year is not known, but there is no evidence among these sets of adult singers sharing. Up to sixteen adult parts (including John Beard’s) were copied each time. There were twenty-six Gentlemen of the Chapel Royal – sixteen laymen and ten priests – but, as already mentioned, only half of those were in waiting at once.\textsuperscript{92} The fact that adult Chapel Royal singers could not be formally compelled to take part in the odes clearly caused problems on occasion, as it was discussed in an exchange of letters between John Pelham, secretary to the Lord Chamberlain, and the Dean of the Chapel Royal in 1748.\textsuperscript{93} The set for the cancelled ode of 1758 contains sixteen parts for solo and chorus adult

\textsuperscript{90} Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 324 b, fols. 1-8.

\textsuperscript{91} Examples can be seen in this collection and elsewhere, such in the sets of William and Philip Hayes, or those sets originating from the Aylesford Collection.

\textsuperscript{92} The reforms that reduced the number to sixteen did not take place until after Boyce’s death. This is confirmed by the Court and City Register for 1779, which lists the usual 26 places: see The Court and City Register; or, Gentleman’s Complete Annual Calendar, for the Year 1779 (London: 1779), p. 78.

\textsuperscript{93} Pelham objected on the Lord Chamberlain’s behalf to the irregularity of the Gentlemen’s attendance at ode performances, and instructed the Dean to give the singers orders to attend; the Dean replied that he was unable to give orders on such a matter. GB-Lna LCS/161, pp. 179-180, quoted in Daub, ‘Music at the Court of George II’, pp. 31 and 189.
singers, again including Beard’s part. As this is roughly consistent with other years, it seems likely that just over half the Gentlemen attended and sang on each occasion, and that the total number of singers was up to 16 adults and up to 10 boys. The total of participants overall might therefore have been around 55. Perhaps the greater variation in the number of singing parts, when compared to the instrumental parts, reflects the fact that band-members could be compelled to attend or send a substitute, but singers could not.

It is consistently clear from the solo parts that the solo singers participated in the choruses also. This was even the case for John Beard, who unlike the other soloists did not come from the Chapel Royal choir.

*Performers Names on the Parts*

The names of performers that appear in the sets of parts are given in Appendix A, and are of two types: those added by the copyist, and those added by the players themselves. Usual practice appears to have been that the copyist added names to the wrappers of solo vocal parts and section leaders’ parts, perhaps indicating that these people received the parts in advance to rehearse with. This is confirmed by the fact that James Nares, the Master of the Children of the Chapel, is named on the solo treble parts, presumably because the parts were sent to him. The covers of the instrumental parts appear, therefore, to confirm that Abraham Brown was effectively the leader of the band, although it is not known if this was a formal post, and that Charles Froud led the second violins on several occasions at least. Occasionally the copyist or Boyce has noted the names of players inside a part, such as when giving instructions for a part-swap at a particular point. All other instances of names
appearing on parts appear to have been written by the performers themselves. Such instances are an overlooked source of musicians’ signatures, although this is of potentially greater value in the case of musicians who did not hold court appointments and whose signatures are therefore not preserved in court records.

Most of those named on the parts are singers from the Chapel Royal and instrumentalists from the King’s Band. The ‘Mr. Parke’ who is named as playing the oboe in 1775 was probably John (1745-1829) and not his brother William (1761-1847), who would have been too young at 14 to be referred to as ‘Mr’. The names on the vocal soloists’ parts are often confirmed by newspaper accounts of the performances. A few musicians who were not in the King’s Band, but were members of the Queen’s Band, of the Household Drummers or of one of the regimental bands, are named on the instrumental parts. For example, Redmond Simpson the oboist and John Frederick Zuckert the bass-player were members of the Queen’s Band as of 1761, although they were not in the King’s band at that time; Simpson was also kettle drummer to the Horse Guards. It is noticeable that, while the adult soloists are frequently named, the boy soloists are always described simply as ‘Boy’. This can be seen in the final ode, No. 43, ‘To arms, to arms’, for which the drum part survives including the cue, ‘Air Mr. Dyne // and Duet by him & a Boy’, in Boyce’s hand. Perhaps this indicates that Boyce or Nares did not choose the treble soloist until the last minute.

---


95 The Court and City Kalendar, or, the Gentleman’s Register for the year 1762 (London: for H. Woodfall and others, 1762), pp. 93-94.

96 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 339 c, fol. 4r.
From the analysis above, the standard bass section for these odes was usually around three cellos and three basses, sharing in pairs; at least two bassoons; and one harpsichord. As noted above, there is a single reference to an organ (‘senza organo’) in a treble air in one score, which may be a mistake. The bass parts in the sets give more information than the scores on how the bass line was actually performed. For example, the bassoons were sometimes missed out of the score altogether, though their presence in every ode is demonstrated by the sets of parts. In addition, it is clear from the parts that every bass instrument did not play all of the time; however, the details of who played what, and when, are usually missing from the score. For example, the bassoon part for Ode No. 7, ‘When Othbert left’, is marked, ‘Note, the Bassoons are desired to play only in the Fortes’, on the first page in Boyce’s hand. Ode No. 27, ‘Discord, hence’ bears the instruction ‘Senza Contra Basso / Violoncello piano’ written in one of the double bass parts against the recitative ‘Is there intent’, further evidence that the part was probably shared between the two instruments. The parts indicate that the bassoons effectively functioned as ripieno instruments, normally playing throughout the overture and choruses, but in the tutti or forte sections only in arias or solo-and-chorus numbers. They did not play during recitatives; and their presence in other numbers is not linked to the presence of oboes.

97 See above, note 80.
98 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 304c, fol. 77.
The cello and double bass parts tended to play throughout, generally even during recitatives, though there were some exceptions to this.\textsuperscript{100}

There is greater discrepancy between the score bass-line and the content of the parts in the earlier odes than in the later ones. However, as late as 1778 Boyce added the instruction ‘Don’t play this line’ on the bassoon parts to the middle movement of the symphony of Ode No. 42, ‘Arm’d with her Native Force’.\textsuperscript{101} This information was not included in the autograph score of the work, and possibly represented Boyce’s second thoughts, as by this date he generally did note important details of bass-line scoring on the score, presumably to prevent the copyists from copying music unnecessarily.

**Conclusions**

Boyce’s court ode sets, together with his other sets discussed in the following chapter, form the most important surviving collection of eighteenth-century English performing sets. The large sample-size together with the relative completeness of the collection, the accurate dating, the long time-span it covers, the regularity with which it was added to, and the fact that the parts were only used once, give it a unique status among collections of English performing parts. These factors make it a valuable reference-point in identifying and dating scribal hands in other collections; its usefulness in this respect has yet to be fully exploited. It also gives useful information on copying practices such as counting-systems.

\textsuperscript{100} See Smith, ‘William Boyce and the Orchestra’ (pp. 12-13) for analysis of the bass line in individual odes.

\textsuperscript{101} Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 339 c, fol. 73v.
The parts give some information on the identities of the performers, which sheds further light on court music during the reigns of George II and George III. They offer some information on contemporary ornamentation and much on ensemble-leading practice of the time: the players were apparently less reliant on direction and more on watching each other and particularly the leading part. This is consistent with the practice apparent in other contemporary sets and parallels can also be drawn with the Oxford practice of a century earlier. The parts are a particularly useful source of information on marking-up practices, again because of the large sample-size. They are also the single biggest source of information on bass-line practice during this period and are particularly useful in this respect because of the high survival-rate of the parts.

The high survival rate of the parts, in combination with a copyists’ counting system and clear evidence of part-sharing, enables the size of the ensemble to be determined. A mean of 17 vocal parts and 16 instrumental parts survive for each ode; numbers of instrumental parts are particularly consistent. Evidence of part-sharing among the instrumentalists includes sharing between combinations of instruments that would now be unusual, such as between cello and double bass or cello and harpsichord. Given the consistent evidence in the parts that most of the instrumentalists shared parts, but the singers did not – with the probable exception of the boys – this implies an ensemble of approximately 22 singers, with a probable maximum of 26, and around 30 instrumentalists, evidence that it was still normal during this period for the instruments to outnumber the voices. The parts show clearly that the solo singers also sang throughout the choruses, as is consistent with evidence from elsewhere. This practice seems to have scarcely altered between 1755,
when Boyce took over the position of Master of the King’s Music, and 1779, when he prepared his last ode shortly before his death.
Table 5.2: The Copyists in the Instrumental and Vocal Parts for William Boyce’s Court Odes Nos. 1-13

This table omits performance addenda by Boyce or by the performers; only music and text hands are included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ode No.</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>First Line</th>
<th>Hand/fol. nos. (excluding folios on which no music is copied, such as part-wrappers)</th>
<th>Principal Copyist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**B1b**: Mus. Sch. D. 298 b., fols. 3v., 8r., 20-23v., 24v.-26r., 27.  
| B1a/b    |
| 2       | GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 299 b-c | Birthday 1756 | ‘When Caesar’s natal day’ | **B1c**: Mus. Sch. D. 299 b., fols. 1-4v., 6-7, 9, 10r. (2nd hand on page)  
<p>| B1c/d    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ode No.</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>First Line</th>
<th>Hand/fol. nos. (excluding folios on which no music is copied, such as part-wrappers)</th>
<th>Principal Copyist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3       | GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 300 b-c | New Year 1756 (numbered out of order) | ‘Hail, hail, auspicious day’ | B2b: Mus. Sch. D. 299 b., fols. 10r. (1st hand); 11r. (1st hand); 20r. (1st hand); 21r. (1st hand).  
B1d: Mus. Sch. D. 299 b., fols. 55r (features of B1c and d), 69, 76. | B1b |
B1c: Mus. Sch. D. 301 c., fols. 56-57v., 60v.-61r., 86.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ode No.</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>First Line</th>
<th>Hand/fol. nos. (excluding folios on which no music is copied, such as part-wrappers)</th>
<th>Principal Copyist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 302 b-c</td>
<td>Birthday 1757</td>
<td>‘Rejoice, ye Britons’</td>
<td><strong>John Buswell:</strong> all (except Mus. Sch. D. 302 c., fol. 33r, 2nd half, which is William Boyce). These have been marked up as usual by Boyce.</td>
<td>John Buswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 303 b-c</td>
<td>New Year 1758</td>
<td>‘Behold, the circle forms’</td>
<td><strong>John Buswell:</strong> all except fol. 37r of Mus. Sch. D. 303 c. These parts were never used. Not marked up by Boyce, presumably as the performance was cancelled before he had done it. <strong>William Boyce:</strong></td>
<td>John Buswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 304 b-c</td>
<td>Birthday 1758</td>
<td>‘When Othbert left’</td>
<td><strong>B5a:</strong> Mus. Sch. D. 304 b: fols. 1-2r., 3-4r., 5-6r., 8-10, 12-13r., 14-15r, 17-21r; 23-28r., 30-33, 36-37, 39-40r., 41-42r., 43-44r. Mus. Sch. D. 304 c, fols. 1-3, 5, 6v (2nd hand)-7r., 10r.-v(1st hand), 11r.(2nd hand)-12r., 15-21r., 24-30r., 33-39r., 42-48r., 51-57r., 60-66r., 69-75r., 78-84r., 87-93r., 96-r (1st hand), 97-102r., 105r.-v (1st hand), 106-111r. <strong>William Boyce:</strong> Mus. Sch. D. 304 c, fols. 5r-v. (1st hand), 10v.(1st hand)-11r. (2nd hand), 96v.(2nd hand), 105v. (2nd hand).</td>
<td>B5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 305 b-c</td>
<td>New Year 1759</td>
<td>‘Ye guardian Powers’</td>
<td><strong>B5b:</strong> Mus. Sch. D. 305 b., fols. 1-3, 5-6, 8r. (except second half text), 9-10r. (except second half text), 12-15r., 17-18r. (1st hand), 19r. (1st hand), 21-22, 25-26, 28r. (1st hand), 29r. (1st hand), 30. Mus. Sch. D. 305 c., fols. 1-3, 5v-6, 9v.-10, 13v.-18, 21v.-26, 29r.,</td>
<td>B5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ode No.</td>
<td>Shelfmark</td>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td>First Line</td>
<td>Hand/fol. nos. (excluding folios on which no music is copied, such as part-wrappers)</td>
<td>Principal Copyist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 306 b-c</td>
<td>Birthday 1759</td>
<td>‘Begin the Song. – ye Subject Quires’</td>
<td>30-34, 37v.-42, 45v.-50, 53r., 54-58, 61r., 62-66r. (63v. has one line of bass copied by WB), 69v.,70v.-71r., 74r., 75-79r., 82v.-87r., 90v.-95r. (including figuring).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B6:** Mus. Sch. D. 305 b., fols. 8r. (2\textsuperscript{nd} text hand)-8v. (text and music), 10r. (2\textsuperscript{nd} text hand)-10v. (text and music), 18r(2\textsuperscript{nd} hand)-18v., 19r. (2\textsuperscript{nd} hand)-19v., 28r.(2\textsuperscript{nd} hand)-28v., 29r.(2\textsuperscript{nd} hand)-29v. Mus. Sch. D. 305 b., fols. 70r.

**William Boyce:** Mus. Sch. D. 305 c., fol. 63v (one line of bass only).

<p>| 9 | GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 306 b-c | Birthday 1759 | ‘Begin the Song. – ye Subject Quires’ | B5c: Mus. Sch. D. 306 b., fols. 1-2r. (1\textsuperscript{st} hand), 3-4r. (1\textsuperscript{st} hand), 6-7, 9r. (1\textsuperscript{st} hand), 10r. (1\textsuperscript{st} hand), 11, 13-16r., 18-19r. (1\textsuperscript{st} hand), 20r. (1\textsuperscript{st} hand), 22-23, 26-27r., 31r. (1\textsuperscript{st} hand). Mus. Sch. D. 306 c., fols. 1-2b, 4-5, 8-9, 12v.-16, 19v.-23r., 26v.-30r., 33v.-37r., 40v.-44r., 47v.-51r., 54v.-58r., 61v.-64r., 67v.-71r., 74v.-78r., 81v.-85, | B5c |
| 9 | GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 306 b-c | Birthday 1759 | ‘Begin the Song. – ye Subject Quires’ | B7a: Mus. Sch. D. 306 b., fols. 2r. (2\textsuperscript{nd} hand)-2v., 4r.(2\textsuperscript{nd} hand)-4v., 9r. (2\textsuperscript{nd} hand)-9v., 10r. (2\textsuperscript{nd} hand)-10v., 19r. (2\textsuperscript{nd} hand)-19v., 20r. (2\textsuperscript{nd} hand). | B7a |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ode No.</th>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>First Line</th>
<th>Hand/fol. nos. (excluding folios on which no music is copied, such as part-wrapers)</th>
<th>Principal Copyist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 307 b-c</td>
<td>New Year 1760</td>
<td>‘Again the Sun’s revolving Sphere’</td>
<td><strong>B7b</strong>: Mus. Sch. D. 306 b., fols. 20v. (with B7a), 29-30, 31r. (2\textsuperscript{nd} hand)-31v.</td>
<td><strong>B5c</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B8</strong> Mus. Sch. D. 306 b., fols. 4r.(3\textsuperscript{rd} hand)-v.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ode No.</td>
<td>Shelfmark</td>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td>First Line</td>
<td>Hand/fol. nos. (excluding folios on which no music is copied, such as part-wrappers)</td>
<td>Principal Copyist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 310 b-c</td>
<td>New Year 1762</td>
<td>‘God of Slaughter, quit the Scene’</td>
<td>B5e: Mus. Sch. D. 310 b., fols. 1r., 2r., 3r., 4r., 5r., 6r., 7r., 8r., 9r., 10r. (2nd hand), 12r.-13r., 16r.-17r., 20r.-22r., 25-29, 33-36r., 39-40. Mus. Sch. D. 310 c., fols. 1r., 2r., 3r., 5-6r., 9-10r., 13-18r., 21-23v. (1st hand), 24v.-25r., 26r., 29-31v. (1st hand), 32v.-33r., 34r., 37-41r., 42r., 45-47v. (1st hand), 48v.-49r., 50r., 53-55v. (1st hand), 56v.-58r., 61-65v. (1st hand), 65v. (3rd hand)-66r., 69-72r., 75-80r., 81r., 84-89r. (1st hand), 90r., 93-98r. (1st hand), 99r., 102-107r. (1st hand), 107v.-108r.</td>
<td>B5e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ode No.</td>
<td>Shelfmark</td>
<td>Occasion</td>
<td>First Line</td>
<td>Hand/fol. nos. (excluding folios on which no music is copied, such as part-wrappers)</td>
<td>Principal Copyist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4: Surviving Parts in Boyce’s Court Ode Sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ode</th>
<th>Mss. Mus. Sch.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Solo Vocal Parts</th>
<th>Chorus Parts</th>
<th>Instrumental Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D. 298 a-c</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D. 299 a-c</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D. 300 a-c</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D. 301 a-c</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>D. 302 a-c</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D. 303 a-c</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>D. 304 a-c</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>D. 305 a-c</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>D. 306 a-c</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 I acknowledge indebtedness to Frederic Hugh Ford’s Table 6.3, ‘Extant Parts to Boyce Court Odes’, in *idem*, ‘Court Odes of William Boyce’ (pp. 206-211), on which this table is partially based.

2 One Vc, one VC+CB.

3 One Vc, one VC+CB.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ode</th>
<th>Mss. Mus. Sch.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Solo Vocal Parts</th>
<th>Chorus Parts</th>
<th>Instrumental Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T r</td>
<td>C T</td>
<td>T B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>D. 307 a-c</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>D. 308 a-c</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>D. 309 a-c</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>D. 310 a-c</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>D. 311 a-c</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>D. 312 a-c</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>D. 313 a-c</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>D. 314 a-c</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>D. 315 a-c</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 One VC, one CB and one shared by VC+CB.
5 One cello, one double bass and one shared by cello and double bass.
6 Shared with cello.
7 Shared between harpsichord and cello.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ode</th>
<th>Mss. Mus. Sch.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Solo Vocal Parts</th>
<th>Chorus Parts</th>
<th>Instrumental Parts</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T   Tr C   C    T  B Tr C C T  B V  V  V  V  V  V  C  C  B  B  H  H  Ob  Ob  F  F  F T T T H H</td>
<td>(CT) S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>D. 316 a-c</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>2  1  1 - 1  3  4  5  3  3  1  1  2  1  1  l=1  1=1  -  -  1  1 -</td>
<td>17:16 N S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>D. 317 a-c</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1  1  1 - 3  3  4  5  3  3  1  3^8  1  1^9  1  -  1  -  -  1  1 -</td>
<td>18:16 N S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>D. 318 a-c</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>1  1  1 - 1  2  3  4  5  3  3  1  1  2  1  1  l=1  1=1  1  1  -  -  1  1 -</td>
<td>18:17 N S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>D. 319 a-c</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>1  1  1 - 2  3  4  5  3  3  1  1  2  1  1  l^11  1  -  1  -  -  -  1  1 -</td>
<td>18:16 N S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>D. 320 a-c</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>1  1  1 - 3  3  4  5  3  3  1  1  2  1  1  l^12  1=1  1=1  -  -  1  1 -</td>
<td>18:16 N S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>D. 321 a-c</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>1  1  1 - 2  1  3  4  5  3  3  1  1  2  1  1  l^13  1=1  1=1  -  -  1  1 -</td>
<td>18:16 N S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^8 One of each, one shared by both.

^9 Shared between harpsichord and cello.

^10 Clearly shared between 2 soloists.

^11 Shared between harpsichord and cello.

^12 Shared between harpsichord and cello.

^13 Shared between harpsichord and cello.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ode</th>
<th>Mss. Mus. Sch.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Solo Vocal Parts</th>
<th>Chorus Parts</th>
<th>Instrumental Parts</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>D. 322 a-c</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>D. 323 a-c</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>D. 324 a-c</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>D. 325 a-c</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>D. 326 a-c</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>D. 327 a-c</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>D. 328 a-c</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>D. 329 a-c</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>D. 330 a-c</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>D. 331 a-c</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>D. 332 a-c</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>D. 333 a-c</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Shared between harpsichord and cello.

15 Shared between harpsichord and cello.

16 Shared between harpsichord and cello.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ode</th>
<th>Mss. Mus. Sch.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Solo Vocal Parts</th>
<th>Chorus Parts</th>
<th>Instrumental Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tr  C  T  B</td>
<td>Tr  C  T</td>
<td>B  Vl  Vl  Vla  Vl  C  B  Bsn  Hps  Ob  F  Ob  F  Tp  Tp  H  H  D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>D. 334 a-c</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>2  -  1  1</td>
<td>1  4  3</td>
<td>5  3  3  1  1  2  1  1  1  1  1  1  -  1  -  1  1  -  -  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>D. 335 a-c</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>1  1  2  1</td>
<td>2  3  4</td>
<td>4  3  3  1  1  2  1  1  1  1=1  1=1  1  1  -  -  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>D. 336 a-c</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>2  -  2  -</td>
<td>1  1  3  4</td>
<td>3  3  3  1  1  2  1  1  1  1=1  1  -  1  1  -  -  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>D. 337 a-c</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>1  1  1  -</td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
<td>4  2  2  -  1  2  1  -  1  -  1  -  -  -  -  -  -  -  -  13:10 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>D. 338 a-c</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>1  1  1  -</td>
<td>2  3  4</td>
<td>4  3  3  1  1  2  1  1  1  1  -  1  -  1  1  -  -  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>D. 339 a-c</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>1  1  2  -</td>
<td>2  3  4</td>
<td>5  3  3  1  1  2  1  1  1  1  -  1  -  1  1  -  -  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>D. 340 a-c</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>-  -  -  -</td>
<td>1  2  1</td>
<td>-  2  2  -  -  2  1  -  -  -  -  -  -  1  -  -  1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

- **B** = bass (voice)
- **D** = drum
- **N** = numbering system visible
- **Tp** = trumpet
- **Vla** = viola
- **Bsn** = bassoon
- **Fl** = flute
- **Ob** = oboe
- **Tr** = treble
- **CB** = double bass
- **H** = horn
- **S** = evidence of shared parts
- **VC** = violoncello
- **CT** = counter-tenor
- **Hps** = harpsichord
- **T** = tenor
- **VI** = violin

17 Headed ‘Principal Tenor Bass’.
6: William Boyce’s Other Performing Sets, 1736-1766

Apart from the court ode sets described in Chapter 5, fourteen other performing sets survive for works for voices and instruments by William Boyce, that also appear to originate from the composer’s own library. Thirteen of these are now in the Oxford Music School collection in the Bodleian, having apparently arrived there via the same route as the court ode sets, as described in Chapter 5. Again, they do not appear in the sale catalogue of 1779, but seem to have been among the manuscripts sold privately to Philip Hayes for the Oxford Music School. The most important sets in this group are those for the court events of 1760 and 1761: the funeral of George II on 11 November 1760; the wedding of George III and Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz on 8 September 1761 and the coronation of George III and Charlotte on 22 September that year. Sets for two more court odes, that were not part of the regular series honouring the monarch’s birthday and the New Year, also survive: ‘Another passing year has flown’, for the birthday of George, Prince of Wales in 1752; and ‘See, white-robed peace’ celebrating the end of the Seven Years’ War in 1763.

Performance sets for four non-court odes also survive, including for the two Cecilian odes, ‘See, fam’d Apollo and the nine’ and ‘The charms of harmony display’; the ode in commemoration of Shakespeare, ‘Titles and ermine fall behind’; and the Pythian Ode ‘Gentle Lyre, begin the strain’. The other four surviving sets are for a version of the anthem ‘The King shall rejoice’ for the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy in 1766; the masques Peleus and Thetis and the Secular Masque; and the cantata David’s Lamentation over Saul and Jonathan. Two of the works, the ode ‘Another passing year is flown’ for the Prince of Wales’s birthday in 1752 and the Shakespeare ode ‘Titles and ermine fall behind’ of 1756 – the only two to date from
the 1750s – do not meet the definition of concerted music given in Chapter 1 because they lack a chorus, and so are excluded from this study. The final surviving set considered in this chapter is the partial set for the anthem ‘O be joyful in God’ held in the British Library, which was used in Hereford and cannot be linked directly to Boyce’s library. However, the organ part at least is in Boyce’s autograph.

This must represent less than half of Boyce’s library of performing sets for his own concerted works. Even if he did not retain sets for the three theatre works for which no parts survive (The Chaplet; The Shepherd’s Lottery; and The Tempest), he must have had sets for the seven other orchestral odes he is known to have composed, as well as parts for at least four other orchestrally-accompanied anthems. The biggest losses are undoubtedly the parts for the lost oratorio Noah, which were sold by Puttick and Simpson in 1850 but have not survived; and Boyce’s own set for the serenata Solomon. However, when compared with the totals of sets surviving from the libraries of Boyce’s contemporaries listed in Chapter 1, this is a good survival-rate.

The losses of sets once owned by Boyce for other composers’ works are easier to judge, as most such were probably included in the sale of 1779. The losses of the sets he inherited from Maurice Greene have been discussed in Chapter 1. In addition to these, the catalogue mentions at least twelve sets of parts for works by composers other than Greene: four by Handel, two by Porpora and one each by Bononcini, Bassani, Carissimi, Georgi and Baccato (neither of these last two composers have

---

been identified), and two bundles of sets for works by various Italian composers.\(^2\) All these sets are apparently lost.

