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ABSTRACT

Following the Restoration of the English monarchy in 1660, musical culture gradually began to thrive under the support of royal patronage and the emerging middle class. The newly crowned Charles II brought with him a love of French music acquired during his time in exile at the court of his cousin, the young Louis XIV. Organ builders, most notably Bernard Smith and Renatus Harris, brought new life to the instrument, drawing from their experience on the Continent to build larger instruments with colorful solo stops, offering more possibilities for performers and composers. Although relatively few notated organ works survive from the Restoration period, composers generated a niche body of organ repertoire exploring compositional genres inspired by late 17th-century English instruments.

The primary organ composers of the Restoration period are Matthew Locke, John Blow, and Henry Purcell; these three musicians began to take advantage of new possibilities in organ composition, particularly the use of two-manuals with a solo register, and their writing displays the strong influence of French and Italian compositional styles. Each adapts Continental forms and techniques for the English organ, drawing from such forms as the French overture and récit pour le basse et dessus, and the Italian toccata and canzona. English organ composers from the Restoration period borrow form, stylistic techniques, ornamentation, and even direct musical quotations, to create a body of repertoire synthesizing both French and Italian styles.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

English organ building and composition flourished in the late 17th century, allowing the development of new compositional techniques and genres appropriate to the new tonal design of the English organ. The tumultuous period of the English Civil War and autocratic Puritan rule under Oliver Cromwell was immensely destructive for the English organ, and organ construction virtually ceased. Following the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660, organ builders returned to work in England, including the two figures who would ultimately become the most influential builders in England in the late 17th- and early 18th-centuries: Bernard Smith and Renatus Harris. Drawing from their prior experience working on the Continent, Smith and Harris built instruments with a new tonal design that inspired generations of English composers throughout the Restoration period and well into the 18th-century.

English composers had access not only to unique new instruments, but also to manuscript sources of French and Italian keyboard repertoire and the wealth of knowledge provided by musical colleagues. Key figures influential on English Restoration keyboard composers include Girolamo Frescobaldi, Johann Jakob Froberger, and Jacques Champion de Chambonnières, as well as countless foreign composers and performers active in England following the Restoration. New genres such as the Voluntary for Double Organ and Cornet Voluntary were established, and composers synthesized elements from the French and Italian styles into a new English style embracing French color and Italian virtuosity. The following literature review contains a brief introduction to the best-known studies of the organ music of English Restoration
composers, and the principal scholarship regarding the characteristics of the late 17\textsuperscript{th}-
century English organ for which they wrote.

\textit{Review of Scholarly Literature}

\textbf{Development of the English Organ}

The primary source regarding the history of English organ building is Stephen
Bicknell’s \textit{The History of the English Organ}, published in 1996.\textsuperscript{1} Bicknell’s extensive
coverage includes specifications, documentation from accounts and contracts, and
photographs when applicable. Beginning from the earliest accounts of organs in England
(c. 900), Bicknell traces the development of the English organ until the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century.
He incorporates recent research arising from the Early English Organ Project, centered on
the discovery of two very well-preserved 16\textsuperscript{th}-century soundboards and historically-
inspired reconstructions of the instruments by the builders Martin Goetze and Dominic
Gwynn. Bicknell also includes a “Guide to Surviving English Organs,” helpful for the
performer when searching for appropriate historic instruments for study, recording, and
performance. In addition to Bicknell’s landmark volume, recent research regarding
British organ building is published in the \textit{BIOS Journal} by the British Institute of Organ
Studies, published by Positif Press. A discussion specific to the late 17\textsuperscript{th}-century English
organ and its relationship to repertoire can be found in the collection \textit{Performing the
Music of Henry Purcell},\textsuperscript{2} edited by Michael Burden. Prominent English organ builder
Dominic Gwynn has contributed an informative chapter titled “The English Organ in


\textsuperscript{2} H. Diack Johnstone, “Ornamentation in the Keyboard Music of Henry Purcell and His Contemporaries,”
Purcell's Lifetime,” in which he discusses the international influences on late 17th- and early 18th-century styles of organ building, and how they impact performance of Purcell’s organ works.

**Restoration Organ and Keyboard Repertoire**

Regarding organ and other keyboard literature of the Restoration period, the best-known survey is found in John Caldwell’s *English Keyboard Music before the Nineteenth Century*, first published in 1973. Caldwell’s work is a comprehensive study including the vast majority of relevant English organ repertoire; especially pertinent for this project are the chapters “The Transition, 1625-1660” and “Sacred and Secular Forms, 1660-1700.” Caldwell includes a discussion of French and English ornamentation styles, based on the work of John Harley (“Ornaments in English Keyboard Music of the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries.”), which is particularly relevant for the music of Matthew Locke and John Blow.

For a survey and analysis of organ music specifically from the Restoration period, the most extensive study is Geoffrey Cox’s *Organ Music in Restoration England: A Study of Sources, Styles, and Influences*, a dissertation published in two volumes. Volume 1 contains a thorough discussion of the works of all known Restoration composers, including Locke, Blow, and Purcell, accompanied by Cox’s manuscript edition of selected repertoire in Volume 2. Cox includes a discussion of French and Italian stylistic elements, as well as a comprehensive listing of known English organ

---


manuscript sources and the works they contain. Like Cox, John Shannon also discusses English organ literature in the context of European styles (The Evolution of Organ Music in the 17th Century: A Study of European Styles, 20125), and Franklin Zimmerman discusses the influence of French and Italian musical styles in a general context (without reference to organ repertoire) in his dissertation “Purcell’s Musical Heritage: A Study of Musical Styles in Seventeenth Century England” (1958).6

Overview

The following chapters delve more deeply into the sources of French and Italian influence on English composers for the organ, with appropriate examples from late 17th-century organ works. Chapter 2 explores the tonal characteristics of the Restoration English organ as epitomized in the instruments of Bernard Smith and Renatus Harris, with particular focus on new timbres available to English organists and composers. Chapter 3 details possible sources of French influence in England, including French musicians supported by royal patronage, manuscript sources of French organ repertoire available to English composers, and French ornamentation practice in the 17th-century. Examples from Matthew Locke, John Blow, and Henry Purcell demonstrate the development of new forms aptly suited to the Restoration English organ, many with fixed registrations in line with the French Classic organ tradition. Chapter 4 highlights the influence of a range of Italian musical sources in England, including Italian vocal

---


compositions, manuscript sources of Italian organ literature, and Italian organists working in England following the Restoration. Composers such as Locke, Blow, and Purcell frequently adopted Italian stylistic elements such as the *stile durezze e ligature* ("style of dissonances and suspensions") and virtuosic toccata figuration, and in several cases Blow integrates direct quotations from the organ works of Girolamo Frescobaldi into his own compositions. Chapter 5 is a case study of three works that epitomize composers’ synthesis of French and Italian stylistic techniques during the Restoration period. Matthew Locke’s Voluntary in A Minor (*Melothesia*, 1673), John Blow’s Voluntary in G, for Double Organ, and Henry Purcell’s Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ each feature strong French and Italian components, and analysis of the three works demonstrates a noticeable evolution in the type of musical synthesis favored by Restoration composers. Early predominance of the French style shifts to later preference for Italian, which is likely an indication not only of the composers’ personal preference but also of influence tilting away from royal patronage and toward public taste. Drawing from a relatively small pool of musical resources, English organ composers of the Restoration period masterfully combined Italian formal elements and composition techniques with French ornamentation and motivic writing, synthesizing them into a unique musical style and developing new genres of organ composition well-suited to the late 17th-century English organ.
CHAPTER 2

THE ORGAN IN RESTORATION ENGLAND

Organ building flourished in Restoration England, following a period of destruction and neglect of instruments under Puritan rule during the Commonwealth. Two primary builders emerged following the Restoration, Bernard Smith (c. 1630-1708) and Renatus Harris (c. 1652-1724), who competed at a high level and applied knowledge from their respective German/Dutch and French backgrounds to organ building in England. The typical Restoration English organ was comprised of two manuals and no pedalboard, with the addition of a third manual division (the “echo organ”) in the largest instruments. Large organs often featured an unusually low compass, and builders sought to incorporate a variety of colorful timbres, including reed stops, mixtures, third-sounding ranks, and the solo Cornet and Trumpet. Restoration organ builders, particularly Smith and Harris, adopted Continental styles according to English taste, and in so doing developed a consistent tonal design that formed the foundation for late 17th- and 18th-century English organ literature.

The Rise of Puritanism and the Commonwealth: 1640-1660

The early 17th century saw the construction of quite elaborate instruments under the influence of Charles I and Archbishop William Laud, but the subsequent rise of Puritanism in the mid-17th century instigated one of the most destructive periods in the history of English organ building. In their quest to rid churches of “all monuments of Idolatry and Superstition,” the Puritan Parliament did not spare the organs. On May 19,

---

1644, Parliament banned all organs from religious institutions.\(^8\) The Puritan public quickly took heed of the ordinance, and numerous accounts exist that describe the brutal destruction of church organs. One particularly extensive source is *Angliae Ruina*, a compilation of accounts of Puritan destruction; the section entitled “Mercurius Rusticus,” by Bruno Ryves, includes many references to the desecration of organs.\(^9\) In Exeter, Ryves writes, “they brake down the Organs, and taking two or three hundred Pipes with them, in a most scornful contemptuous manner, went up and downe the streets piping with them.”\(^10\) In Chichester, “[they] brake downe the Organs, and dashing the Pipes with their Pole-axes, scoffingly said, *Harke how the Organs goe*.”\(^11\) Further references can be found throughout Ryves’ document, demonstrating both the shamelessness and the geographic extent of the Puritans’ destruction.\(^12\)

Generally, organs were not returned to English churches until the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660, by which time there were few skilled organ builders remaining in England. One was John Loosemore, best known for his organ built for Exeter Cathedral in 1665. Loosemore apparently remained active in England during the Commonwealth

---

\(^8\) “All organs and the frames and cases wherein they stand in all Churches and Chapells aforesaid shall be taken away and utterly defaced, and none other hereafter set up in their places.” E. J. Hopkins and Edward F. Rimbault, *The Organ: Its History and Construction*, Bibliotheca Organologica v. 4 (Hilversum: Frits Knuf, 1965), 590. The date cited varies among sources, but the correct year appears to be either 1643 or 1644.


\(^10\) Ibid., 242.

\(^11\) Ibid., 224.

\(^12\) Ryves, “Angliae Ruina.” In addition to the selections quoted above, see pages 104, 236, and 248, and further references to the destruction of organs found throughout the document.
period: a positive organ in Blair Atholl Castle is attributed to him,\(^\text{13}\) as are a pair of virginals now held in the Victoria & Albert Museum, London. In response to the renewed demand for instruments, exiled organ builders returned to Britain, most notably Robert Dallam, who had emigrated with his family and settled in Quimper, Brittany, during the Commonwealth. Dallam returned to England sometime before October 22, 1660 to build a new organ at St. George's Chapel, Windsor.\(^\text{14}\) He also constructed an organ for Eton College in 1662-3, and proposed a French-inspired specification for New College, Oxford c. 1663 (which was ultimately not constructed).\(^\text{15}\) Bicknell cites a document in which a New College representative inquired about adding several additional stops, particularly a Trumpet and a Cornet, to the proposed organ.\(^\text{16}\) This document may be the earliest mention of solo organ stops such as the Trumpet and Cornet, which were quickly established as prominent solo timbres in the Restoration English organ.

**Bernard Smith and Renatus Harris**

After the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660, and the Great Fire of London in 1666, foreign builders immigrated to England in search of new work. The Rebuilding Act of 1667, passed by Parliament to govern the post-fire reconstruction process, ended the monopoly of trade guilds in London for up to seven years and greatly encouraged the

---


\(^\text{16}\) Bicknell, *The History of the English Organ*, 111.
immigration of Continental craftsmen.\textsuperscript{17} The Act brought new English and foreign organ builders to the city in the 1660s, particularly Bernard Smith (c. 1630-1708) and Renatus Harris (c. 1652-1724). The two rivals brought with them knowledge of German, Dutch, and French organ building techniques, and together initiated a new era in English organ building.

Although Smith's origins are not known conclusively, it is widely accepted that he was born in Germany, and then worked in the Netherlands for ten years before immigrating to London in 1667.\textsuperscript{18} In the first known account of his activities, he is referred to as Baerent Smitt, marking his arrival in Hoorn, the Netherlands (from Bremen, Germany) in 1657.\textsuperscript{19} He is known to have repaired the organ in the Hoorn Parish Church in 1660 and received a contract to build two organs in Edam under the name Barent Smit (for the Grote Kerk and the Cleinjne Kerk, both in 1662; see the Grote Kerk specification

\textsuperscript{17} “XVI. Artificers working made free of London; and liable to serve in Offices as Freemen: And be it further enacted That all Carpenters Brickelayers Masons Plaisterers Joyners and other Artificers Workemen and Labourers to be imploymed in the said Buildings who are not Freemen of the said Citty shall for the space of seaven yeares next ensuing and for soe long time after as untill the said buildings shall be fully finished have and enjoy such and the same liberty of working and being sett to worke in the said building as the Freemen of the City of the same Trades and Professions have and ought to enjoy, Any Usage or Custome of the Citty to the contrary notwithstanding: And that such Artificers as aforesaid which for the space of seaven yeares shall have wrought in the rebuilding of the Citty in their respective Arts shall from and after the said seaven yeares have and enjoy the same Liberty to worke as Freemen of the said Citty for and during their naturall lives.” John Raithby, ed., “Charles II, 1666 - An Act for Rebuilding the Citty of London,” in Statutes of the Realm: Volume 5: 1628-180, 1819, 603–612, accessed October 27, 2014, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=47390.

\textsuperscript{18} For arguments claiming Smith was of English origin, see Andrew Freeman and John Pickering Rowntree, Father Smith, Otherwise Bernard Schmidt, Being an Account of a Seventeenth Century Organ Maker (Oxford: Positif Press, 1977), 1–2, or Cecil Clutton and Austin Niland, The British Organ (London: B.T. Batsford, 1963), 69–70.

in Table 1).\textsuperscript{20} Smit contracted to build a six-stop organ for a church in Amsterdam in 1665, and was to receive a final payment in May of 1667. It is likely that Smit departed for England in 1667, the year following the fire. He is first mentioned in England in the same year, under the name Bernard Smith, for receiving payment of tuning expenses in the account books of Westminster Abbey. While there is no direct evidence of Smith's journey from the Continent, it is highly likely that the builders are one and the same, due to comparisons of Smit and Smith's signatures and the similarity of pipe markings in the Grote Kerk, Edam with markings on Smith's extant English pipes.\textsuperscript{21} Continental variants of Smith’s name persisted in English usage: as late as 1819, Smith was referred to as Schmidt in an article in the \textit{English Musical Gazette}.\textsuperscript{22} Smith quickly established himself as a highly-respected (and prolific) English organ builder: he was officially named the King's Organ Maker from 1681 onward,\textsuperscript{23} and became affectionately known to future generations as "Father Smith."

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[Ibid., 10–11. For specifications as given in the 1662 contract, see Bicknell, \textit{The History of the English Organ}, 125.]
\item[See note 38 below.
\item[Smith succeeded James Farr as the King’s Organ Maker on May 30, 1681, but he had already done work in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall and the King’s Chapel, Windsor in the previous ten years. See Freeman and Rowntree, \textit{Father Smith, Otherwise Bernard Schmidt, Being an Account of a Seventeenth Century Organ Maker}, 13–16.]
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Table 1. Specification of Grote Kerk, Edam (Barent Smit, 1662-1663).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoofdwerk</th>
<th>Positief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestant</td>
<td>Gedacht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holpijp</td>
<td>Quintadeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octaef</td>
<td>Prestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quint</td>
<td>Holpijp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixtuir</td>
<td>Naestquint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Super Octaef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cimbel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sesquialtera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufflet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cromhoorn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 8 4 4 2 2/3 2 2/3 2 2 8

Smith’s primary competitor, Renatus Harris, was a Roman Catholic organ builder who spent the years prior to the Restoration in France. His father, Thomas Harris, was an apprentice to Thomas Dallam, and immigrated to France with the Dallam family in 1642. After building at least three organs in Brittany, the senior Harris returned to England with the Dallam family c. 1660. Renatus ultimately took over his father's firm, and soon became Bernard Smith's great rival in English organ building. The two men built an impressive number of instruments across England and, through their family legacies, initiated a national school of English organ building.

The lasting rivalry between Smith and Harris culminated in a celebrated competition between the two builders, the so-called “Battle of the Organs,” in which each was hired to build an organ for the Temple Church, London. The winner was ostensibly chosen by an impartial panel of gentlemen from the two Inns of Court: the Inner and the Middle Temples. (The responsibility for managing and maintaining the church was granted to the two legal societies by James I in 1608). While the contest between Smith and Harris was allegedly only a matter of each builder's ingenuity, it became a six-year affair (1682-1688) involving prominent organists, the two builders' followers, and
internal politics of the legal societies themselves.

The reason for the battle remains unknown, but it appears to have begun officially on February 16, 1683,\(^\text{24}\) when a bench table order of the Inner Temple states: “Whereas Mr Smith and Mr Harris, organ makers, have been employed by the treasurers of both societies of the Temple to prepare two organs respectively by them to be made, the said society to have the election jointly of that which shall be esteemed the best organ both as to sound and price.”\(^\text{25}\) According to Bicknell, Smith declared soon after the previous order was made that he alone was awarded a contract to build a new organ for the Temple Church in the previous year, 1682.\(^\text{26}\) A statement in the Middle Temple archives, dated May 8, 1863, supports this claim:

> I William Cleare . . . together with diverse other workmen . . . did hear [the treasurers of the Inner and the Middle societies of the Temple] both of them being in the Tempell Church together in the Month of September last [i.e. September 1682] give full orde and directions unto Mr Bernard Smith the Kings organ maker to make an organ for the Tempell Church and also give orders to the Said Smith to take care and give Directions for the Setting up of the Organ loft in the Tempell Church as the Said Smith should judge Most Convenient . . . and that then neither Reny Harris nor any other person Whatsoever was ever mentioned to have any orders or Directions to make a organ for the Tempell Church.\(^\text{27}\)

No record of a resolution to the claim has been found, and the Temple dispute continued while both builders began to set up instruments in the church in 1684.\(^\text{28}\) Harris employed


\(^{27}\) Knight, “The Battle of the Organs, The Smith Organ at the Temple and Its Organist,” 79.

Giovanni Baptista Draghi, organist of Queen Catherine of Braganza, to demonstrate his organ, while the organists John Blow and Henry Purcell demonstrated Smith’s instrument.

It is likely that Smith met both Blow and Purcell through John Hingeston, court organist under Cromwell and “Keeper and Repairer of his Majesties Organs, Harpsicalls and other Instruments of Musick” under Charles II (Hingeston was Smith’s predecessor, for whom Smith lowered the pitch of the organ in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall by 1676). Blow may have studied with Hingeston, and Purcell was Hingeston’s apprentice (from 1673 on) as well as his godson.

Perhaps delayed by the organists’ demonstrations, the winner of the competition was not decided quickly, hindered by politics within the Inner and Middle Temples and sabotage committed by followers of both organ builders. Although Smith's organ was ultimately judged the winner, he did not sign a contract to sell his instrument formally to the Temple Church until June 21, 1688.

