

Musical Creativity in Restoration England

Musical Creativity in Restoration England is the first comprehensive investigation of approaches to creating music in late seventeenth-century England. Understanding creativity during this period is particularly challenging because many of our basic assumptions about composition – such as concepts of originality, inspiration and genius – were not yet fully developed. In adopting a new methodology that takes into account the historical contexts in which sources were produced, Rebecca Herissone challenges current assumptions about compositional processes and offers new interpretations of the relationships between notation, performance, improvisation and musical memory. She uncovers a creative culture that was predominantly communal, and reveals several distinct approaches to composition, determined not by individuals, but by the practical function of the music. Herissone's new and original interpretations pose a fundamental challenge to our preconceptions about what it meant to be a composer in the seventeenth century and raise broader questions about the interpretation of early modern notation.

REBECCA HERISSONE was educated at the University of Cambridge and is Senior Lecturer in Musicology and Head of Music at the University of Manchester. She is the author of *Music Theory in Seventeenth-Century England* (2000) and *'To Fill, Forbear, or Adorne': The Organ Accompaniment of Restoration Sacred Music* (2006). She has also produced a critical edition of the treatise *Synopsis of Vocal Musick* (2006), and edited and contributed to *The Ashgate Research Companion to Henry Purcell* (2012). Recent journal articles have appeared in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society* and the *Journal of Musicology*, and her article for *Music & Letters* on the scoring of Purcell's *Come ye Sons of Art* won the Westrup Prize for 2007. She is now a co-editor of the journal. She has written extensively on approaches to composition in late seventeenth-century English music.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-01434-3 - Musical Creativity in Restoration England
Rebecca Herissone
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-01434-3 - Musical Creativity in Restoration England
Rebecca Herissone
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Musical Creativity in Restoration England

REBECCA HERRISSONE
University of Manchester



Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-01434-3 - Musical Creativity in Restoration England
Rebecca Herissone
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University’s mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of
education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107014343

© Rebecca Herissone 2013

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2013

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Herissone, Rebecca.

Musical creativity in restoration England / Rebecca Herissone.

pages cm

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-01434-3

1. Music – England – 17th century – History and criticism. 2. Composition
(Music) – History – 17th century. I. Title.

ML286.2.H47 2013

780.942’09032–dc23

2013008968

ISBN 978-1-107-01434-3 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of
URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication,
and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain,
accurate or appropriate.

Contents

List of figures [page vi]
List of music examples [x]
List of tables [xv]
Preface [xvii]
Editorial method [xxv]
List of abbreviations [xxviii]

PART I CREATIVE CONTEXTS AND PRINCIPLES [1]

1 Imitation, originality and authorship [3]
2 Sources and their functions [61]

PART II CREATIVE STRATEGIES [117]

3 ‘Ye fowle Originall in score’: initial invention and the functions of notation [119]
4 ‘I have here sent ye full Anthems’: transmission and the culture of serial recomposition [209]
5 ‘For Seaverall Friends’: consort music and the study of musical texts [260]
6 ‘His mind be filled with the materiall’: arrangement, improvisation and the role of memory [315]

Bibliography [392]
Index of manuscripts [412]
Index of musical works [416]
General index [420]

Figures

- 2.1 End of the opening three-part verse of Purcell's *The Lord is my Light*; Bu 5001, fol. 147r. Reproduced by permission of the Trustees of the Barber Institute of Fine Arts [page 64]
- 2.2 End of the opening three-part verse of Purcell's *The Lord is my Light*; Lbl R.M. 20.h.8, fol. 23r. Reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board. All rights reserved [65]
- 2.3 John Playford's hand in Lcm 871, treble partbook, fol. 2v. Reproduced by permission of the Royal College of Music [86]
- 3.1 Poor spacing in third ritornello of Cooke's *Come we Shepherds*; Bu 5001, fols. 16v–17r. Reproduced by permission of the Trustees of the Barber Institute of Fine Arts [124]
- 3.2 Space for fourth ritornello left unfilled in Cooke's *Come we Shepherds*, also showing fifth ritornello; Bu 5001, fols. 17v–18r. Reproduced by permission of the Trustees of the Barber Institute of Fine Arts [125]
- 3.3 Extract from 'Hark each tree', in Henry Purcell's *Hail! Bright Cecilia*, showing poor spacing and alterations to instrumental parts; Ob Mus.c.26, fol. 35v. Reproduced by permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford [128]
- 3.4 First ritornello in the opening chorus of *Hail! Bright Cecilia*, showing alterations; Ob Mus.c.26, fol. 28v. Reproduced by permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford [129]
- 3.5 Added instrumental parts in bass solo in Blow's *Appear in all thy Pomp*; Lcm 776, fol. 10v. Reproduced by permission of the Royal College of Music [130]
- 3.6 'Behold great princess' from Daniel Purcell's *Again the Welcome*, showing string parts and continuo part (from b. 2) in the hand of Daniel Purcell, with clefs and vocal parts in the hand of London E; Lbl Add. 30934, fol. 44r. Reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board. All rights reserved [136]
- 3.7 Henry Purcell's alterations to instrumental parts in the chorus 'To Caesar all hail' in *Sound the Trumpet*; Lbl R.M. 20.h.8, fol. 136v.

- Reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board.
 All rights reserved [152]
- 3.8 Three-part writing in Locke's curtain tune to *Cupid and Death*, preceded by music for treble and bass only; Lbl Add. 17799, fol. 3v. Reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board. All rights reserved [160]
- 3.9 Copying error suggesting initial absence of second violin in the second 'synfony' in Cooke's *Good Morrow to the Year*; Bu 5001, fol. 7v. Reproduced by permission of the Trustees of the Barber Institute of Fine Arts [163]
- 3.10 Henry Purcell, altered details in second movement of Suite in G; Lbl Add. 30930, fol. 53v (inv.). Reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board. All rights reserved [165]
- 3.11 Fourth Act Tune from *The Fairy Queen* copied by Henry Purcell (outer parts) and FQ2 (inner parts); Lam 3, fol. 81v. Reproduced by permission of the Royal Academy of Music [167]
- 3.12 Erasures in the copying of FQ2 in Chaconne from *The Fairy Queen*; Lam 3, fol. 165v (inv.). Reproduced by permission of the Royal Academy of Music [169]
- 3.13 George Jeffreys's outline for the opening platform of a Fantazia a 6; Lbl Add. 10338, p. 403. Reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board. All rights reserved [175]
- 3.14 Anonymous fragment of four-part vocal section showing imitative entries within incomplete anthem *I will Love Thee, O Lord*; Ob Mus.c.26, fol. 114r. Reproduced by permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford [176]
- 3.15 Opening of William King's fowle originall of his Fantaisie in G minor; IRL-Dm Z2.1.13, fols. 5v–6r. Reproduced by permission of the Governors and Guardians of Marsh's Library © Marsh's Library [178]
- 3.16 William King's fowle originall of his untitled fantazia; IRL-Dm Z2.1.13, fols. 1v–2r. Reproduced by permission of the Governors and Guardians of Marsh's Library © Marsh's Library [180]
- 3.17 Opening of John Blow's *My God, my God*, as notated in his fowle originall in Lbl Add. 30932, fol. 128r. Reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board. All rights reserved [182]
- 3.18 Matthew Locke's fowle originall of his Prelude and Gloria Patri; Ob Mus.Sch.c.44, set D21. Reproduced by permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford [185]

- 3.19 Text for Lowe's *Eia eruditam* copied in unknown hand, with indications of metre and annotations by Lowe; Ob Mus.Sch.c.123. Reproduced by permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford [191]
- 3.20 Addition of inner part to Lowe's *Eia eruditam*, Ob Mus.Sch.c.123: (a) opening of chorus 'Cautes canoris' in two-part version in Score A; (b) opening of chorus 'Cautes canoris' in three-part version in Score B, with alterations. Reproduced by permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford [192]
- 3.21 Addition of instrumental parts to Lowe's *Eia eruditam*, Ob Mus.Sch.c.123: (a) opening of chorus 'Phabea nervis Barbidos' in version without instruments in Score A; (b) opening of chorus 'Phabea nervis Barbidos' in version with instruments in Score B. Reproduced by permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford [193]
- 3.22 'Outline' draft of Goodson's ode *Laurus cruentas*; Och 1142a, fols. 21v–22r. Reproduced by permission of the Governing Body of Christ Church, Oxford [198]
- 3.23 'Second-stage draft' of part of chorus 'Hanc si benignus' and verse 'Cultam togatis' from Goodson's *O qui potenti*; Och 1142a, fols. 25v–26r. Reproduced by permission of the Governing Body of Christ Church, Oxford [200]
- 4.1 Opening of John Blow's *Jesus, Seeing the Multitudes*; Och 14, fol. 13r, bottom two systems. Reproduced by permission of the Governing Body of Christ Church, Oxford [212]
- 4.2 Blank Tenor Decani and Tenor Cantoris parts in the chorus 'Behold, God is my helper' in Purcell's *Save me, O God*; Cfm 88, fol. 115v. © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge [222]
- 4.3 Post-copying reworkings to correct part writing at the beginning of Purcell's *Remember not, Lord, our Offences*; Cfm 88, fol. 99r. © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge [224]
- 4.4 Hands of John Blow and Henry Purcell in Blow's *Sing we Merrily*; Cfm 88, fol. 20r. © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge [235]
- 4.5 Blow's Voluntary 17 in G minor, as copied by William Davis in Lbl Add. 31468, fol. 16v. Reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board. All rights reserved [252]
- 4.6 Blow's alteration to the instrumental bass line in Humfrey's *Like as the Hart*; Cfm 88, fol. 8v, bottom two systems, beginning in b. 128. © The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge [256]

- 5.1 Jeffreys's revisions to 'Te laudamus Deus noster' in *Quando natus es*; Lbl Add. 10338, p. 323, bottom system with added paper slip. Reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board. All rights reserved [266]
- 5.2 Post-copying alteration of anacruses in Locke's Courante (Galliard) from *The Consort of Four Parts*; Lbl Add. 17801, fol. 49r. Reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board. All rights reserved [281]
- 5.3 Treble part for Fantazia 1a (1) from Locke's *Consort of Four Parts*, altered by unknown annotator in Lbl Add. 31435, fols. 71v–72r. Reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board. All rights reserved [302]
- 5.4 Examples of alteration in the continuo part in Purcell's *Ah! Few and Full of Sorrows*; Lbl Add. 30930; (a) fol. 15v, bottom system; (b) fol. 17r. Reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board. All rights reserved [306]
- 6.1 Setting of Purcell's 'Britons strike home' from *Bonduca*, as copied in CHog M1090, fol. [2r], beginning in second system. Reproduced by permission of Christopher Hogwood [350]
- 6.2 Settings in F and G of the opening strain of 'Wanton zephyrs' from Thomas Clayton's *Arsinoe* (1705), as copied by Robert King in AY D/DR 10/6a, fols. [30v]–[31r]. Reproduced by permission of the Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies, Aylesbury [352]
- 6.3 Lully's 'Scocca pur' copied by scribe of HADolmetsch II.e.17; (a) texted vocal part, p. [14]; (b) first page of keyboard setting, p. [15]. Reproduced by kind permission of the Dolmetsch Library, Haslemere [354]
- 6.4 Opening of Reggio's 'Arise ye subterranean winds', as copied by Daniel Henstridge in Lbl Add. 29397, fol. 78v (inv.). Reproduced with the permission of the British Library Board. All rights reserved [378]