A few other eighteenth-century performing sets or partial sets survive for Boyce’s works that do not originate from his collection, for example the set for *Solomon* held in the Bodleian’s music collection and the unlinked stray parts for the same work held in the Royal Academy of Music and the Shaw Club Archive in the Royal Northern College of Music.\(^3\) The set for Boyce’s arrangement of Richard Leveridge’s music in *Macbeth* is another such example.\(^4\) As none of these can be linked to the composer – the set for *Macbeth*, for example, appears to derive from the published edition and dates from after Boyce’s death, and the parts in the Shaw Club Archive relate to that society’s own performances and again derive from a published edition – they are not considered here.\(^5\)

*Previous Research on Boyce’s Performance Sets*

As might be expected, the court sets have received the most attention from researchers. Two of the anthems, ‘The souls of the righteous’ for the funeral of George II, and ‘The King shall rejoice’ in the version for the royal wedding in 1761, have been published in modern editions.\(^6\) Van Nice discusses these works and


\(^3\) GB-Ob Mss. Mus. D. 127-128; GB-Lam MS 27Q; GB-Mcm SC 24.

\(^4\) GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 47860, fols. 1-19.

\(^5\) See Ch. 4 for a discussion of some of the Shaw Singers’ sets for Handel’s music.

others in his thesis on Boyce’s larger sacred choral works, focusing particularly on David’s Lamentation Over Saul and Jonathan, the various settings of ‘The King shall rejoice’ and the funeral anthem ‘The souls of the righteous’. Billy Wayne Summers’s thesis of 2001 presents a performing edition of the coronation anthems, but does not consider the performing parts at all. Matthias Range’s study of music in British coronations also considers the coronation anthems. Range also considers the wedding anthem, although not the parts, in an article of 2006. The St Cecilia odes, David’s Lamentation and the stage works are discussed in a series of articles by Ian Bartlett, Robert Bruce and Roger Fiske.

Boyce’s Performance Sets of the 1730s-1740s

Seven sets or partial sets from Boyce’s early career survive that meet the criteria for inclusion in this study. They can be summarised as follows:


12 The set for the anthem ‘Blessed is he that considereth the sick’ that survives as IRL-Dte Mercer’s Deposit 1-44 is not considered here, because it was not used within England, but in Dublin. See Bartlett and Bruce, Tercentenary Sourcebook, pp. 26-8.
1. GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 267 a-c: *David’s Lamentation Over Saul and Jonathan* (1736).\(^{13}\)

2. GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. C. 110 a-c: ‘The Charms of Harmony Display’ (1737 or 1738).\(^{14}\)

3. GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. D. 266 a-c: ‘See fam’d Apollo and the nine’ (1739).\(^{15}\)

4. GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. C. 113 a-c: *Peleus and Thetis* (c.1740).\(^{16}\)

5. GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. C. 111 and C. 112 a-c: The Pythian Ode (‘Gentle lyre, begin the strain’, 1741).\(^{17}\)

6. GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. C. 107 a-b: *The Secular Masque* (c.1746).\(^{18}\)


The instrumental parts they contain are summarised in Table 6.1.\(^{19}\) These sets are of particular interest because of the relative scarcity of any performance sets for concerted music from these decades, let alone for works of the scale, stature and variety of genre of those represented here. The group includes two dramatic works, *Peleus and Thetis* and the *Secular Masque*, as well as one sacred cantata or oratorio (both descriptions were used for *David’s Lamentation*), two Cecilian odes and one other ode. The Cecilian odes and *David’s Lamentation* were probably written for the Apollo Academy, but the origins of *Peleus and Thetis* and the *Secular Masque* are

---

\(^{13}\) See Bartlett and Bruce, *Tercentenary Sourcebook*, pp. 9-10.

\(^{14}\) See Bartlett, ‘Boyce’s Homage to St Cecilia’ and Bartlett and Bruce, *Tercentenary Sourcebook*, p. 21.

\(^{15}\) See Bartlett, ‘Boyce’s Homage to St Cecilia’ and Bartlett and Bruce, *Tercentenary Sourcebook*, pp. 20-22.


\(^{17}\) See Bartlett and Bruce, *Tercentenary Sourcebook*, p. 21.


\(^{19}\) See end of chapter.
unknown. However, there is no evidence that they were staged. Unfortunately the sets are in poorer condition than the court ode sets and the later sets discussed below. This is probably not because they are older, but is instead a result of the different function of these sets when compared with the others. The court ode sets were single-occasion sets; the group of sets from the 1760s considered below were also largely such. The six sets considered here all show signs of repeated use.

The vocal parts in particular have been affected by the reuse of the parts, as new performance conditions each time necessitated the redistribution of the solos, which often meant recopying whole solo parts or sections of parts. As a result, solo numbers are often duplicated across two or three parts that date from different performances. Some individual solo numbers survive in entirely separate parts that must have been used together with one of the main solo parts. Some parts are incomplete or missing. A number have been copied without the chorus parts included. This does not correspond to Boyce’s usual practice, as seen in the court ode sets and the later sets discussed below; or to the general practice of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as seen in the Oxford Music School performance sets and those of the Hayeses and the Academy of Ancient Music.\(^{20}\) It may be that Boyce was aware the solo parts might have to be partially or wholly recopied, and minimised the necessary work by having only the solo numbers included. Given the convention that solo singers sang throughout, the soloists may have used these parts in conjunction with a separately-copied chorus part. These vocal parts give useful information on performance history, in particular the names of singers involved and the changes that were made to accommodate them. However, they are not useful as a record of size and composition of vocal forces: their

\(^{20}\) See Chapters 2-5.
authority in this respect has been compromised by the copying, replacement and loss. They have therefore been omitted entirely from Table 6.1, because the numbers alone give no useful information and might give a misleading impression.

The instrumental parts seem less affected by the reuse, perhaps because recopying was only normally necessary when an aria had to be transposed for a new singer or when a section was re-worked entirely. However, the reuse of the sets must be borne in mind when assessing the instrumental parts: it should not be assumed that all parts date from the year the work was first performed. Despite this, it can be seen in Table 6.1 that the numbers of instrumental parts in each set are roughly consistent with the numbers in the court ode sets discussed in Chapter 5. Despite some obvious losses, the ratio of the string parts (first violins to second violins to violas to cellos and basses combined) frequently approaches 3:3:1:3 or 4:4:2:4, with the bass section further supported by bassoon and a keyboard instrument and the top lines frequently supported by oboes. As is also the case in the court ode sets, the flute parts are always written into the oboe parts and it is clear that the same players routinely doubled on both. These figures suggest that the ensemble of the main court ode series, described in Chapter 5, was Boyce’s standard ensemble, at least at the start of his tenure as Master of the King’s Music. This is particularly interesting given that, while the court odes were produced for performance in one specific setting with one specific ensemble, the sets considered here were used in a variety of settings. The figures indicate that the balance of the sound would have been slightly different to that preferred today, being more weighted towards the outer parts.21

---

21 The two odes from the 1750s not included in this study further support these numbers: the Ode for the Birthday of the Prince of Wales in 1752, ‘Another passing year is flown’, was apparently played by a string ensemble in the ratio 3:3:1:4 supported by organ and two each of oboes, horns and trumpets, and a drum. The surviving string parts for the Ode to Shakespeare of c.1756, ‘Titles and ermine fall behind’, are in the ratio 3:2:1:3, probably indicating that a second violin part has been lost.
The set of parts for *David’s Lamentation Over Saul and Jonathan* is probably the earliest among this group, being likely to date from the work’s first performance. Many of the parts are still in their original blue paper wrappers. The instrumental set is possibly incomplete, as the organ part (the only keyboard part) gives music for the overture and choruses only. A harpsichord part must therefore have been lost, unless Boyce played from the score. The surviving string set is in the ratio 3:3:1:2, plus one extra partial first violin part; it is likely that at least one other bass is missing. The set includes two oboe parts, each with a corresponding flute part separately copied and added at the back of the booklet, although any bassoon part that once existed is now lost. Bartlett has commented that the autograph score does not include oboes, although the score prepared for the later Dublin performances includes instructions to the copyist relating to the preparation of oboe parts from the violin lines.\(^\text{22}\) However, the lack of oboe parts in the autograph score need not imply a lack of oboes in the first performance; it is possible that similar instructions to those in the Dublin score were given verbally by Boyce to the copyists. The blue paper wrappers of the oboe parts match those of the main set, including the organ part, and might therefore have been produced at the same time. However, Boyce did continue to use blue paper wrappers for some years. Examination of the paper types might clarify whether the oboes parts are on the same paper as the other parts.

The vocal set for *David’s Lamentation* is in much poorer condition than the instrumental set, for the reasons described above. Parts have clearly been lost: no counter-tenor chorus parts survive, and only one of the three counter-tenor solo parts includes the choruses. Three bass chorus parts survive and two each of treble and tenor, indicating that the original set might have contained around three of each. The

solo parts were sung at one performance by the bass Samuel Weely – whose part includes the bass chorus and two of the tenor solo numbers – and the Chapel Royal priests Edward Lloyd and John Abbott singing counter-tenor and tenor respectively, plus at least one further unnamed counter-tenor soloist.\textsuperscript{23} The presence of Weely’s and Abbott’s names on one of the blue-covered parts is an indicator that the set must date from within six years of the work’s first performance, as Weely died in 1743 and Abbott in early 1744.\textsuperscript{24} All three singers were well-known soloists in the 1730s and early 1740s, and it may be that they took part in the first performance and that the blue-covered parts are the remnants of the original set. The two counter-tenor solos sung by Lloyd are duplicated in another counter-tenor solo part, also in a blue wrapper. It and the third counter-tenor solo part combine to give all the solo numbers for that voice, without the choruses; perhaps Boyce wanted to leave his options open in the distribution of the solo numbers. Both these parts contain rare marking-up that seems to have originated from the singer who used them; ‘Strong’ and ‘Tender’ are written at various points in ‘Israel is fallen’ and ‘Swift indulge thy cruel aid’.

The parts for the Cecilian ode ‘The charms of harmony display’ are likewise probably the set used by Boyce at the first performance. The instrumental set may be near-complete: it has string parts in the ratio 3:3:1:3 and first and second trumpets and oboes, but lacks a harpsichord, bassoon or drum. The vocal parts are clearly incomplete: only five survive and the set lacks the principal solo counter-tenor or any trebles including the solo part. However, it may have been a small set to start


\textsuperscript{24} Burrows, \textit{Handel and the English Chapel Royal} , pp. 576, 590, 593.
with, and may be further evidence that a small group of voices against a larger instrumental ensemble was normal at the time. The solo bass was sung by Mr Abbott, according to the cover of the part. However, Abbot’s part lacks the bass part in the trio ‘Where peace prevails’, which is given instead in a bass chorus part labelled ‘M’: Pinkney M: Weely’. A corresponding counter-tenor chorus part labelled ‘M’: Row. / M. Chelsum’ gives that voice’s line in the trio, though none of the rest of the counter-tenor solos; a corresponding treble part is now missing. As well as being a rare example of adult singers sharing parts, these parts suggest that the trio might have been performed with two singers per line.

The set of parts for the second Cecilian ode, ‘See, fam’d Apollo and the nine’, was likewise probably written for the Apollo Academy. The autograph score is of interest because it is not the usual fair copy but contains a lot of corrections, and is therefore perhaps an example of what Boyce’s composing scores might have looked like. The symphony contains the autograph addenda, ‘Note, The figures under the notes, are for the Through Bass, those wrote above are not all right’ and, ‘Leave these two Bars to be alter’d’. A further addendum, later scored through, reads, ‘N:B: This Minuet has been added, ‘Tis not in y^e Instrumental Copies’, in reference to the final movement of the Overture which was evidently composed last. This suggests that no fair copy of this work was produced: the parts were probably produced from this copy.

The parts divide into at least two groups: a number are in blue paper wrappers like those of David’s Lamentation; two are in brown paper wrappers; and several vocal parts are without wrappers. The instrumental parts in the blue wrappers are lacking the minuet and are therefore identifiable as belonging to the original set,

---

25 Gb-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 266 a, fol. 2r.
while the single instrumental part in a brown wrapper – a first violin part – contains the minuet copied in its proper place in the sequence. Several loose single-leaf parts give the minuet for some of the parts that originally lacked it. However, they do not match the surviving full parts in number and type, as they include three labelled ‘basso’ and one labelled ‘basso organo’, suggesting that the full set once contained more bass parts and that an organ part did once exist. Based on these, the original set contained first and second trumpets, kettle drum, first and second oboes, at least two each of first and second violins, one viola, at least three bass parts and an organ part.

The instrumental parts show a number of cuts that may have later been reinstated, as the paper and sealing-wax that once covered them is no longer in place. The early performance history of the work is still unclear, but the original London performance by the Apollo Academy probably took place in 1739.26 At least two performances took place in Dublin in 1740-1, and another in 1744.27 A rehearsal of the work held in London ‘in the Apollo great Room, near Temple-Bar’ by ‘Gentlemen belonging to the three Choirs, &c.’ was reported in the press in 1743.28 Some of the alterations in Boyce’s set may have been made for the London rehearsal and the Three Choirs performance of 1743, but the parts must have been used on several other occasions at least.

It is hard to judge the number of vocal parts in the original set, but at least three survive: treble and tenor chorus parts, and a counter-tenor solo part inscribed with the name of James Chelsum, who died in 1743. Chelsum was probably the original

26 Bartlett and Bruce, Tercentenary Sourcebook, p.20.
27 Bartlett and Bruce, Tercentenary Sourcebook, pp. 20-21 and 37.
interpreter of these solos; at some point a few were reassigned to a Mr. Smith, probably at a later performance, and another recitative and aria (‘The melting theme’ and ‘Music can the passions raise’) were inserted into the part. One further part, which lacks its cover but may belong to the original set, gives the bass-line of the choruses interspersed with all but one of the tenor solos. As a similar part used by Samuel Weely survives in the set to David’s Lamentation, this part may have also belonged to Weely, who would have therefore been the original tenor soloist.

The masque Peleus and Thetis must date from 1740 or earlier, as the libretto was published in the Apollo Academy’s word-book of that year. The first recorded performance was a benefit performance held on 29 April at the Swan Tavern in London in 1747 for a Mr Jones; the work was performed again in 1749 at the festival of Boyce’s music in Cambridge which marked the conferment of his doctorate. The performing parts contain several layers of revision and transposition and clearly relate to at least three occasions. For example, the final duet, ‘O my Soul whither’, appears in at least three different versions: in the second, the vocal parts of the original version are swapped around, and a third version is transposed from A major down to G. Most parts are in blue paper wrappers, but some are covered in buff cartridge paper or purple paper and some lack wrappers entirely. Those covered in blue paper may be the original parts, as this paper was clearly used by Boyce in the late 1730s. One vocal part in a purple wrapper also contains a part to Part 1 of the Pythian Ode: as this work was composed later than Peleus and Thetis, the part cannot therefore belong to the original set. The Pythian Ode was performed with

29 The omitted solo is ‘Thus whilst the muse’.
30 Bartlett and Bruce, Tercentenary Sourcebook, pp. 17-18.
31 Advertisement, General Advertiser (1744) (London), 28 April 1747, Issue 3899; Bartlett and Bruce, Tercentenary Sourcebook, p. 59.
Peleus and Thetis during the 1749 festival of Boyce’s music in Cambridge; this part may have been among those added to the main set for that occasion.

The instrumental set contains string parts in the ratio 4:4:2:4, plus two oboes/flutes, bassoon, trumpet (a second trumpet part is missing), drum and organ. The organ as usual plays only in the symphonies and choruses, with the exception of the last chorus. Most of the content of the wind parts does not appear in the score, in which wind instruments appear only in the final chorus. However, the parts indicate that they played a greater role than this: the oboes doubled the strings in many numbers, replaced by the flute where convention would suggest it, while the bassoons doubled the bass line. Fiske suggests that this indicates the oboes and flutes were either regarded as inessential or were added for a later performance, having been unavailable for the first.\(^{32}\) However, Boyce might have always intended that oboes and flutes would double the violins at appropriate points: instructions could easily have been given to the copyists to produce such parts, regardless of their presence or absence in the score. Indeed, their presence in the score in the final number confirms this: the parts may have been included in the score version of this chorus merely to differentiate them from the trumpets in this number. Contrary to another suggestion by Fiske, there is no evidence in the parts that the flutes and oboes replaced the violins in some numbers, although some individual soli passages may have been played by the wind instruments alone.\(^{33}\)

The name of Samuel Weely again appears in the parts, possibly in relation to the first performance. In any case, his name must relate to a performance before his death in 1743. According to the names on the parts, the roles of Peleus and Thetis


\(^{33}\) Boyce, *Peleus and Thetis*, ed. by Fiske.
were sung at one performance by John Beard and Elizabeth Turner. This must have taken place in the mid-1740s or later, as Elizabeth Turner does not appear to have been active as a performer before 1744; the blue-covered part assigned to her in any case shows signs of revision. Beard and Turner did both sing in the Cambridge festival of Boyce’s music in 1749, and it may be that the original blue-covered parts formed the nucleus of the set used on that occasion, with additional copies added as necessary. At another revival the part of Thetis was sung by Giulia Frasi, but it is unclear when this took place.

The parts for the Pythian Ode are similar to the other sets in that the instrumental parts are in much better condition than the vocal parts; the bulk of both are covered in blue wrappers; and a number of the vocal parts are newer than the rest of the set. The older vocal parts all bear fold marks, probably as a result of the transportation implied in the note on the solo bass part, ‘From M:r Boyce to be perform’d / next Wedn[e]sday at the Academy’. Two generations of singers’ names are visible on the two bass solo parts: Samuel Weely and John Abbott sang in an early performance, and Robert Wass and William Savage at a later one. As Wass and Savage both began their performing careers at approximately the time of the deaths of Weely and Abbott, who died in November, 1743 and February, 1743/4 respectively, the parts may have continued in use for some time. The instrumental set is almost identical in composition to the set for Peleus and Thetis. Although the work dates from around 1740 and the main instrumental set was probably produced for the first

---

34 Margaret Yelloly, “‘The Ingenious Miss Turner’; Elizabeth Turner (d 1756), Singer, Harpsichordist and Composer," EM 33/1 (February 2005), 65-79.

35 Yelloly, “‘The Ingenious Miss Turner’”, p.74.

36 Burrows, Handel and the English Chapel Royal, pp. 576 and 592.
performance, at least one of the bass parts was copied after the autumn of 1742, as a wrapper intended for the now-lost set to *Solomon* was used to cover it.\textsuperscript{37}

The instrumental set for *The Secular Masque* seems to be less complete than most in this group: the four bass parts (three cellos and one double bass) indicate that it probably once included at least four each of first and second violin parts, although only one first and two second violin parts survive. The vocal parts are also clearly incomplete, as only two chorus parts survive. Again the main set is in the cheap blue wrappers that Boyce seems to have used during this period. All the parts show signs of extensive revision, but the performance history of the work is not very clear. The part of Momus is marked with John Beard’s name: this might refer either to the planned performance of 9 April 1747 that was postponed and then cancelled; the performance at Cambridge in the festival of 1749, in which Beard took part; or to the performance at Drury Lane on 31 October, 1750, in which Beard also sang this part.\textsuperscript{38} However, the other singers named on the parts are Baildon, Wood and Warren, with Thomas Baildon singing the role of Diana; Venus’s part does not survive. This matches the version presented by the only surviving score, which indicates that the role of Venus was also originally sung by a male singer.\textsuperscript{39} That this was probably the original version is indicated by the fact that John Beard performed Diana’s song, ‘With horn and with hounds’, several times at Covent Garden in March 1746, the earliest recorded performance of any of the music.\textsuperscript{40} The other singers in the Drury Lane performance of 1750 were Reinhold, Wilder, Master

\textsuperscript{37} See Bartlett and Bruce, *Tercentenary Sourcebook*, p. 21, for information on *Solomon*.

\textsuperscript{38} See Bartlett and Bruce, *Tercentenary Sourcebook*, pp. 48-49 and 59; also advertisement, *General Advertiser* (London), 31 October 1750, Issue 5001.

\textsuperscript{39} GB-Lcm Ms. 93. A modern edition, unpublished, has been edited by Richard Platt for Opera da Camera (n.d.).

\textsuperscript{40} Bartlett and Bruce, *Tercentenary Sourcebook*, p. 42.
Mattocks, Miss Norris and Mrs Clive, none of whom are mentioned in this set. The Cambridge performance probably also gave the version with female singers; the transposition necessitated by this might have been the reason for the excision of sections of the few surviving parts.

There is no set of parts in the Music School collection for Boyce’s orchestral anthem ‘O be joyful’, which served as his doctoral submission in 1749; however, three parts (drum, tenor voice and organ) do survive in the British Library. The provenance of the set is not known: it has clearly been used in Hereford, as the organ part is in a cover inscribed ‘Boyce’s O be Joyfull. / Organo. / Hereford. / W: Felton’. William Felton (1715-69) was a clergyman and organist of Hereford who was involved in organising the Three Choirs Festival. As the part is in Boyce’s autograph, and was written before the change in style of his clefs in 1759, the set may have been left behind by Boyce or given by him to Felton when he conducted one of the Three Choirs festivals, which took place in Hereford every three years. It is in reduced-score format, does not appear to have been intended as a fair copy, and may have been written for the composer himself to play from at Cambridge in 1749. The surviving drum part contains the direction, ‘The Boys lead the Chorus upon the Close Note of the Duet - Rest 13 bars with the bar that the Boys lead away’: the reference to leading in this case appears to be purely a cue for the purposes of counting bars. It is unfortunate that the complete set does not survive.

41 GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 31670, fols. 1-16.
43 GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 31670, fol. 13r.
Apart from the sets of the main court ode series (see Chapter 5), no performance sets survive for Boyce’s concerted music from the periods between 1750 and September 1760, and after 1766. The second group of surviving performing sets from Boyce’s collection consists of sets produced for five performances between September 1760 and April 1766. These sets differ considerably from those in the first group. All were produced for specific occasions and four out of the five sets were produced for court events rather than for private societies or the theatre. All were for performance forces that were much bigger than either the standard court ode ensemble, or the forces indicated by the sets in the first group. Finally, only three of the sets are known to have been reused on a subsequent occasion or occasions. They can be summarised as follows:


44 Two sets from the 1750s are excluded from this study as described above.
The years 1760 and 1761 were a high point in Boyce’s career as Master of the King’s Music. George II died on October 25, 1760, in the 34th year of his reign. Boyce began a funeral anthem, ‘The Souls of the Righteous’, on 31 October, and had completed it within a week presumably including the copying of the parts, in time to rehearse it in public in Hickford’s Room on 7 November. The funeral took place in Henry VII’s Lady Chapel in Westminster Abbey on 11 November. The entire Band of Music was re-sworn on 20 December 1760, and preparations began for the coronation of George III the following September. A marriage was quickly negotiated between George and Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, who arrived in England on 8 September 1761, was married to him that evening and crowned with him two weeks later in Westminster Abbey on 22 September 1761.

Boyce was responsible for the composition of the wedding anthem, ‘The King shall rejoice’, and for almost all the music performed during the coronation. The

---

45 Bartlett and Bruce, Tercentenary Sourcebook, pp. 179-80.

46 Located at the end of the chapter.

47 The autograph score has a note in Boyce’s hand giving the circumstances of composition and dates of rehearsal and performance (GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115a, fols. 1r. and 47r.).


only exception was the anthem ‘Zadok the Priest’, for which Handel’s setting was used. Boyce also held overall responsibility for almost all the organisation of the musical performances on all three occasions, and for the performance of music at the ball on 9 September to celebrate the royal wedding. The warrants from the Lord Chamberlain for monies to be paid to Boyce show that he received £568. 17s. 6d. in recompense for his services and for money disbursed for the funeral; followed by £396. 10s. 6d. in respect of the wedding and £1059. 16s. 6d. for the coronation, plus an extra £137. 13s. to pay for work done on the organs used for both events. In total, therefore, the huge sum of £2162. 17s. 6d. passed through Boyce’s hands as a result of the funeral, wedding and coronation. In typical court fashion, the greater part of this was paid to him two years late. It is unclear whether Boyce had already paid the performers and was merely claiming the money back – unlikely, as this would have required a very significant sum of ready money – or whether everyone involved simply had to wait for the money to be paid by the Treasurer of the Chamber.

These performances have already been discussed, notably by Range, Van Nice, Bartlett and Bruce, and Burrows. However, the precise composition and balance of the orchestra on each occasion has never been fully examined, despite the fact that large sets of performance parts and information on payment to musicians survive for all three of these performances, making it possible to estimate the balance of instruments. Range rightly notes that the coronation set may be incomplete. However, the funeral of George II in 1760 and the wedding and coronation of George III in 1761 are very extensively documented: indeed, the 1761 coronation,

50 See above, notes 6-10; Bartlett and Bruce, Tercentenary Sourcebook, pp. 139-142 (funeral), 144-5 (wedding) and 146-153 (coronation); and Burrows, Handel and the English Chapel Royal, pp. 179-180 and 553.

51 Range, Music and Ceremonial, p. 164.
taken as a whole, might lay claim to be the single most comprehensively-documented performance in eighteenth-century England. The completeness of the sets of parts needs to be assessed in light of the documentary evidence, much of which has previously been overlooked, before the usefulness of the parts as a performance-practice resource can be assessed. In particular, the warrants authorising extraordinary payments in settlement of music-related expenditure for these occasions have not yet been adequately assessed. These provide valuable information about the numbers of musicians who took part in the three ceremonies.