Smith's organ was renowned for its sweetness and fullness of sound, and likely won the competition due to Smith's superior pipe voicing and his innovations with regard to temperament. Since a scale cannot be perfectly tuned without compromise, some fifths must be tempered, or altered in order to enable a feasible tuning system (called the


temperament). The most common temperament used in late 17th century England was \(\frac{1}{4}\) comma meantone, which called for all fifths to be equally out of tune by a small amount, with the exception of one “wolf fifth,” a painfully dissonant interval which absorbed all tuning errors. Each of the eleven tempered fifths are flatted by \(\frac{1}{4}\) Syntonic comma (5.38 cents), or \(\frac{1}{4}\) the difference in cents between ascending four pure fifths and ascending two octaves and a pure third. Unfortunately, organs tuned in \(\frac{1}{4}\) comma meantone are only playable in eight of the twelve major keys, as the four major thirds affected by the wolf fifth are too dissonant to function as a tonal center. By adding two additional keys to each octave (known as split sharps or subsemitones, corresponding to D-sharp and A-flat), Smith allowed the Temple Church organ to be playable in several more keys before the organist encountered dissonant intervals.\(^{33}\) Bicknell claims that the full compass of Smith's three Temple keyboards was FF, GG, AA-c".\(^{34}\) If Smith's additional keys began at G-sharp, the compass would span 61 notes as seen in the specification from Smith's original contract, transcribed below in Table 2. As each additional key required a full set of corresponding pipes and consequently a greater supply of expensive metal resources, Smith’s innovation was a rare extravagance in early English organ building, and demonstrates the high stakes of the competition between the two builders.

Regarding the pitch of the two organs, it is evident from the 1688 contract that Smith's instrument had three manuals (the first known three-manual instrument in

\(^{33}\) Each split sharp was divided into two keys, with the most common key (E-flat and G-sharp) placed at the front and the less common key (D-sharp or A-flat) positioned at the back, raised slightly so as to be easily accessible for the performer.

\(^{34}\) Bicknell, *The History of the English Organ*, 131.
England\textsuperscript{35} and was based on 12' pitch. A further note in the contract states that Smith's organ was “a hoel not loer [a whole note lower],” than Harris', probably meaning that Harris' organ began at GG.\textsuperscript{36} It is unlikely that the comment refers to pitch, as Smith's organs tended to be at a higher pitch than Harris'.\textsuperscript{37} An article in the \textit{English Musical Gazette} relates that “it is a remarkable thing that all Schmidt's instruments were a quarter, and some even a half tone above pitch;” at St. Paul’s, London, “this was so severely felt by the wind instruments, at the performances of the Sons of the Clergy, that they could not get near the pitch of the organ.”\textsuperscript{38} The discrepancy among pitch levels may be due to Smith and Harris’ Continental affiliations, or merely part of an inconsistent movement away from the transposing system in English organ building.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 130; John Caldwell, \textit{English Keyboard Music before the Nineteenth Century} (New York: Praeger, 1973), 159.

\textsuperscript{36} Knight, “The Battle of the Organs, The Smith Organ at the Temple and Its Organist,” 87.


\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.

Table 2. Specification of Temple Church, London (Bernard Smith, 1683-88).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Organ</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestand</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holflute of wood and mettle</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principall of mettle</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinta of mettle</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super octavo</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornett of mettle [IV ranks, from c-sharp']</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesquialtera of mettle [III ranks]</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedackt of wainescott</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture of mettle [III-IV ranks]</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpett of mettle</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair Organ</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gedackt wainescott</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohlflute of mettle</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Sadt of mettle</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spitts flute of mettle</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Viol and Violin</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice humane of mettle</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecchos</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gedackt of wood</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Octavo of mettle</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedackt of wood [from c’]</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>[12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flute of mettle [from c’]</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>[6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornett of mettle [III ranks, from c’]</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesquialtera [III ranks, FF-b?]</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpett [from c’]</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>[12]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foreign stop names and other evidence that can be gleaned from Smith’s Temple Church specification (Table 2) make it clear that Smith retained many organ-building techniques common on the Continent. Several of the stops frequently found in Smith’s instruments are of Dutch or German origin, particularly the Quintadena and stops with tapered pipes, such as the Spitts Flute on the Temple Organ. A Quintadeen appears in the Edam contract, as does a Naestquint, a tapered 3’ stop analogous to the

---

40 The proposed specification of Smith’s Temple Church organ, as transcribed from the 1688 contract by Macrory and edited by Stephen Bicknell. See Macrory, A Few Notes on the Temple Organ, 30–31; Bicknell, The History of the English Organ, 129–130.
Spitts Flute. Bicknell claims that Smith hereafter abandoned the use of tapered pipes, and his 1695 organ for St. Paul’s, London, with a ‘Quinta Dena Diapason’ in the Chayre Organ, may well be the only later example. Table 3 provides examples of stops of Dutch or German origin common to Smith’s instruments throughout his career, beginning with the organ for the Grote Kerk, Edam, and ending with his monumental instrument for St. Paul’s.

Table 3. Comparison of stops in four Smith organs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edam (1662)</th>
<th>Temple Church (1683)</th>
<th>Durham (1684)</th>
<th>St. Paul's (1695)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestant</td>
<td>Prestand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holpijp</td>
<td>Holflute</td>
<td>Holfluit</td>
<td>Holfleut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixtuir</td>
<td>Mixture</td>
<td>Mixture</td>
<td>Mixture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedacht</td>
<td>Gedackt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintadeen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super octaef</td>
<td>Super octavo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cimbel</td>
<td>Cimball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexquialtera</td>
<td>Sesquialtera</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sesquialtera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromhorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crum horne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smith’s use of 12’ pitch and his use of split sharps to increase the number of playable keys can also be traced to his Dutch background. While earlier English organ keyboards traditionally began at C (at either 5’, 10’, or 8’ pitch), many of Smith’s early English organs began at FF at 12’ pitch. Organs in the Netherlands were nearly all built with compass F-a’’ by 1500, and many were maintained with this compass

---

42 Ibid., 137.
well into the 17th century. Likewise, several organs with split keys were built near Hamburg between 1610 and 1630, and sporadically elsewhere in Germany throughout the 17th century. The Hagerbeer family of organ builders, from Ostfriesland in North Germany, are known to have built split-key organs in the Netherlands, particularly in The Hague (1641) and Alkmaar (1643-1646). As only two English organs are known to have featured split keys, the Temple Church organ and Smith’s Durham Cathedral organ (1684-5), it is likely that this innovation was unique to Smith in England and that it was inspired by split-key instruments on the Continent.

Renatus Harris, Smith’s competitor, learned the Dallam family’s style of organ building from his father Thomas Harris, and hence incorporated several aspects of 17th-century French organ building into his work. Harris frequently stopped the pipes of the Twelfth (similar to the French Nasard 3’), and used mutation stops such as the Quint and Tierce on multiple manuals. For example, Harris’ organ for St. Bride Fleet Street, London (1696) included a ‘Stop’d twefth’ on the Chair Organ and a Twelfth and Tierce on each of the three manuals. Harris’ organ for Salisbury Cathedral (1710) included both Twelfth and Tierce on three out of four manuals, whereas Smith’s organs rarely include independent mutations higher than the Fifteenth (one exception is his organ for St. Nicholas, Deptford, of 1697). Harris’ use of mutations and both solo and chorus reeds in the French tradition produced a rich, brilliant

---

45 See J. van Biezen, Het Nederlandse orgel in de Renaissance en de Barok, in het bijzonder de school van Jan van Covelens (Utrecht: Koninklijke Vereniging voor Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis, 1995), chap. 4.


sound,\textsuperscript{48} with the dynamic increasing from bass to treble in a similar style to the earlier work of the Dallam family in Brittany.

\textit{Tonal Design of the 17\textsuperscript{th}-Century English Organ}

Led by Smith and Harris, a new style of English organ building developed in the late 17\textsuperscript{th} century. The typical organ of Smith's and Harris' time was characterized by the inclusion of reed and mixture stops, as well as the addition of a third manual, the Echo. The doubled principal ranks found from the early 16\textsuperscript{th} century onward were replaced by new reed and mixture stops. Reed timbres and stop names were based on common instruments, including the human voice: Trumpet, Cremona or Crumhorn, Vox Humana, Bassoon, French Horn, Clarion, and Hautboy (oboe). Mixture compositions included the Cornet (five ranks, often treble solo) and the Sesquialtera (three ranks, often bass solo), and both mixtures included third-sounding ranks. These characteristics of 17\textsuperscript{th}-18\textsuperscript{th} century English tonal design are first evident in early organs of the Restoration period, before the careers of Smith and Harris began, and they were synthesized into an English national style of organ building by the turn of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century.

Builders such as Robert and Ralph Dallam, Thomas Harris, and John Loosemore began to incorporate new reed and mixture stops from c. 1660 onward, conserving the essential principal chorus from the pre-Restoration organ but eliminating its doubled principal stops (though the practice remained in larger organs placed on a rood screen, in which one rank of principal pipes comprised each façade).\textsuperscript{49} The St. George's Chapel,

\textsuperscript{48} Gwynn, “The English Organ in Purcell’s Lifetime,” 23.

Windsor, specification below exemplifies the typical Restoration English organ; it includes the half-compass Cornet, Sesquialtera, and Trumpet, but no doubled principals.

**Table 4. Specification of St. George's Chapel Windsor (Robert Dallam, 1661).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Diapason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped Diapason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornet (III, treble)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesquialtera (III, bass)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet (treble)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet (bass)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The St. George's Chapel, Windsor organ is one of the first instruments in England known to feature half-compass solo stops (the Cornet, Sesquialtera, and Trumpet), and the inclusion of solo registers (either half or full compass) was frequently adopted in the design and construction of new Restoration instruments. In 1664, the fellows of New College, Oxford requested that a Trumpet, Cornet, and other stops be added to Robert Dallam’s 1662 proposal, since “several New Organs in other Churches” had “more stops than our Organ in New College.” Although such solo stops have been scoffingly described as extraordinary “baubles for the aspiring merchant classes,” they were featured in nearly all post-Restoration Smith and Harris organs.

Bernard Smith would have encountered Dallam’s instrument at St. George’s Chapel, Windsor when he constructed a new organ for the King's Private Chapel.

---


Windsor, in 1674 (at least eight years before he was awarded the Temple Church contract). The same stops featured in Dallam's organ at Windsor are found throughout Smith's later instruments, most notably the Temple Church organ, and the inclusion of solo registers became a distinctive feature of the late 17th- and early 18th-century English organ.

In 17th-century France and England, solo stops such as the Cornet and Trumpet were meant to be played in a manner appropriate to the character of the stops and the instruments they imitate. The 18th-century French builder Dom Bédos recommends that “the Positif Tierce of the Cornet should be played with rapidity, while others – such as Trumpets imitating fanfares – should be played more moderately. Each one should be handled according to its tonal character.” Both the cornett and brass instruments were utilized in England; according to Anthony Baines, cornets and trombones were used to double the voices of the choirs in the Chapel Royal, large cathedrals, and even some provincial and collegiate churches before the Commonwealth. As no Cornet stop is found on an English organ until 1660, however, it is highly likely that the Cornet came to England from France, where it developed a prominent role in the French Classical organ by the 1630s.

53 As evidenced by a petition “for payment of the sum of £110 unto Bernard Smith, organist, or his assigns, being for his extraordinary charges and expenses in putting up the organ in His Majesty’s Private Chapel at Windsor,” dated Dec. 19, 1674. Boeringer, Freeman, and Royal College of Organists, Organa Britannica Organs in Great Britain 1660-1860, 1:180.


Other solo stops, too, were prized for their imitation of instrumental sounds. In Thomas Tudway’s account of the Battle of the Organs, he writes of additional reed stops constructed by Smith and Harris:

These were the Vox-Humana, Cremorne, the double Courtel, or double bassoon, and some others. The stops, which were newly-invented, or at least new to English ears, gave great delight to the crowds who attended the trials; and the imitations were so exact and pleasing on both sides, that it was difficult to determine who had best succeeded.\(^{56}\)

The earliest mention of a Vox humana in England may be in 1669, when a Dallam family member added a ‘Vox Humane’ to the organ at Dulwich College.\(^ {57}\) While the stop was completely unknown in England before the Restoration,\(^ {58}\) the Dallams frequently used the ‘Voix humaine’ during their time in France (1642-1660), notably at Lanvellec (Robert Dallam, 1653), Lesneven Priory (Robert Dallam, 1654), and Daoulas Abbey (Thomas Dallam de la Tour, 1667-9).\(^ {59}\) An anonymous manuscript in the Temple Church library refers to a Vox humana stop on Smith’s organ: “It hath several excellent stops, as the Cremona stop, ye Trumpet stops, the Voice Humane, which last stop is set to Mr. Gascall’s voice, who can reach one of the deepest basses in England.”\(^ {60}\) Although Smith solely included the Vox humana in the Temple Church organ in order to fulfill a


\(^{57}\) Gwynn, “The Origins of the English Style in Church Organ-Building,” 125.

\(^{58}\) Bicknell, The History of the English Organ, 95.

\(^{59}\) Ibid., 102, 94, and 101.

challenge given by Harris, Smith previously employed the stop in England as early as 1675, at St. Mary-the-Virgin in Oxford. He also incorporated the Vox humana into later instruments, including those for Durham Cathedral (1684-5), St. Paul's Cathedral, London (1695-7), and Trinity College, Cambridge (1708).

It is unclear how the use of the Vox humana first took hold in England, and whether the Dutch or French organ building style was more influential in its early adoption. It is possible that Smith encountered a Vox humana in the Netherlands before immigrating to England: several 17th century Dutch organ builders favored the stop, particularly the van Hegerbeer family, Jan Morlet, and Roelof Barentsz. However, the Voix humaine was employed by the Dallams during their years in Brittany, and it was regularly included in French Classical specifications. Predominantly located on the Grand Orgue (or on the Positif or Echo of larger instruments), the Voix humaine was used as a solo stop imitating the “singing style.” Evidence that the Dallams were incorporating the Voix humaine into post-Restoration English organs (as at Dulwich College, above) suggests that the practice of including a Vox humana in late 17th- and

61 “At length Harris challenged Father Smith to make additional reed-stops within a given time; these were the Vox-Humana, Cremorne, the double Courtel, or double bassoon, and some others.” Macrory, A Few Notes on the Temple Organ, 20.

62 Freeman and Rowntree, Father Smith, Otherwise Bernard Schmidt, Being an Account of a Seventeenth Century Organ Maker, 120.

63 Ibid., 28, 34, and 44.

64 In his survey of Dutch organ building, Jan van Biezen claims that a new type of Vox humana, with a large, full tone, came into fashion between 1650 and 1680. Biezen, Het Nederlandse orgel in de Renaissance en de Barok, in het bijzonder de school van Jan van Covelens, 369–370.


66 Ibid., 196.
18th-century English organs may well have been brought from France by the Dallam family following the Restoration.

The inclusion of a variety of new reed stops, including the Vox humana and Cremorne, became a distinctive feature of the Restoration English organ, and was especially popular with contemporary English audiences. These solo reeds combined effectively with the diapason chorus, solo Cornet and Trumpet stops, and mutations to form a complete tonal design which reached its culmination in the specifications of Smith and Harris. The variety of registration possibilities and the new capabilities of two- and three-manual instruments allowed English composers to experiment with new forms, highlighting particular registrations as inspired by the French Classic tradition. Three of these forms, the Double Organ Voluntary, Cornet Voluntary, and Trumpet Voluntary, will be examined in the following chapter along with other sources of French musical influence in late 17th-century England.
CHAPTER 3

INFLUENCE OF THE FRENCH STYLE

Due to the close proximity of England and France, there is a long and storied relationship between the musical traditions of the two nations, dating from 1066 (the Battle of Hastings). Royal patronage particularly supported French musicians in England during the time of the Restoration, when Charles II’s preference for French musical style and his desire to imitate French musical institutions brought numerous French musicians to England. French influence was significant in both repertoire and organ building, and new registrations made possible by organ building innovations encouraged the development of registration-specific genres similar to those in France. English organ composers, particularly Matthew Locke, John Blow, and Henry Purcell, took advantage of colorful solo stops and the use of two manuals to establish forms such as the Double Organ Voluntary and the Cornet Voluntary. In addition, composers adopted French ornamentation, motivic writing, and performance practice conventions. When Restoration composers combined French elements with the influence of other national styles, particularly Italian, they created a unique, well-crafted body of repertoire suited to performance on late 17th-century English instruments. The following sections assess the impact of French music in Restoration England, identifying significant French musicians supported by Charles II, English manuscript sources of 17th-century French keyboard repertoire, and key components of French performance practice.

Royal Patronage and French Influence

French music and musicians established a presence in England as early as 1066 following the Battle of Hastings, and French musicians were frequently supported in the
courts of English monarchs. The renowned troubadour Bernart de Ventadorn likely traveled to England in the service of Henry II and Eleanor of Aquitaine in the mid-12th century, and later monarchs Henry III and Edward I delighted in French narrative genres such as the romance and chanson de geste. In the early 17th century, Stuart courts supported French musicians, and Charles II held French music and musicians in high regard both during his years in exile and after his Restoration to the monarchy in 1660. As an exiled prince, Charles resided predominantly in France and the Netherlands, initially joining his mother and first cousin (the young Louis XIV) in France, before joining his sister Mary and brother-in-law William II of Orange in The Hague. Charles returned to England with a pronounced preference for French musical style, as evidenced by his patronage of French musicians and the imitation in England of contemporary French musical institutions such as Louis XIV’s ensemble of 24 violins and Académie Royale de Musique. As a result, Charles II supported musicians traveling from France to England and vice versa, with key figures including Robert Cambert and Luis Grabu (the earliest producers of French opera), English composer Pelham Humfrey, and the illusive organist François de Prendcourt.

Charles II’s preference for music in the French style, particularly dance music and opera, is evident in the accounts of biographer Roger North (1651-1734):

[Charles II] had lived some considerable time abroad, where the French musick was in request, which consisted of an Entry (perhaps) and then Brawles, as they were called, that is motive aires, and dances. And it was, and is yet a mode among the Monseurs, always to act the musick, which habit the King had got, and never in his life could endure any that he could not act by keeping the time; which made the comon andante or else the step-tripla the onely musicall styles at Court in his
time. And after the manner of France, he set up a band of 24 violins to play at his dinners, which disbanded all the old English musick at once.\textsuperscript{67}

North also emphasizes the King’s complete disinterest in the contrapuntal music composed in the early 17\textsuperscript{th} century: “King Charles II was a professed lover of musick, but of this kind onely, and had an utter detestation of Fancys…”\textsuperscript{68} Charles II’s band of 24 violins, commonly known as the band of “four and twenty fiddlers,” were established in direct imitation of Louis XIV’s similar ensemble. Their duties included performing for the King’s meals, as well as accompanying performances of anthems with the Chapel Royal.

Charles II is also known for his attempts to establish French opera and \textit{ballet de cour} in England in the 1670s, the decade in which English operatic activity began to flourish.\textsuperscript{69} Central to Charles’ efforts was the recruitment of key figures in early French opera, most notably Robert Cambert and Luis Grabu. Cambert and Grabu both held multiple royal appointments during their years in England, and they are best known for establishing the English equivalent to Louis XIV’s \textit{Académie Royale de Musique}, the Royall Academy of Musick.


\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., 350.

Robert Cambert (c. 1628-1677)

Robert Cambert, a pupil of Chambonnières, is credited with co-creating the school of French opera alongside Pierre Perrin. Formerly organist of Saint-Honoré (Paris), Cambert moved to London in 1673 with the aid of Louis XIV, who acquired him the position of maître de musique and harpsichordist for Louise de Queroualle, Dutchess of Portsmouth and primary mistress of Charles II. Along with Luis Grabu, Cambert is likely responsible for founding the new Royall Academy of Musick for musical theater productions, and he was active in the king’s band of violins. (In July 1674, a group of 12 violinists was instructed “to practice after such manner as Monsr. Combert [sic] shall enforme them.”) Cambert is also known to have composed a Ballet et musique pour le divertissement du roy de la Grande-Bretagne, in celebration of the wedding of James II and Mary of Modena in 1677. Cambert’s broader significance is unclear, but he may have brought key manuscript sources to England, especially organ works by Louis Couperin.

