

Correspondence (email) Relating to the Turner Manuscript

From Greg Oehm, 3 October, 2013

Hi Rod,

What a great web resource! Thanks for all your trouble on this.

One comment - in the biography on Turner, you mention Turner having sung at Oxford under Edward Lowe. This is a pretty common reference, and comes from a document written in Turner's time by Anthony à Wood. I have quoted it myself in the past. Unfortunately, there is no evidence for Wood's claim. Keri Dexter's entry in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography refutes this claim, and I have independently confirmed her findings. There are no records in the Christ Church archives recording any payments to a chorister called William Turner. While there was a cook called Turner at Pembroke College (reportedly William's father), the dates for that appear wrong, too. That historical source is very much based on third-hand evidence.

Interestingly, my research suggests strongly that Turner came from a privileged background - his wife's family (the Patheriches) were well-connected and, in Queen Elizabeth's time, were courtiers and diplomats. Elizabeth Turner's great aunt was Bess Throckmorton, a lady-in-waiting to Queen Elizabeth and the wife of Sir Walter Raleigh, whom he married in secret (earning himself the Queen's displeasure when she found out and his first spell in the Tower of London!). It makes sense William came from a similar social milieu. Elizabeth's father, Edward, was a lawyer and was an MP in 1679. He owned two substantial properties, one in Warwickshire and the other in Cambridgeshire, and boasted an income around £10,000 a year, quite a sum in those days.

Tantalisingly, there was a prominent family called Turner in North Yorkshire, at Kirkleatham. Samuel Pepys' cousin Elizabeth married into this family, and her brother-in-law was Sir William Turner, Lord Mayor of London in 1667. References to them, and Pepys' favourite niece "The", are scattered throughout his Diary. I have no concrete proof our William Turner was part of this family, save for one clue - the record of the birth of a boy called "Willyam" in 1652, nephew to Sir William Turner. I couldn't find the one document I needed, though - Turner's Allegation of Marriage, which would give very useful information. This was not helped by the fact that Turner's marriage was ten years later than supposed, too. I would love to prove this connection.

Regards,

Greg.

Sent from my iPad

From Nicholas Temperley (3/20/13)

Who composed the Service in F in this manuscript?

1. We know that it is a fair copy in the handwriting of William Turner, despite what an earlier owner wrote on the flyleaf about Dr. Aldrich. Turner was either making a fair copy of his own composition, or writing out somebody else's, for reasons unknown.
2. He used a book printed with manuscript staves, which was sold between 1663 and 1665 if we are to believe the advertisement stuck on the back of the front cover. Zachariah Watkins was in business as a bookseller in the Temple between those years (Humphries & Smith). So the book may have been used any time after that date.
3. The first page has a paste-over on a different kind of music paper. It has been suggested this might have been designed to cover up some music that had been written on the page earlier, which had nothing to do with the Service in F. But in that case what was the point of using a piece that sticks out beyond the margin by a couple of inches, so that after writing on it, the copyist would have to fold it over in order to prevent it sticking out of the closed book? And why would the copyist then insert a measure of 2/2, the only one in the Service?
4. It is far more likely that this was added after the Service, or at least several pages of the Te Deum, had been copied, in order to write out an emendation that was longer than the music underneath. One possible reason was that the copyist had accidentally omitted a couple of measures. Another is that he wanted to make a deliberate change in this passage that was longer by two measures or so than what was underneath. Actually the difference seems to be one-and-a-half measures of 4/2 time. This supports the view that we are looking at an emendation, precisely 3 whole notes longer than the original and thus necessitating an additional one-and-a-half measures of 4/2. And it explains why it sticks out to the side of the page.
5. What was the original reading under the pasteover? A few notes are visible from the back of the page, where the glue or paste seems to have re-moistened the ink and it has sunk through the paper. In my hand out these are shown as large notes at the beginning of the second measure -- just the first notes in the treble and bass, the first 4 notes in the alto, the first three notes of the tenor. It is a fairly simple matter to guess what the rest was, mostly on the basis of the revised version written on the pasteover. The emendation gives the treble and alto a short phrase on "all the earth doth worship thee", followed by the whole choir repeating the words, whereas in the original version (shown on the handout) these words were sung only once by the full choir.
6. Who would be likely to make such a change after the fair copy was done? Only the composer, surely. I think he looked it over after he'd finished copying it, and thought "This is a pretty dull beginning. Why not insert a phrase here for the upper voices?" Then he proceeded to do so.
7. Conclusion: Turner was the composer as well as the copyist.

In-person conversation with Dr. Jonathan Green (3/19/13)

Dr.Green (IWU) noticed that the wormhole shape on the verso cover matches that on the final page of the manuscript. This suggests that the boards were reversed when the book was rebound. It also suggests implications for the French connection (i.e. no connection at all or could have originated with the Filmers. N.B. Nicholas's early dating of the book).
See also "The wormhole"

From Robert Shay to Nicholas Temperley (3/18/13)

Nicholas,

I don't know if you will be checking email before tomorrow yet, but I wanted to let you know that I need to retract my earlier comments about the correction slip in the manuscript. I was able to spend a little time with it this afternoon, and it's clearly a first attempt at those several measures of the Te Deum. My notes from a year and a half ago had reduced some of the individual voice staves to a keyboard score, and I simply forgot that I had compressed the music this way when I was first trying to transcribe what was under the slip. I imagine Turner at the time of copying decided he could do better, preferring some imitation between the upper and lower voices (explaining the leftward extension of the slip). It would seem to me that a correction of this nature points strongly to Turner's authorship of the service. He wouldn't be "improving" someone else's work. Rod showed me your conjectural reconstruction of the passage, and I think it makes very good sense.