The Funeral of George II

A set of 36 instrumental and 31 vocal parts for the funeral anthem ‘The Souls of the Righteous’ survives together with an autograph full score.\(^52\) An inscription in Boyce’s hand on the first leaf of the score reads ‘An / Anthem, / Perform'd at the Funeral of / King George the Second, / In Henry the Seventh's Chapel, / at Westminster, / Nov.\(^7\) the 11.\(^\text{th}\) 1760.’\(^53\) A further inscription at the end, also by Boyce, reads ‘Note, Began this Anthem on Friday, Oct: 31.\(^\text{st}\) 1760. Rehears'd it at Hickford's Room, the Friday / following’.\(^54\) From this it is clear that composition was begun only twelve days before the funeral and that enough parts must have been copied for a public rehearsal only seven days after Boyce had started composing the

\(^{52}\) GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. C. 115 a-c.

\(^{53}\) GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115a, fol. 1r.

\(^{54}\) GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115a, fol. 47r.
work. The anthem’s text appeared in the London press on Wednesday 12 November, the day after the funeral, with the following introduction:

The following anthem set to music by Dr. Boyce, (organist, composer, and master of the band of music to his Majesty) was performed last night at the funeral of our late most gracious Sovereign, in King Henry the Seventh’s Chapel: the vocal parts by the Gentlemen of the Chapel Royal, the Choir of Westminster, the Rev. Mr. Mence, Mr. Beard, and other additional voices; and the instrumental, by his Majesty’s band of music.\footnote{News, \textit{Gazetteer and London Daily Advertiser} (London) 12 November 1760, Issue 9856, p. 1.}

Apparently, therefore, the music was a joint effort between at least two choirs, as would also be the case at the coronation ten months later. The earliest recorded estimate of the number of performers involved may be that of 14 November, three days after the event in the pages of the newspaper just quoted, which stated that ‘[t]here were upwards of two hundred performers, vocal and instrumental, in the anthem composed and conducted by Dr. Boyce’.\footnote{News, \textit{Gazetteer and London Daily Advertiser} (London), 14 November 1760, Issue 9858, p. .2.} A possible bias is, however, revealed in the comment directly preceding it, which estimated the entire expense of the funeral at £50,000.\footnote{‘It is said the cost of the wax lights, lamps, and torches, used in Westminster-hall, the Abbey, and the scaffolding without, amounted at his late Majesty’s funeral to a thousand pounds; and that the whole expense \textit{sic} thereof, will amount to 50,000l.’}

Most recent estimates of the number of musicians are considerably smaller. Van Nice and Bartlett both appear to conflate the number of parts with the number of participants and ignore evidence of part-sharing on the covers of the instrumental parts. Van Nice suggests a total of just 67, consisting of an orchestra of 35 plus the organ and a choir of 31 ‘if the cover of the organ part is an adequate guide’.\footnote{Van Nice, ‘Preface’ in Boyce, \textit{Two Anthems}, ed. by Van Nice, Part 1, ‘The Souls of the Righteous’, p. 6.} Bartlett and Bruce suggests a total of around 64, comprising an orchestra of around 33 and a choir of around 31, although the number of surviving instrumental parts is
actually greater than 33. Burrows’s estimate of between 138 and 155 takes into account the evidence of part-sharing and that of the surviving payment warrant (see below) and is closer to the only contemporary estimate, but does not assess whether the totals in the payment warrant include or exclude the musicians of the King’s Band and the Gentlemen and Children of the Chapel. There is, therefore, discrepancy between current modern estimates and the only surviving contemporary one, and further discrepancy between most modern estimates and the number of surviving parts.

The surviving set of parts for the funeral anthem has the same provenance as that of the court ode sets described in Chapter 5; this provenance combined with the inscriptions on the score and others on the parts establishes clearly that this was the set used in the funeral itself. The parts are uniform in appearance and, on the evidence of the copying patterns (see below), have been copied together as a set. There is no direct evidence, such as cuts, alterations or later addenda, that it was reused afterwards, although the work appears to have entered the repertoire of the Academy of Ancient Music almost immediately. Apparently, therefore, at least one other set of parts was in circulation at the time. The following list, largely in the hand of the copyist B5, is pasted on the front of the organ part:

---

59 Bartlett and Bruce, Tercentenary Sourcebook, p. 140.
60 Burrows, Handel and the English Chapel Royal, pp. 179-180 and 553.
61 The text (‘Anthem for the Funeral of his Late Majesty’) appears in The Words of Such Pieces as Are Most Usually Performed by the Academy of Ancient Music (London: Academy of Ancient Music, 1761), pp. 164-165.
62 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115 b, fol. 185r.
Score and- / Parts of the Funeral / Anthem, Vocal and / Instrumental. –

Vocal.

2   4. First Trebles.
3   4. Second Trebles.
8   9. Contratenors.
9   11. Tenors.
9   40. Basses.

Instrumental

1. Drum.
1. First, and 1. Second, Trumpet.
1. First, and 1. Second Horn.
2. First Hautboys.
2. Second Hautboys.
7   8. First Violins.
7   8. Second Violins.
4   5. Tenor Violins.
1   2. First Bassoons.
1   2. Second Bassoons.
3   4. Violoncello’s
3   4. Double Basse’s with / the organ part, / and Score.

The figures in the inner column are the originals; the column of figures on the far left has been added in pencil, is probably in Boyce’s own hand and corresponds to the numbers of parts now surviving. The list has been interpreted by Van Nice as representing actual (outer column) and projected (inner column), or possibly actual and ideal, numbers of participants. Even if Van Nice’s interpretation were correct and Boyce had wished for more performers than he eventually got, it would have been an easy matter for him to engage more, as the finances for the music were largely under his control. It is also clear from the surviving records that performance conditions were fairly optimal in terms of money and resources available, as with the court odes. It would seem strange for Boyce to have used only five trebles for a state occasion when ten were available to him from the Chapel Royal even before the choir of Westminster Abbey is taken into account. However, Van Nice’s

interpretation does not take into account the fact that participants and copied parts are not the same thing. Many of the instrumental parts bear the names of more than one performer, indicating that part-sharing took place. It is clear from the inscriptions (‘Wm. Hodson and C. Lampe’; ‘Courtup & Stainer’; ‘Freake & Reeves’; ‘Wood & / Hacksame’) that the performers were using the parts together: they do not indicate that the parts were re-used by different performers at a later date. The total of named first violinists on the covers is greater than the number of first violinists in either column of the list.

The list does not, therefore, make sense as a record of actual performers on the occasion. It makes more sense when interpreted as a copyists’ list or catalogue record rather than a performance record. This interpretation is supported by the copyist’s hand in the original list, which is that of B5, Boyce’s principal copyist between 1758 and 1765, who was also one of the principal copyists for the funeral anthem. As described in Chapter 5, there are indications on the court ode parts that the copyists kept count of parts copied; even where no counting system was marked on the parts, they must have worked from just such a list as this. Interpreted as such, the original list probably represents the number of parts copied or intended to be copied: a total of thirty-eight vocal parts and forty-three instrumental parts, including the organ part. The pencilled column on the left, which may be in Boyce’s hand, must represent either the totals of the surviving parts at a later date, or the totals that were actually copied out of the planned number. In the first case, fourteen parts are missing from the set; in the second case, the set is still complete. The fact that the list is accurate for the current state of the set suggests it represents surviving parts; additionally, it would be surprising for only five treble parts to be copied for an

---

64 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115 c, fols. 230r., 238r., 246r., 262r.
occasion of this size. However, it is possible that fewer parts were copied than planned, as the scribes cannot have had more than four days or so to prepare the entire set. In either case, the ratios of the parts to each other are broadly consistent with those in other sets examined. The exception to this is the number of viola parts, which is disproportionately high compared to Boyce’s normal number: string parts are in the ratio 8:8:5:8 or 7:7:4:6 according to which figures are taken as correct for the original state of the set. The number of woodwind parts is normal at around half the total of the violin parts.

Strong evidence of the number of singers is given by the parts themselves. Of the twenty-six surviving vocal parts for alto, tenor and bass voices, twenty-three have names of a single performer on the cover, while the rest have no names at all. This seems to confirm that adult singers did not generally share parts. Little can be deduced on the subject of part-sharing by the children as the five surviving treble parts bear no names. However, it seems likely that they did share parts, as the full number of available boys from both the Chapel Royal and Westminster Abbey would probably have taken part. Unlike the adults, children could not hold positions in both choirs simultaneously, so the total of available boys might have been as high as twenty.

Of the thirty-six surviving instrumental parts, thirteen have the signatures of performers on the cover: an unusually high proportion. Of these, two have a single name, ten have two names and one has three, giving twenty-five named performers in all. If part-sharing was standard among the instrumentalists (with the exception of the drummer, organist and brass players) but not among the singers, and the list on the organ part gives the original totals of parts copied, this suggests totals of around 30 adult singers and 80 instrumentalists, plus around 16 to 20 boys, giving around
130 in all. It is interesting to compare these totals with the information given in the relevant copy warrant in the Treasurer of the Chamber’s warrant book for the year 1761:

D: William Boyce Master of the Music
for the hire of Performers of the Anthem at the Funeral of His late Majesty.
£326., '11., d

These are &c. to D: William Boyce, Master of His Majesty’s Musick, the Sum of Three Hundred and Twenty Six Pounds, Eleven Shillings for the hire of Thirty three Vocal and Sixty two Instrumental Performers at three Guineas each, to perform in the Anthem of His late Majesty, and for several other Particulars relating thereto, as appears by the annex’d Bill, And &c. Given &c. this 20th Day of February 1761. In the First Year of His Majesty’s Reign.

To the R:th Hon. Charles Townshend &c.

Devonshire

This gives a total of ninety-five performers for the anthem. A further warrant detailing payment to Valentine Snow, the Serjeant Trumpeter, for performers for the funeral is preserved in the same volume, granting him ‘the Sum of Fourteen Pounds Fourteen Shillings, being money / Disburst by him for a fife, Drum Majors and an Extraordinary / Drum hired to Attend the Proclamation [sic.] of His present Majesty / and also to Attend the Funeral of His late Majesty, as appears / by the annex’d Bill’. This probably accounts for the drummer in the anthem, though use of the fife and other drums would have been restricted to the funeral procession. These two copy warrants appear to be the only payment records for musicians among the fairly comprehensive records that survive for the funeral, and probably give the entirety of money disbursed to the musicians.

---

65 GB-Lna LC 5/168, p. 29.

66 20 February 1761; GB-Lna LC 5/168, p. 39.
The numbers in the warrants agree well with the number of surviving parts, when the evidence of part-sharing is taken into account. Thirty parts were copied for adult singers, against thirty-three singers who were paid. Forty-three instrumental parts were copied, and the extra names on the covers of the surviving shared parts bring the total of known instrumentalists to fifty-five, against sixty-three paid via warrants to Boyce or Snow. The total of singers in the warrant probably does not include the boys from either choir, whose masters may have received payment for their attendance, but presumably not as much as three guineas per boy. As the payment of ninety-five performers at three guineas each only amounts to £299. 5s., it is possible that payments to James Nares and Benjamin Cooke, the master of the boys at Westminster, were included among the ‘Sundry other Particulars’ that accounted for the remaining £27. 6s. of the bill. The total number of performers may therefore have been in the region of 115, if the addition of around twenty boys is taken into account. This is almost twice as many as most modern estimates and is much closer to the contemporary estimate quoted above of ‘upwards of two hundred performers’.

The only remaining questions are whether the totals in Boyce’s warrant exclude the performers from the Band of Music and the Chapel Royal, and whether extra unpaid supernumeraries might have played or sung. If the Band and Chapel members are excluded, as Burrows assumes, the warrant and the surviving parts do not agree so well, as another 50 band members and Gentlemen would have to be taken into account. However, it appears from the warrant books that the funeral was treated as an extraordinary event. Work performed for the funeral was not covered by the usual salary, as demonstrated by the warrant to Boyce of 20 February 1761 ‘for the Composition and Coppying Musick for the Anthem for the Funeral of His late Majesty’. This granted him ‘the Sum of Two Hundred and forty two Pounds, six
Shillings and six pence, for the Composition of the Anthem for the Funeral of His late Majesty, for copying the Score of D:⁰ for the Vocal and Instrumental Parts, with paper for the Same and Sundry other Particulars, as appears by the annex’d Bill’. ⁶⁷ Unfortunately the bill has not survived. If Boyce’s salary did not include extraordinary events, the band members and Gentlemen of the Chapel also might have been paid extra for the occasion, and would therefore already be included in the numbers in the payment warrant. In this case, however, the proportion of singers to instrumentalists would have been around 1:2, which does not correspond to the proportions indicated by the wedding and coronation sets discussed below. This would also mean that more instrumental parts were copied than was strictly necessary, and that only around half the players were required to share, though the presence in the set of one part that was shared between three players would suggest that the opposite was the case. Perhaps extra unpaid players took part and Burrows’s estimate of 138 to 155 performers is closer to the correct number.

Of the named singers, only ten can be matched with Gentlemen of the Chapel Royal at the time: Ralph Cowper or Cooper, Thomas Baildon, Thomas Barrow, Thomas Vandernan, Anselm Bailey or Bayley, Robert Hudson, William Coster, Nicholas Ladd, William Savage and Hugh Cox. The other thirteen were probably members of the choir of Westminster Abbey and other supernumeraries engaged for the occasion. The ‘Mr. Baildon’ singing alto was probably the Chapel Royal singer Thomas Baildon, while the tenor ‘Mr. Baildon’ was probably his relative Joseph, a lay clerk at Westminster Abbey. ⁶⁸ At least two of the named singers appear to have

⁶⁷ GB-Lna LC 5/168, p. 29.
⁶⁸ See Percy M. Young, ‘Baildon, Joseph’, GMO [accessed 29 July 2014]. Thomas and Joseph Baildon sang alto and tenor respectively in a performance of Handel’s Esther using the parts surviving as GB-Drc Ms. D15 (see Ch. 4).
been theatre performers, the bass Gustavus Waltz and the tenor George Mattocks. It is known that Waltz did sing as a choral bass, as he received the choral singer’s fee for taking part in the Foundling Hospital performances of Messiah in 1754, 1758 and 1759; records suggest that he only performed as a chorus singer in the last eight years or so of his known performing career.\(^69\) If he took part in the Funeral Anthem, this would be his last currently known performance; the date of his death is not known. There is no surviving tenor part that names either John Beard or ‘Mr. Mence’, presumably the counter-tenor Benjamin Mence, both of whom took part according to the above-quoted newspaper account.\(^70\) If this is correct, they probably used two of the parts that may be missing according to the list on the organ part. Apparently neither sang solo on this occasion: all surviving parts give the relevant vocal line in its entirety, indicating that no sections were sung solo.

Of the twenty-five named instrumentalists, only six can be identified as members of the Band of Music, which numbered twenty-four: Abraham Brown (violin 1), Thomas Jackson (violin 1), George Peat (violin 2), Thomas Rawlings (violin 2), Thomas Morgan (viola) and Thomas Vincent (oboe 1). Of the others, the two bassoonists ‘Macfarland’ and ‘Miller’ are probably the oboists Patrick McFarland and George Miller of the First Regiment of Foot Guards.\(^71\) Some of the other instrumentalists might also have been from the various regimental bands, although it is difficult to identify many with certainty because of the lack of standardised spelling of names and the existence of musical families such as the Baildons in which multiple members pursued similar careers during the same period. ‘C.


\(^70\) See above, note 56.

\(^71\) Their names appear in the livery records in GB-Lna LC5/95 p. 11, Warrant 10.
Lampe’ is probably Charles Lampe, the son of the composer John Frederick and his wife Isabella. The viola player ‘Bennett’ may be John Bennett, who little more than a year later was appointed to the Queen’s Band of Music.72

The autograph fair copy of the full score, that survives as GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115 a., was probably the principal source of the parts, but a second full score of the work does survive. This copy, GB-Lbl-Egerton MS 2964, originates from the library of Boyce’s son, William junior, and was apparently produced from Boyce’s autograph score by the copyist B5 (see Chapter 5).73 It is likely that this score, not the autograph, is the one referred to at the foot of B5’s list discussed above, as the similar list by B5 of the parts for the wedding anthem does not mention a score. This further supports the view that these lists are of items to be copied. The handwriting of B5 indicates that the score was copied during his ‘B5d’ period, that is, before September 1761, as his c-clef had altered by that date.74 It must, therefore, date from within a year of the funeral, and was probably in fact produced for that occasion, perhaps to provide a second score to speed up the part-copying process. It is unfigured, and was therefore clearly not used at a second organ, though it may have been the copy from which Boyce beat time as implied by the above-quoted newspaper report. Alternatively, it may have been copied shortly afterwards as a ‘presentation’ copy. This theory is supported by the folio format of the score – landscape quarto was the usual choice for volumes that might be used at a keyboard – and by B5’s handwriting in the volume. At this date, B5 preferred the heart-shaped bass clef seen in the Egerton score, but would sometimes use the plainer form

72 See The Court and City Kalendar: or, Gentleman’s Register, for the Year 1762 (London, 1762), p. 94.
73 William Boyce junior was born in 1764. See Bartlett and Bruce, Tercentenary Sourcebook (pp. 168-171).
74 See Ch. 5.
he preferred in the vocal bass parts to the funeral anthem, presumably because it was quicker to write when time was short. His use of the more elaborate form in the Egerton score, together with the careful, unhurried copying, seems to indicate that he did not feel short of time. However, perhaps the score was copied between the rehearsal on 7 November and the funeral four days later, once the parts were already complete. The presence of autograph addenda by Boyce, similar to those he usually added to sets of parts, might indicate that the score was used for time-beating after all.

It is clear from analysis of the surviving parts that at least eight copyists, along with Boyce himself, were involved in their production. Although the parts show signs of having been copied at speed, the overall standard of copying is extremely high and it is evident that several of the scribes were probably professionals. Putting names to the hands has proved complex: the high number of copyists active in London at the time who had professional or social contact with Boyce is confirmed by the number of active copyists among the names on the parts to the funeral, wedding and coronation anthems. At least six of these named are known to have worked as professional scribes (Thomas Barrow, Daniel Stayner, George Scovel, Thomas Vandernan, Redmond Simpson and Thomas Pinto). Around thirteen others are known to have been active as composers (James Nares, Carl Friedrich Weidemann, Matthew Dubourg, Joseph Agus, Thomas Jackson, Charles Lampe, Thomas and Joseph Baildon, William Savage, John Freake and possibly George Morgan) or teachers (Hugh Cox and Stephen Storace senior), and would therefore have possessed the requisite level of musical literacy to act as copyist.\footnote{Information on copying, composing and teaching activities of those musicians taken from Highfill et al, \textit{BDA}.} At present
only the regular and assured hand of the minor composer, collector and editor
Edmund Thomas Warren, also known as Warren Horne, can be firmly identified.  

Examination of the parts shows at least two methods by which time was saved in copying. Production may have speeded up by using the first-copied example of each part as a template for the others, so that many of the parts were not copied from the score at all. It is clear from the patterns of copying that in some cases a particular scribe was assigned responsibility for all or the majority of parts belonging to a particular voice. So, for example, the copyist B9 was responsible for the majority of the leaves in the surviving treble and contratenor parts; Thomas Warren was responsible for all the surviving tenor parts bar three leaves. At other times a ‘production line’ system seems to have operated, with single parts being the work of multiple individuals (Illus. 6.1). It is noticeable that the breakdown of responsibility for the copying of individual numbers is often quite consistent across several parts, giving an appearance of uniformity. This suggests that the copying of the parts may have begun before the copying of the full score was complete, perhaps using unbound score leaves that had already been copied, and proceeded in stages, as further folios from the score became available. The number of copyists active in producing the set and the methods employed to speed up production make it likely that Boyce’s planned complement of parts was copied, and that he did not have to make do with fewer parts than he wished for.

---

76 Warren changed his name on inheriting the estate of Edmund Horne; see Nicholas Temperley, ‘Warren [Warren-Horne], (Edmund) Thomas’, GMO [accessed 29 July 2014].
6.1: Treble part in the hands of B9 and another copyist from William Boyce’s Anthem for the Funeral of George II (GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115 b, fol. 4r.; by permission of The Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford).

A number of the parts are splashed with candle-wax, presumably from the £1000-worth of wax lights, candles and torches described in the press reports.77 Their contents differ a little from both full scores. The short-score organ part, for example, in the hand of the copyist B10, contains figuring which does not appear in the score. Boyce apparently also changed his mind about the organ participation in the opening of the chorus ‘They shall judge’, as it is marked ‘Tacet Organo’ despite being provided with a figured bass (Illus. 6.2); the instruction ‘The Organ, in long notes here’ above the stave probably indicated minim chords (Illus. 6.2).78 Indecision is

77 See above, note 55.

78 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115 b, fol. 192v.
further evident in the cancellation of the bassoon part for the symphony.\footnote{79} Addenda by the players include added slurs in the violin parts; the second bassoon part used by Macfarland and Chapman contains articulation marks.\footnote{80} The inscription ‘watch ye Flutes & Boys’ in the viola part used by Morgan, Bennett and Willis is further evidence of how leading functioned within a large ensemble.\footnote{81} It was evidently anticipated that players would practise the type of inter-player communication that is nowadays more associated with small chamber ensembles than with large orchestras; the presence of a time-beater was not intended to replace this.

The Wedding of George III and Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz

22 vocal and 30 instrumental parts (including two organ parts), together with an autograph full score, survive for Boyce’s anthem for the royal wedding, ‘The King shall rejoice’. This is not the setting used in the coronation two weeks later or that used five years later at the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, although all three settings share some musical material. Again, a list of parts survives pasted on the cover organ part, again in the hand of B5:

Vocal and Instrumental / Parts of the Wedding / Anthem.

Vocal.

2. First Trebles.
2. Second Trebles.
6. Contratenors.
6. Tenors.

Instrumental.

1. Drum.
1. First, and 1. Second Trumpet.
2. First Hautboys.
1. Second Hautboy.
6. First Violins.
2. Tenor Viols.
1. First, and 1. Second Bassoon.
3. Violoncello’s.
3. Double Basses.

with the organ Part.

All the parts on this list survive, and it can therefore be assumed that the set is complete. The ratios of instruments indicated by the set are entirely consistent with those in all the other sets examined, and suggest a balance that is weighted towards the outer parts, particularly the bass line, and a greater proportion of wind to strings than is often the case today. Again the parts are uniform in appearance and show

---

82 Bartlett and Bruce, Tercentenary Sourcebook, pp. 147 and 179-80.
little sign of reuse, though they were used in at least two public rehearsals before the
wedding itself: one in Hickford’s Room and one in the Chapel Royal. In addition, they must have been used twice more on 27 and 29 April, 1762, when the anthem was performed during a charity concert for Westminster Infirmary, held at St Margaret’s Church, Westminster, at which Boyce directed.

A second organ part for this setting of the anthem survives in the set for Boyce’s third setting, for the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy (see below). The two organ parts are in different keys, one in D, the original key, and one in C; the transposition might have been necessitated by a change in plan regarding which organ would be used. A warrant of 3 February 1762 records a payment to Christopher Shrider for removing the usual organ entirely to make room for the band, but does not state when this was done:

Mr. Christoph. Shrider / Organ Builder for / taking to Pieces the / Organ in His Majesty’s / Chapel at S: James’s / Putting together / again and Replacing / it there after Their / Majesties Wedding. / £60,, „,, „,, D „,
There are &c: to M:Christopher Shrider, Organ Builder in / Ordinary to His Majesty, the Sum of Sixty Pounds for taking to / Pieces the Organ in His Majesty’s Chapel Royal at S: James’s / and taking the same away, in order to make Room for the Band of / Musick that perform’d at the Royal Nuptials, cleaning and / Repairing the Defects in the Pipes Sound Boards Wind Work / &c:a and Replacing the same in the Chapel after Their Majesty’s / Wedding, as appears by the annex’d Bill.

That a second organ was indeed installed, probably in a more convenient position, is confirmed by a further warrant to Boyce, granting him £137. 13s.

for the Use of an Organ, and putting up and taking down the Same &c: in the Royal Chapel at S: James’s on account of Their Majesty’s Wedding; And also

---


84 See, for example, the advertisement in the London Chronicle, April 22-4, 1762, Issue 832. A description of the public rehearsal was given by the diarist John Courtney (see Chapter 5, note 67 above)


86 GB-Lna LC 5/ 168, p. 171.
for taking down, cleaning and repairing an Organ, and putting up the same in Westminster Abby on account of Their Majesties Coronation.\textsuperscript{87}

Of the twenty-two vocal parts, only the contratenor, tenor and bass solo parts have the names of performers on the cover: those named are Cooper (probably Ralph Cowper), John Beard and Hugh Cox, whose name has been substituted for that of William Savage. However, the newspaper reports of the anthem’s rehearsal, which was held in public, name Savage as singing the solo bass part. That Cox’s name probably relates to the repeat performance at the charity concert the following April is confirmed by a diary entry by John Courtney, quoted below. Only ten of the instrumental parts bear performer names: three of these bear a single name and seven bear two, giving a total of seventeen named instrumentalists. These included some well-known musicians. The violinist ‘Mr. Pinto’ was probably Thomas Pinto, who led the band at the King’s Theatre from 1757 and Drury Lane from 1763.\textsuperscript{88} ‘Dubourgh’ was probably Matthew Dubourg, who as Master and Composer of State Music in Ireland frequently commuted between Dublin and London. He was appointed Master of the Queen’s Band, which was separate from the King’s Band, within a year of the wedding.\textsuperscript{89} The cellist ‘Gillier’ was Peter Gillier, who held the post of bass viol player to the Chapel Royal. Only six of the seventeen names can be identified with members of the King’s Band, again indicating just how far the band was expanded for state occasions.