Luis Grabu (fl. 1665-94)

Catalan-born and French-trained composer Luis Grabu, who may have been responsible for bringing Cambert to England, was appointed Master of the King’s Musick in June 1666. Grabu also took control of the band of 24 violins, to the displeasure


71 Cox, Organ Music in Restoration England 1, 1:34.

72 Ibid.

of his English colleagues.\textsuperscript{74} (Diarist Samuel Pepys reports Pelham Humfrey’s pointed comment that Grabu “understands nothing nor can play on any instruments and so cannot compose.”\textsuperscript{75}) After anti-Catholic sentiment resulted in a ban on payment to Catholic court musicians in 1673, Grabu moved into the realm of opera production, establishing the Royall Academy of Musick together with Robert Cambert. In 1674, the Academy produced a revised version of Cambert’s \textit{Ariane, ou Le mariage de Bacchus}, with music partially composed by Grabu (\textit{Ariane} was originally produced by Cambert and Pierre Perrin in Paris c. 1660-1661). While few details are known regarding the formation of the English Academy, it was almost certainly modeled after Perrin/Cambert’s \textit{Académie Royale de Musique} in Paris (founded 1669), which was replaced by Lully’s \textit{Académie des Opéras} in 1672. Andrew Walkling, an expert on early English musical theater, suggests that the Academy may have been formed as a means of supporting the work of French Catholic musicians during a period of intense anti-Catholic sentiment, in which Catholics were prohibited from court employment.\textsuperscript{76} Grabu largely escaped political backlash and continued to be involved in the production of English musical theater throughout his career; in the early 1680s, he was enlisted “to represent something at least like an Opera in England for his Majestyes diversion,”\textsuperscript{77} as recounted by Lord Preston, the English Envoy Extraordinary to the French court. This directive resulted in the music for

\begin{thebibliography}{999}
\bibitem{74} Ibid.
\bibitem{75} Ibid.
\bibitem{76} Walkling, “Court, Culture, and Politics in Restoration England,” 157–161.
\end{thebibliography}
Dryden’s *Albion and Albanius* in 1684-5 (“effectively a Lullian opera with English words”).

**Pelham Humfrey (c. 1647-1674)**

In addition to supporting French musicians in England, Charles II also encouraged English musicians to be trained in the French style. Pelham Humfrey, a “precocious” chorister and composer under ‘Captain’ Henry Cooke in the Chapel Royal, was favored by Charles II from a young age, and the King paid for Humfrey to study in both France and Italy from 1664-1667. Humfrey’s years in France may have included study with Lully and with Henri Dumont, who was appointed master of Louis XIV’s chapel in 1663. Following Humfrey’s return to England, Pepys describes him as “an absolute Monsieur, as full of form and confidence and vanity,” who “disparages everything and everybody's skill but his own.” Unfortunately Humfrey’s social and musical aptitude was never fully realized, as he died at the young age of 26.

**François de Prendcourt (c. 1640-1725)**

‘Captain’ François de Prendcourt, a foreign-born contemporary of Pelham Humfrey, spent many years in England as documented by Roger North. A shadowy figure with French and German connections, Prendcourt was appointed Master of the

---


80 As proposed by Franklin Zimmerman, an American musicologist specializing in the music of Purcell, who points out that Dumont and Humfrey share the technique of incorporating upbeat sections in triple meter, often marked “gay.” Zimmerman maintains that “Humfrey's works show none of the subtle nuances, and scarcely anything of the rhythmic flexibility we are accustomed to in Lully's works.” Zimmerman, “Purcell’s Musical Heritage,” 49–50, 57.
Children in the Catholic chapel of James II (at Whitehall), where he taught Latin, music, and singing and collaborated with the Master of the Chapel, Italian-born Innocenzo Fede. Regarding Prendcourt’s playing style, North writes:

| His graces were clear, true descant, and harmonious; his movement distinct and swift; but this latter he aided by an undue slurr of the keys, which the eye would catch, sooner than the ear . . . And whatever amazement he raised by affected disorder – I might say confusion – of sounds, he always cleared them by degrees, and left the audience satisfied and pleased. |

Although Prendcourt has no surviving organ repertoire, his theoretical writing on keyboard playing and continuo is recounted by North, and four harpsichord suites in his own hand survive in York Minster MS M.16 (24 pieces in total with French-language annotations). Prendcourt’s court employment ended with the fall of James II on Dec. 23, 1688, after which he served in the military in Ireland and was later imprisoned in the Bastille on charges of espionage until his release in 1697. North does not mention the period of imprisonment, probably due to Prendcourt’s unsuitable political connections, but French documents reveal Prendcourt describing himself to interrogators as born in Würzburg in the 1640s and currently a “Gentilhomme de la Fraconie.” Prendcourt later returned to England, and in 1705, he was employed by Thomas Coke, Vice-chamberlain

---

81 North, Roger North on Music, 52–53.


83 North, Roger North on Music, 55.

84 Ibid., 49–63.


86 Ibid.
to Queen Anne, to arrange music and assist in conversing in French with Camille
d’Hostun, the maréchal-comte de Tallard and the French ambassador in London.\textsuperscript{87}

\textit{English Manuscript Sources of French Keyboard Repertoire}

Despite the presence of French organists such as Prendcourt and Cambert, there are few English manuscript sources of French repertoire specific to the organ from the Restoration period.\textsuperscript{88} Two manuscript sources are particularly significant for French influence on English organ literature: Oxford, Christ Church MS 1179, which contains a work now known to be by Nicholas Lebègue, and a manuscript privately owned by Guy Oldham containing 70 organ works of Louis Couperin. These rare examples of French organ repertoire in England provide important models for the forms found in Restoration English organ composition.

\textbf{Nicholas Lebègue (1630-1702)}

The extensive contents of Oxford, Christ Church MS 1179 include harpsichord works by John Blow, a partial movement of a Frescobaldi partita (\textit{Partite 11 sopra l'aria di Monicha})\textsuperscript{89}, voluntaries by Christopher Gibbons and Henry Purcell, and an organ work by Nicholas Lebègue. All were copied during the manuscript’s second scribal phase, likely in the 1680s,\textsuperscript{90} and the Lebègue work was originally ascribed to Purcell.\textsuperscript{91}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid., 15.
\textsuperscript{88} For English manuscript sources of French harpsichord repertoire, see Bruce Gustafson, \textit{French Harpsichord Music of the 17th Century: A Thematic Catalog of the Sources, with Commentary}, vol. 1, Studies in Musicology no. 11 (Ann Arbor, Mich: UMI Research Press, 1979), 57.
\end{flushleft}
Originally entitled “Trio du 4e [ton]. Tu Solus” (facsimile shown in Figure 1) in Lebègue’s Second Livre d’Orgue (1678-9), the Lebègue movement replaces the sung Gloria verse “Tu solus latissimus” in mode 4. There are no known 17th-century printed sources of Lebègue’s Second Livre d’Orgue in the United Kingdom today, but other collections of Lebègue’s organ works can be found in the British Library (e.g. Premier Livre des Pieces d’Orgue).92

![Facsimile of Lebègue’s “Trio du 4e [ton]. Tu Solus” from Second Livre d’Orgue (1678-9).](image)

**Figure 1.** Lebègue, “Trio du 4e [ton]. Tu Solus” (Second Livre d’Orgue, 1678-9).

**Louis Couperin (c.1626-1661)**

The second, and more significant, known manuscript source of French organ repertoire in England is a manuscript privately owned by Guy Oldham in London.

---

91 Cox, Organ Music in Restoration England I, 1:160.

92 Ibid.
containing 70 organ works of the composer Louis Couperin. Couperin’s keyboard works were never published during his lifetime, and the vast majority of the organ works in the Oldham MS were previously unknown. Due to limited access to the manuscript, Couperin’s works remained unpublished for many years after their discovery. (The first published edition, by Nicolas Gorenstein, appeared in 1993, and was soon followed by Oldham’s own edition of the works in 2003.) In addition to the works of Louis Couperin, the Oldham MS includes harpsichord works by Chambonnières, d’Anglebert, and Hardel (both pupils of Chambonnières along with Couperin), and an otherwise unknown organ work attributed to Frescobaldi (*Duresse de Frescobaldi*). There are no other known English copies of Louis Couperin’s organ repertoire, and the Oldham MS was most likely brought to England by a French musician employed in the court of Charles II. One possible candidate is Robert Cambert, a fellow student of Chambonnières.

The 70 works by Louis Couperin are predominantly dated between 1650-1659, and include 2 *plein jeux*, 31 fugues or fantasies, 6 *basses de trompette* (each titled *Fantaisie*), 2 duos, and 29 chant-based works (mostly trios). Couperin’s compositional style is notable for bridging the gap between the contrapuntal style of Titelouze (c. 1562-93) 

---


1633) and the more colorful style first appearing in the music of Nivers (1632-1714).\(^{96}\)
Couperin is also the first French Classic composer to indicate specific registrations, and many of the 70 works in the Oldham MS even include specific dates of composition.

The 33 fugues are titled either \textit{Fugue} or \textit{Fantaisie} (\textit{Fantaisie} in early examples, with the transition to \textit{Fugue} occurring c. 1654-1656\(^{97}\)), and are composed in both \textit{grave} and \textit{légère} styles. Seven are provided with registration specifications for the \textit{cromhorne} or \textit{tierce} (e.g. no. 20, \textit{Fugue sur le Cromhorne}, or no. 58, \textit{Fantaisie sur la tierce du Grand Clavier avec le tremblant lent}\(^{98}\)). The registration likely depends on the style of fugal writing, as described by Nivers: "\textit{Fugues graves} [are to be performed] on the large \textit{jeu de tierce} with the tremulant, or on the \textit{trompette} without tremulant. The other fugues [are to be performed] on a medium registration [‘un jeu mediocre’] or on the small \textit{jeu de tierce}.”\(^{99}\) Several of Couperin’s chant-based works are also fugal in style.

Many of the chant-based works are trios featuring the chant in the middle voice, with each phrase of the chant melody anticipated by fore-imitation in the surrounding voices. Couperin’s trios have no strict canons as in the trios of Titelouze (\textit{Hymnes de l’Église}, 1623), and hence enjoy much greater compositional flexibility.\(^{100}\) David Ponsford, author of \textit{French Organ Music in the Reign of Louis XIV} and specialist in

---


\(^{98}\) Ibid., 162.

\(^{99}\) Ibid., 165.

\(^{100}\) Ibid., 252.
French Classic organ repertoire, suggests that the trios could be performed with a 4’ pedal in the *cantus firmus* voice, or via three-hand performance with a colleague! Two of Couperin’s works do specify, however, that the *cantus firmus* voice may be played by the thumb (le poulce), most likely on a third registration: *Urbs Beata Jherusalem en Haulte Contre avec le poulce droict ou en trio* and *Conditor en Haultecontre avec le poulce droict en trio.* (See the opening of *Urbs Beata Jherusalem* in Figure 2.) The thumbing-down technique, where the thumb plays on a lower manual than the rest of the hand, is also found later in the printed *quatuors* published by d’Anglebert, prescribing the performance of four independent voices on separate registrations by thumbing down and adding the pedal (e.g. *Quatuor sur le Kyrie à trois sujets tires du plein chant*, 1689).

![Figure 2. Louis Couperin, *Urbs Beata Jherusalem en Haulte Contre avec le poulce droict ou en trio*, m. 1-8.](image)

101 Ibid., 255. Note, however, that French and English instruments of this period are unlikely to have a 4’ available in the pedal division.


103 Ibid., 10.
Louis Couperin’s organ works include two duos, the earliest examples of the duo in the French organ repertoire. In an anonymous instruction for duo performance from the late 17th-century, the author instructs: “The duo is played gaily, boldly, and very fast, and in a lively manner full of fire. To succeed in this one must detach the fingers well . . . The duo is to be extremely dotted, because therein lies its beauty.”

The second of Couperin’s two duos is a rapid, virtuosic work full of distinctive dotted rhythms in the style later associated with the canarie and gigue dance forms (see the opening imitation in Figure 3). As such, Ponsford suggests that Couperin’s work may be the earliest known French Baroque organ work derived from a secular dance form.

Duo

![Musical notation]

Figure 3. Louis Couperin, Duo, m. 1-3.

---

105 Ibid., 193.
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107 Couperin, Pièces d’orgue, 25.
Six of Louis Couperin’s works titled *Fantaisie* are in fact in the style of a *Basse de trompette* or other bass solo.\(^{108}\) Dated 1651-1656, the six works each feature an imitative introduction performed on the accompanying registration; the left hand then moves to the solo registration with figurative passages based on the imitative theme, and continues on the solo registration for the remainder of the work (see opening of *Fantaisie* in Figure 4 below). Distinctive characteristics of Couperin’s solo writing include disjunct motion, leaps over large intervals, motivic sequencing, broken chord figures, and dactyl rhythms. For registration, Oldham suggests any desired bass registration on a separate manual: “either the *chromhorne* on the *positif*, or the *jeu de tierce* or reed on the *grand orgue*.”\(^{109}\) Ponsford discusses the similarity of Couperin’s figurative writing to the motives found in military fanfares, appropriately performed on the trumpet. On the trumpet stop at St. Gervais available to Couperin, Ponsford writes: “Musical characteristics of this stop include immediacy of speech (as opposed to a flue pipe, especially in the lower range) making available the possibility for fast repeated notes, an explosive transient, a highly coloured formant rich in upper partials, and a natural crescendo down to the lowest notes.”\(^{110}\) These features would be ideal for performance of Couperin’s active bass figuration, as shown at the conclusion of the same *Fantaisie* below in Figure 5.
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\(^{109}\) Ibid., 127.

Figure 4. Louis Couperin, *Fantaisie*, m. 1-24.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{111} Couperin, *Pièces d’orgue*, 20.
Finally, Louis Couperin’s works in the Oldham manuscript include two works in the style of the *plein jeu*: *Duretze fantaisie* (1650) and *Prelude: Autre Livre – Grand Livre d’Orgue* (1654). The two works both feature the Italian *durezze e ligature* style seen in the toccatas of Girolamo Frescobaldi; an unknown work by Frescobaldi (*Duresse*). 

---

112 Ibid., 21.
de Frescobaldi) is found between two of Louis Couperin’s works in the Oldham MS.\textsuperscript{113}

In fact, there are multiple links between Louis Couperin and Italian composers influential in France, particularly Frescobaldi and Froberger (who is known to have visited France c. 1651 or 1652, with a performance in his honor at the chapel of the Jacobins, Paris, in 1652).\textsuperscript{114} One keyboard work by Couperin, \textit{Prélude de Mr Coupin à l’imitation de M. Froberger} in A minor, opens with a passage from Froberger’s Toccata no. 1 in A minor (1649), and later quotes Froberger’s \textit{Plainte faite à Londres pour passer la mélancolie}.\textsuperscript{115}

Couperin also borrows from Froberger in two others works, his Prelude in D minor (incorporating Froberger’s \textit{Tombeau de M. Blancrocher}) and his Prelude in F (quoting Froberger’s Toccata in D Minor for the Elevation, 1649).\textsuperscript{116} Meanwhile, the dates ascribed to Couperin’s organ works suggest that he was preoccupied with writing for the harpsichord during and immediately following Froberger’s time in Paris, as there are no compositions dating from 1652 and only one from 1653.\textsuperscript{117}


\textsuperscript{114} Works by both Frescobaldi and Froberger were published in Roberday’s \textit{Fugues et caprices}, 1660. For more on the influence of Frescobaldi and Froberger in France, see Hammond, “The Influence of Girolamo Frescobaldi on French Keyboard Music.”

\textsuperscript{115} Ibid., 149.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid.; Fuller, Gustafson, and Higginbottom, “Couperin.”

\textsuperscript{117} Fuller, Gustafson, and Higginbottom, “Couperin.”
French Performance Practice in England

Ornamentation

The most significant component to Restoration organ performance practice is the study of ornamentation, with ample resources including primary sources from contemporary composers, known stylistic influences, and written-out examples in repertoire. The move from contrapuntal textures, predominant in the 16th and early 17th centuries, to more virtuosic solo lines following the Restoration, inspired greater use of ornamentation and written-out figuration. In addition, English ornamentation practice in the 17th century is marked by a new emphasis on codification of the notation and realization of ornaments, as well as distributing printed tables to the public. There are three primary sources for ornamentation performance practice in the Restoration organ repertoire: ornament tables by Henry Purcell, Matthew Locke, and the afore-mentioned ‘Captain’ Prendcourt.
The most frequently cited source for Restoration English ornamentation is Purcell’s published ornament table, first appearing as “Rules for Graces” in two posthumously-published collections: A Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinet (1696) and The Harpsichord Master (1697). Purcell’s table includes realizations of each ornament, although the precise realizations have been extensively debated. The table was reprinted identically many times following its original publication, and remained standard for about 25 years.\footnote{Cox, Organ Music in Restoration England 1, 1:264.} The version printed in 1699 is shown in Figure 6, followed by a transcription in modern notation in Figure 7.

---

**Figure 6.** Purcell, "Rules for Graces," A Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinet (1699).
Figure 7. Purcell, "Rules for Graces," *A Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinnet* (1699).

Organist and composer Matthew Locke published an earlier table accompanying his collection *Melothesia* (1673), but Locke’s table only includes the names and signs of ornaments, without realizations. Of the five ornaments included, four are also found in Purcell’s table, and the fifth (the compound ornament “a Fore-fall and Shake”) is unique to Locke’s table. Finally, a third ornament table is attributed to ‘Captain’ Prendcourt c. 1700, as found in York Minster MS M.16(s) and imparted in Roger North’s accounts on music, but featuring realizations slightly varied from those in common English usage.¹¹⁹

The forefall and backfall are the simplest English ornaments of the Restoration period, consisting of a single added note. The ornament is most often denoted by a slash, indicating stepwise motion down from the note above, or up from the note below, and are usually performed on the beat. The sign is also found in Muffat’s *Componimenti musicali* (c.1739). Examples of both the forefall and backfall can be seen in the theme of Locke’s Voluntary in A Minor from *Melothesia*:

---

120 Michael Tilmouth, “York Minster MS. M.16 (s) and Captain Prendcourt,” *Music & Letters* 54, no. 3 (July 1, 1973): 305.

Voluntary in A Minor

Figure 10. Locke, Voluntary in A Minor, *Melodies* (1673), m. 1-6.122

Shake

The shake is a simple trill, denoting rapid alternation between the main note and the note above in a variety of lengths. It is denoted with a variety of symbols depending on the source: Prendcourt uses the French sign for tremblement, whereas Purcell uses the more traditional English double stroke. North implies that the main note should be prolonged slightly at the end of the ornament: “This mark is called a Shake, which is a swift movement with 2 fingers upon 2 keys and at last remaining with one finger upon that note before which the signe stands.”123 Sir William Blakestone, too, holds that both the first and last notes should be slightly prolonged, with the main note sounding clearly at the end of the ornament.124 North’s commentary also suggests flexibility in speed and duration of the shake, depending on the musical context: “For some trill at the same rate, whether the division of the Lesson be commensurate with it or

---


not, which is never well. But to take the trill into the course of the deivation, and to goe
out of the one into the other, is the perfection of that grace."125

In ornamented toccatas by Froberger and Rossi (see discussion in Chapter 4),
many written-out trills are replaced by the shake sign \[\text{\textit{\textdagger}}\text{\textdagger}\], usually replacing a trill
beginning on the main note (due to the predominance of main-note trills in this
repertoire).126 The termination is generally specified, either by written out notes in short
note values, or by a curve above the double-stroke shake sign \[\text{\textdagger} \text{\textdagger}\]. In the ornamented
Rossi toccatas, the copyist’s interpretation of the ornamentation is more liberal than in the
copied works of Froberger, providing less insight into the prevailing system of
ornamentation notation.127

*Forefall and Shake*

The forefall and shake combines the two ornaments in its name, but the method of
performance is unclear. This compound ornament is found only in Locke’s table for
*Melothesia*, where it is given without explanation or musical realization. The symbol
\[\text{\textdagger}\text{\textdagger}\] recurs in the organ works of Locke, Blow, and Purcell, and it is usually found
above longer note values. Johnstone argues that the ornament is likely separated as two
ornaments in performance, with the shake occurring on the second division of the beat on
longer note values.128

---


127 For a table of ornamentation substitutions in the copied works of Froberger and Rossi, see ibid., 272–276.

In Locke’s Voluntary in A Minor, the compound ornament occurs in m. 1 and m. 4, with the shake possibly performed on beat three in both cases:

**Voluntary in A Minor**

![Melothesia (1673)](image)

**Figure 11. Locke, Voluntary in A Minor, Melothesia (1673), m. 1-6.**

The ornament appears divided in two over tied notes in the works of John Blow, as in his Verse in G, m. 8 and 17, strongly suggesting precedent for separation of the ornament in other contexts:

**Verse in G**

![Verse in G](image)

**Figure 12. Blow, Verse in G, m. 8 and 17.**

Further examples of the forefall and shake can be seen in the opening themes of Purcell’s Verse in F (m. 2) and the following works by John Blow: Voluntary in D Minor, for

---


Double Organ (m. 1 and m. 3), Verse in A Minor (m. 1), Verse in D Minor (m. 1), and Verse in G (m. 1).

