1.

\_\_\_\_

TT.	<b>T</b>
Нι	$\mathbf{P} \circ \mathbf{q}$
	IX O.C.I.

Some answers.

1. Aldrich left NO catalogue of the music he donated to Christ Church. For information about the earliest catalogues of his collection, see the Christ Church library online catalogue, section on provenance history:

http://library.chch.ox.ac.uk/music/page.php?page=Resources+for+provenance+research#A2

2. There's a Turner autograph MS at Christ Church; the hand matches that of your MS. Here's the online catalogue entry for it:

\_ \_ \_

used in such cases. At this point, I am eager for another look, though I can see on the PDF what appear to be ascenders that would correspond to the l and d in Aldrich.

I was able to make some notes on what's under the correction slip while I was there. My notes say that two staves were marked with treble and bass clefs and one-flat signatures, and there are five two-note chords in the treble: a simple cadential progression in F (I copied this much down)—something one would play in rudimentary keyboard training. You might recall that I was able to determine the foliation while I was there (looking at visible stitching and pairing watermarks) and that this indicated an incomplete quire at the beginning, with probably one missing page. My surmise is that Turner came into the possession of a perfectly good book with only two used pages. He excised one (that much can be shown from foliation) and pasted over the other. The first usable page became the verso of the pasteover, and he simply covered up the several chords rather than waste the page. My recollection is that I did not think there was any connection between the writer of these few chords and Turner. The loosely circumstantial Filmer connection could also come into play here, and that there are numerous Filmer books in which younger musicians scribbled a few things, which went on to see more formal use. But I agree completely that it looks like a fair copy.

Hopefully, we will have time for a private session with the some of the presenters and the MS. I think it would be highly beneficial to have several sets of eyes looking at the same time!

\_ \_ \_

## Rod:

Could I ask you to scrutinize a couple of things in the original MS? (Maybe you have already done so.)

- 1. On the second flyleaf, below the bit about Dr. Aldrich's Service, etc, it looks to me as if there was another line in the same hand that may have said "In Dr. Aldrich's handwriting", and then "Aldrich" was erased and replaced by "Turner", probably by Bumpus (the overwrite looks like the same hand as "E Libris Johannis Bumpus" on the first flyleaf). Can you confirm this -- or correct it -- by examining the MS?
- 2. Is there any way of seeing what is under the correction sheet stuck on to the first page of the Te Deum, without damaging the MS? It looks as if the original is shorter than the corrected passage by a measure or two. The correction was made on a different kind of paper with slightly smaller staves (note the "join" in the alto and tenor staves) and a smaller gap between staves as well, but is obviously in the same hand as the rest. It would be helpful to compare it with the original to see whether the writer was correcting an accidental error or making a deliberate revision. The whole MS has the air of a fair copy. If the measures underneath make sense verbally and musically, it will suggest a deliberate revision, and that will tell us that the copyist

was the composer, who first copied his own rough MS, then later decided to revise it (probably by repeating the words "doth worship thee" and hence adding to the length of the passage). If the copyist was the composer, then the composer was presumably Turner, because the hand is the same as that of the signed anthems. On the other hand, if the original passage doesn't make sense, it will suggest that the copyist missed out a couple of measures accidentally, didn't find out until later, and had to use this method to correct his mistake.

**Nicholas** 

\_\_\_

## Dear Rod,

I have started more careful work on the music in the MS, since you said you hoped I would play a leading part in the discussion. I have a couple of questions for you.

Have you checked around libraries to see whether these works are duplicated in other sources? Turner's "Try me, O God" is at York Minster and the Bodleian, and his "Behold now praise the Lord" is at the BL, Harl. 7341. It would be nice if we could be sure that the anthems in your MS are indeed those same works. Spink classifies "Behold" as a symphony anthem, which suggests, at least, a different version. (I notice in the Grove worklist that two other anthems by Turner exist in two forms, one a capella and the other with orchestra). Grove classifies "Try me, O God" as a full anthem, whereas the one in the MS is a verse anthem, though it could easily be sing by a single choir without soloists. I think it would be worthwhile comparing the incipits to see if these anthems are related to the ones in the MS. Very likely you have already taken this step.

Grove lists a Service in F by Aldrich, without giving any sources, but says it is for 5 voices. I'm sure Robert Shay knows all about this; has he seen the one listed?