Music examples

- 1.1 Beginning of Henstridge’s incomplete Gloria 2 in 1, Lbl Add. 30933, fol. 127r (inv.) [page 20]
- 1.2 Opening point in treble part of Purcell’s *Miserere mei*, as copied by Henstridge in Lbl Add. 30933, fol. 122v [20]
- 1.3 Opening point in treble part of Purcell’s Gloria 4 in 1, as copied by Henstridge in Lbl Add. 30933, fol. 124v [20]
- 1.4 Second imitative point in Child’s Gloria 2 in 1, as copied by Henstridge in Lbl Add. 30933, fol. 123r [20]
- 1.5 Abandoned Gloria 2 in 1, Lbl Add. 30933, fol. 127v [21]
- 1.6 Opening of Purcell’s Gloria 4 in 1, as copied by Henstridge in Lbl Add. 30933, fol. 124v [21]
- 1.7 Henstridge’s incomplete Gloria 2 in 1, Lbl Add. 30933, fol. 127v [22]
- 1.8 Opening of Blow’s Gloria 3 in 1 as copied by Henstridge in Lbl Add. 30933, fol. 123v [23]
- 1.9 Opening of Child’s Gloria 2 in 1, as copied by Henstridge in Lbl Add. 30933, fol. 123r [23]
- 1.10 (a) First verse of Humfrey’s *Have Mercy upon me, O God*, as copied by William Isaack in Cfm 117, fol. 80; (b) First verse of Henman’s *Have Mercy upon me, O God*, as copied in Henman’s autograph in Lbl Add. 30932, fols. 56r–56v [28]
- 1.11 (a) Extracts from Pietro Reggio’s ‘She loves and she confesses too’, as presented in his self-publication, *Songs* (London, 1680), pp. 1–3; (b) Extracts from Henry Purcell’s ‘She loves and she confesses too’, as copied by John Walter in CH Cap. VI/I/I, p. 411 [36]
- 1.12 (a) Opening of Jeffreys’s *Jubilate Deo*, first version; Lbl Add. 10338, p. 405; (b) Opening of Jeffreys’s *Jubilate Deo*, altered version; Lbl Add. 10338, inserted sheet before p. 405 [44]
- 3.1 Transcription of ‘Sicut erat’ from Locke’s Gloria Patri; Ob Mus.Sch.c.44, Set D1 [187]
- 3.2 Goodson’s opening Prelude for *O qui potenti*; (a) version copied in Och 617, p. 1; (b) ‘outline’ draft in Och 1142a, fol. 28v [199]

- 4.1 Opening of John Blow's *Jesus, Seeing the Multitudes* as copied in Och 14, fol. 13r; (a) continuo line in Lbl K.9.b.9, fol. 14r; (b) continuo line originally copied in Och 14, fol. 13r; (c) corrected continuo line in Och 14, fol. 13r [213]
- 4.2 John Blow, *Jesus, Seeing the Multitudes*, bb. 13–19; (a) as copied in Och 14, fol. 13v; (b) as copied in Lbl K.9.b.9, fol. 14r. [230]
- 4.3 John Blow, *Jesus, Seeing the Multitudes*, bb. 102–7; (a) as copied in Och 14, fols. 16v–17r (b) as copied in Lbl K.9.b.9, fol. 17r [232]
- 4.4 John Blow, *Sing we Merrily*, bb. 47–53; (a) as copied in Och 14, fols. 46r–46v; (b) as copied in Cfm 88, fol. 16r. [237]
- 4.5 Henry Purcell, *I will give Thanks unto Thee, O Lord*, bb. 188–203; (a) as copied in Lbl Add. 47845, fol. 42r; (b) as copied in Lbl R.M. 20.h.8, fol. 50r [241]
- 4.6 Opening bars of Blow's Te Deum from the Service in G as copied by the composer in Och 780, p. 1, with variants shown above the staves as follows: (a) Blow's autograph in Lbl K.9.b.9, fol. 31; (b) Isaack's score in Cfm 117, fol. 329v; (c) Henstridge's score in Lbl Add. 30933, fol. 3r; (d) Reading sr's score in Lbl Add. 47845, fol. 1r [248]
- 4.7 Opening of Purcell's 'She loves and she confesses too'; (a) as copied by Charles Morgan in Lbl Add. 33234; (b) in the hand of John Walter in CH Cap VI/I/I, fol. 203v (inv.); (c) as copied by Daniel Henstridge in Cfm 118, p. 74 and Lbl Add. 29397, fol. 68v; (d) as printed in *Choice Ayres and Songs . . . The Fourth Book* (1683), p. 42, and copied in Cfm 120, p. 239 [250]
- 4.8 Opening of Blow's Voluntary 17, in G minor; (a) in the hand of William Davis in Lbl Add. 31468, fol. 16v; (b) in the hand of London F in Lbl Egerton 2959, fol. 20r; (c) in the hand of Henry Hall, H 30.B.ii, fol. 2v (rev. end) [253]
- 4.9 Extract from Humfrey's *Like as the Hart*; (a) as copied initially by Blow in Cfm 88, fol. 8v and by Isaack in Cfm 117, fol. 130; (b) as emended by Blow in Cfm 88 [257]
- 5.1 Opening of Pavan 6a (36) from Locke's consort *For Several Friends*: (a) version in Och 409–10; (b) version originally copied in Lbl Add. 17801, fol. 14r; (c) revised version on paper slip in Lbl Add. 17801, fol. 14r [268]
- 5.2 Extract from Fantazie 5a (21) from Locke's *The Flat Consort*: (a) earlier version in Lg GMus 469–71; (b) revised version in Lbl Add. 17801, fols. 35v–36r [278]