*Plain Note and Shake*

A second compound ornament, the “plain note and shake,” is found in Purcell’s ornament table (sometimes referred to as the “backfall-and-shake,” as it is named by Howard Ferguson\(^{131}\)). Ferguson adds a tie between the first and second notes (possibly already implied by the slur), creating the equivalent of the *tremblement appuyé* of d’Anglebert (Johnstone argues that Ferguson’s tie is a “gratuitous addition.”\(^{132}\))

![Plain note and shake notation](image)

Johnstone also argues that Ferguson’s nomenclature is deceptive, as “backfall” implies too short a note value; instead, the initial note should have the same values denoted by an Italian *appoggiatura*, i.e. \(\frac{1}{2}\) of the original note value (or \(\frac{3}{2}\) if dotted).\(^{133}\) This timing is similar to that of the *forefall-and-shake* described above, with the shake delineating the second major division of the beat.

The plain note and shake appears in the works of Blow and Purcell, as shown in Blow’s Verse in G below (originally the fourth verse of a Frescobaldi hymn; see Chapter 4).

---

\(^{131}\) Howard Ferguson, *Keyboard Interpretation from the 14th to the 19th Century: An Introduction* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), 149–150.


\(^{133}\) Ibid., 98.
Figure 13. Blow, Verse in G (from Frescobaldi), m. 17-18.\textsuperscript{134}

The plain note and shake also appears with faster note values, as in Purcell’s Voluntary in D Minor, m. 15-16 below. Following the entrance of the theme in the left hand (m. 14), the lighthearted ornaments lead the left hand downward to dissolve into virtuosic figuration.

Figure 14. Purcell, Voluntary in D Minor, m. 14-17.\textsuperscript{135}

\textsuperscript{134} Blow, Complete Organ Works, 14.

\textsuperscript{135} Henry Purcell, Organ Works, ed. Hugh McLean (Sevenoaks, Kent: Novello, 1967), 4.
Shake Turn’d

The “shake turn’d,” a shake followed by a termination figure, is depicted by the “ingenious graphic symbol”\textsuperscript{136} of a curved line over the shake: \(\frac{2}{4} \downarrow\). If the ornament leads directly into the material immediately following, the termination eliminates the need to audibly pause on the final note of the shake, but a shake with termination on a longer note need not necessarily be extended for the full note value. The turned shake is synonymous with the alternative compound symbol of the double stroke with written-out termination: \(\frac{2}{4} \downarrow\). There is ample evidence for equivalence of the two symbols: variant versions of Purcell suites, as noted by Johnstone,\textsuperscript{137} and Blow’s interpretations of written-out trills in the works of Froberger. Blow reinterprets lengthy written-out trills as shakes with written-out terminations. (Assuming that Blow attempts to be consistent with Froberger’s original, surely no pause is intended before the continuation of the ornament).\textsuperscript{138} Occasionally, the turned shake is preceded by a slide before the beat, as in Purcell’s Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ, m. 5:

\textsuperscript{136} Johnstone, “Ornamentation in the Keyboard Music of Henry Purcell and His Contemporaries,” 93.

\textsuperscript{137} Ibid.

Beat

The beat is undoubtedly the most controversial English ornament of the Restoration period. Purcell’s ornament table (“Rules for Graces”) implies that the beat should be a compound mordent beginning on the lower note (at least four notes total), and Prendcourt’s interpretation (the “undershake”) concurs with the version printed in “Rules for Graces.” Prendcourt uses the sign for the French pincement (mordent or double mordent sign), , and North’s account specifies that “the movement is to be made from the key next under the note by which this mark doth stand.” Purcell concurs, observing that “you allwayes shake from the note above and beat from the note or half note below, according to the key you play in.” Johnstone agrees with Prendcourt and Purcell’s printed rendering, except in cases where the ornamented note is immediately preceded by its lower neighbor.

---

139 Purcell, Organ Works, 7.

140 North, Roger North on Music, 62.

The most significant argument against the printed ornament depicted by Purcell and Prendcourt is that put forth by Howard Ferguson, who has proposed that Purcell’s table was printed in error, omitting a full line of the table containing the true realization of the beat and the compound ornament “forefall-and-beat.” See Ferguson’s attempted reconstruction in Figure 16:

**Figure 16. Ferguson, Reconstruction of missing row of "Rules and Graces."**

Ferguson suggests that in reality, the beat was intended to be realized as a mordent, and the missing “forefall-and-beat” to be realized as a four-note mordent beginning from the lower note. Ferguson argues that since the mordent was common elsewhere in Europe and known in England, it is unreasonable that it would not be in use. References in England are rare, but a mordent was described as a *beate* in Thomas Mace’s instructional book for the lute, *Musick’s Monument* (1676). (Johnstone points out that this is the only possibility for performance of the beat on the lute, however, since only the consonant main note is plucked, while the lower note is produced by touching the vibrating string.) The best argument in favor of Ferguson’s interpretation of the

---

142 Ferguson, *Keyboard Interpretation from the 14th to the 19th Century*, 148–152.
143 Ibid., 150.
144 Ibid., 149.
145 Ibid., 150.
beat is the fact that both the beat and forefall-and-beat appear together in compositions, suggesting that each may have a different realization. For example, see the theme of Purcell’s Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ, which features both ornaments:

![Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ](image)

Figure 17. Purcell, Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ, m. 1-6.¹⁴⁷

The symbol for the forefall-and-beat is described in two contemporary sources as a “Prepair’d Beat” and “preparing beate.” Ferguson also notes that use of the sign for the forefall-and-beat declined into the early 18th century, and was used rarely c. 1725-1730, as the printed interpretation in Purcell’s table became widely accepted.¹⁴⁹ In response to the claim that the published version is correct, including the published performance direction to “beat from ye note or half note below,” Ferguson points out that the word “from” in this context could mean “to and from” rather than “beginning with.”¹⁵⁰

---

¹⁴⁷ Purcell, Organ Works, 7.


¹⁴⁹ Ferguson, Keyboard Interpretation from the 14th to the 19th Century, 151.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 152.
The primary counterargument to Ferguson comes from H. Diack Johnstone, as put forth in his 1992 chapter “The English Beat.”\(^\text{151}\) Johnstone argues that there have been no significant alterations of “Rules for Graces,” despite numerous reproductions in various publications for decades with no mention of the forefall-and-beat.\(^\text{152}\) At least one known version is printed with different lineation, the 1697 edition of *The Harpsichord Master* found in the Auckland Public Library, New Zealand, which nevertheless maintains the same order and realizations of ornaments as the table in its more commonly printed form (see facsimile below in Figure 18). Johnstone also present additional manuscript sources which corroborate performance of the beat beginning on the lower note. See, for example, the following inscription in the hand of Sir William Blakeston (British Library Add. MS 17853, 1694). In a prefatory note on the “Graces in Musick,” Blakeston writes that the beat “comes from y\(^e\) Note next below, w\(^ch\) is to be heard before you beat down your proper note, w\(^ch\) must also be heard clearly at y\(^e\) last. [...] But whether they be Beats or Shakes, you must be sure to play ‘em in time; otherwise you had better play only the plain Notes.”\(^\text{153}\) Johnstone also argues that the sign ostensibly representing the forefall-and-beat in Purcell’s Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ instead denotes a Plain Note and Beat (i.e. the reverse of a Plain Note and Shake). Thus, the first note of the ornament would be held for half the length of the note (or the primary value if dotted) before concluding with a typical beat. Johnstone’s interpretation does not conflict with

\(^\text{151}\) Johnstone, “Aspects of Keyboard Music.”

\(^\text{152}\) Ibid., 37–38.

\(^\text{153}\) Ibid., 40.
the other instances of the ornament described above, denoted as “Prepair’d Beat” and “preparing beate.”

![Rules for Graces](image)

**Figure 18.** Purcell, "Rules for Graces," *The Harpsichord Master* (1697). Unique extant copy held in the Auckland Public Library, New Zealand.

In contemporary French ornament tables, a variety of ornaments can be found that are related to the traditional mordent, including the *agrément*, *pincement*, *pincé*, *martellement*, and *battement*. The earliest ornament tables in the French Classic tradition are those found in the prefaces of Nivers’ *Livre d’orgue* (1665) and Chambonnières’ *Pièces de clavécin* (1670). These two were subsequently followed by Raison’s *Démonstration des cadences, et agrèmens* (1688), and d’Anglebert’s comprehensive table in *Pièces de clavécin* (1689). The *agrément* presented by Nivers is essentially the

---

154 Ibid., 41.

beat as originally printed in Purcell’s table, whereas Lebègue’s *pincement* is essentially a mordent (the beat as claimed by Ferguson). While both interpretations are supported by evidence from primary performance practice sources, English evidence seems to give preference to Purcell’s original realization. Lines that are ascending or descending, approached by leap, or include multiple ornament signs in the same context (as in Purcell’s example above), may require special consideration by the performer. Above all, the manner of performance takes precedence; in his 1717 Preface to *L’art de toucher le clavécin*, François Couperin gently reminds the performer that “just as there is a great distance between grammar and declamation [in language], there is also an infinity between musical notation and the manner of performing well.” The ambiguous nature of the beat gives the performer both greater freedom for personal interpretation and greater responsibility, requiring mental consideration of the ornament’s musical context for a convincing performance.

*Slide*

The slide, an ascending three-note pattern beginning on the third below, is presented in Purcell’s ornament table using the French notation for the *coulé* or *port de voix doublé*: \( \frac{3}{4} \). Prendcourt’s table includes a different symbol, denoted “Slurr” \( \frac{3}{4} \), with the caution that “it must be done very swift or the grace is lost.” North adds: “to understand this excellent grace well, requires some knowledge of composition,

---

156 For more on the variety of mordent ornaments and examples in French repertoire, see Ponsford, *French Organ Music in the Reign of Louis XIV*, 70–73.

157 Ibid., 60.

for it is (properly) harmonious, and mixeth the sound of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} below with the note played.”\textsuperscript{159} The slide is usually performed on the beat, but written out examples do occur before the beat in repertoire (see Purcell’s Voluntary in D Minor for Double Organ, m. 5 below). In French usage, the slide is equivalent to the \textit{coulé sur une tierce} or the \textit{tierce coulée en montant} of Couperin.

Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure19}
\caption{Purcell, Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ, m. 5.\textsuperscript{160}}
\end{figure}

Slides of more than three notes are also found throughout Restoration organ literature, in line with Étienne Loulié’s description of a \textit{coulade}: “two or more conjunct small sounds or little notes placed between two distinctive tones in order to connect them more pleasingly.”\textsuperscript{161} Examples can be found in Blow’s Verse in A Minor (m. 16, 19, and 21; see Figure 20 below), as well as in Blow’s ornamentation of Froberger’s \textit{Fantasia sopra sol, la, re} (Figure 21). In an English copy of Rossi’s \textit{Toccata settima}, the copyist has even added a slide over the course of two octaves in the opening measures (see Figure 22).\textsuperscript{162} In his edition of Blow’s organ works, Shaw points out that the sign for the

\textsuperscript{159} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{160} Purcell, \textit{Organ Works}, 7.

\textsuperscript{161} Cox, \textit{Organ Music in Restoration England 1}, 1:286.

\textsuperscript{162} Ibid., 1:289.
forefall is often elongated in manuscript sources, which may signify filling in a gap with a slide instead.  

**Figure 20.** Blow, *Verse in A Minor*, m. 16, 19, and 21.  

**Figure 21.** Froberger, *Fantasia sopra sol la re* (as ornamented by Blow), m. 1-5.
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164 Ibid., 20.

Figure 22. Rossi, *Toccata Settima* (as ornamented by English scribe), m. 1-2.\(^{166}\)

**Battery**

The battery, an arpeggiating ornament, rarely occurs in Restoration organ repertoire but does appear in Purcell’s “Rules and Graces.” The realization of the ornament in Purcell’s printed table is unusual, and Ferguson amends it to be a simple arpeggiation of the chord from the bottom upward:

In Prendcourt’s ornament table, the battery is called *Harpeger* (“that is to say imitate an harp”), with an indication to play repeated arpeggios:

**Turn**

The turn, as printed in Purcell’s table and recurring in the French harpsichord and organ repertoire, is rarely found in Restoration English music. When utilized, it begins on the main note and returns to it for the remainder of the note’s duration, and the sign is placed over a single note rather than between two notes in stepwise motion.

---

\(^{166}\) Cox, *Organ Music in Restoration England 1*, 1:289.
Notes inégales

A major consideration in the performance of French Classic organ works is the practice of *notes inégales*, or unequal notes, a performance convention that also affected English organ repertoire in the 17th century. In France, the term *notes inégales* refers to performing equal subdivisions of the beat in an unequal manner (to varying degrees, either gently unequal or in a precise dotted rhythm). There is ample evidence for the practice of *notes inégales* in England, including varying rhythms in multiple editions of the same works.\(^ {167}\) (Most evidence is from the harpsichord repertoire, but as Caldwell maintains, the performance practices for organ and harpsichord are difficult to differentiate, and are probably largely analogous in context.\(^ {168}\)) Rhythmic discrepancies can be found between various consort partbooks of John Jenkins, and there are two differing versions of Purcell’s “Almand” from Suite No. 3 in G Major. The printed version includes extensively-dotted sixteenth-note rhythms, whereas the manuscript (Oxford, Christ Church MS 1177) shows straight rhythms. It is possible that the published version was made more precise for an amateur audience (however, not all concordances with the manuscript follow the same pattern; sometimes the reverse instead!).\(^ {169}\) Roger North also references the practice of performing *notes inégales*, with regard to the “point” or added dot in *inégal* rhythms: “In short notes it gives a life and spirit to the stroke, and a good hand will often for that end use it, tho’ not express’t.”\(^ {170}\)

---


\(^{168}\) Caldwell, *English Keyboard Music before the Nineteenth Century*, 165.


The convention of *inégal* performance is justifiably appropriate to English organ music of the Restoration period, either gentle inequality applied to pairs of eighth notes, or the extension of dotted rhythmic motives as in Locke’s second Voluntary in A Minor (see full score below).
Figure 23. Locke, *Voluntary in A Minor*, Fitzwilliam Museum MS 735.\(^{171}\)

English repertoire also incorporates the Lombardic reverse *inégal* rhythm (short-long), denoted by a slur over a pair of notes. Since the rhythm is especially apt for the natural flow of the English language, it is frequently found in Purcell’s vocal music.\textsuperscript{172} In France, notated Lombard rhythms are found in the organ repertoire and writing of Gigault (1685), Loulié (1696), and François Couperin (1713).\textsuperscript{173} Couperin refers to the reverse *inégal* rhythms as *coulés*, denoted by slurred pairs with a dot over the second note of each. The French (and consequently English) practice may have been linked to earlier vocal innovations by Monteverdi.\textsuperscript{174} The best-known example from English organ literature is in the theme of Purcell’s Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ, with the same rhythmic figure recurring throughout the work (reverse *inégal* rhythm denoted by dotted slurs; see Figure 24 below).

\textsuperscript{172} Ponsford, *French Organ Music in the Reign of Louis XIV*, 55.

\textsuperscript{173} Ibid., 42–43.

\textsuperscript{174} See Lombard rhythms, especially together with unprepared dissonances on the beat, found in Monteverdi’s madrigal “Troppo ben può” (*Fifth Book of Madrigals*, 1605). Ibid., 41.
French Influence on Form and Registration

Alongside the widespread adoption of French ornamentation and performance practice, late 17th-century English organ composers embraced the French practice of writing in forms characterized primarily by their registration. As seen in Chapter 2, builders such as Bernard Smith and Renatus Harris incorporated a variety of tonal innovations, many of which can be linked to corresponding forms developed by English composers. Three primary forms were established during the Restoration period and early 18th century, each directly related to the technical capabilities of the organ used for

---

175 Purcell, *Organ Works*, 7–12.
performance: the double organ voluntary, the cornet voluntary, and the trumpet voluntary.

**Double Organ Voluntary**

One distinctively English genre which developed during the Restoration period is the voluntary for double organ. The term “double organ” originally referred to an instrument with an unusually low compass, a characteristic feature of early English organs. By the early 17th century, however, “double organ” referred to a two-manual instrument, usually with “Great” and “Chair” divisions. The new registration possibilities provided by a two-manual instrument inspired the advent of the double organ voluntary, a contrapuntal work based on one or more themes highlighting contrasting registrations. The earliest example is likely a double voluntary by Orlando Gibbons, as copied by Benjamin Cosyn, along with a small number of other examples from the early 17th century. In typical later instances of the double organ voluntary, the form features thematic entrances in the left hand on the solo registration, possibly alternating with right hand solo passages and often ending with both hands on the Great organ. Other common features include pre-imitation on the accompanying manual before the solo thematic entrances, and thematic entrances which dissolve into virtuosic toccata figuration (particularly in later examples). Related figuration can be found in English divisions on the bass viol, the Spanish *tiento de medio registro*, and the French *basse de trompette*.

Similar examples in French repertoire can be seen in the *basse de trompette* and the *dialogue à deux choeurs*. The earliest known examples of the *basse de trompette* are

---


177 Ibid., 1:207.
found in the organ works of Louis Couperin (see above): six works entitled “Fantasie,” composed in the *basse de trompette* style but with no registration indications. A notable early work in the *dialogue à deux choeurs* style is Nivers’ *Offerte en Fugue et Dialogue* from his *Deuxième Livre d’orgue* (1667), which alternates between left and right hand solos on the *Grand jeu* before concluding with both hands together on the stronger registration.¹⁷⁸

English examples of the double organ voluntary include works by each of the three main composers: Locke, Blow, and Purcell. Locke’s Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ, features thematic entrances on the Great organ for both hands, before concluding in the French *dialogue à deux choeurs* style. Blow contributes four voluntaries for double organ in a combination of French and Italian styles; his four works share a similar formal construction with Locke’s, but Blow moves away from the *dialogue à deux choeurs* style and closes each work with new thematic material on the Great organ. Purcell’s contribution is the extensive Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ, which also synthesizes French and Italian elements. The two most prominent French elements in Purcell’s Voluntary are its strict formal structure (with alternating bass and treble solo entries), and the Lombardic reverse *inégal* rhythm found in the primary theme (denoted by slurred pairs of sixteenth notes, see below). Together, the double organ voluntaries of these three composers present a unified approach to the form, and provide a solid foundation for the work of later composers leading into the 18th century.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 1:213.
Most early examples of the double organ voluntary do not include registration indications, so it is unclear if there was a common registration practice. Some examples call for a sesquialtera (bass) and cornet (treble) for the solo registration,\(^\text{179}\) drawn along with foundation stops and ideally covering the full compass with no audible break. According to Cox, “it is quite clear . . . that the cornet and sesquialtera were considered complementary, equally suitable either for solo writing in the right or left hand, or for chorus writing using both hands together.”\(^\text{180}\) Regardless, it is likely that performers took advantage of the colorful registration possibilities available in post-Restoration instruments.