I am making a more careful study of certain style features to see whether they are found in both the service and the anthems. In the process I have found a few minor errors in your otherwise excellent edition; would you like me to send you these?

\_\_\_\_

with good reason if it was composed for the opening of St Paul's. There is a false relation in the Nunc and the traditional canonic Doxology also places it very much in the Westminster Abbey / St Paul's tradition of Purcell & Blow. But it may well be by Aldrich, of course. Are you chasing up the York MS of 'Try me'? If you like I could ask Bryan White at York if he knows or could pop in to check...

Best wishes,

Geoffrey

\_\_\_\_

- 2) As I mentioned to you earlier, the hand is undoubtedly that of Wm Turner
- 2) Re the two full anthems:

"Try me O Lord" I included in my catalogue of incipits, dating it before 1680. It is the same musical setting of the text is found in your ms. As sources, I list the York Gostling part books as

\_\_\_\_

Stylistically, the biggest thing is that the works are full or full-with-verse in style, which is common to the two services we know are connected with St PAul's and date to around 1698. That was when the Choir of St Paul's was opened (well, late 1697...). Spink says that the style was a form of "Protestant Comprehension", but I wonder if it was as much a response to the acoustic in St Paul's. Turner came into his own around this time, coming out from Purcell's shadow. All his greatest works can be reliably dated to 1696-8. In my thesis, I conjecture that this might be an attempt by Turner to put himself forward as the new Composer-in-Ordinary. It didn't happen, and there's no evidence of any Turner sacred compositions after about 1710. So it's a fairly narrow window - anyway, but my instinctive guess is 1698-1700 for these works, and with a St Paul's provenance. But, of course, we would need more evidence than just a hunch.

Greg Oehm

\_\_\_\_

Hi Rod.

Sorry for the delayed response on this.

Thank you for your hospitality during my visit to WIU. I am pleased I had a chance to meet you and some of your colleagues, and it was interesting to get to know this manuscript better.

On the paper, I think late 1670s to 1705 is a reasonably close window (though I suppose a little later is possible), and of course we don't know how long the book sat unused (or very partly used, given the pasteover on page 1).

The watermark is the very common "Angoumois" fleur-de-lys, with the maker's initials in a different location, either IV or AI. The paper was consistently cut across the initials (as well as the main watermark), making it difficulty to determine if it's an A or V, and I would have to spend more time figuring out the original front and back side of the paper to corroborate further. In any case, these initials are common, IV usually indicating Jean Villedary (which doesn't help much with dating, since "Villedary" paper was made for a long time) and AI indicating Abraham

The thought occurred to me as I was driving home yesterday evening, that it would be good to date these works. Did Robert Shay have any ideas about the a possible date range for the copying, based on the type of paper used? (I know he is a bit of an expert in this!) If not, is it possible to ask him? I'm guessing the mid to late 1690s is about right for a date, largely because most of Turner's services date from this time. I would love to be proved wrong, however, and show that these works date from much earlier and the time of Charles II. (Though, unlikely, I reckon!) The paper type would give us a range about when the works were copied, and from that, we could assume a composition date.

\_\_\_

The thought occurred to me as I was driving home yesterday evening, that it would be good to date these works. Did Robert Shay have any ideas about the a possible date range for the copying, based on the type of paper used? (I know he is a bit of an expert in this!) If not, is it possible to ask him? I'm guessing the mid to late 1690s is about right for a date, largely because most of Turner's services date from this time. I would love to be proved wrong, however, and show that these works date from much earlier and the time of Charles II. (Though, unlikely, I reckon!) The paper type would give us a range about when the works were copied, and from that, we could assume a composition date.

Greg Oehm

\_\_\_\_

Dear Rod,

Your email has taken my breath away, quite literally! I am indeed VERY interested in your document. Bumpus's name is very familiar to me – I have scans of the Winchester organ book (now at US-BE) in my possession which was part of his collection. While I have discovered a few ne anthems of Turner myself, the finding of a MS with another service is quite a find!

I can answer a few questions for you – firstly, "Try me, O God" is the version found in the Bing-Gostling Part books at York. I have viewed the Part books at first hand in my transcription of the anthem. However, your transcription includes a "Hallelujah" for Verse and Chorus which is NOT found in the York version. "Try Me O God" was a Gostling addition to the Part books, so dates from the late 1690s. I'm guessing, but the addition of a Hallelujah may well indicate a

Chapel Royal provenance for the anthem, and Gostling "edited" it for use at St Paul's, London, by its removal. Your edition would appear to be little known primary source.