- 5.3 Variant versions of original ending of Locke's *O Lord, our Lord*; (a) version in Mp BRm 370.Lu.31; (b) autograph version in Lbl Add. 31437, fols. 3v–4r [285]
- 5.4 Variant versions of opening of Hingeston's Fantazia, Set B, Suite 6: (a) as copied in Ob Mus.Sch.d.211, p. 9; (b) as copied in Ob Mus.Sch.e.382, p. 4 [289]
- 5.5 Variant versions of opening of Saraband 3d (12) of *The First Part of the Broken Consort*: (a) version copied in Och 772–6, no. 48, US-R Vault ML.96.L814f, fol. [4v] and first version of Lbl Add. 17801, fol. 41r; (b) amended version in Lbl Add. 17801, fol. 41r [296]
- 5.6 Alterations to detail made by Henry Purcell in Lbl Add. 30930: (a) Fantazia 12, bb. 36–9, fol. 59r; (b) Fantazia 10, bb. 1–5, fol. 61r; (c) Fantazia upon One Note, bb. 15–17, fol. 50r [298]
- 5.7 Variant versions of 'But thou forgiveness dost proclaim' in Henry Purcell's *Plung'd in the Confines of Despair*: (a) version in Purcell's hand in Bu 5001, fol. 73r; (b) variants from version in Blow's hand in Och 628, p. 41; (c) variants from version in Purcell's hand in Lbl Add. 30930, fol. 3v [309]
- 6.1 Purcell's solo arrangement of 'Turn then thine eyes' from *The Fairy Queen*, bb. 1–21; (a) in setting for one voice in Lg Safe 3, fols. 14r–15r; (b) in duet version in Lam 3, fols. 102r–103r [324]
- 6.2 Opening section of Roger Hill's 'The thirsty earth'; (a) in setting for treble and bass made by Edward Lowe and copied by Henry Aldrich, Och 17, fol. 8; (b) in setting for bass solo with continuo attributed to Hill and published in *Select Ayres and Dialogues*, 1669, p. 94 [328]
- 6.3 (a) Solo arrangement of opening vocal section of Blow's *Welcome Every Guest; Amphion Anglicus*, p. 1; (b) Full score of opening vocal section of Blow's *Welcome Every Guest*; autograph copy in Lbl Add. 31457, fols. 4v–6r [334]
- 6.4 Purcell's Minuet from *The Double Dealer*, (a) in setting for keyboard copied in Lbl Mus.1, fol. 2v; (b) in version published in four parts in *Ayres for the Theatre* (1697), pp. 33 (violino primo), 33 (violino secundo), 26 (tenor) and 27 (bassus) [339]
- 6.5 Purcell's Hornpipe from *Abdelazar* in settings for keyboard: (a) Cfm 653, p. 19, copied by James Kent; (b) Lbl Add. 40139, fol. 13v (unknown hand); (c) US-LAuc M678 M4 H295, fol. 4v (unknown hand); (d) CHog M1090, fol. 5v (unknown hand); (e) Lbl Add. 22099, fol. 9v (unknown hand); (f) US-NYp Drexel 5609, in the hand of John Hawkins; compared against (g) version published in four parts in

- Ayres for the Theatre*, pp. 42 (violino primo), 42 (violino secundo), 35 (tenor) and 35 (bassus) [342]
- 6.6 Purcell's Hornpipe from *The Fairy Queen* in settings for keyboard: (a) Lbl Mus. 1, fol. 5v, in Purcell's autograph; (b) En Inglis 94 MS 3343, fols. 54v–55r, in the hand of Philip Hart; compared against (c) full score in the hand of FQ3 in Lam 3, fols. 2v–3r [347]
- 6.7 Barrett's Minuet from *The Pilgrim* in settings for keyboard: (a) AY D/DR 10/6a, fol. 15v, copied by Robert King; (b) *The Third Book of the Harpsichord Master* (1702); (c) Ob Mus.Sch.e.397, p. 41 (unknown scribe); (d) Lbl Add. 22099, fol. 6r (unknown scribe); (e) Lbl Add. 31465, copied by Nicholas Harrison, and Lbl Add. 41205 (unknown scribe) [357]
- 6.8 The Highlanders' March: (a) as printed by Playford in *The Dancing Master* in 1657, p. 47; (b) as printed by Playford in *Musicks Hand-maid* (1663 and 1678), p. 40; (c) as copied in Och 1179, pp. 4–5; (d) as copied by Robert Wintersall in Och 1175, fol. 12v, 'set by John Stone'; (e) as copied by Robert Wintersall in Och 1175, fol. 13v, 'set by Robert W' [364]
- 6.9 Opening of Orlando Gibbons's Prelude; (a) as copied by Henry Purcell in Lbl Mus. 1, fol. 4r; (b) as copied by Aldrich in Och 47, p. 43; (c) as copied in HADolmetsch II.e.17, p. 65; (d) as printed in *Parthenia* (c. 1613, repr. 1651, 1655), no. 21 [371]
- 6.10 Opening of Draghi's Prelude in C minor: (a) as copied by London A in US-Wc M21/M185 Case, p. 82; (b) from the composer's autograph in Lbl Mus. 1, fol. 26r [373]
- 6.11 Opening of Ground in C minor by Henry Purcell: (a) as copied by Richard Goodson sr in Och 1177, fol. 32r; (b) as copied by an unknown scribe in US-LAuc M678 M4 H295, fol. 20; (c) as copied by an unknown scribe in Lbl Add. 47846, fol. 9v; (d) as copied by Charles Babel in Lbl Add. 39569, fol. 24v; (e) as copied by an unknown scribe in Ob Mus.Sch.e.397, p. 70; (f) as copied by James Kent in Cfm 653, p. 30 [376]
- 6.12 Opening of Reggio's 'Arise ye subterranean winds': (a) as copied by Daniel Henstridge in Lbl Add. 29397, fol. 78v (inv.); (b) as copied by Charles Campelman in Lbl Add. 19759, fol. 10v; (c) as copied by Charles Morgan in Lbl Add. 33234, fol. 38r; (d) as printed in *Songs Set by Signior Pietro Reggio* (London, 1680), p. 12 [380]
- 6.13 Ending of Reggio's 'Arise ye subterranean winds': (a) as copied by Daniel Henstridge in Lbl Add. 29397, fol. 77v (inv.); (b) as copied by Charles Campelman in Lbl Add. 19759, fol. 10v; (c) as copied by