**Cornet Voluntary**

The cornet voluntary, like the voluntary for double organ, began to emerge as a genre in the Restoration period and then fully developed in the 18\(^{\text{th}}\) century. The cornet voluntary is much like the double organ voluntary in that solo passages are highlighted on the second manual, but all solo passages are given to the right hand and the registration is more definitive (cornet solo with diapason accompaniment). There are three primary examples from the second half of the 17\(^{\text{th}}\) century, all by John Blow. (No extant examples are attributed to Locke or Purcell.)

The cornet voluntary, especially in later examples, features solo writing in the light, quickly flowing playing style possible on a cornett. The cornett, played with sackbutts in the Chapel Royal and many cathedrals until the Commonwealth,\(^\text{181}\) is a

\(^{179}\) Ibid., 1:221–223.

\(^{180}\) Ibid., 1:225.

curved, woodwind instrument, with a brass-like mouthpiece and finger holes along the bore to allow for modulation into different keys. The wide range of possible pitches and ease of fingering make the cornett ideal for lively, highly ornamented solo passages. Theorist Marin Mersenne describes the corresponding organ stop as an imitation of the cornett instrument:

What makes the Cornet different from other stops depends particularly on the seventeenth, which makes a rather sharp sound, imitative of the *Cornet de Musique* [the musical instrument], of which I spoke in the fifth book of instruments; for the other four ranks . . . cannot perfectly imitate the Cornet, when the seventeenth is absent.¹⁸²

The third-sounding rank in the Cornet lends it a bright sound, ideal for the virtuosic lines found in Cornet voluntaries.

**Trumpet Voluntary**

A third genre, the trumpet voluntary, also took root during the Restoration period, but examples are sparse until the genre flourished in the 18th century. Early Restoration examples include three anonymous works and one attributed to either Blow or Purcell (Blow D.36 or Purcell D.244¹⁸³). The primary feature of the trumpet voluntary is a style of solo writing idiomatic to the natural trumpet: keys of C or D major, predominance of tonic and dominant harmonies, and writing in triadic figuration or parallel thirds.¹⁸⁴

---


¹⁸⁴ The origins of the genre are unclear; for a discussion of the four Restoration examples, see Ibid., 1:248–258.
French Influence on Organ Repertoire of the Restoration Period

Matthew Locke (c. 1630–1677)

The infusion of French ornamentation and adoption of French forms can be readily seen in the music of Matthew Locke, a prominent composer in the court of Charles II and organist for the chapel of Queen Catherine. Only eight of Locke’s organ works survive, seven published in Melothesia (1673), but his organ writing consistently displays a strong French influence. Locke’s style of ornamentation is primarily French, and his four most frequently used ornaments correspond directly to French ornaments in use in the late 17th century: the forefall (port-de-voix), backfall (coulé), shake (tremblement), and beat (port-de-voix et pincé). In a published essay, Locke names Chambonnières as one of his most highly esteemed composers, and it is likely that Locke would have encountered works by Chambonnières and other French composers through his royal appointments. Locke’s organ works include two Voluntaries in A Minor: one found in an unpublished manuscript source (see below), and one published in Melothesia, a piece which is discussed at length in Chapter 5 as a primary example of the synthesis of French and Italian styles. In addition, Locke provides one of the earliest substantial contributions to the genre of the Double Organ Voluntary, a work strongly rooted in the styles of the French récit pour le basse et dessus and dialogue à deux choeurs. Together, these works show Locke’s preference for French ornamentation,

motivic writing, and formal construction, incorporating the form of the French overture as well as techniques of form and registration commonly seen in French organ literature.

The unpublished Voluntary in A Minor by Locke is found only in the manuscript source Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS 735, and is strikingly similar in construction to the Voluntary in A Minor published in Melothesia (see Chapter 5). Although the manuscript is dated c. 1800, the scribe references an original manuscript source dated c. 1660, and it is apparent that the scribe was attempting to compile a comprehensive selection of Locke’s work in all genres.\(^ {186} \) The second Voluntary in A Minor is constructed in the basic form of a French overture, opening with a slow, fugal movement and concluding with a faster fugal movement which dissolves into a passage of motivic writing. (See the full score in Figure 25.) As Geoffrey Cox suggests, it is appropriate to apply a dotted \textit{inégal} rhythm, an essential characteristic of the French overture, to each pair of eighth notes in the fugal motive.\(^ {187} \)

\footnotesize

Figure 25. Locke, Voluntary in A Minor, Fitzwilliam Museum MS 735.188

Locke’s second-longest work (after the published Voluntary in A Minor) is his Voluntary for Double Organ, composed in the style of a French *récit pour le basse et dessus*. While early English double organ voluntaries favored solo entries in the bass, Locke begins with a solo in the treble register, and then alternates between the two. Caldwell notes that the work exhibits a much higher degree of compositional skill compared to examples by previous composers,\textsuperscript{189} and indeed Locke’s work is a substantial contribution to the genre of the double organ voluntary. Locke makes ample use of dotted rhythms in the French style, and he concludes the work in the style of the French *dialogue à deux choeurs*, featuring antiphonal passages alternating between the Great and Chaire organs. Locke’s double organ voluntary is similar in form to Nivers’ *Offerte en Fugue et Dialogue (Deuxième Livre d'orgue, 1667)*, which features alternating left and right hand solos on the *Grand jeu* before the two hands rejoin for the concluding passage.\textsuperscript{190}

At the opening of the voluntary, as seen in Figure 26, both hands play on the Chair division. After two entrances of the theme on the Chair, the right hand moves to a solo registration on the Great, entering on the theme at the fifth, and the two original voices are heard in inverted counterpoint. The conclusion of the work is shown in Figure 27: here, both hands move to the Great, traversing the compass of the instrument. A short dialogue between the hands can be seen in m. 31-33, before figuration based on dotted rhythms concludes the work. The predominance of these dotted rhythms, together with

\textsuperscript{189} Caldwell, *English Keyboard Music before the Nineteenth Century*, 159.

\textsuperscript{190} Cox, *Organ Music in Restoration England 1*, 1:213.
the formal structure of the *récit*, give Locke’s Voluntary for Double Organ a striking resemblance to French organ repertoire of the same period.

Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ

![Musical notation](image)

Figure 26. Locke, Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ (*Melothesia*, 1673), m. 1-12.¹⁹¹

John Blow (1649–1708)

Locke’s organ works are succeeded by the compositions of John Blow, the most prolific of the Restoration organ composers, who continues to display evidence of French influence in his chosen forms, registration, and ornamentation. Blow’s ornamentation style is derived from that of Locke (still deeply rooted in contemporary French practice), with Blow’s distinctive preference for use of the slide. Blow’s forms include four examples of the double organ voluntary, derived from the French récit de basse et dessus, and three examples of the cornet voluntary, inspired by the French récit de cornet.

In Blow’s voluntaries for double organ, he begins to establish a conventional approach to the form: each of the four works opens with an imitative introduction on the

\[\text{Figure 27. Locke, Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ (Melodiesia, 1673), m. 29-39.}^{192}\]

\[\text{John Blow (1649–1708)}\]

\[\text{Locke’s organ works are succeeded by the compositions of John Blow, the most prolific of the Restoration organ composers, who continues to display evidence of French influence in his chosen forms, registration, and ornamentation. Blow’s ornamentation style is derived from that of Locke (still deeply rooted in contemporary French practice), with Blow’s distinctive preference for use of the slide. Blow’s forms include four examples of the double organ voluntary, derived from the French récit de basse et dessus, and three examples of the cornet voluntary, inspired by the French récit de cornet.}\]

\[\text{In Blow’s voluntaries for double organ, he begins to establish a conventional approach to the form: each of the four works opens with an imitative introduction on the}\]

\[^{192}\text{Ibid., 7.}\]
Chair organ, features several solo passages, and concludes with both hands on the Great organ with new thematic material. The French dialogue à deux choeurs style disappears, but Blow combines diverse French and Italian elements, particularly French ornamentation and formal practice (such as alternating treble and bass solo entries), with contrapuntal inspiration from the Italian canzona and toccata. Solo passages may feature two-part writing or virtuosic toccata figuration.

In Blow’s Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ, the theme highlights the slide and the forefall-and-shake ornament discussed above (probably split into two ornaments on beats one and three, as in m. 8, Figure 28). A thematic change is introduced beginning in m. 28, where the right hand anticipates the left-hand thematic entrance on the Great organ in m. 30 (Figure 29). The two hands then alternate entrances of the new material, before both hands move to the Great for the conclusion of the work.
Figure 28. Blow, Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ, m. 1-13.\textsuperscript{193}

\textsuperscript{193} Blow, Complete Organ Works, 47.
Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ

Blow, Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ, m. 27-34.

Blow’s Voluntary in C, for Double Organ and Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ are composed in a similar style, and Geoffrey Cox speculates that the latter may be the earliest of Blow’s voluntaries for double organ. Blow’s most well-developed example of the form is his Voluntary in G, for Double Organ, which is discussed at length in Chapter 5. In its construction, Blow adeptly turns the existing double organ voluntary form (with alternating bass and treble entries) into a multi-sectional work, highlighting a *durezze e ligature* passage borrowed from Frescobaldi’s *Toccata ottava (First Book of Toccatas)*. Blow transforms Frescobaldi’s writing by applying ornamentation and dotted motives derived from French practice, and thereby creates a distinctive and contrasting passage to insert into the surrounding virtuosic work.

---

194 Ibid., 50–51.

John Blow’s organ works also include three examples of the Cornet Voluntary. His Cornet Voluntary in A Minor can be performed on either a one- or two-manual instrument, although Cox maintains that later copyists have arranged the work for two manuals in the surviving manuscript sources, transposing many passages up an octave.\textsuperscript{196} (Cox has reconstructed a version of the work suitable for one-manual performance.\textsuperscript{197}) The Cornet Voluntary in A Minor displays some motivic interaction between the solo and accompanying parts, particularly in m. 56-58 and m. 63-65 (see m. 56-58 in Figure 31). The closing section, m. 72-86, is likely still intended for performance on contrasting solo and accompanying registrations, with both hands playing simultaneously on the Cornet in m. 73-74 and 77-80 (see Figure 32). The Cornet may be removed for the final six measures, or the right hand may finish strongly with both parts on the Cornet.

\textsuperscript{196} Ibid., 1:233–234.

Cornet Voluntary in A Minor

Figure 30. Blow, Cornet Voluntary in A Minor, m. 1-16. 198

Figure 31. Blow, Cornet Voluntary in A Minor, m. 56-60. 199

198 Blow, Complete Organ Works, 55.
Figure 32. Blow, Cornet Voluntary in A Minor, m. 72-86.\textsuperscript{200}

Blow’s Cornet Voluntary in D Minor includes a specific indication for the Cornet registration in one manuscript source (British Library Add. MS 34695), and the compass of the solo passage extends upward from $d'$ rather than $c'$ or $c\#'$, the typical points for dividing the Cornet register during the Restoration period. Cox notes that Blow’s instrument at the Chapel Royal was lowered by a half step in 1676 (the year Blow was appointed organist there), which could explain the unusual division of the cornet compass in his compositions. The Cornet Voluntary in D Minor features cornet solos in figurative style, with intervening material that often anticipates the next phrase in fore-imitation. The left hand incorporates thematic material in m. 24-28, and the work ends with a three-

\textsuperscript{199} Ibid., 57.

\textsuperscript{200} Ibid., 58.
part imitative texture (m. 75-96) based on a new motive. It is possible that Blow intended for the left hand to remain on the accompanying registration, but it is also possible for the Cornet to be removed entirely or to perform the work on a two-manual instrument.

Blow’s third example of a cornet voluntary is his Voluntary in G for Cornet and Echo, which is clearly intended for performance on multiple manuals. In fact, it is the earliest known English work to require a third “Echo” division, as found in several instruments by Smith and Harris (see Chapter 2). The registration is provided, indicating accompaniment on “2 diapa[sons]” against solo passages on the “Cor[net]” and “Ecco.” The work ends with both hands joining together on the Great (as in the voluntaries for double organ), with the Sesquialtera stop added in the bass. Although a typical Chair division from this period does not include both open and stopped diapasons, Cox suggests that the work may have been composed between the years 1697-1703 for the new Smith instrument at St. Paul’s, London, which featured two 8’ diapason ranks on the Chair: a “Stop Diapason” and a “Quinta Dena Diapason.”

**Henry Purcell (1658–1695)**

In Purcell’s few surviving organ compositions, the impact of the French style is limited to indirect influence via established ornamentation practice and musical forms. French duo and trio writing can be seen in the Verse in F (Z. 716) and Voluntary in C (Z. 717), while the French-derived form of the double organ voluntary is epitomized in Purcell’s Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ (Z. 719). The imitative opening of the

---

201 Cox, *Organ Music in Restoration England* 1, 1:231.
202 Ibid., 1:241.
203 Ibid., 1:243.
Verse in F is shown in Figure 33 below: notice the forefall-and-shake ornament found in m. 2, and the reverse *inégal* rhythm formed by the backfalls in m. 1-3.

**Verse in F**

![Verse in F](image)

Figure 33. Purcell, Verse in F (Z. 716), m. 1-4.\(^{204}\)

Purcell’s Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ (Z. 719) marks the peak of the development of the double organ voluntary in the 17\(^{th}\) century. As in Locke and Blow’s contributions to the genre, the solo voice alternates between the bass and treble registers in the style of a French *récit*. The opening exposition of the theme is ornamented in the French style, including both dotted motives and Lombardic reverse *inégal* rhythms as discussed in connection to *notes inégales*. A full analysis of the work is presented in Chapter 5, as Purcell’s Voluntary displays a mature synthesis of French and Italian stylistic elements, and represents the peak of compositional artistry in the Restoration period.

**Summary**

Through the works of the three primary organ composers of the Restoration period (Locke, Blow, and Purcell), it is possible to trace the influence of French style to its origins in the works of early French Classic composers such as Louis Couperin and Guillaume-Gabriel Nivers. English composers adopted French ornamentation techniques, with clear overlap between primary performance practice sources from both nations. In

\(^{204}\) Purcell, *Organ Works*, 2.
addition, composers applied French récit forms to their own work, creating compositions based on fixed solo and accompaniment registrations such as the Cornet and Double Organ Voluntaries. The unique combination of French ornamentation and formal principles, with Italian figuration and imitative writing, created compositions well-suited to the late 17th-century English organ and established compositional traditions that would carry on well into the 18th century.
CHAPTER 4

INFLUENCE OF THE ITALIAN STYLE

Alongside French practices, Italian repertoire and stylistic techniques have been consistently influential in the development of English organ repertoire throughout the 16th-18th centuries. Italian organists have been prominent in royal courts, particularly those of Henry VIII, Elizabeth I, and the Stuart monarchs Charles II and James I. Italian composers have had a notable influence on English secular music, including families of works based on harmonic grounds such as the passamezzo antico or bergamesca. Nicholas Yonge’s publication of Italian madrigals in Musica Transalpina in 1588, complete with English translations, spurred a native English school of madrigal composition that flourished until c. 1625. In the 17th century, prominent composers Claudio Monteverdi, Giulio Caccini, and Giacomo Carissimi had a profound impact on English vocal technique and instrumental writing, and John Playford included Caccini’s guidelines for vocal ornamentation in his popular instructional method A Breefe Introduction to the Skill of Musick (from 1664 on). English composers for the organ had access to both manuscript and print editions of Italian and South German composers, including Frescobaldi, Froberger, Michelangelo Rossi, and composers of the Neapolitan school. In addition, a large number of Italian musicians were present in England following the Restoration, particularly the prominent organist Giovanni Baptista Draghi, who worked closely with Matthew Locke. Although English composers did not directly imitate Italian forms or fully embrace intricate contrapuntal writing, Italian stylistic traits can be clearly seen in their work (even direct quotations, in the case of John Blow). Together with a popular preference for Italian style, these influences shaped the musical
taste of Restoration organ composers and broadened the range of musical techniques in their repertory.

**History of Italian Organists in England**

Foreign musicians were held in high esteem in the court of Henry VIII, particularly Italian organist Friar Dionisius Memo. A former student of renowned Austrian organist Paul Hofhaimer, and organist of St. Mark’s, Venice, from 1507-1516, Memo came to England in September of 1516 as a highly regarded performer. He was depended on by the King, not only for public performances for the court, but also for private performances in his Privy Chamber. Accounts of Memo’s success are primarily found in diplomatic communication of the Venetian ambassador Sebastian Guistinian and his secretary, Sagudino. In a letter to Venice dated Sept. 30, 1516, Guistinian recounts:

Friar Dionisius Memo, the organist of St. Mark’s, arrived in London a few days ago. He brought a most excellent instrument with him at great expense. [Guistinian] presented him to the Cardinal [Wolsey] first, who desired to hear him play in the presence of many lords and virtuosi. They were much pleased with him. He afterwards visited the King, who sent for him immediately after dinner, and made him play before his Lords and all his virtuosi. He played to the incredible admiration of everybody, especially of the King, who is well skilled in music, and of the two Queens. His (Guistinian’s) secretary was present, who explained to the King how much favour Memo enjoyed at Venice. The King had made him chief of his instrumental musicians, and said he would write to Rome to have him unfrocked out of his monastic weeds, so that he might only retain holy orders, and that he would make him his chaplain. A royal chaplaincy was an honourable appointment and very profitable.

---


To further convey Memo’s position in the King’s favor, Guistinian notes that while the court had disbanded due to plague in 1517, the King was attended “only by his physician, [Dionisius] Memo, and three favourite gentlemen, and admitted no one for fear of the sickness, which was making great progress in England.”\footnote{Brown, Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy. Vol. II. 1509-1519., 417.} Despite the King’s faith in Memo’s loyalty, it is rumored that he acted as an agent for the Venetians in some capacity, and he left London, possibly for fear of his life, sometime before Dec. 24, 1525.\footnote{Ashbee and Lasocki, “Memo, Dionysus,” 797–799.}

Another prominent Italian organist in England, Alfonso Ferrabosco I (c. 1543-1588), served the court of Queen Elizabeth I from 1562-1578. Like Memo, he served in the Privy Chamber, and is rumored to have acted as a diplomatic agent (but in allegiance to Elizabeth I, who interceded with Catherine de Medici on his behalf, in an attempt to release him from prison in 1580).\footnote{John V. Cockshoot and Christopher D.S. Field, “Ferrabosco,” Grove Music Online, accessed October 7, 2014, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/09507pg2.} Ferrabosco was renowned for both his diplomatic and musical talent, and “for musicians in post-Reformation England he came to personify the more serious side of Italian musical art.”\footnote{Ibid.} As a composer, Ferrabosco has only two surviving keyboard fantasies, of which one is a short score of an otherwise-incomplete fantasia for viols (possibly for organ accompaniment),\footnote{Found in Alan Brown, ed., Elizabethan Keyboard Music. Musica Britannica 55 (London: Stainer & Bell, 1989). No. 56.} while the other incorporates toccata-like writing with a concluding galliard.\footnote{Found in Alan Brown, ed., Elizabethan Keyboard Music. Musica Britannica 55 (London: Stainer & Bell, 1989). No. 56.}
Italian Influence on Composition

Italian influence can be seen in both keyboard and vocal writing in England in the 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} centuries. The fantasias of William Byrd (1540-1623) demonstrate the influence of the Merulo toccata style, primarily scalar figuration against consonant accompaniment (in contrast to later, more sophisticated toccata writing by Blow and Purcell as influenced by Frescobaldi). English composers commonly set variations on Italian harmonic ground basses, including the passamezzo antico, passamezzo modern, romanesca, and bergamesca, as well as settings of popular secular tunes such as More palatino. Frescobaldi’s setting of More palatino from his Second Book of Toccatas (1627; titled Aria detto Balletto) is found in an English manuscript source (Royal College of Music MS 2008; see discussion under Girolamo Frescobaldi below), and Orlando Gibbons has written a delightful variation setting of the same tune entitled “The Italian Ground.” It is notable that Gibbons’ variations are found in Christ Church MS 1113, along with Frescobaldi’s entire First Book of Toccatas and a varied selection of English and Continental repertoire.