It seems that the usual pattern of part-sharing was followed, that is, adult singers did not share parts while usually instrumentalists did. The parts suggest, therefore,

\textsuperscript{87} GB-Lna LC 5/168, p. 246.
\textsuperscript{88} Dorothy de Val, ‘Pinto, Thomas, (bap. 1729, d.1783), violinist and composer’, \textit{ODNB} [accessed 30 July 2014].
\textsuperscript{89} Brian Boydell, ‘Dubourg, Matthew’, \textit{GMO} [accessed 30 July 2014]; \textit{The Court and City Kalendar, or the Gentleman’s Register, for the Year 1762} (London, 1762), p. 94.
that around 18 adult singers, 8 to 10 boys and around 52 players took part, assuming again that the organist, drummer, and brass players did not share. However, in an account of the rehearsal, the diarist John Courtney suggested that the charity performance of April 1762 included a greater number of performers than this, estimating around 40 singers and 60 instrumentalists:

[T]here were I dare say an hundred performers Beard, Champness, Baildon Cox etc. sung; near 40 voices I believe; Handells Te Deum, The Grand Chorus in the Messiah for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. The Anthem of Dr. Boyce’s for their Majesties Nuptials, and the Coronation Anthem [that is, Handel’s ‘Zadok the Priest’] were performed, and it was vastly grand, their being all sorts of instruments. Dr Boyce beat time in the front.  

The payment warrant for the wedding performance, to ‘Dr.’ Boyce Master of His Majesty’s Musick for the Hire of Musicians to Perform at Their Majesties Wedding and for other Disbursements &c, is less informative than the corresponding warrant for the funeral. It states only that £314. 1s. 6d. was payable to Boyce, for Musicians Hired for the Performance of the Anthem on account / of Their Majesty’s Wedding, and other Disbursements, and also for the Doctor’s / own Composition and extraordinary Trouble, as appears by the annexed Bill.  

Three guineas, as paid at the funeral, was probably the standard fee on such occasions: this is further confirmed by the payment warrant for the coronation (see below). If so, seventy-three performers hired at this rate would cost £229. 19s., well within the £314. 1s. 6d. paid above, but 100 performers would alone cost more than the amount paid out. This suggests that fewer musicians took part in the wedding performance than Courtney claimed in respect of the charity performance. Two further warrants, to Valentine Snow and Redmond Simpson, refer to the hire of musicians for the wedding, but probably not to musicians for the anthem. That to Snow includes payment ‘for a Fife to Attend Their Majesty’s Wedding and

---

90 27 April 1762. See Chapter 5, note 67 above.

91 LC 5/168 p. 246, paid 10 June 1763. Office fees were a further £37 3s.
Coronation and for the Five Household Drummers for Attending D:o and probably refers solely to the procession. That to Simpson granting him ‘Twenty-one Pounds for Attending Their Majesties Wedding and Coronation and sundry other Proceedings and Proclamations’ might also refer to the procession, although he might have been the drummer for which an anthem part survives, if he was not already playing the oboe.

One further piece of evidence relates to the trumpets. There is no evidence among any of Boyce’s sets of brass parts being shared between two players; they were seemingly an exception to the usual rule of instrumental parts being shared between two. This assumption is supported by a draft note from the Lord Chamberlain of 7 September, 1761, relating to the provision of trumpeters to play in the wedding anthem. The majority of the trumpeters had travelled to Stade as part of the entourage to meet the princess and accompany her back to Britain; as she was to be married to the king almost immediately on arrival, this caused a problem with the availability of the trumpeters:

His Grace The Lord Chamberlain sends his Compliments / to Lord Cadogan and acquaints his Lordship that / there is to be a Rehearsal of the Anthem for / the Wedding this Morning at Twelve o’Clock / and as His Majesty’s Trumpets are on Attendance / on the Princess Charlotte of Mecklenburg His / Grace desires that His Lordship will order / will be pleased \ to order Messrs. Richards & Jenkins / the / Two Trumpets belonging to the Troop of Horse / Guards in Waiting [?] under his Lordship’s Command in Waiting / to attend / at the said Rehearsal and at the Performance of the Anthem at H M. in the Wedding in case the other Trumpets / shall not be then arrived. / Lord Chamberlain’s Office / 7 Sept. 1761.  

The letter implies that only two trumpeters are necessary, though perhaps it was intended that two would suffice, but more would be optimal.

---

92 GB-Lna LC2/29, unfoliated loose paper. A fair copy does not appear to survive.
The surviving parts for the coronation consist of fifty-five instrumental and thirty vocal parts. Unusually, the vocal parts are all in portrait format rather than landscape and are bound in boards covered in Dutch brocade paper. Though much of the gilding is now lost, this would have given them a rich and colourful appearance, particularly when compared with the usual covers of plain cartridge or sugar paper. The instrumental parts are mostly in blue paper wrappers covered with Dutch red marbled-paper; again, this was lavish compared with Boyce’s usual wrappers. As it seems that particular trouble was taken to cover the vocal parts in expensive and visually impressive gilded brocade paper, while the instrumental parts were covered in the cheaper Dutch red marbled-paper, it can be assumed that the singers were standing at the front of the main music gallery, where they were visible, with the instrumentalists seated behind them.

The vocal parts bear their original paper labels, mostly inscribed with the part-name and the rubric ‘Music for the Coronation / of his Majesty King George / the Third, & his Queen Charlotte’; some are labelled simply ‘Coronation Musick / 1761’. Only four carry names or initials of a singer; one of these is the solo tenor part, which is marked ‘M. Beard’ on the label and which as usual also contains the first tenor chorus part. The parts are in the ratio 6:5:8:11 (Tr:CT:T:B); in the eight-part anthem, the split is 3:3:4:1:3:5:6:5 (Tr:Tr:CT:CT:T:T:B:B), indicating that some second counter-tenor parts, at least, must be missing. Of the instrumental parts, some are missing their wrappers, and two violin parts (one second violin and one third) are in stiff buff covers that do not match the others. The string parts are in the ratio 11:11:4:12; the second violins occasionally split into second and third parts in
the ratio 7:4. An extra viola part survives for the final orchestral anthem, ‘My heart is inditing’, that lacks a cover, contains none of the other music and does not seem to belong with any of the other parts. The wind and brass parts consist of six oboe and six bassoon parts, three trumpet parts and a drum. It is clear that the organ part, at least, is missing, though the other parts may be complete. Probably the organ part would have had a copyists’ list on the cover, as with the organ parts for the funeral and wedding sets, but this is now lost.

The coronation set is more difficult to assess than the sets for the funeral and wedding anthems. This is partly because of the lack of a copyists’ list, but also because it has clearly been reused at least once, under considerably different performance conditions, necessitating extensive alterations to the parts. The set presumably originally contained all the music performed in the coronation: eight anthems by Boyce, of which five were orchestral and three were for choir and organ; Handel’s ‘Zadok the Priest’; and some other liturgical music that does not survive, but appears in surviving lists in the parts as ‘The Litany’ and ‘The Commandments and Creed’. Unfortunately, large numbers of pages have been excised from the parts and a number of performance instructions relating to the coronation have been deleted. The non-orchestral anthems and liturgical music in the vocal parts are particularly affected; in the instrumental parts, the music for Handel’s setting of ‘Zadok the Priest’ has been removed from many. In addition, other music that apparently does not relate to the coronation has been inserted into some of the vocal parts, including two choruses from Messiah, ‘And the Glory of the Lord’ and ‘For unto us a child is born’, and a number of songs and duets of the ‘concert-piece’ type, such as Arne’s ‘Water parted from the sea’. This suggests the set was reused when two of the orchestral anthems – which two is unknown – were performed at the
Three Choirs festival in Worcester on 5 and 6 September, 1764, in which year *Messiah* (presumably not the entire work) was also performed, according to newspaper reports. This assumption is supported by the fact that, unusually, the 1764 Festival did not include ‘Zadok the Priest’ according to the programme advertised in the press.

The reuse of the parts in this manner has compromised them as a record of the coronation performance. The uniformity of the covers and labels on most of the parts, as well as the rubrics on the vocal parts, indicate that the majority of them were indeed copied for the coronation. However, the stray viola part for ‘My heart is inditing’, at least, was probably copied for the Three Choirs festival and not for the coronation, indicating that this was one of the anthems chosen for the festival performance. Most of the performer names on the covers may relate to the coronation, given that the funeral and wedding sets are similar in this respect. However, the majority of the 31 named instrumentalists were not members of the King’s Band. The name of the bass-player Zuckert is repeated on different double bass parts, perhaps indicating that he played in both performances.

At least eleven copyists were involved in copying the coronation parts; the instrumental parts in particular are not neatly copied. It is a measure of the speed with which the task proceeded that it was apparently done in the order in which the copyists received the music, not in the order of performance. This is demonstrated by instructions in some of the volumes such as ‘The Te Deum, shou’d come after this // look at ye End for it’ in the principal cello part, and the deleted ‘* M’. Handel’s Zadok come in here. / Look at ye end of the book for it’ in some of the violin parts.

---


94 According to newspaper advertisements, Zadok was performed in 1761-3, 1765 and 1767-71, often twice in the course of each festival. I cannot locate an advertisement for 1766.
This speed is not surprising, given that the composition of the anthems was apparently still at an early stage in mid-August, although the coronation was to take place on 22 September.\(^{95}\) The parts show signs of similar copying practices to those in the Funeral Anthem, for which the parts also had to be copied quickly. This includes the presence of multiple hands in one part, in the manner that Larsen has observed among manuscript scores from J. C. Smith’s scriptorium.\(^ {96}\) Further comparison with the copying practices displayed in other surviving large performance sets, such as those of Philip Hayes, would be worthwhile.

The numbers of surviving parts (55 instrumental and 35 vocal) indicate that, as might be expected, the coronation performance was on a larger scale than the funeral and wedding performances, both of which were big when judged against the main series of court odes. However, the ratios of the instruments described above are broadly consistent with those in the other sets examined in this chapter, and it is likely that these have not been substantially affected by the reuse of the parts. The string ratios, with the number of viola parts being around one-sixth of the number of upper string parts combined, is the same as that in the court odes and the wedding anthem. The ratio of woodwind to strings is also similar, with the number of woodwind parts being around half the total of violin parts. Similar evidence of sharing to that in the funeral and wedding sets, in the form of pairs of performer names, is present on eleven instrumental parts but no vocal parts. The surviving parts suggest an ensemble of perhaps 40 singers, taking into account sharing among the boys and the loss of a few tenor and counter-tenor parts, against perhaps 105

\(^{95}\) This is confirmed by the exchange of letters of 14-17 August 1761 between Boyce and Thomas Secker, Archbishop of Canterbury, discussing the proposed settings; see Bartlett and Bruce, Tercentenary Sourcebook, pp. 146-8.

\(^{96}\) Larsen, Handel’s Messiah, pp. 286 and 312.
instrumentalists, assuming that all except the organist and drummer (and perhaps the trumpeters) were sharing in pairs.

As with the funeral and wedding anthems, this estimate can be compared against evidence from contemporary accounts and payment warrants. However, contemporary accounts give conflicting information. One newspaper report claimed that the anthems were performed by ‘upwards of three hundred hand’. The same report printed in a different paper was altered to read ‘upwards of one hundred and fifty Hands and Voices’: this second estimate seems to concur more closely with the estimate from the parts. The relevant payment warrant, of 10 June 1763, granted Boyce the sum of £500. 4s. as follows:

[..] the Sum of Four Hundred and Forty-seven Pounds Twelve Shillings and / six Pence for the Hire of Eighty-eight Instrumental Performers and Forty eight Vocal / Performers in Westminster Abby the 22. Day of September 1761. (at Three Guineas each) / upon Account of Their Majesties Coronation, and for the Instrument Keeper and five / Assistants Summoning the Instrumental Performers, and carrying the Instruments / and Desks to and from the Rehearsals and Performance, as appears by the annexed / Bill. Also to pay or cause to be paid to him the further Sum of Fifty-two Pounds, Eleven / Shillings and Six pence on account of Office Fees, amounting in all to the Sum of Five / Hundred Pounds and Four Shillings.

The 88 instrumentalists and 48 singers mentioned here agree fairly well with the totals of 105 instrumentalists and 40 singers suggested by the surviving parts, and are certainly closer to this estimate than to the newspaper reports of 300 performers. Two further warrants granted payment to other musicians who might have taken part in the anthems: Redmond Simpson the oboist was paid separately for attending in his capacity as kettle drummer, and Valentine Snow, the Serjeant Trumpeter, was paid

---


for the hire of two extraordinary trumpeters.\textsuperscript{100} It seems from the records that anything relating to the household trumpeters and drummers was Snow’s province, although the general responsibility for hiring performers was Boyce’s. Simpson’s name appears on one of the oboe parts, albeit crossed through; possibly he was paid as kettledrummer but doubled on oboe, although why he was paid separately is unclear. However, this increases the total of instrumentalists hired who might have played in the anthems by at least three, bringing it over 90.

\textit{The Ode for the Treaty of Paris, 1763}

A note in Boyce’s hand on the score of the ode ‘See white rob’d peace’ reads as follows:

\begin{quote}
An / ODE / Performed on the Sixth of June 1763 / Before Their Majesties, & the rest of the / Royal Family, in the Garden of the / Queen’s Palace, S’. James’s Park. / Note, The Performance was in the Ev’ning, and the / Garden was finely illuminated. / The words were wrote by M’. Mallet- / The music by W. Boyce.\textsuperscript{101}
\end{quote}

The ode was commissioned from Boyce by the queen, apparently as an additional celebration of the king’s birthday – although the usual birthday ode had been performed on 4 June – and to mark the end of the Seven Years’ War with the Treaty of Paris.\textsuperscript{102}

\textsuperscript{100} GB-Lna LC 5/268, pp. 248-9.

\textsuperscript{101} GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 118 a, fol. 1r. This set of parts is the subject of the first sample catalogue entry in Appendix B.

\textsuperscript{102} The circumstances of the performance were described in the \textit{Gentlemen’s Magazine}, June 1763, quoted in full in Bartlett and Bruce, \textit{Tercentenary Sourcebook}, pp. 162-163.
The solo tenor voice part contains a note in Boyce’s hand, ‘Parts of the Queen’s Ode for 1763- / Perfect.’, and it is likely that this is still the case. The set indicates a larger ensemble and a grander occasion than the usual birthday ode. Sixteen chorus parts and two solo voice parts survive, implying around twenty chorus singers split evenly between first and second trebles, counter-tenor, tenor and bass parts. The report in the *Gentlemen’s Magazine* stated that the singers were John Beard, Mrs Scott and Miss Brent. The two solo parts do have the names of John Beard and Mrs Scott on the covers; but between them they give all the solo music. It is not clear what Miss Brent’s role was, but she may have sung the first or second treble chorus line with the Children of the Chapel Royal. Both solo parts have all the chorus music as well as the solo numbers, implying that Mrs Scott also joined the boys on the top line. This was a practice that can also be seen in other contemporary sets, suggesting that the mixing of treble and soprano voices in a chorus was not regarded as undesirable.

The instrumental parts consist of string parts in the ratio 4:4:2:5 plus two each of trumpets, horns, oboes and bassoons; one harpsichord part and one drum. The stringed basses are two cellos and three double basses; all seem to play throughout. Unusually, all the violin parts bear the names of two performers, confirming that two per stand was usual; only one (Abraham Brown) was a member of the King’s Band. John Frederick Zuckert, who as usual is named on a double bass part, and Matthew Dubourg, who was among the violinists, were both members of the Queen’s Band, as was Brown; the only other named musician to hold a court position was the cellist

---

103 GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 118 b, fol. 18v.
104 This is confirmed by the description of the occasion in the *Gentlemen’s Magazine*; see note 98.
105 See above, note 98.
106 See, for example, the vocal set for the Hayeses’ oratorio *David*, GB-Ob Mss. Mus. D. 122.
Peter Gillier. Other names on the parts include Giovanni Battista Noferi and Carl Friedrich Baumgarten. The instrumental ensemble implied by the parts is 16 violins evenly split into firsts and seconds, 4 violas, 4 cellos, 6 double basses, 4 oboes, 4 bassoons and harpsichord, plus probably two each of horns and trumpets: around 43 in total against the 20 singers already mentioned. This agrees fairly well with the report in the *Gentlemen's Magazine*, which mentions ‘a magnificent orchestra with above fifty of the most eminent performers’. The parts show no signs of having been used again.

**The Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, 1766**

Boyce’s third version of the anthem ‘The King shall rejoice’, which reuses the first and last choruses from the wedding anthem, was composed for and first performed at the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy in 1766. It initially replaced his earlier orchestral anthem, ‘Lord, Thou hast been our refuge’, and was performed again at the festival the following year. Both anthems were performed in the years 1768 to 1770, but the festival seems to have reverted to the use of the earlier anthem thereafter.\(^\text{107}\) This anthem was, therefore, used in five successive years both at the festivals and at the public rehearsals that preceded them. Some signs of reuse can be seen on the parts; for example, the name of the counter-tenor John Dyne can be seen on two counter-tenor parts, one of which also bears two other names from different

\(^{107}\) See Bartlett and Bruce, *Tercentenary Sourcebook*, pp. 179-180, for a description of the anthem and the circumstances of its use as well as the newspaper advertisements of its first performance.
occasions. However, the parts are otherwise very clean and have been carefully kept.\footnote{108}

The full score that survives with the parts is in a copyist’s hand, but an incomplete autograph score survives in the Royal College of Music.\footnote{109} The parts are in buff cartridge-paper covers and are mainly in the hands of three copyists, including B5. The set is a large one and interesting because of the existence of a numbering system. This is clearly original, as the parts are numbered internally on the folios as well as externally on the covers, and because the vocal parts are not bound in their numbered order. No list survives of the total numbers of copies that should exist for each section, but as no numbers are missing from within each sequence, the set is probably complete. There are 28 parts in the vocal set, which consists of four first trebles, four second trebles, six counter-tenors, seven tenors and seven basses, implying a chorus of around 36 (16 trebles sharing parts, plus 21 adults). Six of the vocal parts are solo parts, which as usual include all the choruses.

The 32 instrumental parts consist of strings in the ratio 6:6:3:6, with the bass parts consisting of two cellos and four double basses. There are seven woodwind parts, consisting of two each of first and second oboes, plus three bassoons. Two trumpet parts and a drum complete the set. The only part that is obviously missing is the organ: the part present in this set is the second copy of the wedding anthem part, which is clearly a mistake. The internal ratios of parts are roughly consistent with Boyce’s other sets: stringed bass parts are half the total number of violin parts, and violas are one quarter of that number. Woodwind parts are just over half that number. There are no names on the instrumental set, but it is likely that all except

\footnote{108}{This set of parts is the subject of the second sample catalogue entry in Appendix B}

\footnote{109}{GB-Lcm Ms. 585, fols. 44-64, not viewed; see Bartlett and Bruce, \textit{Tercentenary Sourcebook}, p. 179.}
the organ, drum and trumpet parts would have been shared by two players, implying an orchestra of around 60. This is apparently the only set surviving for any of the Festivals of the Sons of the Clergy; however, this total agrees well with one description of a festival rehearsal in 1771, which reports an orchestra consisting of ‘upwards of 50 eminent masters’. Again the balance would have been towards a heavier bass line (four cellists and eight double bass players, all of which played throughout, six bassoons and an organ) and outer parts (twelve violins reinforced with four oboes on each of the first and second lines) against a viola section of around six on the inner part.

Conclusions

The sets examined here are from very different contexts to the court ode sets. The first group examined is from an earlier period and consists mostly of sets used in performances for private music societies; the second group consists of sets for special occasions that required ensembles several times the size of the court ode ensembles. Despite this, the performance practice they reveal remains consistent; they support the conclusions drawn from the court ode sets on part-sharing, orchestral balance and performance practice. This suggests that Boyce’s practice as revealed in the main series of court ode sets can be taken as extending backwards to at least 1736.

---

110 *London Evening Post* 9-11 May 1771, cited in Bartlett and Bruce, *Tercentenary Sourcebook*, p. 180. This is a much smaller number of performers than apparently took part in the Festival in the 1730s; see the account of the rehearsal for the 1735 Festival, which claims over 130 instruments and 40 voices (News, *London Evening Post* (London), 11-13 February 1735, Issue 1129).
There is no evidence in the parts of adult singers sharing, although as fewer treble parts were consistently copied than other vocal parts, this suggests that boy trebles did share. It was usual for the soloists’ parts to contain all the chorus music, indicating that it was the norm for them to sing throughout. The sets consistently show that the vocal ensemble was always considerably smaller than the instrumental ensemble and sometimes less than half its size. This suggests that the choir would normally have been placed in front of the orchestra, a layout which is confirmed both by surviving iconographic evidence and by the expensive paper covering the vocal parts for the coronation, which suggests that the singers were visible but the instrumentalists were less so. It is possible that the singers were not able to see the time beater. However, performance directions in the parts such as ‘watch y° Flutes & Boys’ in a viola part for the Funeral Anthem suggest that player-to-player communication was of greater importance in large ensembles than is nowadays normally the case. To some extent, this would have reduced the importance of the time-beater’s role.

Instrumental parts were routinely shared between two players apart from such obvious exceptions as the organ and drum parts. The only other exception may have been the brass parts, which may have been played one-to-a-part as there is no evidence at all of brass players sharing. The number of instrumentalists can therefore generally be assumed to be almost double the number of surviving parts. The ratios of instruments as demonstrated by the parts are remarkably consistent: the number of stringed bass players (cellos and double basses combined) was generally around half the total of violins; the number of violas was roughly one-sixth to one-quarter of the total of violins. Violins were apparently split roughly equally into firsts and seconds. These numbers indicate a balance of sound that is weighted
towards the outer parts, particularly towards the bass line, which was further reinforced by bassoons and a harpsichord or organ. The number of woodwind players was roughly half the number of violins: the woodwind section might therefore have sounded slightly more prominent than that of a modern orchestra. It was usual for the flute parts to be played by the oboists.

Contemporary accounts of the funeral, wedding and coronation anthems suggest that Boyce conducted by beating time, assisted by William Howard in the coronation anthems; though it is not clear whether both beat time throughout, perhaps positioned in different places, or whether they took turns.\textsuperscript{111} The survival of a folio score of the funeral anthem, copied to a high standard and apparently produced at around the same time as the performing set, suggests that Boyce may have used a score to beat time from. However, annotations in the sets of parts confirm that the presence of a time-beater did not negate the need for performers to communicate with each other, even in large ensembles. Although some instructions on the parts that appear to refer to ensemble-leading are actually a type of cue for the purposes of counting rests (for example, ‘The Boys lead the Chorus upon the Close Note of the Duet - Rest 13 bars with the bar that the Boys lead away’), others, such as the instruction ‘watch ye Flutes & Boys’, clarify that the interaction required of the players was more complex than simply counting rests from a particular part’s entry.\textsuperscript{112} In an ensemble of over 100 participants, the business of keeping together clearly required initiative from everyone.

\textsuperscript{111} See the report of the rehearsal in the \textit{St James’s Chronicle} (19 September 1761), quoted in Range, \textit{Music and Ceremonial}, p. 174.