- Charles Morgan in Lbl Add. 33234, fol. 38v; (d) as printed in *Songs Set by Signior Pietro Reggio* (London, 1680), p. 13 [382]
- 6.14 Opening of Humfrey’s ‘O the sad day’: (a) as copied by Richard Goodson sr in Och 350, p. 10; (b) as copied by Charles Campelman in Lbl Add. 19759, fol. 6; (c) in the version in an unknown hand in Och 49, p. 108; (d) in the copy in an unknown hand in Lbl Add. 14399, fol. 28v; (e) as copied by Edward Lowe in Lbl Add. 29396, fol. 91v [385]
- 6.15 Excerpt from Humfrey’s ‘O the sad day’: (a) as initially copied by Richard Goodson sr in Och 350, p. 11; (b) as corrected by Goodson in Och 350; (c) as copied by Edward Lowe in Lbl Add. 29396, fol. 92r [387]

Tables

2.1	Fowle originalls of London-based odes and welcome songs	[page 72]
2.2	Fowle originalls (first usable copies) of Oxford odes and Act songs	[73]
2.3	Likely fowle originalls of liturgical music	[74]
2.4	Scores of theatre music directly connected to earliest productions	[77]
2.5	Instrumental consort-music performing parts associated with ownership in private households	[82]
2.6	Partbooks of instrumental consort music possibly associated with manuscript publication	[87]
2.7	Institutional file copies of odes and liturgical music	[94]
2.8	Loose-leaf scores of odes and liturgical music probably intended for institutional file manuscripts	[96]
2.9	Composers' personal scores of instrumental consort music, and secular and devotional song	[103]
2.10	Bound copies of odes and theatre music in the hands of Croft, London F, London A and London E	[106]
2.11	Interconnected sources of Purcell's odes and theatre music	[108]
2.12	Song and keyboard manuscripts linked with pedagogy in private households	[110]
3.1	Distribution of hands in Daniel Purcell's partial autograph of <i>Again the Welcome</i>	[132]
3.2	Identification of hands in <i>The Fairy Queen</i>	[139]
3.3	Preliminary notation of Oxford odes and Act songs	[189]
4.1	Sources of Purcell's Funeral Sentences	[215]
4.2	Sources of Purcell's <i>My Beloved Spake</i>	[219]
4.3	Sources of Blow's <i>Jesus, Seeing the Multitudes</i>	[229]
5.1	Sources of Locke's consort <i>For Several Friends</i> , their dates and major variants	[270]
5.2	Principal versions of Locke's <i>The First Part of the Broken Consort</i>	[275]
5.3	Principal versions of Locke's <i>Consort of Four Parts</i>	[280]

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-01434-3 - Musical Creativity in Restoration England
Rebecca Herissone
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Preface

This book has its origins in a research project of the same name, funded between 2006 and 2010 by the Arts and Humanities Research Council in the UK, although in many respects it represents the culmination of work on Restoration sources that I have been carrying out since the mid-1990s. It aims to assess from a historically contextualized perspective the conceptual and practical approaches to musical invention in England during the late seventeenth century, using as its principal sources the surviving manuscripts and print publications in which the music is preserved. This means of studying creativity has been described by Alan Howard in his recent chapter in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Henry Purcell* as ‘palaeographical’ (see Howard, ‘Understanding Creativity’, 66), and differs to some extent from the ‘analytical’ methodology that has been adopted by Howard and a number of other scholars, which attempts to detect traces of creative processes from the evidence preserved within the music itself (as demonstrated, for example, in Howard’s PhD thesis, ‘Purcell and the Poetics of Artifice’). As will become clear throughout this book, however, the two approaches have a good deal in common, and have much to contribute to one another.

Understanding creativity in this period is a particular challenge for the modern scholar because so many of the basic tenets we take for granted in considering creativity today – such as the primacy of the author, and concepts of originality, inspiration and genius – were only fully developed during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Given that the musicological sub-discipline of source studies originated in the analysis of the music of these later periods, many of the established terms for describing creative practices are demonstrably inappropriate for seventeenth-century music. *Musical Creativity in Restoration England* thus seeks to adopt a new methodological approach that takes into account the practical, social and cultural contexts in which Restoration sources were produced, as well as the concepts underlying musical invention in the period. Earlier scholarship has focused on particular works by single composers, the main studies comprising four articles on Purcell – Ford, ‘Purcell as His Own Editor’; Herissone, ‘Purcell’s Revisions’; Manning, ‘Revisions and Reworkings’; and Shay,

‘Purcell’s Revisions’ – and two on Locke’s compositional revisions – Thompson, ‘The Sources of Locke’s Consort’ and Tilmouth, ‘Revisions in the Chamber Music’. In addition, I have published papers on the creative procedures of Richard Goodson sr (‘Richard Goodson the Elder’s Ode’) and William Turner (‘The Revision Process in William Turner’s Anthem’), and my article ‘Fowle Originalls’ formed a pilot study for the current project, using Purcell as a case study. In this book, however, composer-centred analyses are avoided in favour of an approach that places individuals within the institutions and cultures in which they trained and worked, and that seeks to interpret musical sources within the environments in which they were produced and used. In so doing it reveals creative practices that were often – indeed predominantly – collaborative, and where musical texts could be influenced by a host of musicians in addition to named composers; it suggests new interpretations of the relationships between functional contexts, notation, performance, improvisation and musical memory; and it demonstrates the ways in which musical notation served different purposes in different environments, thus calling into question the current practice of applying a single set of editorial principles – in any case derived from literary textual criticism – when interpreting early modern notation for a modern audience. Given the fluidity of the creative environments considered in the book, the description ‘musical creativity’ is preferred over ‘compositional process’.