Italian composers were particularly renowned in England for their vocal writing, as popularized by the publication of Nicholas Yonge’s Musica Transalpina in 1588 and 1597.\textsuperscript{214} In two volumes, Yonge compiles exceptional Italian madrigal settings accompanied by English translations of the texts (purportedly translated in 1583 by “a


Gentleman for his private delight." 215) Featured composers include Marenzio, Palestrina, Byrd, de Lassus, Ferrabosco, Marenzio, and Venturi. Marenzio and Ferrabosco in particular were immensely popular with the English audience, and the resulting English madrigal school flourished until c. 1625.

After 1625, notable Italian composers with influence in England include Claudio Monteverdi (1567-1643), Giulio Caccini (1551-1618), and Giacomo Carissimi (1605-1674). English composer Walter Porter may have studied with Monteverdi in Venice c. 1613-1616, and two decades later he published Madrigales and Ayres (London, 1632), a set of madrigals in Italian concertato style. 216 In a preface to a copy of his own Mottets of 2 Voyces (London, William Godbid, 1657), below the printed text “that unparallel’d master of musick, my good friend and maestro,” Porter has added the inscription “Monteuerde” in his own hand. Porter may also have compiled manuscripts containing selected madrigals of Monteverdi, several of which have been reduced from a five-voice texture to two voices with continuo. 217

Giacomo Carissimi (1605-74) quickly became one of the most popular Italian composers in 17th-century England, and his motets and cantatas were widely distributed as early as 1645. Carissimi was particularly popular after the Restoration; after hearing an unknown Carissimi work, Samuel Pepys proclaimed it to be “the best piece of musique


216 For more on Porter’s career and his published madrigals, see Charles W. Hughes, “Porter, Pupil of Monteverdi,” The Musical Quarterly 20, no. 3 (July 1, 1934): 278–288.

counted of all hands in the world, made by Seignior Charissimi the famous master in Rome.** Carissimi’s music was widely distributed in England following the Restoration (possibly due to the presence of his student Vicenzo Albrici in London**), and Carissimi was held in such high regard as a composer that many works were misattributed to him.

Italian composer Giulio Caccini (1551-1618) was also prominent in England throughout the 17th century. It is likely that John Dowland heard Caccini’s work while visiting the Florentine Medici court in 1595, and Dowland’s brother Richard later included two songs from Caccini’s *Le nuove musiche* in his collection *A Musicall Banquet* of 1610. A redacted translation of Caccini’s innovative preface to *Le nuove musiche* reached a wide English audience via inclusion in John Playford’s *A Breefe Introduction to the Skill of Music* (editions from 1664 onward), where Caccini’s work is disguised as the tale of “an English Gentleman who lived many years in Italy.”

Caccini’s preface is one of the most significant sources for contemporary Italian vocal

---


220 For an overview of English manuscript sources of Italian music from the second half of the 17th century, including descriptions and detailed contents, see Wainwright, *Musical Patronage in Seventeenth-Century England*. Part II. Wainwright also provides a table of the most popular Italian works from before 1638 found in English sources: Ibid., 201.

performance practice, and Playford’s publication notably provides the first printed description of the *trillo* in English.\(^{222}\)

Following his adaptation of Caccini’s preface, Playford proceeds to justify his “English” author’s use of Italian-language examples:

> The Author hereof having set most of his Examples and Graces to Italian words, for indeed it cannot be denied, but the Italian Language is more smooth and better vowell’d than the English, by which it has the advantage in Musick, yet of late years our language is much refined, and so is our Musick to a more smooth and delightful way and manner of singing after the method set down by the Author, and all those Graces by Trills, Grups, and Exclamations, are and may be used to our English words, as well as Italian.\(^{224}\)

---


\(^{223}\) Playford, *A Brief Introduction to the Skill of Musick*, 57.

\(^{224}\) Ibid., 75–76.
In later editions, Playford compliments the nuanced style of English text setting found in “the excellent compositions of Mr. Henry Lawes, and other excellent Masters in this Art.”²²⁵ Perhaps Playford is directly responding to Lawes, who, while especially well-known for his natural settings of English texts, vehemently rejected the “pervasive Italian influence”²²⁶ in the preface to his collection Ayres and Dialogues (1653)!

Playford also points out that Italian vocal technique was not new in England, but had been utilized in training the choristers of the Chapel Royal under the leadership of Captain Henry Cooke (c. 1615-72): “Nor are these Graces any new Invention, but have been used here in England by most of the Gentlemen of His Majesties Chappel above this 40 years, and now is comes to that Excellency and perfection there, by the Skill and furtherance of that Orpheus of our time Henry Cook.”²²⁷ Noted English diarist John Evelyn likewise praises Cook as “the best singer after the Italian manner of any in England,”²²⁸ and in Cook’s work with the Chapel Royal, he may have had a formative influence on the choristers John Blow and Henry Purcell.


²²⁶ Rogers, “Voices,” 361.

²²⁷ Playford, A Brief Introduction to the Skill of Musick, 76.

The presence of Italian musicians in England and the widespread popularity of the work of Italian composers are complemented by numerous English sources of 17th-century Italian keyboard composers, most notably Girolamo Frescobaldi (1583-1643). Frescobaldi’s complete *First Book of Toccatas* is found in Oxford, Christ Church MS 1113, the most significant English manuscript source of Italian organ repertoire, which is generally assumed to be the work of English organist, entrepreneur, and scribe William Ellis (c. 1620-74). Originally organist at St. John’s College, Oxford, from 1639 until the beginning of the Civil War, Ellis held for-profit musical gatherings at Oxford during the Commonwealth before resuming his position at St. John’s following the Restoration of Charles II. William Ellis is credited with assembling several manuscripts, including those containing the “earliest examples of 17th-century Italian keyboard music in England” (Oxford, Christ Church MS 1113) and “some of the earliest copies of French music in English keyboard sources” (Oxford, Christ Church MS 1236). Christ Church MS 1113 is also the earliest manuscript in England to mention use of organ pedals, and the source of Frescobaldi’s entire first book of toccatas. Other manuscripts attributed to Ellis include Oxford, St. John’s College MS 315 (an organ book compiled for services after

---


the Restoration, definitively in Ellis’ hand), and Oxford, Christ Church MS 1003, including four works likely copied directly from MS 1113.\textsuperscript{231}

Christ Church MS 1113 is a large source of both Italian and English repertoire, including works by Frescobaldi, Tomkins, Bull, Philips, Orlando Gibbons, and more. There has been much discussion regarding the dating of this manuscript; early research led to the suggestion of c. 1620, a date which would eliminate Ellis from consideration (approximately the time of his birth.)\textsuperscript{232} However, Candace Bailey and Geoffrey Cox agree that the manuscript was likely copied by Ellis, due to comparison with St. John’s College MS 315 (which is clearly in Ellis’ hand\textsuperscript{233}) and in consideration of Ellis’ ideal musical placement during the Commonwealth: “It cannot be merely coincidental that the earliest English copies of music by Chambonnières and Frescobaldi, as well as pieces by more obscure foreign composers, appear in a manuscript copied by a man who frequently entertained a diverse group of musicians in a city through which many musicians passed.”\textsuperscript{234}

Christ Church MS 1113 includes Frescobaldi’s complete first book of toccatas (from either the 1616 or 1628 publication, as it includes none of the additions from

---

\textsuperscript{231} Attributed by the initials “W.E”; the initial part of the manuscript was likely copied from Christ Church MS 1113 by Ellis’ student Charles Morgan. See Bailey, “William Ellis and the Transmission of Continental Keyboard Music in Restoration England,” 213.

\textsuperscript{232} Barry Cooper, \textit{English Solo Keyboard Music of the Middle and Late Baroque} (New York: Garland, 1989), 463; Caldwell, \textit{English Keyboard Music before the Nineteenth Century}, 151.

\textsuperscript{233} Cox, \textit{Organ Music in Restoration England 1}, 1:143.

1637), with the attribution “Frisco Baldy. Organ: In Sanct Eclesi petri, â Romam.”

Ellis marks the toccatas as “for the organs,” but the corrente and partitas as “for ye virginalls,” and provides some works with the pedal indication “col pedali.” The collection includes many unidentified works, predominantly toccatas and canzonas generally assumed to be of Italian origin. Some works can be linked to manuscripts local to the Roman region, and all are composed in a similar style, c. 1630-1640. One canzona is based on Palestrina’s madrigal “Vestiva i Colli,” and another work has been identified as a variation of a partita on Arie di Fiorenza, possibly by Giovanni Battista Ferrini, which would imply a mid-17th century copy date. Roman repertoire could have been brought to England by Frescobaldi’s pupil, Johann Jakob Froberger, who would have had access to Frescobaldi’s oeuvre as well as other repertoire local to the Roman region between 1637 and 1649.

Works by Frescobaldi can also be found in several later English manuscript sources, especially London, Royal College of Music MS 2008. The manuscript includes a complete transcription of both books of toccatas from the 1637 editions, and was possibly compiled in 1673 (unless the year is a miscopy of 1637!). In addition, British Library Add. MS 31422 holds Toccata quarta from Frescobaldi’s Second Book of Toccatas, likely copied by John Jenkins (d. 1678), which may have been added to the MS

235 Cox, Organ Music in Restoration England I, 1:142.

236 Caldwell suggests that the anonymous works may be by German composers, in association with Hans Leo Hassler. See Caldwell, “The Influence of German Composers on English Keyboard Music in the Seventeenth Century.”


concurrently with a figured bass by Antonio Lotti (c. 1667-1740). Four works from Frescobaldi’s first and second books of toccatas are copied in Wimborne Minster MS P.10, which notably includes page numbers from the printed editions (showing that Frescobaldi prints were available to English copyists). The manuscript also includes English mid-17<sup>th</sup>-century organ works. In addition, the manuscript Christ Church, Oxford MS 1179 contains a portion of <i>Partite sopra La Monicha</i> from the <i>First Book of Toccatas</i>, and two canzonas from the second book can be found in Fitzwilliam Museum MS 652 (one incomplete).

Two sets of works are dubiously attributed to Frescobaldi, found in British Library Add. MS 36661 and British Library Add. MS 40080. The works in Add. MS 36661 are unknown in any other source (with the exception of a partial concordance with Add. MS 40080<sup>239</sup>), but five pieces titled toccata and canzona are here ascribed to “Freses baldi” (labeled by Cox as Frescobaldi D.56-60<sup>240</sup>). The manuscript also includes 17<sup>th</sup>-century English keyboard music copied by Thomas Tunstall (dated c. 1630), and eight pieces ascribed to Pasquini (one prelude and seven toccatas) not found in other sources, possibly from his early works.<sup>241</sup> British Library Add. MS 40080 contains eleven

---

<sup>239</sup> Cox, <i>Organ Music in Restoration England 1</i>, 1:147–148.

<sup>240</sup> Ibid., 1:415–416.

<sup>241</sup> Willi Apel, <i>The History of Keyboard Music to 1700</i> (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972), 695. See also an otherwise-unknown toccata attributed to Pasquini in Cambridge, Fitzwilliam MS 652, as transcribed by John Harris, son of prominent organ builder Renatus Harris. Cox, <i>Organ Music in Restoration England 1</i>, 1:151.
canzonas and one toccata attributed to Frescobaldi, but the single attribution (applying to the entire volume) is provided by another scribe in a later hand.\textsuperscript{242}

**Johann Jakob Froberger (1616-1667)**

German organist Johann Jakob Froberger is known to have studied with Frescobaldi in Rome, and it is generally accepted that Froberger visited England in the mid-17\textsuperscript{th} century. According to Siegbert Rampe, Froberger arrived in England in late 1652 or early 1653,\textsuperscript{243} while Caldwell suggests a slightly earlier date of 1651 or 1652, based on an autograph letter from Froberger to Fr. Athanasius Kircher in Rome.\textsuperscript{244} Anecdotes from Mattheson and others claim that Froberger was robbed or accosted by pirates en route to London, arriving destitute and forced to seek work as an organ-blower for Christopher Gibbons. Froberger is said to have “aroused Gibbon’s anger by neglecting his duties,”\textsuperscript{245} and indeed, an annotation in a manuscript copy of Froberger’s Suite No. 30 in A Minor (Minoritenkonvent, Vienna) states that “out of melancholy, he forgot to blow, and was kicked out of doors by the organist. Upon which occasion he composed this lament.”\textsuperscript{246} While the anecdotal evidence is circumstantial at best, it is certain that the movement from Suite No. 30 (an allemande titled “Plainte faite à Londres

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{242} Cox, *Organ Music in Restoration England 1*, 1:148.
\item \textsuperscript{244} Caldwell, “The Influence of German Composers on English Keyboard Music in the Seventeenth Century,” 41–42.
\item \textsuperscript{245} Cox, *Organ Music in Restoration England 1*, 1:30–31. Gibbons himself was said to have neglected his duties at the organ; Anthony Wood describes Gibbons as a “person most excellent in his faculty, but a grand debauchee. [He would] sleep at Morning Prayer when he was to play on the organ.” See Ibid., 1:51.
\item \textsuperscript{246} Howard Ferguson, *Early German Keyboard Music (including Austria & the Netherlands): an Anthology*, vol. 1 (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), 48.
\end{itemize}
pour passer la melancholie”) was composed in London. Regardless, during his time in England, Froberger likely encountered both Christopher Gibbons and his close colleague Matthew Locke, with profound impact on contemporary English keyboard repertoire. As suggested above, Froberger may also have brought Italian repertoire with him on his journey, recently acquired during his study in Rome.\(^{247}\)

The works of Froberger were certainly familiar to Restoration-era organists, particularly John Blow. Blow is known to have copied thirteen of Froberger’s works c. 1700 (Brussels Conservatoire MS 15418; see discussion under John Blow below) and ornamented them in line with current English practice. Caldwell argues that the compositional styles of Blow and Froberger (particularly in examples ornamented by Blow himself) are remarkably similar, as shown below in the discussion of Blow’s repertoire.\(^{248}\) One otherwise unknown Froberger work is found in an English source: a canzona labeled “Fuga,” is ascribed to Froberger in Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS 652, as mentioned above in connection to Frescobaldi.\(^{249}\)

**Other Composers**

Another Italian composer prominent in English 17th-century manuscript sources is Michelangelo Rossi (c. 1601-1656), who was active in Rome during the same period as Frescobaldi. Five of Rossi’s ten toccatas are found in British Library Add. MS 24313, which was likely compiled by an Englishman due to its title inscription “Toccatas of

\(^{247}\) For more on Froberger’s years in Rome, see Annibaldi, “Froberger in Rome.”

\(^{248}\) Caldwell, “The Influence of German Composers on English Keyboard Music in the Seventeenth Century.”

\(^{249}\) Cox, *Organ Music in Restoration England 1*, 1:423.
Michela Angelo Rossi” in the same hand. In addition, two of Rossi’s toccatas are found in British Library Add. MS 31446 (one incomplete), accompanied by a selection of English Restoration organ music. While the text of Add. MS 31446 is not drawn directly from Add. MS 24313, the two manuscripts are closely related, and despite variants they may have been copied from a common source.\textsuperscript{250} Intriguingly, both sets of Rossi’s toccatas are followed by the elusive Toccata in A (see discussion below under Henry Purcell), a work which has proven difficult to attribute due to its stylistic ambiguity. It is also worth noting that both sets of Rossi’s toccatas have been ornamented in English style, with written-out ornaments replaced with signs, large leaps filled in with slides, etc. (see discussion under Italian Performance Practice below).\textsuperscript{251}

Finally, a collection of miscellaneous Italian works is found in British Library Add. MS 30491, as copied by Luigi Rossi (c. 1598-1653), a student of Giovanni de Macque. The collection contains works by de Macque, Rinaldo, Scipione Stella, Francesco Lambardo, Ippolito, Gesualdo, Fabrizio Fillimario, and Giovanni Maria Trabaci, all composers from the Neapolitan school which made an important stylistic contribution to the music of Frescobaldi. According to Roland Jackson, the manuscript may have been compiled c. 1617\textsuperscript{252}, but it is unknown how or when the manuscript came to England.

\textsuperscript{250} Ibid., 1:149–150.

\textsuperscript{251} Ibid., 1:289.

\textsuperscript{252} Ibid., 1:152.
**Italian Organists during the Restoration**

Italian organists, most notably Giovanni Battista Draghi (1640-1708), were prominent in London’s musical scene following the Restoration of Charles II in 1660. This is primarily due to employment of Italian musicians in the royal chapels, including Queen Catherine Braganza’s chapel at Somerset House and later James II’s chapel at Whitehall. Draghi, arguably the best-known Italian organist in England during the Restoration period, was heard in England by Pepys as early as Feb. 12, 1667, and the contemporary diarist John Evelyn hails him as “that excellent and stupendous artist, Sign’r Jo. Baptist.” Draghi was appointed organist to the Queen after the death of Matthew Locke in 1677 (“John Baptista” our organist; “the Principal Organist…that admirable Master of Musick, Sig. Giovanni Battista Draghi” from 1682-84), and he was later appointed organist for James II’s Catholic chapel at Whitehall (listed as organist on Mar.

---

253 For detailed accounts of Italian musicians employed by the Stuart court, see Margaret Mabbett, “Italian Musicians in Restoration England (1660-90),” *Music & Letters* 67, no. 3 (July 1, 1986): 237–247.


255 Ibid., 1:25.

256 John Evelyn, *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn, F. R. S.*, vol. 2 (London: Bell and Daldy, 1870), 214.
He remained in England despite the Popish Plot of 1678 and Glorious Revolution of 1688, both of which amplified popular anti-Catholic sentiment and forced many musicians to flee the country. Draghi is also known for performing on Renatus Harris’ instrument for the infamous “Battle of the Organs” at the Temple Church, London (versus Blow and Purcell demonstrating the organ of Bernard Smith). A quantity of extant harpsichord music by Draghi survives, as well as a previously unknown organ work entitled Tocate Grave, found in an 18th-century manuscript owned privately by Susi Jeans.

Three other Italian organists can be associated with music in the post-Restoration Stuart courts: Giovanni Sebenico, Vincenzo Albrici, and his brother Bartolomeo Albrici. Sebenico, while primarily a vocalist, is referenced as an organist in Roger North’s account of music at Somerset House:

Mr Matthew Lock . . . was organist at Somerset House chappell, as long as he lived; but the Italian masters, that served there, did not approve of his manner of play, but must be attended by more polite hands; and one while one Sabinico, and afterwards Sig Baptista Draghe, used the great organ, and Lock (who must not be

---

257 John Evelyn, on Jan. 30, 1687, reports hearing “the Musique of the Italians in the new Chapel, now first of all open’d at White-hall publikely for the Popish Service.” See Cox, Organ Music in Restoration England 1, 1:24. A new organ was built for the chapel by Renatus Harris, 1686-1688: Ibid.