In any case, very much looking forward to tomorrow!

Robert Shay

From John Milsom (3/12/13)

I see that the first anthem after your Service in F is also in F, and has Turner's signature at the end. Services sometimes came with an attached anthem, so that's maybe what you have here. If so, then the signature could refer to the Service AND anthem.

The other anthem is in C, and therefore is presumably an independent piece, signed separately by Turner.

John

From John Milsom (3/12/13)

Hi Rod,

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:

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

3. The Service in F in your MS is NOT Aldrich In F. I checked some other services in F at Christ Church, and it is NOT the ones by Charles King, John Church, Nathaniel Priest, John Goldwin, William Child or Anthony Walkeley. I don't think it's a transposed copy of any other service by Aldrich; but you should ask Robert Shay to check.

4. Are you sure your Service in F isn't by Turner himself? What's under the pastedown on the first page? Is this a cancelled revision? If so, then the Service is likely to be Turner's own.

5. I'm no expert on Service settings c.1700, and I don't know anyone who is. So good luck; you may be on your own from here!

All best,
John (Milsom)

From Robert Shay (3/4/13)

On the questions:

My notes from examining the MS firsthand do not indicate that "Turner's" was written on top of something else, though I went to the PDF just now and it looks like this could well be the case.

It's funny that photography sometimes makes things clearer than what the naked eye can see.

That's why beta-radiography (for watermarks, for example) and UV photography are sometimes

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 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!

From Nicholas Temperley (2/18/13)

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

From Nicholas Temperley (2/18/13)

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?

From Geoffrey Webber (10/15/12)

Dear Rod,

Good to hear plans are going well for the conference. The date counts me out, alas, as we have our university-wide choral award auditions from 18-20 March. We did indeed perform the Service in F twice liturgically in January:

<http://www.cai.cam.ac.uk/sites/default/files/chapelmusiclist-2012-lent3.pdf>

I personally remain confident that it is by WT and my reason for this now is the similarity between the Jubilate in F and the Jubilate in E# which I put on the CD. Note exactly the same shape of phrase at "and into his courts", as well as the melodic/harmonic turn at "the Lord is gracious", and the rare 2-pt texture at "from generation..". I can scan my edition of the Jubilate in E# for you, but if I can find the pages in my printed-out copies of Tudway's MS collection I can also send these if desired/preferred (or do you have this)? The large-scale Te Deum and Jubilate in D were sung in editions by Bryan White. I've now published the splendid A Major Mag. & Nunc via OUP:

<http://ukcatalogue.oup.com/product/9780193950177.do>

I've also a student's edition of the Te Deum of this A major service and may again have the Tudway copy of this.

Best wishes,

Geoffrey

From Greg Oehm (9/27/12)

Temperley's opinion was a bit of a downer, but I've been looking at the service of late as part of a discussion about the manuscript (I think, whatever we determine about the Service, the anthem is an important find in itself and its inclusion in a revised Turner worklist is essential). The worklist now contains several new discoveries. I think I have around 50 distinct anthems (not including subvariants) and 5 services (6, if we count the F major Service - which I think IS a Turner work). With your permission, I would love to quote some of our correspondence on the subject, and I will pass you a copy of my writing on the subject for your perusal very soon.

Greg Oehm

From Geoffrey Webber (1/6/12)

Dear Rod,

Many thanks. I shall put "Aldrich/Turner" on our Music List! Thanks for passing on those comments. I don't know the other Aldrich services but a close look at them may well help. Perhaps I can persuade a student to do an edition of the G & F major services this year; I'll let you know. And as NT suggests, a check of other settings of 'Behold now' would be good. If Turner is the author of this new service, adopting a more conventional idiom for service music seems entirely plausible (e.g. Blow in F), though he did try harder for the A Major service and

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

From Don Franklin (12/5/11)

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 well as the Gostling part books at Tenbury. In a post-dissertation note, I cite another source of the treble part: Eg. 3767, p. 113.

None of these sources is of course autograph.

The setting of "Behold now praise the Lord" clearly is a different setting of text than that found in the verse anthem with the same title, which I list in my catalogue of incipits and transcribed in the appendix to my diss. I found no reference in my notes to a full anthem setting of this text, and your ms could well be the sole surviving source. (The verse anthem version is found in several sources, including the Harley Ms; BM, Add 47845, f.80, and the Set B (1686) ptbks in Lincoln in the Key of D

3, Service. The only services I list in my diss, but do not discuss, are the Whole service in A and Morning and Evening Service in E, whose scores are in the Harley MS. In a post-diss note I list a Whole service in D (with a question mark?), whose source is Durham, Ms. Ms. A. 33

The full service in F is not known to me. Robert Shay may well be correct in saying that it is mis-attributed to Aldrich. I am afraid that I cannot offer an attribution other than Aldrich, and find no reference in my notes to a Full Service in F by Turner. Unfortunately I did not make copies of the services in A and E, but I do have a microfilm copy of the Harley Ms (I believe!) which I am happy to make available to you.

There is no doubt that your newly acquired manuscript is a significant source for our study of William Turner, but also of the Restoration anthem. I trust you will find the time to write up an article to be included in Notes or in a comparable publication.

Don Franklin

From Greg Oehm (11/9/11)

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

From Robert Shay 10/26/11

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 difficult 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 Janssen. I need to think about whether it makes sense for Janssen's initials to appear where they did, since he was a factor not a maker. You can see a bit more about all this in Robert Thompson's and my Purcell MSS book, pp. 10-15.

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.

From Greg Oehm 10/25/11

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

From Greg Oehm (10/23/11)

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

From Nicholas Temperley (10/10/11)

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” flavor 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

From Ian Spink (8/19/11)

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

From John Milsom (4/6/11)

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