The book is divided into two parts, the first (Chapters 1 and 2) examining the principles underlying musical creativity, and the second (Chapters 3 to 6) investigating specific creative strategies used by Restoration composers. Chapter 1 considers how Erasmian theories of rhetorical invention, which were central to literary and artistic creativity in the period, can be detected both in seventeenth-century theoretical writings on music and in manuscripts preserving evidence of musicians’ copying and studying of other composers’ works, thus demonstrating that musical invention was still based on the study and emulation of models in the Restoration period. In the second part of the chapter I consider the implications of the continuing prevalence of *imitatio* for the importance of the composer as individual in Restoration culture. Drawing comparisons with changing approaches to originality that were occurring in playwriting circles in this period, I highlight a number of practical and conceptual differences – including the role of print and the nature of collaborative practices – that led musical creativity to remain distinct in its approaches. In Chapter 2 I focus on the principal source materials used in the book: the musical manuscripts copied and circulated during the Restoration period by composers and other musicians. Although

there is a long history of studying compositional processes through such documents, particularly composers' autographs, such a methodology is problematical for seventeenth-century music, since in this period notation was often a very incomplete codification of both performance practices and compositional detail, and notation could at times be descriptive rather than prescriptive. In this chapter I outline the way in which the book seeks to mediate between these documents and the creative activities undertaken by musicians by identifying the contexts in which the sources were produced, so that we can distinguish between different modes of creativity and thereby learn to interpret the notation within the documents appropriately. In seeking to understand surviving notated materials in terms of their function, I outline six main categories of manuscript, designed to reflect the distinctions between particular sets of sources, thereby helping us to understand the ways in which the music was created and disseminated.

Chapter 3 considers the relatively large number of manuscripts containing what appear to be the composers' first complete copies of particular compositions, together with a handful of less complete materials apparently linked to the initial creation of some pieces. Such sources are more prevalent for some genres of music than others: in particular the preservation of initial autographs of large-scale multi-movement pieces such as odes and symphony anthems is much better than that of the more intimate forms of music that existed in the period. Yet there is a sufficiently wide range of extant fowle originalls for it to be possible to identify several distinct approaches to the initial composition of Restoration music. I explore the ways in which composers' techniques for creating new pieces of music were determined both by the legacy of the *imitatio* principle – which led to the perpetuation of methods of invention that, in some cases, had been developed generations earlier for entirely different creative environments – and by the particular circumstances in which the music was being composed – including practical issues arising mainly when music had to be prepared for specific and large-scale events, and more purely musical requirements determined by the works' stylistic characteristics. In the final section of the chapter I also examine evidence that approaches to composition and the use of notation in initial invention may have differed between composers who were brought up in the Chapel-Royal tradition in comparison with those working in Oxford, the other main musical hub in England in the Restoration period.

In Chapter 4 I scrutinize the effect on creative activity of the consistent and regular re-use of some compositions, and the well-developed systems allowing repertory to be circulated between institutions and thus performed

in multiple contexts. Concentrating particularly on liturgical sacred music, I assess the processes by which major composers writing in this genre continually re-created their music as they made new copies. Examples of pieces by Locke and Purcell demonstrate the circulation of repertory through scribal networks, which resulted not only in multiple versions of the music co-existing with the full knowledge of composers, but also led in some cases to third-party copyists carrying out smaller-scale alterations. Particularly significant in this respect are a number of notational features that seem not to have been regarded as fixed during this period, but were instead notated flexibly. Typically involving rhythmic patterns, melodic ornamentation and the disposition of the continuo part, there is no indication that musicians at the time would have regarded them as being differences of any significance. By way of contrast, Chapter 5 considers a rather different attitude towards musical texts that seems to be reflected in instrumental and vocal consort music. The intimate circumstances in which this music was performed is reflected in the manuscript sources through the apparently close circles in which the material was circulated, particularly amongst professional musicians in London and Oxford. As with liturgical music, the transmission of repertory led to the serial revision of pieces as they were recopied, but the trend is much more marked in consort music; moreover, although there is evidence of the simultaneous co-existence of parallel texts, there was also an apparently paradoxical trend for manuscript owners to check readings of consort music they owned against other sources, indicating that they related to the music as text in a way not seen elsewhere, and suggesting that there was a culture of intellectual engagement with texts of consort music not seen in other musical genres in this period.

Chapter 6 considers the widespread use of adaptation in the Restoration period – in which music from many genres was freely altered by composers and others for use in new contexts – and its relationship to the transmission of music via non-notated routes. While arrangements were often made by musicians working from notated exemplars, and the majority of the music considered in Chapters 3–5 comes from traditions in which notation was the primary form of musical circulation, there is good evidence that some adaptations were based on memorized outlines. Focusing particularly on songs and keyboard music, I examine the complexity of creative relationships between composers, copyists and performers that resulted from recompositional activities of this sort. In the first part of the chapter seventeenth-century approaches to arrangement are considered from this perspective in order to assess the extent to which musicians other than the

composer contributed to the manipulation and reworking of materials that were available to them. The second part of the chapter then investigates in detail surviving evidence for notation of music from memory, which in some cases preserves a snapshot of the way in which particular pieces were realized in performance.

There are many reasons to set the year 1660 as the starting point for this book: the re-establishment of court music-making at the Restoration of the monarchy and the reopening of the public theatres transformed the nature of music-making as it had existed in the previous two decades, and led to new forms of music and new approaches to its composition. Similarly in the church choral services were restarted, and of course at the Chapel Royal Charles II established the use of instruments, which resulted in the invention of the symphony anthem. While there is good reason to reach back into the 1650s to consider a few important manuscripts containing music in these genres – such as Locke’s score of the 1659 performance of *Cupid and Death* – such exceptions are relatively few and are easily defined. The situation is very different, however, for more informal types of music-making that took place in the home, tavern or at music meetings. These activities were relatively little changed by the tumultuous political events of that year: they had flourished during the Commonwealth, and the thriving musical communities that were established in noble households and particularly among musicians in Oxford continued even as professional opportunities for official employment took musicians further afield and led them to take additional compositional roles. There were substantial changes to the styles of music being played and sung in informal and formal music groups during the later decades of the seventeenth century, influenced particularly by the importation and growing popularity of Italian instrumental music; but these shifts were gradual, and there is no distinctive change detectable in sources for these genres of music around 1660. The situation is worsened by the fact that many manuscripts cannot be dated precisely. It is much harder, therefore, to establish consistent criteria for inclusion or exclusion of sources of instrumental consort music, secular and devotional song, and keyboard music than for other types of music considered in this book.