260 Evelyn recounts this serenade of 1668, with “Seignor Joanni” most likely referring to Sebenico: “So I to White-hall, and there all the evening on the Queen’s side; and it being . . . a fine warm evening, the Italians came in a barge under the leads, before the Queen’s drawing-room, and so the Queen and ladies went out and heard it for almost an hour; and it was endeed very good together but yet there was but one voice that alone did appear considerable, and that was Seignor Joanni.” See Mabbett, “Italian Musicians in Restoration England (1660-90),” 239.
turned out of his place, nor the execution) had a small chamber organ by, on which he performed with them the same services.²⁶¹

Sebenico is known to have been employed by the King from April 1, 1666 onward,²⁶² and later was given the title of master of the Italian music for the King’s chamber and cabinet (from April 1668 until at least July 1673, probably succeeding Vincenzo Albrici).²⁶³

The brothers Vincenzo and Bartolomeo Albrici entered the King’s service together on Oct. 1, 1665. A former student of Carissimi, Vincenzo had prior experience in the realm of court music: he began work at the court of Queen Christina of Sweden in 1653,²⁶⁴ and was subsequently appointed Kapellmeister to the Elector of Saxony in Dresden. Following two brief but successful years in London, Vincenzo returned to Dresden by 1668,²⁶⁵ after which he was appointed organist of the Thomaskirche in Leipzig. His brother Bartolomeo remained longer in England, during which time he tutored John Evelyn’s daughter in music, and acted as assistant organist to Draghi in James II’s chapel at Whitehall (as of March 20, 1688: “Seignor Albrici, and to supply at the organ”).²⁶⁶

²⁶¹ North, Roger North on Music, 348.
²⁶³ Ibid., 239.
²⁶⁴ Queen Christina supported a large ensemble of Italian musicians until her abdication in 1654. Many of these musicians subsequently came to the court of Charles II in the 1660s, including Vincenzo and Bartolomeo Albrici, Hilario Suarez, Pietro Reggio, Girolamo Zenti and Andrea Testa. See Ibid., 237.
²⁶⁵ Most likely due to lack of payment from the royal treasury, and the “retrenchment” and dismissal of many musicians in 1668. See Ibid., 240.
²⁶⁶ Cox, Organ Music in Restoration England 1, 1:28.
Italian Influence on Organ Repertoire of the Restoration Period

Matthew Locke (c. 1630–1677)

English organ composers of the Restoration period came into close contact with Italian organists through their royal posts, particularly organist and composer Matthew Locke, who worked closely with Giovanni Battista Draghi. Locke’s positions included “composer in the private musick” of the king, composer “for the violins” and “for the wind music”\(^{267}\), and (most significantly for this chapter) organist for Queen Catherine of Braganza, wife of Charles II. He was referred to as “Mr. Locke ye Queenes-Organist” by Christopher Gibbons in June 1663,\(^{268}\) but he may have been appointed to her chapel as early as October 1661. (An account of the Venetian Resident in England during preparations for the Queen’s arrival states “They are appointing musicians for her chapel and the officials who will attend her here.”\(^{269}\) The Queen’s chapel was originally housed at St. James’ Palace (with its first service on Sept. 21, 1662), but gradually moved to Somerset House along with her entire court after the Queen Mother Henrietta Maria departed from England in 1665. It is likely that Locke was appointed organist of Somerset House in 1668, and according to Roger North, he remained organist there “as long as he lived.”\(^{270}\) North also comments on the relationship between Locke and Draghi, as well as Locke’s “Italianization:”

\(^{267}\) Ibid., 1:41.

\(^{268}\) Ibid.

\(^{269}\) Ibid., 1:42.

\(^{270}\) North, Roger North on Music, 348.
Mr. Lock was organist of Somerset House, much the best master in his time; for by the service and the society of foreigners he was not a little Italianized. But Sig’r Babtista Draghe was made chief organist, and had the great organ, but Lock was not put out, having a chamber organ that stood by, which he accompanied with; so just are Kings and Queens sometimes.\textsuperscript{271}

Just as Locke’s musical style is likely to have been affected by his work with organists such as Draghi, his opinions regarding the music of foreign composers seemed to have shifted during his career. In 1656, in the Prelude to his \textit{Little Consort of Three Parts}, Locke instructs

\begin{quote}
And for those Mountebanks of wit, who think it necessary to disparage all they meet with of their owne Countrey-mens, because there have been and are some excellent things done by Strangers, I shall make bold to tell them (and I hope my known experience in this Science will inforce them to confess me as a competent Judge) that I never yet saw any Forain Instrumental Composition (a few French Corants excepted) worthy an English mans Transcribing.\textsuperscript{272}
\end{quote}

However, in his “Observations on a Late Book” (1672), an episode of a published debate with Thomas Salmon, Locke highlights key composers for “the Organ and Harpsechord,” including the Englishmen John Bull, Orlando Gibbons, Albertus Bryne, and Benjamin Rogers, as well as “Senior Froscobaldi of St. Peter’s in Rome, Senior Froberger of the Christian Emperial Court, [and] Monsieur Samboneer of the French”\textsuperscript{273} (Samboneer referring to Chambonnières). It is likely that Locke had access to the music of all three composers (Frescobaldi, Froberger, and Chambonnières), through various manuscripts discussed previously and through personal connections, including Froberger’s probable London visit to London in the year 1651 or 1652 (see above).

\textsuperscript{271} Ibid., 301–302.

\textsuperscript{272} Cox, \textit{Organ Music in Restoration England I}, 1:47.

In his lifetime, Locke published seven works specifically for organ, all found in his collection *Melothesia* (1673). Two works from *Melothesia* show noticeable Italian influence, along with an unpublished voluntary from a manuscript source and an independent prelude possibly intended for performance on the harpsichord. (The Voluntary in A Minor from *Melothesia* displays strong influence of both French and Italian styles, and the Locke’s synthesis of the two is discussed in Chapter 5.)

Locke’s Voluntary in F is composed in a two-sectional form, comprised of a *durezze e ligature* introduction (m. 1-9) followed by an imitative section, which devolves into shorter motives to conclude the work (see complete score in Figure 35 below). The *durezze e ligature* style (treating “dissonances and suspensions”) is a hallmark of Frescobaldi’s Elevation Toccatas, ethereal organ works composed for the elevation of the host during the Catholic mass. Examples from Frescobaldi’s published repertoire include two toccatas in his second book (*Toccata terza* and *Toccata quarta*; the most likely to be known to Locke), followed by three toccatas in Frescobaldi’s 1635 liturgical collection, *Fiori Musicali* (a compilation of three settings of music for the Italian mass, together with two capriccios). The distinctive chordal opening of *Toccata quarta* is shown in Figure 36.
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274 Locke, *Organ Voluntaries*. 105
Figure 35. Locke, Voluntary in F, *Melodhesia* (1673).\textsuperscript{275}

\textsuperscript{275} Ibid., 8.
The multi-sectional form is in itself of Italian origin, as found throughout the toccatas and canzonas of Frescobaldi. See for example Frescobaldi’s *Canzon dopo l’Epistola* from *Fiori musicali*, a multi-sectional work opening with a *durezze e ligature* passage marked *Adasio*, followed by two imitative sections in common time and triple meter, respectively (the opening 11 measures are shown in Figure 37). Many English Restoration organ works have a similar form, most notably Blow’s Voluntary in C and later Purcell’s Voluntary in G. Blow’s *durezze e ligature* opening is actually drawn directly from Frescobaldi’s *Toccata duodecima* (*First Book of Toccatas*), followed by a continuation by Blow and an independent imitative section. This formal framework, the future form of the 18th-century English voluntary, thus is first found in the early stages of
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Restoration organ repertoire, and will continue to develop in the hands of Blow and Purcell.

Canzon dopo l'Epistola

Figure 37. Frescobaldi, Canzon dopo l'Epistola, Fiori Musicali (1625), m. 1-9.277

Finally, Locke’s Prelude in A Minor, found in British Library Add. MS 22099, is a simple duo in a light, imitative texture. Originally titled “Prelude” and ascribed to “Mr. Lock,” the piece is published in Dart’s edition of Locke’s keyboard suites as an independent work (see score in Figure 38). The work is largely unremarkable aside from the interrupted trill in its penultimate measure, an ornament in line with contemporary Italian vocal practice and Frescobaldi’s recommendation for performance (see discussion in Italian Performance Practice, below).

Locke’s incorporation of techniques such as the *durezze e ligature* style and Italianate toccata writing demonstrates his clear understanding of Italian organ composition in the early 17th century. Locke encountered Italian colleagues through his royal appointments, most significantly while serving in Queen Catherine’s chapel at Somerset House, where he worked alongside Giovanni Baptista Draghi. He also had

---

access to manuscript editions of works by Italian composers, and cites Frescobaldi, Froberger, and Chambonnières as key composers to emulate. One of Locke’s most significant contributions is the two-section voluntary form, as seen in his Voluntary in F. The work is an early predecessor of the 18th-century English voluntary, and the pattern of a *durezze e ligature* introduction followed by an imitative section persists throughout the Restoration. Locke’s second major contribution is his inclination to combine the Italian canzona and toccata styles, writing imitative textures that transition into more figurative passages. This, too, becomes a significant component of later Restoration organ works, a style easily incorporated into the genre of the double organ voluntary found in the oeuvres of Blow and Purcell. Thus, despite Locke’s few published contributions to the Restoration organ repertoire, the musical style he initiates immediately impacts composers such as Blow and Purcell, and subsequently the development of the English voluntary as a whole.

**John Blow (1649–1708)**

As an organist and scribe, John Blow had personal contact with both Italian musicians and repertoire, arguably the most of any post-Restoration organ composer. He would also have come into contact with Italian vocal style indirectly, as a chorister in the Chapel Royal under the leadership of Captain Henry Cooke. As a student and later an esteemed colleague of Christopher Gibbons, Blow likely came into contact with Froberger during his time in London, and Blow certainly would have encountered the Italian organists working in London following the Restoration (perhaps via connections with Locke). At the very least, Blow competed (with Purcell) against Giovanni Battista Draghi in the “Battle of the Organs” at the Temple Church, London in 1688.
Blow was familiar with a wide variety of Continental published works, as evidenced by his early manuscript copying (Oxford, Christ Church MS 14) and his inclusion of Frescobaldi excerpts in his own compositions. Blow is also likely responsible for the anonymous organ works in British Library Add. MS 31403, which contains two embellished hymn versets from Frescobaldi’s *Second Book of Toccatas*. (One is indeed attributed to “Dr Blow” in another source, British Library Add. MS 31468.) Blow is also the copyist of thirteen works by Froberger found in Brussels Conservatoire MS 15418, including eight toccatas, a fantasia, two ricercars, and two capriccios, each ornamented in English style (possibly by Blow himself).

By number of surviving works, Blow is by far the most prolific composer of the Restoration, and his works frequently expand upon the elements of Italian style seen in the earlier music of Locke. Many works are in the familiar two-section form, often with codas based on Italian figuration, and at least three attributed works directly quote passages from Frescobaldi’s two books of toccatas. Through techniques such as the *durezze e ligature* style, tempo changes, Lombardic rhythms, and a variety of toccata patterns, Blow infuses his writing with Italian elements.

Three of Blow’s works directly borrow from Frescobaldi’s organ works, including *Toccata ottava* and *Toccata settima* from the *First Book of Toccatas*, and an

---


280 Ibid., 1:315.


ornamented verset from the partita on *Hinno Iste Confessor* in the *Second Book*. In addition, an unattributed ornamented verset from Frescobaldi’s partita on *Hinno della Domenica* is found on the same folio of the same manuscript (both in British Library Add. MS 31403, f. 65), and is also included in the table below:

### Table 5. Frescobaldi quotations found in organ works of John Blow (1649-1708).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>MSS</th>
<th>Frescobaldi quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blow</td>
<td>Voluntary in C&lt;sup&gt;284&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>British Library Add. MS 31446, 31468, and 34695</td>
<td><em>Toccata duodecima</em>, First Book, m. 1-9 (as m. 1-18 of Blow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow</td>
<td>Voluntary in G, for Double Organ&lt;sup&gt;285&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>British Library Add. MS 34695</td>
<td><em>Toccata ottava</em>, First Book, m. 18-24 (as m. 45-57 of Blow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow</td>
<td>Verse in G&lt;sup&gt;286&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>British Library Add. MS 31403 and 31468</td>
<td>“Quatro verso” from <em>Hinno Iste Confessor</em>, Second Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Verse in G</td>
<td>British Library Add. MS 31403</td>
<td>“Primo verso” from <em>Hinno della Domenica</em>, Second Book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blow incorporates the *durezze e ligature* style in two ways: either as an independent section of a larger work, or as a shorter passage in between sections, with a tempo change to signify the transition from an imitative texture to a *durezze e ligature* passage.<sup>287</sup> The Voluntary in C mentioned above is an excellent example of the former, comprised of a *durezze e ligature* passage from m. 1-52 (Frescobaldi’s *Toccata duodecima* opening in m. 1-18, and Blow’s continuation), followed by an independent imitative section not included in all sources (and not in Shaw’s edition). In Figure 39,

---


<sup>285</sup> Ibid., 59–63.

<sup>286</sup> Ibid., 14.

<sup>287</sup> Cox, *Organ Music in Restoration England 1*, 1:179.
compare the opening of Frescobaldi’s Toccata with the same passage in Blow’s Voluntary in C. The opening measures are nearly identical aside from ornamentation, and Blow gradually weaves additional motives into the chordal structure. Note especially the Lombardic rhythms, a characteristic feature of Frescobaldi’s toccata writing, added in m. 12-14. Geoffrey Cox states: “Blow has retained Frescobaldi’s chordal framework, but has enlivened it with the addition of ornament signs as well as short written-out motives that stand out from the otherwise chordal texture.”

As Blow transitions into original material, the harmonic tension provided by the *durezze e ligature* style is superseded by motivic interplay and shifting three- and four-part textures. Two motives are most prominent, the first heard in m. 23-28 (Figure 40) and the second first heard in the left hand of m. 35-36 (Figure 41) then persisting until the end of the movement.

The two-movement structure of Blow’s Voluntary in C is similar in style to Locke’s Voluntary in F, as above, and an anonymous Verse in A Minor with a lengthy *durezze e ligature* passage is likely an unattributed work by Blow (edited by Cox as “Anonymous 17”). Other examples include William Croft’s Voluntary in D (*durezze e ligature* movement followed by an imitative movement in double counterpoint), Croft’s Voluntary in D Minor (a single *durezze e ligature* movement; probably originally followed by another), Purcell’s Voluntary in G (see discussion below), and many of Frescobaldi’s multi-section canzonas (see his *Canzon dopo l’Epistola* from *Fiori musicali* (1635) above in Figure 37).
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288 Ibid., 1:184.

Voluntary in C in comparison to Toccata Duodecima

Figure 39. Blow, Voluntary in C, m. 1-20, with Frescobaldi, Toccata duodecima, First Book of Toccatas (1616).\(^{290}\)

\(^{290}\) Blow, Complete Organ Works, 2–3; Frescobaldi, Orgel- und Klavierwerke, 3:34–35.
II. Voluntary in C

![Musical notation]

Figure 40. Blow, Voluntary in C, m. 23-28.\textsuperscript{291}

II. Voluntary in C

![Musical notation]

Figure 41. Blow, Voluntary in C, m. 35-40.\textsuperscript{292}

Of the works typically attributed to Blow, a second instance of borrowing from Frescobaldi occurs in his Verse in G. This short verset exists as the “Quatro verso” from \textit{Hinno Iste Confessor}, in Frescobaldi’s \textit{Second Book of Toccatas} (1627),\textsuperscript{293} and the two

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{291} Blow, \textit{Complete Organ Works}, 2–3, m. 12-14.
  \item \textsuperscript{292} Ibid., m. 18-20.
  \item \textsuperscript{293} Hodge, “A New Frescobaldi Attribution,” 263.
\end{itemize}
are presented side by side in Figure 42. The verse features triple counterpoint, slightly
distorted by Blow’s alterations, but not found in any other Restoration works until Hart’s
Fugue in A.294 Blow’s addition of ornamentation, dotted rhythms, and melodic material
to fill in gaps transforms the Frescobaldi variation and lends it a distinctive French sound.
As above, a previously unattributed verse from the same manuscript (Brit. Lib. Add.
31403) has been found to be the first of Frescobaldi’s variations on Hinno della
domenica.295 The works are identical in style, and it is highly likely that both are
contributions of Blow. In addition, Blow’s Verse in F is now known to be based on the
plainsong Bina coelestis, but the origin of the verse (if indeed it is pre-existing) is
unknown.296

294 Cox, Organ Music in Restoration England 1, 1:201.
295 Hodge, “A New Frescobaldi Attribution.”
296 Ibid., 263; Francis Routh, Early English Organ Music from the Middle Ages to 1837, Studies in Church
Figure 42. Blow, Verse in G, with Frescobaldi, "Quarto Verso" from *Hinno Iste Confessor, Second Book of Toccatas* (1627).  

---

While Blow’s direct borrowing from Frescobaldi certainly demonstrates his incorporation of Italian style, Blow uses several other techniques that exhibit Italian stylistic influence, including tempo changes, the use of triple meter, Lombardic rhythms, and a variety of toccata patterns. Blow, like Frescobaldi, uses tempo indications such as “drag” or “slow” to denote the change from a strict imitative texture to a free durezze e ligature passage. In his canzona-like Voluntary in G, Blow concludes the second movement with five measures denoted “Slow” (Figure 43). Similarly, in his Voluntary in A, the two movements are separated by three measures labeled “Drag” (Figure 44). (The indication “drag” is also found in Matthew Locke’s instrumental “ Consort of Fower Parts,” c. 1672.) Marked tempo changes do not enter Frescobaldi’s keyboard repertoire until the publication of Fiori musicali (1635), in which Frescobaldi uses “Adasio” to mark interludes or closing passages of toccatas and canzonas. Examples can be found throughout Fiori Musicali, including the opening of Canzona dopo l’Epistola above (Figure 37) and preceding the second section of Canzon Quarti Toni Dopo il Post Comune below (Figure 45). For Frescobaldi, “Adasio” not only denotes a slower tempo, but also a sense of rhythmic freedom, in which context the English term “drag” seems more appropriate than “slow.”

298 Cox, Organ Music in Restoration England 1, 1:179.


300 Cox, Organ Music in Restoration England 1, 1:180.
X. Voluntary in G

Figure 43. Blow, Voluntary in G, m. 71-75.  

XIV. Voluntary in A

Figure 44. Blow, Voluntary in A, m. 32-35.
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301 Blow, Complete Organ Works, 17–19.

302 Ibid., 26–27.
Blow is also innovative in his use of triple meter, as seen in his Voluntary in C. According to Cox, this is the only example of an imitative work featuring triple meter in the Restoration organ repertoire, despite frequent occurrences of triple meter in Italian canzonas. The use of triple meter for the second imitative movement, as well as the similar contours of the two themes, immediately lend Blow’s Voluntary in C the appearance of an Italian variation canzona.

---


Several of Blow’s works incorporate Lombardic rhythms in the Italian style (as opposed to the French reversed *notes inégales* figure, denoted by slurred pairs of eighth notes). Examples abound in the works of Blow, as well as other Restoration composers. These distinctive rhythms often serve either to highlight a point of imitation or to provide motivic imitation in toccata passages. Lombardic rhythms can be seen in Blow’s Voluntary in C (Figure 39), and they occur extensively in the Verse in G (Figure 48),
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121
where they can be found in the theme and thus liberally sprinkled throughout the work.  

For examples from Frescobaldi’s organ works, see *Toccata terza* (Figure 49) and his third elevation toccata from *Fiori Musicali* (Figure 50).

### IV. Verse in G

![Blow, Verse in G, m. 1-5.](image)

**Figure 48. Blow, Verse in G, m. 1-5.**

![Toccata Terza](image)

**Figure 49. Frescobaldi, Toccata terza, Second Book of Toccatas (1627), m. 1-6.**

---

307 Examples in other Restoration keyboard literature include Christopher Gibbons’ *Verse in D Minor* (theme), the anonymous Verse in A Minor mentioned above (m. 9 and 18), and Purcell’s *Voluntary in G* (see below).


Blow also incorporates a variety of figurative patterns in his toccata style, often in the same manner as Frescobaldi and distinguishing his work from the more conservative toccata writing of earlier English composers such as Byrd. One such device is the distinctive falling thirds pattern, which can be found in Blow’s Verse in A Minor, m. 22-28 (Figure 51). See also Blow’s Verse in F, where falling thirds are extended into a toccata pattern in m. 59-61 (Figure 52). An Italian example which would likely have been known to Restoration-era English composers is Michelangelo Rossi’s *Toccata settima* (British Library Add. MS 24313), featuring an overlapping pattern of falling thirds in both hands (Figure 53).³¹¹
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XI. Verse in A Minor

Figure 51. Blow, Verse in A Minor, m. 22-29.\textsuperscript{312}

V. Verse in F

Figure 52. Blow, Verse in F, m. 59-63.\textsuperscript{313}

\textsuperscript{312} Blow, Complete Organ Works, 20–21.