\textsuperscript{112} The first appears in the drum part for Boyce’s ‘O be joyful in God’, GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 31670, fol. 13r.; the second in a viola part for the funeral anthem ‘The souls of the righteous’, GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115c., fol. 344v.
Table 6.1: Instrumental parts in Boyce’s performance sets: 1736-c.1756, excluding court odes from the main series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of set</th>
<th>Mss. Mus. Sch. (or other Mss no.)</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Instrumental Parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.1736?</td>
<td>D. 267 a-c</td>
<td>David’s Lamentation Over Saul and Jonathan</td>
<td>Vl 1 4 (1 inc) V 1 2 V 1 2 V a 1 Inst C B Bsn Hps O R G 1=1 1=1 1=1 1=1 1=1 1=1 1=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737 or 1738</td>
<td>C. 110 a-c</td>
<td>Cecilian ode ‘The Charms of Harmony Display’</td>
<td>Vl 1 3 V 1 3 V 1 3 Inst C B Bsn Hps O R G 1=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>D. 266 a-c</td>
<td>Cecilian ode ‘See Fam’d Apollo’</td>
<td>Vl 1 3 V 1 3 V 1 3 Inst C B Bsn Hps O R G 1=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1740</td>
<td>C. 113 a-c</td>
<td>Peleus and Thetis</td>
<td>Vl 1 4 V 1 4 V 1 4 V 1 4 Inst C B Bsn Hps O R G 1=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>C. 111, C. 112 a-c.</td>
<td>The Pythian Ode (‘Gentle lyre, begin the strain’).</td>
<td>Vl 1 4 V 1 4 V 1 4 V 1 4 Inst C B Bsn Hps O R G 1=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1746</td>
<td>C. 107 a-b</td>
<td>The Secular Masque</td>
<td>Vl 1 4 V 1 4 V 1 4 V 1 4 Inst C B Bsn Hps O R G 1=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1749?</td>
<td>GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 31670</td>
<td>Anthem ‘O be joyful’ (doctoral exercise)</td>
<td>Vl 1 4 V 1 4 V 1 4 V 1 4 Inst C B Bsn Hps O R G 1=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals Vocal:** Inst. 13:13

**Key:**
- B = bass (voice)
- D = drum
- Inst = instrumental
- S = evidence of shared parts
- VC = violoncello
- Bsn = bassoon
- Fl = flute
- M[number] = parts missing [number of]
- Sp = soprano
- Vl = violin
- C = apparently complete
- H = horn
- N = numbering system visible
- T = tenor
- Vla = viola
- CB = double bass
- Hps = harpsichord
- Ob = oboe
- Tp = trumpet
- Tr = treble
- CT = counter-tenor
- inc = incomplete
- Org = organ
## Table 6.2: Vocal and instrumental parts in Boyce’s performance sets, 1760-1766, excluding court odes from the main series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch.</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Solo Vocal Parts</th>
<th>Chorus Parts</th>
<th>Instrumental Parts</th>
<th>Totals Vocal: Inst.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S p / T r</td>
<td>C T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>C. 115 a-c</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>C. 117 a-c plus org in C.119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>C.116 a-c; D. 268-297</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>C. 118 a-c</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>C. 119 a-c</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Key:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>bass (voice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bsn</td>
<td>bassoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>apparently complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>double bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>counter-tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>drum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl</td>
<td>flute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hps</td>
<td>harpsichord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M[number]</td>
<td>parts missing [number of]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>numbering system visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>soprano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tp</td>
<td>trumpet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>treble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>violoncello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vl</td>
<td>violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vla</td>
<td>viola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>evidence of shared parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>organ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The organ part in C.119a-c belongs with the Wedding Anthem, not the Sons of the Clergy version.*
7: Conclusions

The fact that fewer English manuscript performing sets survive from the period 1660-1784, compared to other European countries, is a major limitation in this study. There are two particularly significant gaps among the surviving sets. Firstly, hardly any theatre sets survive. Secondly, the majority of surviving eighteenth-century sets date from the second half of the century; relatively few sets of any type survive from between 1714 and 1750. As a result, no theatre sets are discussed in the present study, although some individual surviving parts – principally Handel’s continuo scores – are discussed. Likewise, no sets are discussed that date from 1714-c.1735; and relatively few from 1735-1750. (Charles Jennens’s ‘library’ sets, discussed in Chapter 4, probably date from the 1740s, but the information they give is limited by the fact that they were not ‘working’ sets). Survival of sets is sporadic even from the periods principally examined, 1660-1714 and 1735 onwards. The two case-studies in Chapters 2 and 3, on surviving Oxford sets from the Restoration until c.1714, provide an example of the problems this causes: discussion of the performance practices revealed in these sets is necessarily Oxford-centric. Although some degree of extrapolation is possible, the sets’ value as evidence of London or court practice, from whence no sets survive, is limited. It must always be borne in mind that far more sets have been lost than have survived, and the gaps in the surviving evidence are therefore considerable.

However, the five case studies examined here each have strengths in different areas. As well as giving evidence of Restoration performance practice in Oxford, the Oxford sets discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 are particularly informative about creative practices
in concerted music of the time. The information given by the parts reveals striking differences between the works as presented in the scores, and the works as performed. The surviving performing sets for Handel’s works, examined in Chapter 4, that are not linked to the composer himself, give interesting information on Handelian performance practice of the second half of the eighteenth century, from various contexts. The court performing sets of William Boyce, examined in Chapters 5 and 6, give information on court performance practice between 1755 and 1779; and function as a standard against which other performing sets can be compared. Each case-study gives an incomplete picture in some respects, as they inevitably relate primarily to local performing conditions and to single composers, societies, or cities, and because no collection of sets of performing parts has survived absolutely complete with no losses. However, despite the difficulty in generalising, the information they give on a number of topics is often remarkably consistent. These topics include information on how the production of performing parts developed, on copying practices, and on cost; on creative practices; on the performance history of works; and on performance practice, such as ensemble leading, numbers of singers and instrumentalists, ensemble balance and bass-line practice.

The development of a standard format for English performing parts for concerted music can be traced in the surviving sets from the Oxford Music School, discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. At the beginning of the period, during the 1660s and early 1670s, these were still in ‘partleaf’ format, being single or partial leaves. This was possible because concerted works of this date were still relatively short and participation of instruments other than the continuo was relatively little, compared with later practice.
Surviving parts from this date are scrappy in appearance and give the impression that they were often copied on whatever paper was to hand. Often they were recycled from remodelled earlier sets; this was particularly the case with sets for building block anthems and odes, which were formed out of strings of pre-existing shorter instrumental and vocal numbers. Because no short format for notating ‘tacet’ numbers was in widespread use in Oxford at the time, many contained strings of lengthy written instructions as to the work’s order. However, the growth in length and complexity of concerted works; and the growth in the size of ensembles, necessitating the copying of greater numbers of parts, encouraged the development of standard formats and conventions of part-copying to speed up the copying process. By the end of the seventeenth century, parts had become more standardised in appearance. The use of transverse quarto for vocal parts and upright quarto for instrumental parts, and the covering of most parts in wrappers, unless they were single leaves, apparently became conventional during the early decades of the eighteenth century, although this is the period from which fewest examples survive overall.

By the 1740s at least, a new phenomenon had become apparent: manuscript publishing of sets of parts. In England, this trend was centred round one particular composer, G. F. Handel. Sets of parts for Handel’s music were being published in manuscript by J. C. Smith’s scriptorium, and other scribes or groups of scribes such as William Walond and his circle continued this activity throughout the eighteenth century, as described in Chapter 4. It is clear that these sets served more than one function. Some were bought for use as performing sets, while others were never used as such, being bought as ‘library’ or ‘presentation’ sets, which were apparently primarily
collectors’ objects and a form of patronage. Many aspects of this practice remain unclear, and its full extent is not yet known. It is not yet known whether such sets were normally copied to order, or whether they were usually pre-copied and offered for sale. The extent of the market for these sets is not yet known, although a large number survive from the Aylesford Collection, originally largely copied for Charles Jennens, who appears to have been the most significant patron of Smith’s scriptorium in this respect. There is evidence in surviving sets in Durham, discussed in Chapter 4, that the musician Richard Fawcett was also one of Smith’s customers, and that he supplemented his bought sets with copies produced by himself for performance, rather than library, use. However, it is possible that many more such sets may have been sold to other patrons, of which no record now survives. The survival of a few sets that appear to have been copied by Smith’s scriptorium, but cannot be linked to the now-dispersed Aylesford Collection, suggests that this may be true.

It likewise remains to be identified whether there was any significant trade in sets of parts for other composers’ music. A parallel has been identified here with late-seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century Italian sets of parts for motets by composers such as Carissimi, Bassani and others, which may have been part of the souvenir trade. Whether or not this was the case, such parts survive in relatively large numbers across England, when compared with overall numbers of surviving English-made sets. They must therefore have been imported on a fairly large scale. However, it is not known whether any trade in sets of parts was general and widespread, or merely driven by local market conditions, such as the existence of a market for souvenir copies, or for sets of parts for works by a particularly popular composer.
The Handel sets copied by J. C. Smith’s scribes, and those of other eighteenth-century scribes, discussed in Chapter 4, demonstrate that these copyists were able to extract oboe, bassoon and ripieno bass parts from scores that lacked detailed instructions as to how these instruments functioned. Their methods were apparently based on widely-understood conventions. There is also some evidence of this practice in Boyce’s court ode sets, discussed in Chapter 5, and in one of his earlier performance sets discussed in Chapter 6. Such parts should not necessarily be regarded as inauthentic. In such cases as the Foundling Hospital’s oboe and bassoon parts for *Messiah*, and the Durham viola parts for *Esther*, Handel himself might have instructed the copyists to provide the parts, or at least anticipated that they would do so. The provision of such parts, where none exist, can therefore be legitimate in historically-informed performance practice.

Several other types of data relating to the production of sets of parts can be gleaned from the sets themselves. This includes information on the cost of copying, provided by surviving sets copied by John Mathews and discussed in Chapter 4. The sets for William Boyce’s court works are a useful database of court music copyists’ hands and their development for the years 1755-79. The court ode sets also provide a case-study of copyists’ counting systems and their usefulness in assessing the completeness of sets. Boyce’s large sets for the funeral of George II and the wedding of George III in 1760-1, discussed in Chapter 6, are interesting case-studies of how a group of scribes could maximise their copying speed when required to produce a large volume of parts within a short space of time, using what was effectively a production line.
On the subject of creative practices, the Oxford Music School sets discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 are the most revealing, the earlier sets more so than the later ones. The information they give is largely limited to two specific types of creativity: the practice of producing building-block works; and the practice of reworking odes and cannibalising the parts of the old version to produce a new performing set. The building-block works were never written out in score, but existed only in the performing parts, being made from sequences of smaller pre-existing instrumental and vocal numbers that were ordered to give a coherent whole; a practice that was in line with general attitudes to creativity at that time. Greater integration of the instrumental and vocal elements of these works quickly followed; they were probably an important stage in the development of concerted forms in Oxford, because they helped to promote the expansion in length and complexity of concerted works that took place during this period. However, if building-block works played a similar role in developing the early court ode, any evidence of this has been lost with the court performing sets. Oxford composers had apparently stopped producing this type of work by the 1670s, probably because the concept of a coherent work that was planned as such from the start had taken hold. However, it is difficult to be sure of this, as tracking such practices is dependent upon the survival of the performing parts.

In the Oxford sets, the ‘score’ versions of works were often substantially different to the ‘performance’ versions, to the extent that the scores can be misleading as sources. Even after the production of building-block works apparently ceased, it was still normal for the instrumental and vocal sections of odes to be scored separately, even when all were the work of one composer. In such cases, the performing parts are again the
principal evidence as to how the works functioned in performance. This is also often the case in the Oxford sets which have been reworked to produce new odes out of old ones. The parts of these reworked odes reveal that the alterations were performance-driven. They were largely influenced by factors such as which soloists were to take part, what music would be suitable for the new singers, and what changes in fashion had taken place since the work’s composition. This final consideration resulted in changes in the structure of several recycled works, including the reduction in frequency of use and importance of instrumental dances and their gradual replacement as closing numbers with final choruses.

The eighteenth-century performing sets examined in Chapters 4 and 6 also show evidence of extensive remodelling of works. This is of two types, the first being that carried out by a composer on his own works. Such remodelling is visible in all of the surviving performing parts used by Handel: the continuo scores and parts that survive in Hamburg, the continuo part to *Alexander’s Feast* and the tenor solo part to the Foundling Hospital Anthem. As these parts give valuable information on successive alterations by Handel’s in the works transmitted, it is unfortunate that the majority are lost. Such alterations can also be seen in some of the surviving sets for William Boyce’s works discussed in Chapter 6.

The second type of remodelling of works visible in eighteenth-century performance parts is that carried out by someone other than the work’s composer. To judge from the surviving sets for Handel’s music discussed in Chapter 4, that were apparently used by performers without any direct links to the composer himself, some degree of this type of remodelling took place in most performances. It varied from minor alterations of
scoring and excision of numbers, to wholesale remodelling of works to suit the prevailing style or simply the arranger’s preference. Examples of such remodelling include the Stamford Music Club’s version of Purcell’s ‘Welcome to all the pleasures’, discussed in Chapter 2, and the late-eighteenth-century pasticcio arrangements of Handel’s Dettingen Te Deum and his so-called ‘Miserere’, discussed in Chapter 4, both possibly the work of J. C. Smith junior. To best utilise such performing sets in understanding contemporary performance practice, sources such as these should not be viewed primarily as inauthentic or spurious versions of Handel or Purcell, as, for example, Bruce Wood apparently regards the Stamford version of ‘Welcome to all the pleasures’ in his edition for the Purcell Society.¹ Instead, they should be viewed as absolutely authentic for their time. To do otherwise is to risk misunderstanding some aspects of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century performance practice by viewing them from a perspective that was alien at the time.

All the sets examined give useful information on performance practice. It is harder to draw conclusions on ensemble size from the Oxford sets than it is from later sets, because of the obvious losses from many and the general lack of contemporary numbering systems and lists.² However, these sets indicate that small vocal ensembles, generally consisting of a group of concertists reinforced by ripienists (one or two per part) for the chorus sections, were the norm in Oxford until c.1714 at least. This may have been influenced by the Italian practice of some of the imported performing sets


² The faint pencil lists of parts visible on many of the Music School sets appear to have been added by a librarian after their entry into the Bodleian Library, and therefore date from considerably later than the period of their production and use. In all cases the lists correspond to the present content of the sets.
owned by Aldrich and other Oxford musicians during the Restoration period and early eighteenth century; similar practice displayed in Bach’s performing sets. The gradual addition of increasing numbers of vocal ripienists, and hence a firmer distinction between ‘soloists’ and ‘chorus’, appears to have been a later development.

There is some evidence in these sets that both instrumentalists and singers shared parts on occasion, although too little to state whether it was standard practice for singers to share. The evidence of adult singers sharing appears only once in one of the earlier sets; while the evidence of string players sharing is confined to the later Oxford sets and may indicate a change in practice that was aimed at reducing the amount of copying, as both work-length and string participation in works had increased. Sometimes, an instrumentalist would share with a singer; this occurred on at least three occasions. Two instances of this occurrence are of a violinist sharing with a solo singer, suggesting that both performed standing; this was perhaps a local practice linked to the layout of the Sheldonian Theatre, the principal venue for public musical performances in Oxford.

The Oxford sets demonstrate that, in late-seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century Oxford, instrumental ensembles for concerted music apparently consisted of violins, bass viols, a keyboard instrument and possibly a lute. The ensembles initially lacked other instruments such as violas and woodwind instruments, which were slow to be introduced in concerted music in that city. Most of the sets indicate that the number of violins was small by later standards, although one set, for ‘Revixit io Carolus’, implies a bigger ensemble of at least six violins and perhaps more, if parts were shared. The stringed basses apparently played only while the upper strings played, rather than playing throughout. However, the sets indicate that this practice was changing by the

---

3 Parrott, Essential Bach Choir.
second decade of the eighteenth century, towards the end of Goodson’s professorship. The Oxford sets are of particular importance because they give the earliest evidence of an orchestra-type ensemble in England, but outside London.

The performing sets for Handel’s concerted music discussed in Chapter 4, all of which date from after 1740 and are not linked to the composer himself, show some similarities to the later Oxford Music School sets. Although the ensembles indicated are by now much bigger, it was evidently still normal for the soloists to participate in choruses and for instrumentalists to share parts, although singers normally did not. In these respects, the sets are also similar to the Boyce sets discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, which consistently confirm all these practices, as do other eighteenth-century sets not specifically examined here, such as those of William and Philip Hayes and those linked to the Academy of Ancient Music. The surviving Handel sets of the Shaw Singers are an exception, as they derive from the different tradition of psalmody, which typically used a small group of instrumentalists against a bigger choir.

The sets of the Shaw Singers, examined in Chapter 4, and Boyce’s court sets, examined in Chapters 5 and 6, are of particular interest because of the survival of documentary evidence relating to the production and use of these performance sets. Such evidence can, as in these cases, have direct implications for issues of performance practice: for example, it can aid in interpreting how many singers and instrumentalists a particular set of parts implies. In the case of the court sets, this evidence consists largely of warrants for payments relating to the performances, newspaper reports and other contemporary accounts. This combines with the evidence of the performance parts to give a more accurate estimate of numbers of performers, and balance of parts, than
would otherwise be possible. In the case of the Shaw Singers, the evidence consists largely of account-book entries relating to copying payments. These demonstrate in conjunction with the surviving parts that the society’s ‘standard’ instrumental ensemble was very small, and that the addition of such instruments as viola, violoncello and oboe, which were in widespread use in other contexts of concerted-music performance, occurred only gradually from the 1780s. Both these case-studies therefore demonstrate ways in which evidence from surviving performance parts can interact with other types of sources to enhance our understanding of how the sets were produced and used.

All of William Boyce’s sets, both for court and non-court works, indicate an instrumental ensemble with a small viola section set against heavier bass and treble-instrument sections; and a greater proportion of wind instruments to strings than is normal in ‘Baroque’ orchestras today. This was set against a vocal ensemble that was generally only one-third to one-half the size of the instrumental group. The bass group probably consisted of cellos and basses either in equal numbers or with slightly more cellos than basses; plus at least one keyboard instrument and several bassoons, the participation of which might not be mentioned in the full score. The bassoons were treated as ripieno instruments, playing only in instrumental movements, accompanied recitatives and *tutti* sections of arias. This was also sometimes true of the double basses, but generally they played throughout.

The performer numbers indicated by Boyce’s sets vary from the stable ensemble of the court ode sets (around 22 singers and 32 instrumentalists), to the ensembles of three times the size suggested by the sets for the funeral of George II and the wedding and coronation of George III. These sets indicate ensembles of around 80 instrumentalists to
50 singers, 52 instrumentalists to 26 singers and 105 instrumentalists to 40 singers respectively, indicating that in bigger ensembles, the number of voices did not necessarily increase in proportion to the number of instruments. However, the evidence of the coronation set may have been compromised by reuse in the Three Choirs Festival and, correspondingly, the loss of parts. The ensembles used by Boyce during the 1730s and 1740s, in performances of works such as David’s Lamentation Over Saul and Jonathan, The Secular Masque, Peleus and Thetis and several Caecilian odes, were probably roughly the same size as the ensemble for the court odes; however, these sets have also been compromised by loss. Boyce’s sets give the overall impression that his standard ensemble, outside that of the court odes, increased in size from around 1760. It is possible that this is a chance pattern of survival that does not correspond to actuality, as no sets from big occasions such as the Feast of the Sons of the Clergy survive from before 1760, while no sets from small performances survive from after that date.

Evidence from contemporary accounts indicates that in large-scale performances, both Boyce and Handel – at least in his earlier oratorios – gave the beat with a roll of paper, possibly from a full score. However, instructions and performer annotations on Boyce’s parts show that leading from within the ensemble, by the performers, played an important role in performance. The performers apparently paid attention to whichever part was in the lead at the time. This practice is confirmed by the evidence of other eighteenth-century performing sets, such as the late-eighteenth-century sets for Handel’s music and many other English sets examined as part of this study, but not discussed here. For example, the four surviving performing sets of John Alcock senior and his son, John Alcock junior, contain examples of this type of leading, as do those belonging to
William and Philip Hayes and Benjamin Cooke. The practice was more democratic than later practice after the advent of the conductor, and required more initiative from the performers. Some similar evidence of internal ensemble-leading can be seen in the Oxford Music School parts of the late seventeenth century, suggesting that this type of ensemble-leading derived from that practised in these smaller ensembles.

It is clear that sets of parts are a valuable source of information that future research, whether on performance practice or on individual works, composers, institutions and societies should seek to take into account where possible. Where this proves impossible because of loss, a greater awareness that the lost sets of parts pose a problem would be beneficial. As has already been demonstrated in other research, such as that by Richard Maunder, this approach has the potential to transform our understanding of the music and the ensembles that played it. It is hoped that this study demonstrates the benefits of expanding Maunder’s approach in investigating sets of parts for instrumental music, to include both other types of music and other types of research beyond scoring and performance practice. For example, it is clear that sets of parts are more informative than might have previously been supposed on the subject of composer and performer creativity. It is hoped that future research will include a more systematic investigation of sets of parts in contexts beyond the limits of the present study, and an attempt at greater integration of research into performance parts with research into other sources.

4 The Alcocks’ sets are at GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. C. 108 a-c, C. 109, C. 149 and Ms. Mus. d. 140-141; examples of the practice in William Hayes’s sets are at GB-Ob Ms. Mus. d. 118-119 and 120-121; examples in Benjamin Cooke’s sets are at GB-Lcm Ms 829, 832 and 833. See the catalogue entries in Appendix B.

5 Maunder, *Scoring of Baroque Concertos*; idem, *Scoring of Early Classical Concertos*. 
Appendix A: Alphabetical Index of Performers Named on Performing Parts

This index omits instances where performers have simply initialled their parts. Where a name is difficult to read, all principal possibilities are given. Forenames are given where known.¹

Abingdon, [?Joseph senior], violin 2:


Abbott (also ‘Abbot’, ‘Abott’), solo bass voice, sometimes tenor (may be two singers):

GB-Ckc 401 (Maurice Greene, ‘Hearken unto me, ye holy children’, 1728, parts later reused; Abbott apparently sang bass and tenor on different occasions)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 267 c (William Boyce, David’s Lamentation Over Saul and Jonathan, 1736, as tenor soloist)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.110 c (William Boyce, ‘The charms of harmony display’, c.1737-8, as bass soloist)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 112 b (William Boyce, Pythian Ode, ‘Gentle lyre, begin the strain’, c.1741, as bass soloist)

Abrams, Miss T[heodosia], canto/contralto solo:

GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused; in reuse some solos were transposed down a third for Theodosia Abrams)

Agus, [Joseph], violin 2:


¹ Where not present on the performance parts, any forenames given are taken from the BDA and from the membership lists of the Royal Society of Musicians (‘RSM Membership ...1738 to 1749’, <http://www.royalsocietyofmusicians.co.uk/members-1749.html> and ‘RSM Membership ...1750-1799’, <http://www.royalsocietyofmusicians.co.uk/members-1799.html>, The Royal Society of Musicians of Great Britain[accessed 10 October 2014].
GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

Akers, counter-tenor chorus:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.141 (Edward Lowe, ‘Nunc est canendum’)

Antoniotto, violoncello ['Basso Rep.']:  

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 121 (William Hayes, ‘The Passions’)

Attwood, trumpet:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 130 (Philip Hayes, *Prophecy*)

Baildon, [Thomas], principal counter-tenor:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 120 (William Hayes, ‘Commemoration Ode’, among parts to ‘The Passions’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 298b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1755, ‘Pierian sisters’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 299b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1756, ‘When Caesar’s natal day’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 301b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1757, ‘While Britain’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 302b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1757, ‘Rejoice, ye Britons’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 303b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1758, ‘Behold, the circle forms’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 304b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1758, ‘When Othbert left’; name deleted)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 305b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1759, ‘Ye guardian powers’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 306b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1759, ‘Begin the song’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115b (William Boyce, Anthem for the Funeral of George II, ‘The souls of the righteous’, 1760, as chorus singer)
GB-DRc Ms D15 (Georg Frideric Handel, *Esther*, mid-eighteenth-century set)

Baildon, [Joseph], tenor chorus:

- GB-DRc Ms D15 (Georg Frideric Handel, *Esther*, mid-eighteenth-century set)
- GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115 b (William Boyce, Anthem for the Funeral of George II, ‘The souls of the righteous’, 1760, as chorus singer)

Baily, (also ‘Bailey’, ‘Bayley’, ‘Bayly’), A[nselm], counter-tenor chorus:

- GB-Lcm Ms 224/1 (Maurice Greene, Te Deum in D, doctoral submission, Cambridge 1745)
- GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D.277 (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761; the name might in fact be ‘Banty’ or ‘Banly’)

Baker, tenore ripieno:

- GB-Och Mus. 1089 (G. B. Borri Kyrie and Gloria)

Banester, [John], violin 2:

- GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. 129 (Henry Aldrich, ‘Carminum praeses’)

?Banly, see ‘Baily’, [Anselm]

?Banty, see ‘Baily’, [Anselm]

?Barron, (see also ‘Barrow’), counter-tenor

- GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D.274 (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761. The name might in fact be ‘Barrow’; see below.)