In order to try to be as systematic as possible, the following principles have been adopted:

1. Composers who were still alive at the Restoration, but whose compositional activity predominantly pre-dates it, are excluded. Thus Matthew Locke is included, but Henry Lawes (d. 1662) is not. Probably the most

controversial member of the excluded group is John Jenkins (1592–1678), whose lengthy career included involvement in the Caroline masque *The Triumph of Peace*, but who was still teaching the North children in the 1660s. Most of Jenkins’s vast output is copied in sources dating from before the Restoration and it has therefore not been considered central to this study. Similarly, for the most part George Jeffreys’s music is not included in this study, since his main compositional activity pre-dates the Restoration; however, the significance of his manuscript Lbl Add. 10338 to our understanding of seventeenth-century musical creativity in England is such that parts of it are considered in the book in order to help contextualize other sources from the same period, particularly those of Locke.

2. Manuscripts copied over lengthy periods predominantly before the Restoration are generally excluded. One example is John Gamble’s commonplace book of over three hundred songs, US-NYp Drexel 4257, marked ‘John Gamble his booke, amen 1659 ano domine’, since this seems to have been copied predominantly between about 1630 and 1650.
3. Manuscripts containing only music by non-English composers, other than those resident in England during the Restoration, are excluded even where copied by English scribes. There is no desire to underplay the importance of music by Italian, French, German and other composers to English musicians in this period, and the repertory available to composers is discussed at length; however, these manuscripts are not considered primary sources indicative of compositional strategies in the period.

The *terminus ad quem* for the book has been set at approximately 1705, but this is of course a largely arbitrary date, which cannot be applied consistently since many sources cannot be dated with precision. For manuscripts clearly copied after c. 1700, the overriding criterion for inclusion has been evidence of continuity with Restoration approaches and functions. Later sources that do not show this kind of continuity have been excluded. Thus Ob Mus.Sch.e.425 and e.426 – a pair of manuscripts begun c. 1710, containing songs and keyboard settings of music by Handel, Haym and others, partly copied by the German musician Andreas Roner and apparently pedagogical in origin – are not considered, since they include very little Restoration repertory. However, AY D/DR 10/6a – another pedagogical manuscript including keyboard settings of theatre music, copied up to c. 1706 – is used, because it contains music predominantly composed in the Restoration period. In general, composers are included if they made a

significant contribution to English musical life in the period c. 1660 to c. 1705; thus Jeremiah Clarke's manuscripts are considered, but those of William Croft are mentioned only in order to provide comparison with the core set of sources used in the book. In all, the book draws on evidence preserved in more than 350 manuscript sources. Since there is not space within this book to describe them at length, they are listed in a separate online catalogue, available freely at www.alc.manchester.ac.uk/subjects/music/research/projects/musicalcreativity.

The length and complexity of this project has entailed a good deal of collaboration and consultation with colleagues working on Restoration music and its sources. My greatest debt is to Alan Howard, who was research associate on the project between 2006 and 2009, and whose diligence and imagination contributed enormously to the development of the ideas that are presented here; the extent of his input is clearly demonstrated through the many acknowledgements that are spread throughout the book. The methodology I have used was influenced by Robert Thompson's article 'The Sources of Locke's Consort', and by Robert Ford's 'Purcell as his own Editor', which were the first publications to draw attention to the importance of non-autograph manuscripts in the study of creativity in the music of this period. The significance of Robert Shay and Robert Thompson's *Purcell Manuscripts* to this project also cannot be overestimated: without the detailed forensic work Shay and Thompson carried out on many of the core Restoration music manuscripts, providing for the first time a solid foundation in which copying dates and scribal hands were clearly identified, the connections and distinctions between sources that are made here would have been entirely impossible to discern. Robert Thompson has also been a generous source of advice on the sources throughout the project's duration, and I am also very grateful for the assistance of Andrew Woolley, who generously helped with access to sources for Chapter 6, and provided a good deal of guidance on Restoration keyboard music, and to John Cunningham, who provided advice on early seventeenth-century arrangement practices. Many other colleagues gave of their time and expertise, including Martin Adams, Daniel Bamford, Stephanie Carter, David Chung, David Fallows, Peter Holman, James Hume, Margaret Laurie, Sakurako Mishiro, Stephen Rose, Alon Schab, Bettina Varwig and Bruce Wood.

The project from which this book derives was made possible by funding from the Arts and Humanities Research Council in the UK, and financial support for the purchase of the photographic reproductions used in this book was also provided by the University of Manchester and through the granting of a *Music & Letters* award. I am very grateful for the generosity and

considerable assistance of the staff of the many libraries who provided reproductions and allowed access to their manuscript sources, most particularly to Ros Edwards of the Henry Watson Library in Manchester; Nicolas Bell of the British Library; Cristina Neagu of Christ Church Library, Oxford; Patricia Buckingham of the Bodleian Library; Philippa Bassett, senior archivist in Special Collections at the Cadbury Research Library, University of Birmingham; Peter Horton of the Library of the Royal College of Music; Kathy Adamson of the Royal Academy of Music Library; Roger Bettridge of the Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies in Aylesbury; and the staff of Archbishop Marsh’s Library in Dublin. Both Christopher Hogwood and Jeanne Dolmetsch generously allowed the use and reproduction of manuscripts in their private collections.

My husband Peter and children Rob and Rosie have had much to endure while I was absorbed in this project, particularly during its last three years, when it frequently disrupted family life and threatened to become a classic example of serial recomposition itself. To them this book is dedicated.

Editorial method

The emphasis in this book on notation from primary sources of seventeenth-century music makes the adoption of an entirely consistent editorial method difficult: figures have predominantly been used wherever the reader needs to view the physical appearance of particular pages, and music examples have largely been reserved, therefore, for extracts where it is the musical content of the extract to which attention is being drawn. However, in places – particularly where incomplete notation has been transcribed, in Chapter 1 – diplomatic transcription has necessarily been used in order to convey the substance of what the example demonstrates. Notwithstanding these exceptions, the editorial method used for transcriptions is as follows.

Staves and braces

Five-line staves have been used throughout, although the majority of the keyboard sources from which material is taken were originally presented on six-line staves. Braces are added for keyboard music, following modern convention, and are also inserted when barring does not delineate clearly parts belonging within the same source.