"Behold now praise the Lord" I will need to have a good look at tonight. I'm sure that there is a version of an anthem by this name attributed to Turner by Bing in the Bing-Gostling Partbooks, but subsequent scholarship attributes it to a little known composer at either Durham or York (whose name escapes me for the moment). Tudway copied a version of it into the Harleian MSS and nearly got the attribution correct, ascribing it to the son and not the father. I will need to compare yours with the Tudway/Bing version – it may at last clarify the source of the confusion and why Bing got it so wrong. A case of right name, wrong version, possibly.

The Service setting IS unknown. I have noted five services altogether – The huge Morning Canticles in D written for the St Cecilia Service of 1697, Services in A and E copied by Tudway (and A by Gostling), the organ book for a service setting in D at Durham and a Kyrie and Gloria in G (also at Durham). To have one in F is very exciting. It certainly bears no resemblance to any of the known services by Turner.

Greg Oehm

\_\_\_\_

I have never made a close study of either Turner's style or Aldrich's, but after looking over these pieces with some care I feel sure that they are not by the same composer. The two anthems in Turner's hand are bold and colourful, with frequent surprises, and have that "Restoration" lavor that originated with Locke and was gradually watered down after Purcell. Examples: the chromatic writing in bar 18 of "Behold" and 37 of "Try me", the dissonance treatment in bar 44 of "Behold" and 3 of "Try me", and the rhythmic skittishness in bars 35-6 of "Behold" and 17-22 of "Try me" and in the concluding hallelujahs. I can easily believe that Turner composed these anthems. He could have copied out someone else's music, although the signatures certainly carry weight. I suppose you could easily check with York to identify "Try me." There are settings of "Behold now praise the Lord" by Blow, Croft, and Henry Loosemore among many others, as well as Purcell, and it might be wise to get a look at some of those before committing yourself to the view that this one is by Turner.

The service is correctly written, but is thoroughly conventional, even boring, by comparison. It lacks daring harmonies. It is rhythmically cautious, never departing from a sober walking pace (except in the equally conventional compound-time episodes), while the two anthems introduce false relations, unexpected leaps, and abrupt changes of rhythmic pattern. I wouldn't be at all

surprised if the service was indeed by Aldrich, who was an unexciting composer but a thoroughly competent musician with a profound understanding of, and veneration for, traditional counterpoint. With all due respect to Dr. Shay, who is certainly the authority on the subject, Aldrich was an amateur only in the older sense that music was not his profession or source of livelihood.

Nicholas Temperley

\_\_\_\_

Thank you for the e-mail and attachments; the whole story is intriguing – please keep in touch with any further developments. Unfortunately, I thought I was going to be more help than turns out. My thematic catalogue is pretty comprehensive but not complete and better for anthems than services. The Magnificat is not Aldrich's 'usual' F major magnificat. It looks quite good as these things go and might well be by Turner, especially as the two accompanying anthems are by him. The fact that it does not survive at Christ Church suggests that it is not by Aldrich. On the other hand, Bumpus is pretty good for his time..

In fact, the Te Deum you sent me corresponds to none of the services in my catalogue, neither those in F nor any others. (But, as I said, it's got gaps.) One service by Turner I have not seen, one in D major at Durham and incomplete; it might just possibly be a transposed version of this.,

I have a dim memory that there is a MS by Turner surviving somewhere (Manchester?), but I can find no reference to it among my notes (now sadly in disarray after fifteen years retirement.) I look forward greatly to hearing about how this mystery develops. Yours,

Ian

\_ \_ \_

Thanks for your Aldrich/Turner query, which has been passed on to me by the Christ Church team.

I can confirm that your manuscript is an autograph of William Turner (ii). It exactly matches a Christ Church MS in his hand:

http://library.chch.ox.ac.uk/music/page.php?set=Mus.+49+%28pp.+44--7%29

The piece in question, though, is not obviously by Aldrich. The only F major service by him is for five voices, and is musically unrelated.

I don't recognize your piece; but then, I don't know the late 17th-

century service repertory at all well, and don't have access to notes or resources that could assist. Your best contact would be Ian Spink (emeritus, Royal Holloway, University of London); he could then point you towards likely experts.

One thought: could the setting be by Turner himself?

Best wishes, John Milsom