Barrow, [Thomas], counter-tenor:

- GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115 b (William Boyce, Anthem for the Funeral of George II, ‘The souls of the righteous’, 1760, as chorus singer)
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D.274 (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761. The name might in fact be ‘Barron’; see above.)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 122 (William and Philip Hayes, *David*)

GB-Lcm Ms 829 (Benjamin Cooke, Te Deum and Jubilate in G, 1780)

Baumgarten, [Samuel Christian (Frederick)], bassoon:


Baumgarten, [?Charles Frederick?], violin 1:

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

Beal, see ‘Bleal’

Beard, [John], principal tenor:

GB-Lcm Ms 900 (Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*, 1736)

GB-Lfom 1280 (Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*, copy set from the Aylesford Collection)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 113 b (William Boyce, *Peleus and Thetis*, before 1740)


GB-Lcm Ms 2254, fols.15-16 (Georg Frideric Handel, Foundling Hospital Anthem ‘Blessed is he that considereth the poor’, HWV 268, 1749, part reused)

GB-Lfom 2558 (Georg Frideric Handel, *Messiah*, set of 1759)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 118 (William Hayes, ‘Ode to the memory of Mr. Handel’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 298 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1755, ‘Pierian sisters’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 299 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1756, ‘When Caesar’s natal day’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 301 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1757, ‘While Britain’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 302 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1757, ‘Rejoice, ye Britons’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 303 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1758, ‘Behold, the circle forms’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 304 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1758, ‘When Othbert left’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 305 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1759, ‘Ye guardian powers’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 306 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1759, ‘Begin the song’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 307 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1760, ‘Again the sun’s revolving sphere’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 308 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1761, ‘Still must the muse’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 309 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1761, ‘Twas at the nectar’d feast’)


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D.279 (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 310 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1762, ‘God of slaughter’)

GB-DRc Ms D15 (Georg Frideric Handel, Esther, mid-eighteenth-century set)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 311 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1762, ‘Go, Flora’)

GB-Lbl Add. MS. 37027, fols. 56-57 (Henry Purcell, sacrifice scene from The Indian Queen used in a 1762 production of The Royal Convert)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 312 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1763, ‘At length the imperious lord of war’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 308 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1761, ‘Still must the muse’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 310 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1762, ‘God of slaughter’)

GB-DRc Ms D15 (Georg Frideric Handel, Esther, mid-eighteenth-century set)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 311 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1762, ‘Go, Flora’)

GB-Lbl Add. MS. 37027, fols. 56-57 (Henry Purcell, sacrifice scene from The Indian Queen used in a 1762 production of The Royal Convert)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 312 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1763, ‘At length the imperious lord of war’)
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 313 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1763, ‘Common births’)

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 b (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 314 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1764, ‘To wedded love’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 316 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1765, ‘Hail to the rosy morn’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 317 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1767, ‘When first the rude o’erpeopled north’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 318 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1766, ‘Hail to the man’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. d. 319 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1767, ‘Friend to the poor’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 320 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1768, ‘Let the voice of music breathe’)

Bedford, see ‘Redford’

Bellamy, [Richard], principal bass:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 137 (Philip Hayes, Telemachus)

GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 119 b (William Boyce, ‘The King shall rejoice’, version for the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, 1766)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 329 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1773, ‘Wrapt in stole’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 330 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1773, ‘Born for millions’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 331 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1774, ‘Pass but a few short fleeting years’
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 332 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1774, ‘Hark! Or does the muse’s ear’)

Gb-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 333 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1775, ‘Ye powers, who rule’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 334 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1776, ‘On the white rocks’)

GB-Lam MS 25A (Henry Purcell, Dido and Aeneas, concert arrangement by the Academy of Ancient Music, 1787)

Bennett, tenor violin:


B[?]ys, canto ripieno:

   GB-Och Mus. 1086 (G. B. Borri Kyrie and Gloria)

Bleal (possibly ‘Beal’), tenor violin:


Brown, [Abraham], principal violinist:

   GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 298 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1755, ‘Pierian sisters’)

   GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 299 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1756, ‘When Caesar’s natal day’)

   GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 301 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1757, ‘While Britain’)

   GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 304 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1758, ‘When Othbert left’)

   GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 305 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1759, ‘Ye guardian powers’)

   GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 306 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1759, ‘Begin the song’)


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 307 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1760, ‘Again the sun’s revolving sphere’)


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 308 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1761, ‘Still must the muse’)


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 a (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 311 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1762, ‘Go, Flora’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 312 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1763, ‘At length the imperious lord of war’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 313 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1763, ‘Common births’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 315 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1765, ‘Sacred to thee’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 316 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1765, ‘Hail to the rosy morn’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 317 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1767, ‘When first the rude o’erpeopled north’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 318 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1766, ‘Hail to the man’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 319 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1767, ‘Friend to the poor’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 320 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1768, ‘Let the voice of music breathe’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 321 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1768, ‘Prepare your songs’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 322 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1769, ‘Patron of Arts!’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 323 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1770, ‘Forward, Janus’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 324 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1770, ‘Discord, hence!’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 325 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1771, ‘Again returns’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 326 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1771, ‘Long did the churlish East’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 327 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1772, ‘At length the fleeting year’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. d. 328 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1772, ‘From scenes of death’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 329 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1773, ‘Wrapt in stole’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 330 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1773, ‘Born for millions’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 331 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1774, ‘Pass but a few short fleeting years’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 332 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1774, ‘Hark! Or does the muse’s ear’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 334 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1776, ‘On the white rocks’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 335 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1776, ‘Ye western gales’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 336 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1777, ‘Again imperial Winter’s sway’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 338 a (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1778, ‘Now with a brighter eye’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 338 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1778, ‘Welcome, Time! and listen!’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 339 a (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1779, ‘Hear ye the form of things’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 337 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1777, ‘Driv’n out from Heav’n’s ethereal domes’)

Brown, violoncello solo:

GB-DRc MS E20 (i) (Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*, c.1738)

Bryan, tenor chorus:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115 b (William Boyce, Anthem for the Funeral of George II, ‘The souls of the righteous’, 1760, as chorus singer)

Caporale (also ‘Caprale’), [Andrea], principal violoncello:

GB-Lcm Ms 900 (Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*, 1736)

Carbrells, see ‘Carbwells’

Carbwell (possibly ‘Carbrells’ or ‘Cardrells’), violin 1:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 a (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Cardrells, see ‘Carbwells’

Carter, violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 121 (William Hayes, ‘The Passions’)

Cervetti, [probably James Cervetto], violoncello:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 b (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Champness (also ‘Champnes’), [Samuel], solo bass voice:

GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused)

Chapman, bassoon:


Chapman, violoncello ['Basso Rep.']: 

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 121 (William Hayes, ‘The Passions’)
Chard, counter-tenor:

London, Library and Museum of Freemasonry M/S FIS (John Abraham Fisher, Anthem and Ode for the Opening of the Freemason’s Hall, 1776)

?Charlin, counter-tenor:

London, Library and Museum of Freemasonry M/S FIS (John Abraham Fisher, Anthem and Ode for the Opening of the Freemason’s Hall, 1776)

Chelsum (also ‘Chellsum’), solo counter-tenor:

GB-Ckc 401 (Maurice Greene, ‘Hearken unto me, ye holy children’, 1728, parts later reused)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. d. 266 b (William Boyce, ‘See fam’d Apollo and the nine’, c.1739)


Ch[?], (see also ‘Child’), solo counter-tenor:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. d. 266 b (William Boyce, ‘See fam’d Apollo and the nine’, c.1739. See ‘Child’, below; the name appears deleted on the same part)

Cherington, possibly violin

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. F. 29 (William Davis, chorus ‘What mighty joys’ from the Cecilian ode ‘Assist you mighty sons of art’, probably late 1690s)

Chetham, James, bass singer and bass instrumentalist (Crompton and Shaw)

GB-Mcm SC12 (Georg Frideric Handel, Messiah and Judas, copied c.1767).

Child, solo counter-tenor:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. d. 266 b (William Boyce, ‘See fam’d Apollo and the nine’, c.1739)

Chittle [? possibly ‘Mettle’], tenore concertato:

GB-Oeh Mus. 1088 (G. B. Borri Kyrie and Gloria)

Clark, Revd., solo counter-tenor:
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 119 b (William Boyce, ‘The King shall rejoice’, version for the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, 1766)

Clarke, principal treble:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 122 (William and Philip Hayes, *David*)

Clarke, W[illiam], solo tenor:

GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused)

Clements, bass singer:

GB-DRc MS E23/1-9 (Georg Frideric Handel, ‘Ode for St Cecilia’s Day’, HWV 76)

Cocker, James, bass singer (Bercha, Crompton and Shaw)

GB-Mcm SC13 (Georg Frideric Handel, *Samson*, copied c.1771)

Collet, [John], principal violin, violin 1, violin 2:


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 117 c (William Boyce, Anthem for the Wedding of George III and Charlotte, ‘The King shall rejoice’, 1761 as violin 2)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 114 (William Hayes, ‘Commemoration Ode’)

Cooke, Dr. Benjamin, solo tenor(?):

GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused. Name may in fact refer to the work’s composer.)

Cooke, Henry, boy treble:

GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused)

Cooke, Robert, boy treble:

GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused)

Cooper, [?Ralph?], (see also ‘Cowper’ – probably the same singer), principal counter-tenor:
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 309 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1761, ‘‘Twas at the nectar’d feast’)


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 310 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1762, ‘God of slaughter’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 312 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1763, ‘At length the imperious lord of war’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 313 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, ‘Common births’, 1763)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 314 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1764, ‘To wedded love’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 315 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1765, ‘Sacred to thee’)

Coster, [William], tenor chorus:


Count, see ‘Court’

Court [? possibly ‘Count’], violino primo concertato:

GB-Och Mus. 1097 (G. B. Borri Kyrie and Gloria)

Courtup, [George], violin 1 and 2:


GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

Cowper, [Ralph], (see also ‘Cooper’), principal counter-tenor:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 304b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1758, ‘When Othbert left’; substituted for Baildon’s name)
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115 b (William Boyce, Anthem for the Funeral of George II, ‘The souls of the righteous’, 1760, as chorus singer)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 316 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1765, ‘Hail to the rosy morn’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 317 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1767, ‘When first the rude o’erpeopled north’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 320 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1768, ‘Let the voice of music breathe’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 321 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1768, ‘Prepare your songs’)

Cox, [Hugh], principal bass voice:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 307 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1760, ‘Again the sun’s revolving sphere’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115 b (William Boyce, Anthem for the Funeral of George II, ‘The souls of the righteous’, 1760, as chorus singer)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 308 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1761, ‘Still must the muse’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 309 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1761, ‘Twas at the nectar’d feast’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 117 b (William Boyce, Anthem for the Wedding of George III and Charlotte, ‘The King shall rejoice’, 1761; name substituted for that of Savage)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 310 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1762, ‘God of slaughter’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 311 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1762, ‘Go, Flora’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 312 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1763, ‘At length the imperious lord of war’)

Cramer, principal violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 136 (Philip Hayes, Te Deum and Jubilate)
GB-Lam MS 27A (Henry Purcell, ‘Genius of England’ from Don Quixote, arrangement by the Academy of Ancient Music, set used 1777-86 at least)

Cramer junior, violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 136 (Philip Hayes, Te Deum and Jubilate)

Crispion (Crespion, Crispin), Stephen, treble, later bass vocal soloist:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.139 (Christopher Gibbons, ‘Not unto us’);

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.141 (Edward Lowe, ‘Nunc est canendum’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.123 (Edward Lowe, ‘Eia eruditam: joint part for bass soloist and violin)

D’Almeida, Clementina, principal singer:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 137 (Philip Hayes, Telemachus)

Davenport, principal violin 1:

GB-DRc MS E20 (i) (George Frideric Handel, Alexander’s Feast, c.1738)

Davis, William, tenor:

GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 46122 (George Frideric Handel, Messiah and Judas Maccabeus; Thomas Augustine Arne, Judith and Abel; mid/late eighteenth-century part that post-dates the publication of the Handel oratorios and Judith in 1761)

D[ell?], J[ames?], violin 2:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 299b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1756, ‘When Caesar’s natal day’)

Denb[y] , bass chorus:

GB-DRc Ms D15 (Georg Frideric Handel, Esther, mid-eighteenth-century set)

Dieterich, violoncello:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 107a (William Boyce, The Secular Masque, c.1746, parts later reused)

[?] Dipper, organ
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 267 b (William Boyce, *David's Lamentation Over Saul and Jonathan*, 1736. This name, if it is such, appears on the top of fol. 41r. of the organ part.)

Dove, [?George], violin 1:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 a (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Dubourg, [Matthew], (principal) violin 1:


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 a (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

Dyne, [John], principal counter-tenor:

GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 119 b (William Boyce, ‘The King shall rejoice’, version for the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, 1766; name present on two parts)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 330 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1773, ‘Born for millions’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 332 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1774, ‘Hark! Or does the muse’s ear’)

Gb-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 333 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1775, ‘Ye powers, who rule’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 335 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1776, ‘Ye western gales’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 339 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1778, ‘Arm’d with her native force’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 340 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1779, ‘To arms, to arms’)
GB-Lam MS 25A (Henry Purcell, *Dido and Aeneas*, concert arrangement by the Academy of Ancient Music, 1787)

Eiffert, oboe:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Erhard, principal bass:

GB-Lcm Ms 900 (Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*, 1736)

Estwick, [Sampson], basso concertato:

GB-Och Mus. 1094 (G. B. Borri Kyrie and Gloria)

Eversman, principal second violin, principal first violin:

GB-DRe MS E20 (i) (Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*, c.1738)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 114 (William Hayes, ‘Commemoration Ode’)

Falco, violin 1:

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

?Farriss, Mrs, soprano solo:

GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused)

Fawcett, counter-tenor:

London, Library and Museum of Freemasonry M/S FIS (John Abraham Fisher, Anthem and Ode for the Opening of the Freemason’s Hall, 1776)

Felton, W[illiam], organist (Hereford):

GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 31670, no. 1, fols. 1-14 (William Boyce, ‘O be joyful in God, 1749)

Ferrar, Basil, bass voice and instrumental bass (Stamford):

GB-Cfm MU.MS.685 (composite of Henry Purcell, ‘Welcome to all the pleasures’ and Arcangelo Corelli, various movements from Opp.2-4, 1696)
Feringer, bassoon:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Festing, [Michael?], violin:

GB-DRc MS E20 (i) (Georg Frideric Handel, Alexander’s Feast, c.1738)

Flaxney, [William], instrumental bass, bass viol:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.141 (Edward Lowe, ‘Nunc est canendum’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.123 (Edward Lowe, ‘Eia eruditam’)


Francesco, ‘Leuto o organo’:

GB-Och Mus. 1102 ((G. B. Borri Kyrie and Gloria, part used in an Oxford performance; no other indication of which instrument)

Frasi, [Giulia], principal soprano:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 113 c (William Boyce, Peleus and Thetis, before 1740)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 137 (Philip Hayes, Telemachus)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 118 (William Hayes, ‘Ode to the memory of Mr. Handel’)

GB-DRc Ms D15 (Georg Frideric Handel, Esther, mid-eighteenth-century set)

Freake, violin 1:


Froud, principal[?] second violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 304 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1758, ‘When Othbert left’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 305 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1759, ‘Ye guardian powers’)
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 306 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1759, ‘Begin the song’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 307 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1760, ‘Again the sun’s revolving sphere’)


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 a (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 311 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1762, ‘Go, Flora’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 312 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1763, ‘At length the imperious lord of war’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 313 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1763, ‘Common births’)

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 317 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1767, ‘When first the rude o’erpeopled north’)

Galli, [Caterina], principal alto:

GB-Lfom 2558 (Georg Frideric Handel, Messiah, performing set of 1759)

George, Miss, principal soprano:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 122 (William and Philip Hayes, David)

Gibbon, Revd., tenor chorus:


Gibbons, tenor violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 b (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Gibbs, [Edward], violinist:
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 298c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1755, ‘Pierian sisters’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 300 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1756, ‘Hail, hail, auspicious day’)

Gilbert, violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.141 (Edward Lowe, ‘Nunc est canendum’)

Gillier, [Peter], violoncello (‘Bass Viol Player to the Chapel Royal’):


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 b (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

Goodson, Richard (senior), 1655-1718. Sang in Christ Church choir 1667-1681; Heather Professor of Music from 1682. Treble voice, violin, organ.

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.141 (Edward Lowe, ‘Nunc est canendum’ treble chorus)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 137 (Henry Aldrich, ‘Revixit io Carolus’, violin)

GB-Och Mus. 1104 (G. B. Borri, Kyrie and Gloria, organ)

Gordon, violoncello:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 b (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Gore, counter-tenor solo:

GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused)

GB-Lcm Ms 829 (Benjamin Cooke, Te Deum and Jubilate in G, 1780)

Griffiths, solo bass (Worcester):

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 111 (pasticcio arr. James Harris, ‘Te Deum and Jubilate’)
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 131 (Philip Hayes, *Prophecy*)

Habgood, [?Thomas], bassoon:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Hacksame, violin 1:


Hackwood [probably Francis], violin 1:

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

Hall, violin (Oxford, late seventeenth century), see ‘Hull’

Hall, counter-tenor solo:

GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused)

Hague, counter-tenor chorus:


Harper, Miss, principal soprano


Haslewood, [John], instrumental bass:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.141 (Edward Lowe, ‘Nunc est canendum’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.123 (Edward Lowe, ‘Eia eruditam’)

Hawes, counter-tenor solo:

GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused)

Hay, [Richard], principal violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 139 (Philip Hayes, *Telemachus*)
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 119 (William Hayes, ‘Ode to the memory of Mr. Handel’, as ripienist; this probably refers to the ‘Installation Ode’, for which the part was reused. Hay is also probably the ‘R.H.’ whose initials appear on the principal violinist’s part for this ode.)

Hayes, [Philip], principal tenor, Heather Professor of Music, University of Oxford:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 321 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1768, ‘Prepare your songs’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 324 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1770, ‘Discord, hence!’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 325 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1771, ‘Again returns’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 329 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1773, ‘Wrapt in stole’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 330 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1773, ‘Born for millions’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 332 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1774, ‘Hark! Or does the muse’s ear’)

Gb-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 333 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1775, ‘Ye powers, who rule’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 335 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1776, ‘Ye western gales’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 336 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1777, ‘Again imperial Winter’s sway’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 337 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1777, ‘Driv’n out from Heav’n’s ethereal domes’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 339 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1778, ‘Arm’d with her native force’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 340 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1779, ‘To arms, to arms’)

Hebden, John, bassoon:
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Herbert, singer:

GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 30951, f.4r.-6v. (Charles Dibdin, finale of *Christmas Gambols*)

Hilman, tenor singer:

GB-Ckc 401 (Maurice Greene, ‘Hearken unto me, ye holy children’, 1728, parts later reused)

Hindle, principal tenor:

GB-Lam MS 25A (Henry Purcell, *Dido and Aeneas*, concert arrangement by the Academy of Ancient Music, 1787)

Hodson, William, violin 2:


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 a (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Hooks, tenor:

GB-Lcm Ms 827 (Benjamin Cooke, Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis in G)

Horsery [or ?Horsey], counter-tenor chorus:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.141 (Edward Lowe, ‘Nunc est canendum’)

Howard, bass chorus singer:


Hudson, [Robert], tenor chorus:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 314 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1764, ‘To wedded love’)

Hudson, [possibly William], violoncello:

GB-DRc MS E20 (i) (Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*, c.1738)

Hughes, violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 121 (William Hayes, ‘The Passions’)

Hull (possibly Hall), [?Edward], violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.141 (Edward Lowe, ‘Nunc est canendum’)

Jackson, [Thomas], violin 1:


James, violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.123 (Edward Lowe, ‘Eia eruditam’)

Jenkins, oboe:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Jennings, bass chorus singer:


Jones, [?John or ?Thomas], violin 1 and 2

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 309 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1761, ‘‘Twas at the nectar’d feast’’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 117 c (William Boyce, Anthem for the Wedding of George III and Charlotte, ‘The King shall rejoice’, 1761, as violin 2)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 316 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1765, ‘Hail to the rosy morn’)

[?]Jostle, tenor singer:
GB-Ckc 401 (Maurice Greene, ‘Hearken unto me, ye holy children’, 1728, parts later reused)

Ladd, [Nicholas], tenor chorus:


Lambourne, [?John], double bass:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 329 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1773, ‘Wrapt in stole’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 330 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1773, ‘Born for millions’)

Lamp (Lampe), [probably Charles John Frederick], violin 1, violin 2:


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 a (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Larke, treble chorus:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.141 (Edward Lowe, ‘Nunc est canendum’)

Lee, tenore ripieno:

GB-Och Mus. 1090 (G. B. Borri Kyrie and Gloria)

Leveridge, Richard, solo bass voice:

GB-T MS 1278 (in GB-Ob; Henry Purcell, The Indian Queen)

Lloyd (also ‘Loyd’), Revd., counter-tenor solo, possibly also tenor:

GB-Ckc 401 (Maurice Greene, ‘Hearken unto me, ye holy children’, 1728, parts later reused. Possibly as tenor soloist)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 267 b (William Boyce, David’s Lamentation Over Saul and Jonathan, 1736)

GB-Lcm Ms 224/1 (Maurice Greene, Te Deum in D, doctoral submission, Cambridge 1745)
Long, tenor chorus:


Longden, possibly violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. F. 29 (William Davis, chorus ‘What mighty joys’ from the Cecilian ode ‘Assist you mighty sons of art’, probably late 1690s)

Lowe, [Thomas], solo tenor:

GB-Lcm Ms 2254, fols.15-16 (Georg Frideric Handel, Foundling Hospital Anthem ‘Blessed is he that considereth the poor’, HWV 268, 1749, part reused)

Lowe, oboe and German flute:

GB-DRC MS E20 (i) (Georg Frideric Handel, Alexander’s Feast, c.1738)

Lowen, violino primo concertato:

GB-Och Mus. 1097 (G. B. Borri Kyrie and Gloria)

Mahon, violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 136 (Philip Hayes, Te Deum and Jubilate)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 124 (William and Philip Hayes, David, principal second violin)

Malchair, principal violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 124 (William and Philip Hayes, David)

Mathews, principal bass:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 132 (Philip Hayes, ‘Ode on the King’s Visit to Oxford’)  

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 122 (William and Philip Hayes, David)

Mathias, bass chorus singer:


Mattocks, [George], tenor chorus and soloist:
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115 b (William Boyce, Anthem for the Funeral of George II, ‘The souls of the righteous’, 1760, as chorus singer)

GB-Bu MS 5008, fols. 65-73 (Thomas Augustine Arne, The Fairy Prince, 1771)

Maxey, Revd., solo counter-tenor:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 119 b (William Boyce, ‘The King shall rejoice’, version for the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, 1766)

McFarland (also ‘Macfarland’), [?Patrick/Pat], bassoon:


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Mence, [Samuel], (see also ‘Mince), solo counter-tenor:

GB-Lcm Ms 224/1 (Maurice Greene, Te Deum in D, doctoral submission, Cambridge 1745)

? GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 119 b (William Boyce, ‘The King shall rejoice’, version for the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, 1766. The name may in fact be ‘Mince’; see below.)

Mettle, see ‘Chittle’.

Miller, bassoon, ‘bass’:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 107a (William Boyce, The Secular Masque, c.1746, parts later reused. This part is labelled ‘bass’ and may be a different player from the bassoonist Miller)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 112 c (William Boyce, Pythian Ode, ‘Gentle lyre, begin the strain’, c.1741, reused in later performances)


Mince, (see also ‘Mence), solo counter-tenor:
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 119 b (William Boyce, ‘The King shall rejoice’, version for the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, 1766; this may refer to Samuel Mence)

Monro, [?Robert, also ‘Munro’], principal violoncello:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 124 (William and Philip Hayes, *David*)

Morgan, [George], tenor violin:


Moseley, violin 2:

GB-DRc MS E20 (i) (Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*, c.1738)

Nares, [James], Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal (named in this capacity unless stated):

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 316 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1765, ‘Hail to the rosy morn’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 327 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1772, ‘At length the fleeting year’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 330 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1773, ‘Born for millions’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 331 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1774, ‘Pass but a few short fleeting years’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 332 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1774, ‘Hark! Or does the muse’s ear’)

Gb-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 333 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1775, ‘Ye powers, who rule’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 334 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1776, ‘On the white rocks’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 335 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1776, ‘Ye western gales’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 339 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1778, ‘Arm’d with her native force’)

Neale, oboe:
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Nicholson, [James], violino primo repieno:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 301 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1757, ‘While Britain’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 302 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1757, ‘Rejoice, ye Britons’)

Noferi, [Giovanni Battista], violin 1:

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

Norris, [?Thomas], principal tenor:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 132 (Philip Hayes, ‘Ode on the King’s Visit to Oxford’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 129 (Philip Hayes, Prophecy)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 137 (Philip Hayes, Telemachus)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 122 (William and Philip Hayes, David)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 125 (William Hayes, Peleus and Thetis)

London, Library and Museum of Freemasonry M/S FIS (John Abraham Fisher, Anthem and Ode for the Opening of the Freemason’s Hall, 1776; mentioned in score only)

Orthman, principal violoncello:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 114 (William Hayes, ‘Commemoration Ode’)

Owen, violin 2:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 a (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Pasqualini, harpsichord continuo:

GB-Lcm Ms 900 (Georg Frideric Handel, Alexander’s Feast, 1736)

Parke, [John], oboe:
Gb-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 333 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1775, ‘Ye powers, who rule’)

GB-DRc MS E20 (i) (Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*, c.1738; parts were presumably reused. This could also refer to Parke’s younger brother William)

Parsons, Master [William?], treble voice:


Pasquali, [Frances/Francisco], violone:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 131 (Philip Hayes, *Prophecy*)

Passerini, [Christina], principal soprano:

GB-Lfom 2558 (Georg Frideric Handel, *Messiah*, performing set of 1759)

Paxton, [?Stephen], double bass:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 b (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Peal [possibly ‘Real’], bass singer, see ‘Real’.