Clefs

Restoration musicians used a wide range of C clefs, which are now unfamiliar to many modern readers. Consequently clefs have been modernized so that vocal parts use only treble, transposed treble, and bass clefs; instrumental parts use treble, bass and C3 clefs. Original clefs used throughout a part are given at the start of each example wherever modernization has occurred.

Note values, barring and metre

Note values and time signatures are retained unchanged from the sources. The placement of bar lines is also retained, but dotted editorial bar lines

have been added sparingly where necessary for reasons of clarity. Bar lines are consistently joined across staves for instrumental parts, while broken between staves for vocal music, according to modern convention. Double bar lines used to indicate repeats in dance music (here for keyboard) have been converted to modern dotted double bar lines.

Stave signatures and accidentals

Stave signatures (key signatures in modern terminology) are retained, but where a single accidental is given at both higher and lower octaves the superfluous accidental is omitted, following modern convention, and accidentals within the signature are placed in today’s standard order. Accidentals given in the sources are reproduced, but converted to modern equivalents where necessary, taking into account the fact that the natural sign was not used until the end of the period with which this book is concerned. Accidentals repeated within the bar are omitted, but care has been taken to show ambiguity where it occurs. Editorial accidentals are placed above the stave in small-size notes.

Beaming

Because there is no indication that beaming was significant to seventeenth-century scribes and it is highly inconsistent in the sources, beaming here follows modern conventions for both instrumental and vocal parts; separate syllables are not beamed separately, therefore.

Slurs and ties

Slurring from the primary sources has been retained, and editorial slurs added sparingly, where necessary for consistency; these are marked with a vertical slash. Editorial ties are marked similarly.

Figuring

Figuring is reproduced as notated in the primary sources, but accidental signs are converted to modern equivalents where necessary, to incorporate the natural sign. The positioning of figures is standardized so that they appear below the stave.

Text, spelling and underlay

Original spellings and capitalizations have not been reproduced, since they are highly inconsistent in seventeenth-century texts generally; a minimum of additional punctuation has been provided tacitly where necessary. Editorial text is placed in italics.

Editorial notes (added where notes are missing from the sources) are shown in small type. All other editorial additions are in square brackets.

Abbreviations

References to pitch and rhythm

Pitch is denoted using the Helmholtz pitch system, in which *c'* denotes middle C. Rhythm is denoted in italics, using the initial letter of the value referred to: thus *c* denotes crotchet, *m* minim, *m.* dotted minim, and so on.

Manuscript shelfmarks

Manuscripts are identified using RISM sigla (see below) followed by the library shelfmark; the term ‘MS’ is omitted.

RISM sigla

Belgium

B-Bc Brussels, Conservatoire Royal, Bibliothèque, Koninklijk
 Conservatorium, Bibliotheek

France

F-Pc Paris, Conservatoire (held in F-Pn)
F-Pn Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France

Germany

D-Hs Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Carl von
 Ossietzky, Musiksammlung

Great Britain (‘GB’ is omitted)

xxviii	AY	Aylesbury, Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies
	Bu	Birmingham, Birmingham University

Cfm	Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, Music Manuscript (Mu is omitted)
CH	Chichester, West Sussex Record Office
CHog	Cambridge, Christopher Hogwood, private collection
Cjc	Cambridge, St John’s College
Cmc	Cambridge, Magdalene College, Pepys Library
Cu	Cambridge, University Library
DRc	Durham, Cathedral Church, Dean and Chapter Library
EL	Ely, Cathedral Library (held in Cu)
En	Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Music Department
Ge	Glasgow, Euing Music Library
H	Hereford, Cathedral Library
HADolmetsch	Haslemere, Carl Dolmetsch, private collection
KNt	Knutsford, Tatton Park
Lam	London, Royal Academy of Music
Lbl	London, British Library
Lcm	London, Royal College of Music, Library
Ldc	London, Dulwich College Library
Lfom	London, Foundling Museum, Gerald Coke, private collection
Lg	London, Guildhall Library
Ll	Lincoln, Cathedral Library
Lsp	London, St Paul’s Cathedral Library
Lwa	London, Westminster Abbey Library
Mp	Manchester, Central Public Library, Henry Watson Music Library
Ob	Oxford, Bodleian Library
Och	Oxford, Christ Church, Music Manuscripts (‘Mus.’ is omitted)
Ooc	Oxford, Oriel College Library
Y	York, Minster Library

Ireland

IRL-Dm	Dublin, Archbishop Marsh’s Library
--------	------------------------------------

Italy

I-Tn	Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, sezione Musicale
------	---

Japan

J-Tn	Tokyo, Nanki Ongaku Bunko
------	---------------------------

United States of America

US-AUS	Austin, University of Texas at Austin, The Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center
US-Cn	Chicago, Newberry Library
US-Cu	Chicago, University, Joseph Regenstein Library, Music Collection
US-LAuc	Los Angeles, University of California, William Andrews Clark Memorial Library
US-NH	New Haven (CT), Yale University, Irving S. Gilmore Music Library
US-NYp	New York, Public Library at Lincoln Center, Music Division
US-R	Rochester, Eastman School of Music, Sibley Music Library
US-Wc	Washington, Library of Congress, Music Division

Anonymous copyists

Many of the scribes who copied Restoration manuscripts remain unidentified, but their hands can sometimes be found across several different sources. Shay and Thompson adopted a number of terms to refer to such copyists in the manuscripts assessed in *Purcell Manuscripts*, related to the copying milieu of the scribes (so London A, London B, Oxford A and so on); their terms are followed in this book to facilitate comparison. Other scribes whose hands are found across manuscripts not included in Shay and Thompson’s book are here identified by the term ‘Anon’ followed by a letter (so Anon A, Anon B, and so on), so that it is possible to group together manuscripts copied by single scribes, even where their names are unknown.

Autograph manuscripts

Throughout the tables in the book scribes’ names are given in italic text where part or all of a manuscript contains composer autographs.