Peat (also ‘Peiet’), [George], violin 2:


Peiet, see Peat

Pemberton, counter-tenor:

London, Library and Museum of Freemasonry M/S FIS (John Abraham Fisher, Anthem and Ode for the Opening of the Freemason’s Hall, 1776)

Perkins, [John], oboe:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Phillips, violin 2:

GB-DRc MS E20 (i) (Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*, c.1738)
Pickel, principal violin 1:

GB-DRc MS E20 (i) (Georg Frideric Handel, Alexander’s Feast, c.1738)

Pinkney, solo bass:


Pinto, [probably Thomas (1714-1782)], violin 2, violin 1:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 117 c (William Boyce, Anthem for the Wedding of George III and Charlotte, ‘The King shall rejoice’, 1761, as 1st violin; this may in fact be Pinto junior)

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

Pinto junior, [?Charles?], violin 1:

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

Pitt, Jno, possibly violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. F. 29 (William Davis, chorus ‘What mighty joys’ from the Cecilian ode ‘Assist you mighty sons of art’, probably late 1690s)

Powell, counter-tenor (Oxford; possibly the same singer as the tenor Powell, below):

GB-DRc MS E20 (i) (Georg Frideric Handel, Alexander’s Feast, c.1738)

Powell (also ‘Powel’), tenor (Oxford; possibly the same as the counter-tenor singer above):

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 104 (Georg Frideric Handel, Chandos Anthems ‘O sing unto the Lord’ and ‘I will magnify thee’, early eighteenth-century set)

GB-Drc Ms. E26 iii (Georg Frideric Handel, Acis and Galatea, first half of the eighteenth century)

Price, principal counter-tenor:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 129 (Philip Hayes, Prophecy)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 122 (William and Philip Hayes, David)
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 120 (William Hayes, ‘Commemoration Ode’, among parts to ‘The Passions’)

Pring, principal treble:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 134 (Philip Hayes, Te Deum and Jubilate)

Prudom, [Maria], principal soprano:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 129 (Philip Hayes, Prophecy)

Rawlin, alto ripieno:

GB-Och Mus. 1092 (G. B. Borri Kyrie and Gloria)

Rawlings, [Robert], violin 1:


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 340 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1779, ‘To arms, to arms’)

Real (see also ‘Peal’), [?possibly Joseph], bass singer, Oxford:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 122 (William and Philip Hayes, David)

Redford [?possibly ‘Bedford’], basso ripieno:

GB-Och Mus. 1096 (G. B. Borri, Kyrie and Gloria)

Reeves, violin 1:


GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

Reinhold, [?Henry or ?Frederick Charles], principal bass singer:

London, Library and Museum of Freemasonry M/S FIS (John Abraham Fisher, Anthem and Ode for the Opening of the Freemason’s Hall, 1776; mentioned in score only)
Reynard, treble voice:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 119 b (William Boyce, ‘The King shall rejoice’, version for the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, 1766)

Rich, bassoon:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Richards, [possibly David or John], violin 1 and violin 2:


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 a (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

Row, (also ‘Rowe’), [Francis], solo counter-tenor:


Rowland, violin 2:

GB-DRc MS E20 (i) (Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*, c.1738)

Sale, principal bass:

GB-Lcm Ms 829 (Benjamin Cooke, Te Deum and Jubilate in G, 1780)

GB-Lam MS 25A (Henry Purcell, *Dido and Aeneas*, concert arrangement by the Academy of Ancient Music, 1787)

GB-Lbl MS. Mus. 146 (Henry Purcell, *King Arthur*, concert arrangement probably by the Academy of Ancient Music, 1787)

Sanders, basso ripieno:

GB-Oeh Mus. 1095 (G. B. Borri, Kyrie and Gloria)

Sarter[?], treble voice:
Savage, [William], principal bass voice:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 112 b (William Boyce, Pythian Ode, ‘Gentle lyre, begin the strain’, c.1741 reused in a later revival)

GB-Lcm Ms 224/1 (Maurice Greene, Te Deum in D, doctoral submission, Cambridge 1745)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 298b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1755, ‘Pierian sisters’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 299b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1756, ‘When Caesar’s natal day’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 301 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1757, ‘While Britain’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 302b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1757, ‘Rejoice, ye Britons’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 303 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1758, ‘Behold, the circle forms’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 304 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1758, ‘When Othbert left’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 305 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1759, ‘Ye guardian powers’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 306 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1759, ‘Begin the song’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 307 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1760, ‘Again the sun’s revolving sphere’)


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 308 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1761, ‘Still must the muse’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 309 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1761, ‘‘Twas at the nectar’d feast’’
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 117 b (William Boyce, Anthem for the Wedding of George III and Charlotte, ‘The King shall rejoice’, 1761; name deleted and that of Cox substituted)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 310 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1762, ‘God of slaughter’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 311 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1762, ‘Go, Flora’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 312 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1763, ‘At length the imperious lord of war’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 313 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1763, ‘Common births’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 315 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1765, ‘Sacred to thee’)

Scola, [Charles], violoncello, double bass:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 b (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761, as cellist)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 322 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1769, ‘Patron of Arts!’ as double bass player)

Scott, [Isabella, née Young], soprano singer:

GB-DRc Ms D15 (Georg Frideric Handel, Esther, mid-eighteenth-century set)


Scovell, tenor violin:


Sharp, John, ? oboe or owner:

GB-DRc Ms. M172 (G. F. Handel, Alexander’s Feast, mid-eighteenth-century set)

Shield, organist[?]:

GB-Lcm Ms 829 (Benjamin Cooke, Te Deum and Jubilate in G, 1780)
Short, principal violoncello:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 114 (William Hayes, ‘Commemoration Ode’)

Simkinson, bass chorus singer:


Simpson, [E. Redmond], oboe:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761; the name is deleted, perhaps indicating the part was later reused)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 314 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1764, ‘To wedded love’)

Smart, F[?], (see also ‘Smartess’), violin 2:

GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused)

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 327 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1772, ‘At length the fleetin g year’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 329 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1773, ‘Wrapt in stole’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. d. 335 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1776, ‘Ye western gales’. The name ‘Smart’ is deleted and replaced with ‘Smartess’ [see below]; it is unclear if they refer to the same player)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 340 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1779, ‘To arms, to arms’)

Smart, Master, alto viola:

GB-Lam MS 27A (Henry Purcell, ‘Genius of England’ from Don Quixote, arrangement by the Academy of Ancient Music, set used 1777-86 at least)

Smartess, violin 2:
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. d. 335 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1776, ‘Ye western gales’)

Smith, [may be ‘Smith LC’ or ‘Smith &C’], canto concertato:

GB-Och Mus. 1085 (G. B. Borri Kyrie and Gloria)

Smith, counter-tenor solo:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. d. 266 b (William Boyce, ‘See fam’d Apollo and the nine’, c.1739)

Smith, [?James], violoncello, ‘basso’

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 136 (Philip Hayes, Te Deum and Jubilate)

GB-Lam MS 27A (Henry Purcell, ‘Genius of England’ from Don Quixote, arrangement by the Academy of Ancient Music, set used 1777-86 at least)

Smith junior, [?James], violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 136 (Philip Hayes, Te Deum and Jubilate)

Smith, Mrs, principal soprano:


Soans (see also ‘Stoans’), violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. 129 (Henry Aldrich, ‘Carminum praeses’)

Soaper, solo bass voice:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 119 b (William Boyce, ‘The King shall rejoice’, version for the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, 1766)

Soderini, [J./Guisepe?], violin 2:

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

Solinus, violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 121 (William Hayes, ‘The Passions’)

Sowery [? perhaps ‘Sperry’], alto ripieno:
GB-Och Mus. 1092 (G. B. Borri Kyrie and Gloria)

Spence, ‘Master’, principal treble:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 129 (Philip Hayes, Prophecy)

Sperry, see ‘Sowery’

Sprong, G., solo treble:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. d. 266 b (William Boyce, ‘See fam’d Apollo and the nine’, c.1739. It is unclear whether this is definitely a name.)

Stainer (see also ‘Stayner), violin 2:


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 a (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761.)

Stayner (see also ‘Stainer’), [?Daniel], violin 1:


Steell, Richard, boy treble:

GB-DRc Ms D15 (Georg Frideric Handel, Esther, mid-eighteenth-century set)

Stoans, violin:

See ‘Soans’ above.

Stockton, viola:


Storace, [Stephen senior], double bass:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 b (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Strada, [Anna], principal soprano:

GB-Lcm Ms 900 (Georg Frideric Handel, Alexander’s Feast, 1736)
GB-Lfom 1280 (Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*, copy set from the Aylesford Collection)

[?]Sweet, John, possibly canto:

GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 31434, fols. 1* and 13-72 (Henry Lawes, songs for five voices)

Teede, oboe:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Terry, [George], violoncello:


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 315 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1765, ‘Sacred to thee’)

Thompson, ‘Joss’, contrabasso:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 121 (William Hayes, ‘The Passions’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 113 c (William Boyce, *Peleus and Thetis*, before 1740)

Thompson, violinist:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 298c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1755, ‘Pierian sisters’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 299c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1756, ‘When Caesar’s natal day’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 300 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1756, ‘Hail, hail, auspicious day’)

Trapp, violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. 129 (Henry Aldrich, ‘Carminum praeses’)

Turner, Miss [Elizabeth], soprano singer:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 113 b (William Boyce, *Peleus and Thetis*, before 1740)

Vale, solo bass voice:
GB-Lcm Ms 826 (Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold, how good and joyful’, 1772, set later reused)

Vandernan, [Thomas], counter-tenor chorus:


Vernon, principal tenor and alto:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 137 (Philip Hayes, *Telemachus*)

GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 30957, fols. 77-78 (Charles Dibdin, chorus ‘Worse than any’ apparently from the burletta ‘He Wou’d if he Could, or an Old Fool Worse Than Any’, 1771)

London, Library and Museum of Freemasonry M/S FIS (John Abraham Fisher, Anthem and Ode for the Opening of the Freemason’s Hall, 1776; mentioned in score only)

Vincent, [Richard], oboe:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761. It is unclear whether the second member of the Vincent family named on the parts is definitely Thomas’s uncle Richard, or another member of the Vincent family. Alternatively, the name might indicate participation by Thomas in another performance, using a different part)

Vincent, [Thomas], oboe:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 300 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1756, ‘Hail, hail, auspicious day’)


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761. The name ‘Vincent’ appears twice, indicating either reuse, or that his uncle Richard Vincent also played on this occasion.)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 314 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1764, ‘To wedded love’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 333 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1775, ‘Ye powers, who rule’)

Vincent, [?Richard], oboe:
Vin[e], Matthew, (trumpet?):

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 133, fol. 140v. (Philip Hayes, ‘Ode on the King’s Visit to Oxford’)

Vinicombe, [Richard], trumpet:

GB-Lam MS 27A (Henry Purcell, ‘Genius of England’ from *Don Quixote*,
arrangement by the Academy of Ancient Music, set used 1777-86 at least)

Walond, [William?], viola:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 121 (William Hayes, ‘The Passions’)

Walsh, [John?], harpsichord continuo:

GB-Lcm Ms 900 (Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*, 1736)

Walton, principal counter-tenor:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 129 (Philip Hayes, *Prophecy*)

Waltz, [Gustavus], bass chorus singer:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 115 b (William Boyce, Anthem for the Funeral of
George II, ‘The souls of the righteous’, 1760)

Ward, [William], bassoon:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of
George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Ward, [John junior], violin 2:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 a (William Boyce, music for the coronation of
George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See
white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

Warren, [Joseph], tenor chorus:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 107a (William Boyce, *The Secular Masque*, c.1746,
parts later reused; Warren’s name is on the solo tenor part of Chronos.)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 308 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1761,
‘Still must the muse’)
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GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 309 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1761, ‘‘Twas at the nectar’d feast’’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 313 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1763, ‘Common births’)

Wass, principal bass voice:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 112 b (William Boyce, Pythian Ode, ‘‘Gentle lyre, begin the strain’, c.1741 reused in a later revival)

GB-Lcm Ms 224/1 (Maurice Greene, Te Deum in D, doctoral submission, Cambridge 1745)

GB-Lfom 2558 (Georg Frideric Handel, Messiah, set of 1759)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 298b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1755, ‘Pierian sisters’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 299b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1756, ‘When Caesar’s natal day’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 301 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1757, ‘While Britain’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 302b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1757, ‘Rejoice, ye Britons’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 304b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1758, ‘When Othbert left’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 305 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1759, ‘Ye guardian powers’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 306b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1759, ‘Begin the song’)

GB-DRc Ms D15 (Georg Frideric Handel, Esther, mid-eighteenth-century set)

Wavery[?], alto concertato:

GB-Och Mus. 1091 (G. B. Borri Kyrie and Gloria)

Webb, principal treble:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 132 (Philip Hayes, ‘Ode on the King’s Visit to Oxford’
GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 134 (Philip Hayes, Te Deum and Jubilate)

Weely, [Samuel], solo bass (sometimes tenor):

GB-Ckc 401 (Maurice Greene, ‘Hearken unto me, ye holy children’, 1728, parts later reused)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 267 b (William Boyce, *David’s Lamentation Over Saul and Jonathan*, 1736, as bass chorus and solo tenor)


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 113 c (William Boyce, *Peleus and Thetis*, before 1740)


Weideman (‘Wiederman’, ‘Wiedaman’), [Carl Friedrich], oboe (flute):

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 c (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761)

Welden[?], tenore ripieno:

GB-Och Mus. 1090 (G. B. Borri Kyrie and Gloria)

Wheatly, bass chorus singer:


Wheeler, bass singer:

GB-DRc MS E23/1-9 (Georg Frideric Handel, ‘Ode for St Cecilia’s Day’, HWV 76)

?Wheeler, boy treble:

GB-DRc Ms D15 (Georg Frideric Handel, *Esther*, mid-eighteenth-century set)

Wheeler, violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 129 (Henry Aldrich, ‘Carminum praeses’)

Wilbye (Withye), violin:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.141 (Edward Lowe, ‘Nunc est canendum’)
Wild, principal tenor:

GB-Lcm Ms 829 (Benjamin Cooke, Te Deum and Jubilate in G, 1780)

Willis, tenor violin:


Wolfe, singer:

GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 30951, f.4r.-6v. (Charles Dibdin, finale of Christmas Gambols)

Wood, tenor chorus; later solo tenor:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 107a (William Boyce, The Secular Masque, c.1746, parts later reused)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. d. 335 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1776, ‘Ye western gales’)


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 339 b (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1778, ‘Arm’d with her native force’, as soloist)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 340 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1779, ‘To arms, to arms’, as soloist)

Wood, violin 1:


Young, [John], violin 2:


Young, Mrs. [Cecilia], principal soprano:

GB-Lcm Ms 900 (Georg Frideric Handel, Alexander’s Feast, 1736)

GB-Lfom 1280 (Georg Frideric Handel, Alexander’s Feast, copy set from the Aylesford Collection)
Zuckhart (Zuckert, Zuckhert), [John Frederick], principal double bass:

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 116 b (William Boyce, music for the coronation of George III and Queen Charlotte, 1761; Zuckhart’s name appears twice, perhaps indicating he also used a part in one of the Three Choirs performances)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 311 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1762, ‘Go, Flora’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 312 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1763, ‘At length the imperious lord of war’)

GB-Ob Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 c (William Boyce, Ode for the Treaty of Paris, ‘See white rob’d Peace’ 1763)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 314 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1764, ‘To wedded love’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 322 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1769, ‘Patron of Arts!’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 329 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1773, ‘Wrapt in stole’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 330 c (William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, 1773, ‘Born for millions’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 334 c (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1776, ‘On the white rocks’)

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 340 b (William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1779, ‘To arms, to arms’)


Appendix B: Two Sample Catalogue Entries

Manuscript

GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. C. 118 a-c

Composer

William Boyce

Contents

‘See white-rob’d peace’ (Ode)

[1]. Allegro, Larghetto, Minuetto
[2]. Recitative Larghetto ‘See white-rob’d Peace’ [tenor]
[3]. [Aria, tenor] Allegro, ‘Where’er her vernal steps are seen’
[4]. Chorus, ‘All nature smiles Serenely’
[5]. Recitative, Vivace, ‘Now mark in that attending train’ [tenor]
[6]. [Arioso, tenor, ‘with Bassoons’ marked against bass], Allegro, ‘See Savage Chiefs’
[7]. Allegro [single section aria, tenor], ‘Tis He’
[8]. [Aria, soprano], Andante assai, ‘I, who from greatness’
[9]. Chorus, Larghetto, ‘Lo thro’ the round of Britain’s Isle’
[10]. Moderato/Recit. [tenor], ‘See Painting, Sculpture’
[11]. [Intro/extended recit, tenor], Andante, ‘With them, behold’/‘Or softly sweeps’
[12]. [Aria, soprano], Allegro, ‘He with my gracious Olive crown’d’
[13]. [Duet S + T, Chorus], Allegro, ‘O be our part’.

Copying date

1763

Occasion

Celebration of the King’s birthday and the Treaty of Paris, 6th June 1763.

In Boyce’s hand on fol. 1 r. of the score:

‘An / ODE / Performed on the Sixth of June 1763 / Before Their Majesties, & the rest of the / Royal Family, in the Garden of the / Queen’s Palace, S’th. James’s Park. / Note, The Performance was in the Ev’ning, and the / Garden was finely illuminated. / The words were wrote by M’r. Mallet- / The music by W. Boyce.’
In Boyce’s hand on 1st leaf of chorus parts (Ms. b): ‘Parts of the Queen’s Ode for 1763 - / Perfect.-’

Location/Venue

The garden of the Queen's Palace, St James’s Park

Full score

Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 a; largely autograph, though fols. 9-10 is by a copyist. Bound in full leather, blind tooled; label on spine reads, ‘QUEEN’S / ODE / 1763’. Upright format.

Vocal Parts (V)

[In Ms Mus. Sch. C. 118 b; transverse format; in original buff paper wrappers, rubric taken from wrapper. All are very clean parts, not altered in any way):

[1]. M’s Scott- [fols. 1-8; soprano. Gives choruses plus numbers 8, 12, 13.]

[2]. M’. Beard [fols. 9-18; tenor; gives numbers 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13. fol. 18v. is labelled, ‘Parts of the Queen’s Ode for 1763 - / Perfect.-’]

[3]. First Treble [fols. 19-20]

[4]. First, Treble, [fols. 21-22]

[5]. Second. Treble. [fols. 23-24]

[6]. Second Treble, [fols. 25-26]

[7]. Countratenor [sic.; fols. 27-28]

[8]. Countratenor [sic.; fols. 29-30]

[9]. Contratenor [fols. 32-32]

[10]. Contratenor [fols. 33-34; corrections on fol. 33r.]
[11]. Tenor, [fols. 35-36]

[12]. Tenor, [fols. 37-38]

[13]. Tenor [fols. 39-40]

[14]. Tenor [fols. 41-42]

[15]. Basso [fols. 43-44]

[16]. Basso [fols. 45-46]

[17]. Basso [fols. 47-48]

[18]. Bass [fols. 49-50]

**Total number of solo parts**

2

**Total number of chorus parts**

18 including soloists

**Instrumental Parts**

[In Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 118 c; upright format, in buff paper covers, rubrics from covers or top of first recto where no cover is present. Clean parts, with few alterations, except for the overture which is marked up by Boyce to be engraved as No. 4 of *Twelve Overtures* (1770).]

[1]. First Trumpet. Tromba Primo [fol. 51 (the first leaf is numbered 1-51). No cover.]

[2]. Second Trumpet. Tromba Secondo [fol. 52. No cover.]

[4]. First Horn [fols. 54-60; fol. 55v. is headed, ‘First Horn Corno Primo’; uses G and D Horns]

[5]. Second Horn [fols. 61-67; fol. 62v. is headed, ‘Second Horn Corno Secondo’; uses G and D Horns]

[6]. First Hautboy [fols. 68-71; includes ‘German Flute’ part; marked ‘H 1.’ on fol. 69r.]

[7]. Second Hautboy [fols. 72-75; includes ‘German Flute’ part; marked ‘H 2.’ on fol. 73r.]

[8]. First Violin. / Mess.rs Hackwood / & / Reeves [fols. 76-87]

[9]. First Violin / Mess.rs Baumgarten / & / Falco [fols. 88-99]

[10]. First Violin / Mess.rs Nöferi / & / Pinto Junf. [fols. 100-111; ‘3’ added in pencil to clarify time signature, fol. 105r.]

[11]. Second Violin / Mess.rs Agus / & / Soderini [fols. 124-137. Paste-down correction on fol. 126v.; fols. 128-129 were originally stuck together with sealing wax to cover a movement that had been partially copied twice. There are also corrections on fol. 131v. and fol. 134 is also two leaves stuck together]

[12]. First Violin. / Mess.rs Dubourg / & / Brown [fols. 112-123. ‘3’ added in pencil to emphasise a time change on fol. 117r. Headed ‘First Violin Violino Primo’ on fol. 119r.]

[13]. Second Violin / Mess.rs Richards / & / Courtup [fols. 138-150; fols. 142-143 are stuck together with sealing wax. The overture is bound as the second-last folio in the wrapper, in the middle of the final chorus]

[14]. Second Violin / Mess.rs Ward / & / Smart [fols. 151-162; corrections on fol. 160r. and v.]

[15]. Second Violin / Mess.rs Pinto / & / Froud [fols. 163-174; pencil dynamics added on fols. 171v. – 172r.; headed ‘Violino Secondo’ on fol. 164r. and v.]
[16]. Tenor. Viol. [fols. 175-186; fol. 176 is headed ‘Tenor Viol Viola’. fol. 179 is two leaves stuck together.]

[17]. Tenor Viol. [fols. 187-198.]

[18]. Bassoon. [fols. 199-205; unfigured. Corrections (ink/overwriting) to fol. 200 v.]

[19]. Bassoon. [fols. 206-212; unfigured. Corrections (ink/overwriting) to fol. 207 r.]

[20]. Violoncello. [fols. 213-224; unfigured, though figures have been written above the Larghetto of the Symphony, and then erased.]

[21]. Violoncello. / Gillier [name in pencil - not Boyce’s hand. fols. 225-236; unfigured. fol. 231r. has a bar scored out in pencil and then corrected with ‘play this’ underneath in ink.]

[22]. Double Bass. [fols. 237-248; unfigured.]

[23]. Double Bass. / M' Zuckert [name in pencil. fols. 249-260; unfigured. fol. 257 is two leaves stuck together with sealing wax.]

[24]. Double Bass. [fols. 261-272; unfigured.]

[25]. Harpsichord. [sic.; fols. 273-284; labelled ‘Basso’ inside on fol. 274 r.; figured.]

All bass parts including the harpsichord are two-stave score during the recitatives and single-stave otherwise.

Total number of string parts

15 (4:4:2:5)

Total number of wind parts
8 (2 tpt; 2 hn; 2 ob inc. fl; 2 bsn)

**Simultaneous flutes and oboes**

- 

**Total number and type of bass parts**

8 (2 bsn; 2 vc; 3 cb; 1 hps)

**Organ part**

- 

**Named instrumentalists**

Hackwood [violin 1]

Reeves [violin 1]

Baumgarten [violin 1]

Falco [violin 1]

Noferi [violin 1]

Pinto Junr. [violin 1]

Agus [violin 2]

Soderini [violin 2]

Dubourg [violin 1]

Brown [violin 1]

Richards [violin 2]

Courtup [violin 2]

Ward [violin 2]

Smart [violin 2]

Pinto [violin 2]

Froud [violin 2]

Gillier [cello; not B's hand]
Mr. Zuckert [double bass]

Named Singers

Mrs. Scott [soprano]

Mr Beard [tenor]

List of Parts/Names

-

Hands

-

Notes

-

Provenance of Mss

William Boyce, Hannah Boyce, Philip Hayes, Oxford Music School. Dates of transfer from Hannah Boyce to Hayes and to the Music School are not known.

Secondary literature

Bartlett and Bruce *Tercentenary Sourcebook*, 162-3.

Manuscript


Composer

William Boyce

Contents

Anthem ‘The King shall rejoice’ (3rd version)
[1]. Allegro [chorus] ‘The King shall rejoice’/Verse (alto and bass, Rev. Clark and Soaper) ‘Thou hast giv’n him his heart’s desire’/chorus, ‘The King shall rejoice’ [earlier version re-used]
[2]. Andante [contratenor aria, Rev. Clark], ‘Blessed is the man’
[3]. Moderato [bass aria, Soaper], ‘His seed shall be mighty’
[4]. Recitative [unnamed tenor], ‘Unto the godly’
[5]. Largo [trio CT T B, Dyne, unknown, Bellamy], ‘A good man is merciful’
[6]. Larghetto [CT aria, Mr Dyne], ‘Riches and plenteousness’
[7]. Chorus, Adagio ‘The merciful goodness of the Lord’.
[8]. Allegro [chorus], ‘Lo! Thus shall they be blessed.’ [reused from the wedding anthem.]

Copying date

1766

Occasion

Festival of Sons of the Clergy, 1st performance, April 22, 1766.

Reused every year until 1770, but not afterwards.

Location /Venue

St Paul’s Cathedral

Full score

1. Incomplete autograph: Lcm Ms 585, fols. 44-64.
2. Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 119 a; copyist. In Boyce’s hand on fol. 1 r: ‘This Anthem was performed / at S'l. Paul’s, for the First time, on / April 22d. 1766-’. Bound in full leather.

Vocal Parts (V)

[In Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 119 b; transverse format, in buff paper covers, rubric taken from cover unless specified otherwise. Most in the hand of a copyist with similarities to Boyce’s autograph.]

[1]. The King shall rejoice - New Anthem / Anthem / First Treble [fols. 1-5; numbered ‘4’ inside on fol. 2 r., top corner.]

[2]. Anthem / First Treble [fols. 6-10; numbered ‘3’ inside on fol. 7 r., top corner.]
[3]. Reynard [name in pencil on top left corner] / Anthem / First Treble [fols. 11-15; numbered ‘1’ inside on fol. 12 r., top corner.]

[4]. Anthem / First Treble [fols. 16-20; numbered ‘2’ inside on fol. 17 r., top corner.]

[5]. Anthem / Second Treble [fols. 21-25; what looks like ‘1 folder is score book’ is written sideways on fol. 25 v.]

[6]. Anthem / Second Treble [fols. 26-30; numbered ‘3’ inside on fol. 22 r., top corner.]

[7]. Anthem / Second Treble [fols. 31-35; numbered ‘4’ inside on fol. 27 r., top corner.]

[8]. Anthem / Second Treble [fols. 36-40; numbered ‘1’ inside on fol. 32 r., top corner.]

[9]. M. Dyne. / Anthem / Verse Contratenor [fols. 41-46. Gives the choruses and the solo part in the trio. fol. 42 r. is headed ‘Anthem Contratenor 1’].

[10]. Rev. Mr Maxey at Hereford College [small writing] / To / The Rev. Mr [?] Mence [?or Mince?] / Mr Dyne. / Anthem. / Verse Contratenor [fols. 47-53. Gives the choruses and the aria, ‘Riches and plenteousness’. fol. 48 r. is headed ‘Anthem Contratenor 2’. The reverse cover, fol. 53 v., is inscribed ‘Rev. M. Maxey’]

[11]. Anthem / Verse Contratenor / Rev. M’. Clark [fols. 54-61; fol. 55 r. is headed ‘Anthem Contratenor’. Includes the choruses, the duet verse in the first chorus, the aria ‘Blessed is the man’ (inscribed ‘Accompanied with a principal Hautboy.’ on fol. 57 v.); the reverse cover, fol. 61 v., is also marked ‘Clark’].

[12]. Anthem / Contratenor [fols. 62-66; fol. 63 r. is headed ‘Anthem Contratenor 3’].

[13]. Anthem / Contratenor [fols. 67-71; fol. 68 r. is headed ‘Anthem Contratenor 5’. Something deleted on fol. 71 v.: ‘[name?] / Violino Primo’].
[14]. Anthem / Contratenor [fols. 72-76; no number.]

[15]. Anthem / Verse Tenor [fols. 77-82; numbered ‘Tenor 1’ inside on fol. 78 r., top corner; gives solo recitative, ‘Unto the godly’, and solo part in the trio.]

[16]. Anthem / Tenor [fols. 83-86; numbered ‘Tenor 6’ inside on fol. 84 r., top corner.]

[17]. Anthem / Tenor [fols. 87-90; numbered ‘Tenor 4’ inside on fol. 88 r., top corner.]

[18]. Anthem / Tenor [fols. 91-94; numbered ‘Tenor 2’ inside on fol. 92 r., top corner.]

[19]. Anthem / Tenor [fols. 95-98; numbered ‘Tenor 7’ inside on fol. 96 r., top corner.]

[20]. Anthem / Tenor [fols. 99-102; numbered ‘Tenor 5’ inside on fol. 100 r., top corner.]

[21]. Anthem / Tenor [fols. 103-106; numbered ‘Tenor 3’ inside on fol. 104 r., top corner.]

[22]. Anthem / Verse Bass / M’. Soaper [fols. 107-114; numbered ‘Bass 7’ inside on fol. 108 r., top corner. ‘Soaper’ is also marked on fol. 114 v. Gives the duet verse, and the aria, ‘His seed shall be mighty’.]

[23]. M’. Bellamy / Anthem / Verse Bass [fols. 115-120; numbered ‘Bass 1’ inside on fol. 116 r., top corner. Gives the bass part of the trio.]

[24]. Anthem / Bass [fols. 121-124; numbered ‘3’ inside on fol. 122 r., top corner.]

[25]. [Something erased, ?title of anthem and then ‘Parts & Score’] / Anthem / Bass [fols. 125-128; numbered ‘Bass 2’ inside on fol. 126 r., top corner.]
[26]. Anthem / Bass [fols. 129-132; numbered ‘Bass 5’ inside on fol. 130 r., top corner.]

[27]. Anthem / Bass [fols. 133-136; numbered ‘Bass 6’ inside on fol. 134 r., top corner.]

[28]. Anthem / Bass. [fols. 137-140; numbered ‘4’ inside on fol. 138 r., top corner.]

**Total number of solo parts**

5

**Total number of chorus parts**

29 inc. soloists

**Instrumental Parts (I)**

[The following is in Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 119 b]:

[1]. Organo. / The King shall Rejoyce / in C. [fols. 141-148; figured; two-stave. This is actually the wedding anthem setting. Not autograph.]

[The following are in Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 119 c; upright format, in buff paper covers, rubric taken from cover or from top of first recto where no cover present. Mostly in copyists’ hands (B5 and same copyist as vocal parts). The parts are all numbered internally as well as on the covers, usually on the top corner of the first inside page. The copies are very clean, with few or no corrections.]

[2]. Drum [fol. 1; no cover. Rest bars marked in both ink and pencil]

[3]. First Trumpet [fol. 2; no cover.]

[4]. Second Trumpet [fols. 3-4; no cover. fol. 4 is stitched on to fol. 3, i.e., fols. 3 v. – 4 r. cannot be read.]

[5]. First Hautboy / No. 1. [fols. 5-10; solos marked ‘For one Hautboy only’ (fol. 7 v.) and ‘For One German Flute only’ (fol. 8 v.); ‘German Flute’ part included.]
[6]. First Hautboy / N°. 2. [fols. 11-15.]

[7]. Second Hautboy / N°. 1. [fols. 16-20.]

[8]. Second Hautboy / No. 2. [fols. 21-25.]

[9]. First Violin / N°. 1. [fols. 26-32.]

[10]. First Violin / N°. 2. [fols. 33-39.]


[12]. First Violin / N°. 4. [fols. 47-53.]

[13]. First Violin / N°. 5. [fols. 54-60.]

[14]. First Violin / N°. 6. [fols. 61-67.]

[15]. Second Violin / N°. 1. [fols. 68-74.]

[16]. Second Violin / N°. 2. [fols. 75-81.]

[17]. Second Violin / N°. 3. [fols. 82-88.]

[18]. Second Violin / N°. 4. [fols. 89-95.]

[19]. Second Violin / N°. 5. [fols. 96-102.]

[20]. Second Violin / N°. 6. [fols. 103-109.]

[21]. Tenor Viol / N°. 1. [fols. 110-116.]
[22]. Tenor Viol / N° 2. [fols. 117-123.]

[23]. Tenor Viol / N° 3. [fols. 124-130.]

[24]. Bassoon / N° 1. [fols. 131-135; unfigured.]

[25]. Bassoon / N° 2. [fols. 136-140; unfigured.]

[26]. Bassoon / N° 3. [fols. 141-145; dated ‘22.1.66’ with initials (?) in front, fol. 142 r., top left corner. Unfigured.]

[27]. Violoncello / N° 1. [fols. 146-153; unfigured.]

[28]. Violoncello / N° 2. [fols. 154-161; unfigured.]

[29]. Double Bass / N° 1. [fols. 162-169; unfigured.]

[30]. Double Bass / N° 2. [fols. 170-177; unfigured.]

[31]. Double Bass / N° 3. [fols. 178-185; unfigured.]

[32]. Double Bass / N° 4. [fols. 186-193; unfigured.]

Total number of string parts
21 (6:6:3:2:4)

Total number of wind parts
9 (2 tpt; 2 ob1; 2 ob2; 3 bsn).

Simultaneous flutes and oboes
-

Total number and type of bass parts
9 (3 bsn; 2 vc; 4 db).
Organ part

- 

Named instrumentalists

- 

Named singers

Reynard [treble]

Mr Dyne [counter-tenor soloist]

Revd. Mr Maxey at Hereford College [on 2 counter-tenor parts, but not clear if he sang]

Revd. Mr [?]Mence [counter-tenor; sideways on and hard to read]

Mr Dyne [solo counter-tenor]

Revd. Mr. Clark [counter-tenor]

Mr. Soaper [bass soloist]

Mr Bellamy [bass soloist]

List of parts/names

None, but parts are numbered throughout and seem to be complete, and are numbered internally as well as externally.

Hands

B5 appears in instrumental parts

2 others, one with similarities to William Boyce. It is incorrect that this is Boyce’s autograph, as stated in Van Nice, ‘The Larger Sacred Choral Works’.

Notes

The organ part does not belong to this version, but is a transposed version of the Wedding Anthem organ part.

Provenance

William Boyce, Hannah Boyce, Philip Hayes, Oxford Music School. Dates of transfer from Hannah Boyce to Hayes and to the Music School are not known.

Secondary literature
Bartlett and Bruce *Tercentenary Sourcebook* (pp.179-80).

Range, ‘William Boyce’s Anthem for the Wedding’

Van Nice, ‘The Larger Sacred Choral Works’ (pp.86-88)

*Two Anthems for the Georgian Court* ed. Van Nice, Vol. 2.
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Manuscript Scores and Continuo Scores


D-Ha MA / 185: Georg Frideric Handel, Sosarme.
D-Ha MA / 189: Georg Frideric Handel, Venceslao (pasticcio).
D-Ha MA / 1000: Georg Frideric Handel, Alessandro Severo.
D-Ha MA / 1005: Georg Frideric Handel, Arianna.
D-Ha MA / 1005a: Georg Frideric Handel, Arianna.
D-Ha MA / 1006: Georg Frideric Handel, Ariodante.
D-Ha MA / 1006a: Georg Frideric Handel, Ariodante.
D-Ha MA / 1015: Georg Frideric Handel, Ezio.
D-Ha MA / 1018: Georg Frideric Handel, Floridante.
D-Ha MA / 1024: Georg Frideric Handel, Jephtha.
D-Ha MA / 1025: Georg Frideric Handel, Joseph.
D-Ha MA / 1031: Georg Frideric Handel, ‘Ode for St Cecilia’s Day’.
D-Ha MA / 1034: Georg Frideric Handel, Oreste (pasticcio).
D-Ha MA / 1034a: Georg Frideric Handel, Oreste (pasticcio).
D-Ha MA / 1036: Georg Frideric Handel, Ormisda.
D-Ha MA 1038a: Georg Frideric Handel, Il Parnasso in Festa.
D-Ha MA / 1039: Georg Frideric Handel, Partenope.
D-Ha MA / 1040: Georg Frideric Handel, Partenope.
D-Ha MA / 1042: Georg Frideric Handel, Poro.
D-Ha MA / 1042a: Georg Frideric Handel, Poro.
D-Ha MA / 1046: Georg Frideric Handel, Rinaldo.
D-Ha MA / 1046a: Georg Frideric Handel, Rinaldo.
D-Ha MA / 1052a: Georg Frideric Handel, *Serse*.
D-Ha MC / 265: Georg Frideric Handel, ‘Ode for the Birthday of Queen Anne’.
D-Ha MC / 266: Georg Frideric Handel, Wedding Anthem for Princess Anne.
GB-DRc MS A24: Georg Frideric Handel, *Joshua*.
GB-DRc MS A32: Georg Frideric Handel, Dettingen Te Deum and ‘The King shall rejoice’.
GB-Lam Ms. 114: Thomas Augustine Arne, *Comus*.
GB-Lbl R.M.19.c.10: George Frideric Handel, continuo score for Act I of *Floridante*.
GB-Lcm Ms 585, fols. 44-64, William Boyce, ‘The King shall rejoice’ (version for the Sons of the Clergy, partial score).
GB-Lfom 330: Georg Frideric Handel, Anthem for the Foundling Hospital (HWV 268); ‘O sing unto the Lord a new song’ (HWV 249b); ‘O be joyful in the Lord’ (HWV 246).

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.44/21, fols. 146-147: Matthew Locke, Gloria.

GB-Och Mus. 19, pp. 157-162: Henry Aldrich, ‘I will exalt thee’

GB-Och Ms Mus 37 (pp.25-58): Richard Goodson junior, ‘Festo quid potius’.

GB-Och Mus 619, fols. 12-15: Henry Aldrich, ‘Revixit io Carolus’

GB-Och Mus 619, fols. 28-30: Sampson Estwick, ‘O Maria, o diva’.

GB-Och Mus 764, fols. 1-10: Johannes Rosenmueller, ‘Miserere’

GB-Och Mus 865A, fols. 1-6: ‘Dialogue between ye Angels and Shepherds at Christ’s Birth’.

GB-Och Mus. 619, fols. 6-11: Henry Aldrich/Giacomo Carissimi, ‘Iam satis somno’.

GB-Och Mus. 619, fols. 31-32: Sampson Estwick, ‘Io triumphe’/Julio festas’.


GB-Och Mus 1142B, fols. 56-57: Richard Goodson, ‘With eager hast’.

GB-Och Mus 1142 b, fols. 46-9: Richard Goodson junior, ‘Festo quid potius’.

*Manuscript Sets of Parts, Partial Sets and Individual Parts*

GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 123-126: George Frideric Handel, *L’Allegro, il Penseroso ed il Moderato* HWV 55

GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 127-161: George Frideric Handel, Coronation Anthems: ‘Let thy hand be strengthened’, HWV 259; ‘My heart is inditing’, HWV 261; ‘The King shall rejoice’, HWV 260; ‘Zadok the priest’, HWV 258


GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 194-224: George Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast* HWV 75;
Judas Maccabeus, HWV 63; Henry Purcell, Te Deum and Jubilate in D (Z 232).

GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 566-568: Maurice Greene, ‘Acquaint thyself with God’

GB-Bu Shaw-Hellier 576: Henry Purcell, Te Deum in D (Z 232), timpani part.


GB-Ckc 401: Maurice Greene, ‘Hearken unto me, ye holy children’.


GB-CFm MU.MS.259, pp. 55-58: Georg Frideric Handel, harp part for ‘Hark, he strikes the golden lyre’ from Alexander Balus


GB-CFm MU.MS.263, pp. 77-78: Georg Frideric Handel, Corno 2do part for two marches, from Judas Maccabeus

GB-CFm MU.MS.265, pp. 13-14, 53-60 and 61-66: Georg Frideric Handel, fragments of parts.

GB-CFm MU.MS.685: Henry Purcell/Archangelo Corelli, ‘Welcome to all the pleasures’.

GB-DRc MS D7: Georg Frideric Handel, Dettingen Te Deum and ‘The King shall rejoice’.

GB-DRc Ms D8: Georg Frideric Handel, Joshua.

GB-DRc Ms D15: Georg Frideric Handel, Esther.

GB-DRc MS E20 (i)-(iii): Georg Frideric Handel, Alexander’s Feast.

GB-DRc MS E23/1-9: Georg Frideric Handel, Ode to St Cecilia’s Day.

GB-DRc MS E25 (xix): Georg Frideric Handel, ‘Zadok the priest’ (2nd tromba part).

GB-DRc MS E26(ii): Georg Frideric Handel, Aci, Galatea e Polifemo

GB-DRc E26 (iii): Georg Frideric Handel, Acis and Galatea.

GB-DRc MS E26 (v)/1-3: Georg Frideric Handel, ‘As pants the hart’.

GB-DRc MS E28/1-4: Georg Frideric Handel, ‘O come let us sing’.

GB-DRc Ms. E35(iii): Georg Frideric Handel, excerpts from Esther.
GB-DRc Ms E35 (i): Georg Frideric Handel, ‘The ways of Zion’


GB-Lam MS 25A: Henry Purcell, *Dido and Aeneas*.


GB-Lam MS 27D: Henry Purcell, ‘Mask in Oedipus’.

GB-Lam MS 27E: Henry Purcell, Te Deum and Jubilate.

GB-Lam MS 27Q: Viola part to ‘tell me, lovely shepherd, where’ from *Solomon*.

GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 27745 (i. 408): George Frideric Handel, organ part for the Dettingen Te Deum (HWV 283) and Jubilate (HWV279).

GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 30951, fol.4r.-6v.: Charles Dibdin, single part for the finale of *Christmas Gambols*.

GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 30957, fols. 77-8: Charles Dibdin, ‘Worse than any’.

GB-Lbl Add. MS. 31400: Giovanni Battista Borri: ‘Miserere a 8’

GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 31434, fols. 1-72,: Henry Lawes, five-part songs.

GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 31436, fols. 118-149v.: string parts for an anonymous early-eighteenth-century *pasticcio*, containing music by Johann Christoph Pepusch.

GB-Lbl Add. MS. 31476, fols. 48-53: Carmine Giordano, Credo.


GB-Lbl Add. MS. 32436, fols. 3-16.: ?Predieri, ‘Domine ad adjuvandum’.

GB-Lbl Add. Ms. 34267B, fols. 12-24:


GB-Lbl Add. MS. 37027, fols. 56-57: vocal part for Henry Purcell, ‘Sacrifice in the Royal Convert’ (from *The Indian Queen*).


GB-Lbl Harl. 7337: Thomas, Tudway, ‘A Collection of the most celebrated services and anthems used in the Church of England from the Reformation to the Restoration of K. Charles II’.


GB-Lbl R.M. 18. b. 6: George Frideric Handel, string parts for *Ariodante* and *Alcina*.

GB-Lbl RM 18 b.5, fols. 1-4: George Frideric Handel, tromba terza part for *Rinaldo* and *Judas Maccabaeus*.

GB-Lbl R.M 19.a.1, fols.90-110v.: George Frideric Handel, organ part for *Alexander’s Feast*.

GB-Lbl R. M. 19.a.9: George Frideric Handel, two vocal parts for *Hercules*.

GB-Lbl R.M19.a.10: George Frideric Handel, organ part for *Alexander’s Feast*.

GB-Lbl R. M. 19.a 11: George Frideric Handel, canto secondo part for *Hercules* and the Dettingen Te Deum.

GB-Lbl RM.19.b.1: George Frideric Handel, vocal parts for *L’Allegro, il Penseroso ed il Moderato*.

GB-Lbl RM.19.b.2: George Frideric Handel, vocal parts for *Esther*.

GB-Lbl RM 19 b 3: George Frideric Handel, vocal parts for *Semele*.

GB-Lbl R.M. 19 b.4: George Frideric Handel, ‘Miserere’.

GB-Lbl R.M. 19 d.1: George Frideric Handel, partial keyboard part for *Messiah*.

GB-Lbl RM 19 e 5: George Frideric Handel, three instrumental parts for *Il Trionfo del Tempo e della Verita* (1737 version).

GB-Lbl RM.19.e.10: George Frideric Handel, instrumental parts for *L’Allegro, il Penseroso ed il Moderato*, *Esther* and *Semele*.

GB-Lcm Ms. 224: Maurice Greene, Te Deum.

GB-Lcm Ms 227: Maurice Greene, *Florimel*.

GB-Lcm Ms. 736: P. Albergati, ‘Laudate dominum’.

GB-Lcm Ms. 801: Giovanni Paolo Colonna, ‘Messa concertata’.

GB-Lcm Ms 826: Benjamin Cooke, ‘Behold how good and joyful’.

GB-Lcm Ms 827: Benjamin Cooke, Magnificat and Nunc dimittis in G.

GB-Lcm Ms 829: Benjamin Cooke, Te Deum and Jubilate.

GB-Lcm Ms 830: Benjamin Cooke, ‘When all thy mercies’.

GB-Lcm Ms 833: Benjamin Cooke, ‘I heard a great voice’.

GB-Lcm Ms 836: William Croft, ‘O give thanks’.

GB-Lcm Ms. 855: F. Durante, Gloria.


GB-Lcm Mss. 975i and 975ii: Johann Christoph Pepusch, *Venus and Adonis*.

GB-Lcm MS 1079: Anon, ‘Ad gaudia mortales’.

GB-Lcm Ms. 1179: Giacomo Carissimi: ‘Confitebor tibi’.

GB-Lcm MS 1183: Anon, ‘Adstabat coram sacro altari’

GB-Lcm Ms. 1192: Anon, ‘Dixit dominus’.


GB-Lcm Ms. 6861: John Ernest Galliard, ‘Mask in Oedipus’.


GB-Lfom 754: Georg Frideric Handel, Anthem for the Foundling Hospital (HWV 268; instrumental parts only); ‘O sing unto the Lord a new song’ (HWV 249b; incomplete set); ‘O be joyful in the Lord’ (HWV 246; instrumental parts only).

GB-Lfom 1254: Georg Frideric Handel, Chandos Anthems and Te Deum.


GB-L: Library and Museum of Freemasonry: John Abraham Fisher, ‘Sound aloud the great Jehovah’s praise’; ‘Behold How good & Joyfull a thing’; ‘Ode Composed for the Opening of the Free Masons Hall, the 23d of May 1776’.

GB-Mcm SC 5: Georg Frideric Handel, Chandos Anthems.

GB-Mcm SC 6: Georg Frideric Handel, *Acis and Galatea*.

GB-Mcm SC 7: Georg Frideric Handel, *Alexander’s Feast*.

GB-Mcm SC 8: Georg Frideric Handel, *Athalia*.


GB-Mcm SC 14: Georg Frideric Handel, *Saul*.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. C. 33-4: James Harris and others (pasticcio), ‘Mr Harris’s Te Deum and Jubilate’.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D.104-112: James Harris and others (pasticcio), ‘Mr Harris’s Te Deum and Jubilate’.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. D. 140-141: John Alcock, ‘We will rejoice’.

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. FOL. 29: William Davis, ‘What mighty joys’ (chorus from ‘Assist you mighty sons of art’).


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 17, fols. 4-5r: John Blow, ‘Awake my lyre’.


GB-Ob Mss. Mus. Sch. C. 108 a-c: John Alcock, ‘The ways of Zion do mourn’ and ‘Blessed is he that feareth the Lord’.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.121: Henry Aldrich, Britannia (‘Dum mosa torpet’).


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 138, fols. 5-20: Christopher Gibbons, Act Sequence including ‘Laudate dominum’ and dances.

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.139: Christopher Gibbons, ‘Not unto us’.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C.142: Anon, ‘Come with our voices’.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. C. 204: various loose parts for sacred music, including Carissimi’s Jephté and an anonymous concerted motet, ‘Quam dulcis es’.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 300 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the New Year 1756, No. 3, ‘Hail, hail, auspicious day’


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 302 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday 1757, No. 5, ‘Rejoice, ye Britons’

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 303 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the New Year 1758, No. 6, ‘Behold, the circle forms’.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 306 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday 1759, No. 9, ‘Begin the Song. – ye Subject Quires’.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 309 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday 1761, No.12, ‘Twas at the nectar’d Feast’.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 315 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1765, No. 18, ‘Sacred to Thee’.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 318 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, No. 21, 1766, ‘Hail to the Man’.

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 319 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, No. 22, 1767 ‘Friend to the Poor’.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 321 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, No. 24, 1768, ‘Prepare your Songs of praise’

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 322 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, No. 25, 1769, ‘Patron of Arts!’.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 324 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, No. 27, 1770, ‘Discord, hence!’

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 326 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, No. 29, 1771, ‘Long did the churlish East’.


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 328 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, No. 31, 1772, ‘From scenes of death’


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 331 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the New Year, 1774, No. 34, ‘Pass but a few short fleeting years’.

GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 332 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, No. 35, 1774, ‘Hark! Or does the Muse’s Ear’


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 335 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, No. 38, 1776, ‘Ye Western Gales’


GB-Ob Ms. Mus. Sch. D. 337 a-c: William Boyce, Ode for the King’s Birthday, No. 40, 1777, ‘Driven out from Heav’n’s etherial domes’


GB-Och Mus 68-75: Giovanni Battista Borri, Giovanni Battista Borri, ‘Messa a 4’: Kyrie, Gloria; ‘Messa a 5: Credo’.


GB-Och Mus. 91, reverse sequence, fols. 27-22: Francis Pigott, ‘Saul and the Witch of Endor’ and other dialogues.

GB-Och Mus 527-30 Giovanni Battista Borri, ‘Messa a 4’: Kyrie, Gloria; ‘Messa a 5: Credo’.

GB-Och Mus. 687: Johannes Rosenmueller, ‘Miserere’.

GB-Och Mus 1024 Giovanni Battista Borri, ‘Messa a 4’: Kyrie, Gloria; ‘Messa a 5: Credo’.


GB-Och Mus 1127: Henry Aldrich, ‘Conveniunt doctae sorores’.

GB-Och Mus. 1141a, fols. 8-9: Richard Goodson junior, ‘Festo Quid Potius’.

GB-Och Mus. 1141a, fol. 48: Georg Frideric Handel, transposed oboe part for ‘I will magnify thee’.

GB-Och Mus. 1141b, fols. 90-93: Richard Goodson junior, ‘Festo Quid Potius’.

GB-Och Mus 1141B, fols. 101 – 110: John Blow, Gesta Britannica.

GB-Och Mus 1142A, fols. 32-33: Richard Goodson: ‘With eager hast’.

GB-Och Mus 1142B, fols 52-53: John Blow, Gesta Britannica.

GB-Och Mus. 1142B, fols. 54-55: Anon., unidentified ode.


GB-Och Mus. 1142b, fol. 64: Richard Goodson junior, ‘Festo Quid Potius’.

GB-Och Mus. 1154:

GB-Och Mus 1162-71: Giovanni Battista Borri, ‘Messa a 5: Credo’.

GB-Och Ms. Mus. 1188-9, fols. 1-14: Matthew Locke, ‘O be joyful’.

GB-Och Mus. 1188-9, fols. 42-5: Henry Purcell, ‘My song shall be alway’.

GB-Och Mus 1203A-D: John Blow, Service in E Minor.

GB-Och Mus. 1211: Francis Pigott, ‘Saul and the Witch of Endor’ and other dialogues.

GB-Och Mus 1219 (I-T): Richard Goodson, ‘Rejoice in the Lord’.

GB-T MS 1278: Henry Purcell, The Indian Queen, bass part.

GB-Y M35 /13s: Giacomo Carissimi, ‘Tollite sancti mei’ (Martyres),

GB-Y M35 S/11: Giacomo Carissimi, ‘Summi regis puerpera’

GB-Y M41: Agostino Steffani, ‘Sonitus armorum’

D-DS Mus. Ms. 444/26: Christoph Graupner, ‘Es ist eine Stimme eines Predigers’

D-DS Mus. Ms. 429/25: Christoph Graupner, ‘Gott ist Zeuge über alle’