\textsuperscript{313} Ibid., 8–10.
In light of Froberger’s probable visits to both Rome and England in the mid-17th century, it would be remiss not to expand upon Blow’s connection to Froberger’s work. Late in his career, Blow copied thirteen published works of Froberger now found in Brussels Conservatoire MS 15418, comprising eight toccatas, a fantasia, two ricercars, and two capriccios. Each work is ornamented in English style, possibly by Blow himself. As John Caldwell has pointed out, the similarity between Blow’s work and ornamented compositions by Froberger is extraordinary: “When Froberger’s fugal works have been copied out with all the extravagances of English ornamentation, the result can

---


begin to look very like the work of Blow.”\textsuperscript{316} The following example shows thematic similarity between Blow’s Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ and Froberger’s 

*Fantasia sopra sol la re* (1693):

![Comparison of Themes](image)

**Figure 54. Comparison of themes: Blow's Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ and Froberger's *Fantasia sopra sol la re* (as ornamented in English style, possibly by Blow).\textsuperscript{317}**

By copying the manuscript works of Froberger and others, Blow acquired direct access to the work of Continental composers, as well as a thorough understanding of their musical style. In his repertoire, Blow incorporates many Italianate techniques, including the *durezze e ligature* style, Lombardic rhythms, various patterns of toccata writing, and even direct quotations from the organ works of Frescobaldi. Blow also adopts the major formal precedents set by Locke, composing many works in the familiar two-section form, with toccata and motivic writing assimilated into the imitative texture. These compositional techniques and formal frameworks are subsequently found in the organ repertoire of Blow’s student, Henry Purcell.

\textsuperscript{316} Ibid., 44.

\textsuperscript{317} Ibid.
Henry Purcell (1658–1695)

Henry Purcell, easily the most well-known organist and composer of the Restoration period, maintained connections with Italian musicians and keenly observed a shift in public musical taste toward contemporary Italian style. Like Blow, Purcell was a chorister in the Chapel Royal under Captain Henry Cooke, known for his Italianate manner of singing. As an organist, Purcell was a student and later esteemed colleague of Blow, from whom Purcell would most likely have encountered Continental keyboard repertoire and met foreign musicians.

In the prefaces to his trio sonatas (1683) and opera *Dioclesian* (1690), Purcell aptly demonstrates his awareness of public opinion regarding French and Italian musical styles. The preface to Purcell’s trio sonatas includes the following comments: “[I have] faithfully endeavour’d a just imitation of the most fam’d Italian Masters; principally, to bring the seriousness and gravity of that sort of Musick into vogue, and reputation among our Country-men, whose humor, ‘tis time now, should begin to loath the levity, and balladry of our neighbours [the French].” In fact, Roger North proclaimed that Purcell’s trio sonatas “were just and quick, set off with wonderful solemne Grave’s, and full of variety,” yet “clog’d with somewhat of an English vein, for which they are unworthily despised.”

---


319 James Day, “*Englishness* in Music: From Elizabethan Times to Elgar, Tippett and Britten” (London: Thames Pub., 1999), 51–52. North also recounts a general shift toward Italian music, as spurred by the presence of famed Italian violinist Nicola Matteis. Regarding English travelers to Italy, North writes of “the numerous traine of yong travellers of the best quallity and estates, that about this time went over into Italy and resided at Rome and Venice, where they heard the best musick and learnt of the best masters; and as they went out with a favour derived from old Nichola [Matteis], they came home confirmed in the love of the Italian manner, and some contracted no little skill and proved exquisite performers.” North, *Roger North on Music*, 310.
The preface to *Dioclesian* advocates a balanced approach, incorporating the best of both French and Italian styles:

Musick is yet but in its Nonage, a forward Child, which gives hope of what it may be hereafter in England, when the Masters of it shall find more Encouragement. ‘Tis now learning Italian, which is its best Master, and studying a little of the French Air, to give it somewhat more of Gayety and Fashion. Thus being farther from the Sun, we are of later Growth than our Neighbour Countries, and must be content to shake off our Barbarity by degrees.\(^{320}\)

Purcell’s autograph manuscripts include copies of Italian vocal works, including a recently discovered fragment of Monteverdi’s five-voice madrigal “Cruda Amarilli” from *Il Quinto Libro de Madrigali a Cinque Voci* (Venice, 1605),\(^{321}\) and a two-voice motet “Crucior in hac flamma” by Maurizio Cazzati. Purcell was later praised by Christopher Smart for his ingenuity at balancing disparate styles successfully:

> But hark! The temple’s hollow’d roof resounds
> And Purcell lives among the solemn sounds, -
> Mellifluous, yet manly too,
> He pours his strains along.
> As from the lion Samson slew,
> Comes sweetness from the strong.
> Not like the soft Italian swains,
> He trills the weak enervate strains,
> Where sense and music are at strife;
> His vigorous notes with meaning teem,
> With fire, and force explain the theme,
> And sing the subject into life.\(^{322}\)

Purcell’s talent for assimilating foreign styles is clearly revealed in his few surviving works for organ, and the best example of Italian influence in Purcell’s organ

\(^{320}\) Westrup, *Purcell*, 69.


\(^{322}\) Day, “Englishness” in Music, 52.
repertoire is his two-movement Voluntary in G. The first movement resembles a Frescobaldi elevation toccata written in *durezze e ligature* style, while the second movement is imitative. Purcell features Lombardic rhythms (see especially m. 23-26), as mentioned above in regard to Blow and in Frescobaldi works such as his *Toccata terza* (*Second Book of Toccatas*). Purcell also adopts a modern approach to dissonance treatment, writing bold chromatic inflections (m. 8, 11-12, 25, 35), augmented triads (m. 11-12) and a cross relation (m. 26).\(^{323}\) Purcell’s stylistic techniques demonstrate a clear familiarity with Italian compositional practice, while continuing to establish the form of the two-movement English voluntary. As early as Locke’s Voluntary in F, the form was comprised of a free *durezze e ligature* introduction followed by a lively second movement (still primarily imitative until the early 18\(^{th}\) century, as opposed to movements featuring the solo cornet or trumpet stop), a basic structure which became a favorite of English composers throughout the 18\(^{th}\) century.

Voluntary in G

Figure 55. Purcell, Voluntary in G, m. 1-14.\textsuperscript{324}

Voluntary in G

Figure 56. Purcell, Voluntary in G, Lombardic rhythms and cross relation, m. 22-26.\textsuperscript{325}

\textsuperscript{324} Purcell, \textit{Organ Works}, 13–15.

\textsuperscript{325} Ibid.
An additional work once attributed to Purcell, the elusive Toccata in A, indirectly demonstrates the influence of Italian style on Purcell’s writing. Attributed to Henry Purcell and Michelangelo Rossi in multiple English manuscripts\textsuperscript{326}, the toccata has enticed authors attempting to secure an attribution on stylistic grounds. The work was even once attributed to Bach, and indeed has been catalogued as BWV Anh. 178.\textsuperscript{327} In her article “Purcell, Michelangelo Rossi and J. S. Bach: Problems of Authorship,” Gloria Rose rejects either Rossi or Purcell on stylistic grounds, comparing the work stylistically to the music of Bach and other 18\textsuperscript{th}-century German composers; she suggests Wilhelm Hieronymous Pachelbel but draws no firm conclusion. Most recently, Pieter Dirksen has argued that the toccata is the work of Johann Adam Reincken (1643-1722),\textsuperscript{328} on the grounds of both stylistic evidence and John Blow’s strong connections with the German school.\textsuperscript{329} Regardless of its unknown composer, however, the composition aptly demonstrates the comingling of Continental styles during the late 17\textsuperscript{th} century, with its potential composers hailing from three geographically disparate countries of origin.

\textsuperscript{326} British Library Add. MSS 24314 (following collection of toccatas attributed to “Michela Angello Rossi”), 31446 and 34695 (“Toccato by Mr Hen. Purcell”), and 39569 (incomplete, no attribution). See Cox, Organ Music in Restoration England 1, 1:363.


\textsuperscript{329} See Caldwell, “The Influence of German Composers on English Keyboard Music in the Seventeenth Century.”
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Although the difficulty of ascribing works to Purcell (even ones attributed in manuscript sources) has limited his already-small output for organ, the few definitive works are of high quality. In the Voluntary in G, Purcell adopts the two-movement form established in the early works of Matthew Locke, here with a fully developed durezze e ligature movement firmly rooted in Italian style. In the Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ (see Chapter 5), Purcell showcases the peak of his organ technique and compositional talent. He continues to expand the genre of the double organ voluntary, effectively bringing together the imitative texture of a canzona, the virtuosity of a toccata, and the timbral possibilities available on a two-manual instrument. Purcell thus solidifies his position as a multinational composer fluent in a variety of national styles, while simultaneously making an original contribution to the development of the English organ voluntary in its own right.

Musical Borrowing Trends

In his survey of common forms in English Restoration organ repertoire, Cox points out that English composers did not adopt Italian forms such as the toccata, canzona, and ricercar in a straightforward manner, but rather incorporated individual elements of the Italian style into their own work. Indeed, English composers utilize a wide range of borrowing techniques, including direct quotation, distinctive rhythmic devices, contrapuntal styles, and formal thematic relationships, often combining multiple techniques to create a unique expanded form. The English borrowing practice itself provides the strongest evidence connecting the English and Italian schools of composition in the 17th century, linking organ and keyboard composers as well as highlighting a broader trend of international musical collaboration.

Borrowing by English composers is primarily linked to compositional styles (durezze e ligature, canzona-like imitative writing, and toccata figuration), but also includes the use of trademark Lombardic rhythms and Italian vocal ornamentation. John Blow establishes the most direct link to the Italian school by specifically quoting works of Frescobaldi and seamlessly incorporating them into his own repertoire. In addition, Blow adopts signature techniques from the Italian repertoire (e.g. the thematic relationships between imitative movements of the Italian variation canzona). Blow adds ornamentation and motivic embellishment to his borrowed material, and in the Prelude in C and Prelude in G, for Double Organ, he incorporates the borrowed passages into the larger works. While the exact means of Blow’s exposure to Frescobaldi’s music is unknown, there are many possible avenues by which Blow could have accessed it,

---

331 Cox, Organ Music in Restoration England 1, 1:205.
including as a result of Froberger’s visit to England, and the quotations are so exact that it is certain Blow had access to either a printed or manuscript source. In both his embellishment of Frescobaldi passages and the repertoire he copied (see Froberger example in Figure 54), Blow applies ornamentation in a distinctively English manner, transforming the works into a style deeply resembling his own writing.

As the influence of the Stuart monarchs (and French taste) waned, the Italian style became increasingly prominent in English music. While no works by Purcell are known to include direct quotations from Italian writing, Purcell’s style clearly echoes that of contemporary Italian composers (with an uncanny aural resemblance), incorporating techniques such as the *durezze e ligature* style, Lombardic rhythms, striking dissonances, and virtuosic toccata figuration. Purcell blends these Italianate traits seamlessly into the principal forms of Restoration English organ repertoire: the two-movement voluntary and the voluntary for double organ, thereby preparing the way for composers to further expand the voluntary form in the 18th century.

*Italian Performance Practice*

The extensive borrowing of Italian repertoire and stylistic techniques naturally prompts a discussion of Italian performance practice techniques of the same period and to what extent they may be applied to English repertoire. The most significant primary source for performance practice of this repertoire is Frescobaldi’s preface to each book of his toccatas, a set of instructions to the performer which was gradually expanded to its most comprehensive version in the 1637 printing of his *First Book of Toccatas*. (The full text and translation is presented in Table 6.) Frescobaldi includes directions for choosing
a suitable tempo, adjusting it accordingly for figuration or *durezze e ligature* passages, and performing ornaments and extended figurative passages (*passaggi*) convincingly.

Frescobaldi’s instructions in the preface are most applicable to works featuring toccata figuration, motivic writing, and the *durezze e ligature* style of the elevation toccata, including two excerpts directly quoted by Blow. The opening movement of Purcell’s Voluntary in G is conceived in a very similar style to Frescobaldi’s elevation toccatas, and Purcell’s Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ features extensive Italianate toccata figuration. Frescobaldi includes several specific references to performance of his toccatas. Regarding the sectional character of the works, he writes “I not only ensured that they were rich in different figurations (*passi*) and moods (*affetti*), but also that each passage could be played separately, so that the player can end where he wishes without being obliged to finish all of them.”\(^3\) Contemporary English practice is similar: many works are found with only a single movement or in a reconfiguration. Frescobaldi recommends beginning the toccatas “adagio, and arpeggiated,” a technique most relevant for the harpsichord but also possible on the organ.\(^4\) An adagio tempo (both slow and free) can be applied to the beginning of most English *durezze e ligature* movements, such as the opening movement of Purcell’s Voluntary in G (Figure 55).

Finally, regarding the performer’s choice of tempi, Frescobaldi writes:

> In the Partitas, when there are figurative and expressive passages, it is best to adopt a broad tempo; this is also observed in the Toccatas. Other sections without figuration can be executed at a lively speed, leaving the choice of tempo to the

---

\(^3\) Kimberly Marshall, “Frescobaldi Prefaces,” e-mail message to author, September 26, 2014.

\(^4\) Ibid.
good taste and fine judgment of the player. The true spirit and the perfection of this manner and style of playing reside in the choice of tempo. In English works, the contrast between styles is tempered by the combination of imitative and figurative writing. For an example of a toccata passage where adjusting the tempo slightly is appropriate, see Purcell’s Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ, m. 17-19 (Figure 65).

One particularly significant aspect of Frescobaldi’s toccata preface is his association of keyboard writing with vocal performance, particularly the madrigal. Frescobaldi directly compares his compositional style to that of the “modern madrigal,” featuring “singing moods (affetti) and varied figurations (passi),” and not “subject to a regular beat (Battuta).” The Italian madrigal style of the seconda prattica, as coined by Monteverdi, was influential in English madrigal composition (see especially Walter Porter’s Madrigales and Ayres of 1632). Similarly, Caccini advocates for the stile moderno in his Preface to Le nuove musiche (1602), later adapted by Playford for an English audience. The influence of Italian vocal writing in England can be seen readily in other genres, such as early English opera, and vocal ornaments can occasionally be seen written out in English keyboard works (see Locke’s Prelude in A Minor, Figure 38).

It is also worth noting that performance practice techniques may also be applied in the reverse direction, since composers and copyists are known to have added English ornamentation to South German and Italian works. Recognized examples of this include Blow’s application of English ornaments to Frescobaldi quotations, the ornamentation of works by Froberger and other composers in Brussels Conservatoire MS 15418 (likely by

334 Ibid.
335 Ibid.
Blow), and the English ornamentation applies to the toccatas of Michelangelo Rossi found in British Library Add. MS 24313. Performers might consider programming works by composers such as Froberger or Rossi alongside 17th-century English repertoire, and applying ornamentation in a similar style.
1. Havendo io conosciuto quanto accetta sia la maniera di sonare con affetti cantabile e con diversità di passi, mi è paruto di mostrarme altrettanto favorevole, quanto affettionato con queste mie deboli fatiche, presentandole in istampa con gli infrascritti avvertimenti, protestando ch’io preferisco il merito altrui, et osservo il valor di chiascunmio. Et gradiscasi l’affetto, con cui l’espongo alio studioso, et cortese Lettore.


3. Li cominciamenti delle toccate sieno fatto adagio, et appeggigando: e cosi nella ligature, è vero durezze, come, anche nel mezzo del opera si bateranno insieme, per non lasciar voto l’istromento: il qual battimento ripigliersià a beneficato di chi suona.

4. Nell’ultima nota, così di trilli, come di passagi di salto, ò di grado, so deo fermare ancorche detta nota sia croma, o bismastra o dissimile alla seguente: perché tal posamento schiverà il confonder l’un passaggio con l’altro.

5. Le cadenze brenche sieno scritte veloce convienne sostenerele assai; e nello accostarsi il concluser de passaggi o cadenze si andrà sostenendo il tempo più adagio. Il separare e concluser de passi sarà quando troverassi la consonanza insieme d’ambedue le mani scritta di minime.

6. Quando si trovera un trillo della man destra, ò vero sinistra, e che nello stesso tempo passeggerà l’altra mano non si deve compartire a nota per nota, ma solo cercar che il trillo sia veeloce et il passaggio sia portato men velocemente et affettuoso: altrimente sarebbe confusion.

7. Trovandosi alcun passo di crome, e di semicrome insieme a tutte le due mani, portar si deo non troppo veloce: e quella che farà le semicrome dovrà farle alquanto puntuale, cioè non la prima, ma la seconda sia col punto: è così tutte l’una nò, e l’altra si.

8. Avanti che si facciano li passi doppi con amende le mani di semicrome dovessi fermare alla nota precedente, ancorche sia nera: poi risolutamente si farà il passaggio, per tanto più fare apparire l’agilità della mano.

9. Nelle Partite quando si troveranno passaggi, et affetti sarà bene di pigliare il tempo largo; il che osservassasi anche nelle toccate. L’altre non pассaggiati si potranno sonare alquanto allegre di battuta, rimettendosi al buon gusto è fino giudicio del sonatore il guidar il tempo, nel qual consiste lo spunto, e la perfettione di questa maniera, e stile di sonare. Li Passaghi si potranno separatamente sonare, conforme à chi più piacerà, con agiustare il tempo dell’unà è altra parte cossì delle Ciaccone.

1. Because I realize how popular it is to play with singing moods (affetti) and varied figurations (passi), it seemed favorable to me to show my favor with these modest compositions, presenting them in print with the following instructions, stressing that I appreciate the merit of others and that I observe the value of everyone. And this is the spirit in which I offer this to the studious and courteous reader.

2. Regarding the Toccatas, I not only ensured that they were rich in different figurations (passi) and moods (affetti), but also that each passage could be played separately, so that the player can end where he wishes without being obliged to finish all of them.

3. The beginnings of the toccatas are to be played adagio, and arpeggianted; the same applies to the suspensions, or dissonances (durezze). These chords are also repeated in the middle of the piece to avoid emptiness in the instrument’s sound [referring to the decay of a harpsichord.] Restricting the chords in this way is to be used at the discretion of the player.

4. One should take time on the last note of trills or passages (both with leaps or stepwise motion), whether the note is an eighth- or sixteenth-note, or different from the note that follows. This resting on the note prevents one passage from being mixed up with another.

5. Even when cadences are written with fast notes, they should be broadened; one should make the tempo more adagio when concluding a passage or approaching a cadence. The separation and conclusion of passages is found where the chord in both hands is written in half notes.

6. When there is a trill in either the right or left hand, and at the same time the other hand has figuration (passaggi), these should not be played note against note, but strive for the trill to be played quickly and the figuration played less quickly and expressively. Otherwise there will be confusion.

7. When figuration in eighth notes falls against figuration in sixteenth notes in the other hand, do not play too quickly. The sixteenth notes should be played slightly dotted, not on the first note, but on the second, and soon, the first without a dot and the second dotted. [Lombardic rhythm]

8. Before proceeding with sixteenth-note figurations simultaneously in both hands, one should linger on the preceding note, even if it is short. Then the figuration should be played resolutely in order better to demonstrate the agility of the hands.

9. In the Partitas, when there are figuregative and expressive passages, it is best to adopt a broad tempo; this is also observed in the Toccatas. Other sections without figuration can be executed at a lively speed, leaving the choice of tempo to the good taste and fine judgment of the player. The true spirit and the perfection of this manner and style of playing reside in the choice of tempo. The Passacaglias may be played separately, like the Ciacconas, according to the desire of the player, adjusting the tempo between the individual sections.
Summary

Given the ample Italian influence on English organ composition of the Restoration period, performance and study of these works can greatly benefit from familiarity with the early 17th-century Italian style of composition and recognizing its significance in England. Italian composers were influential in many areas of English music throughout the 17th century, including the vocal madrigal, keyboard, and instrumental repertoires (most notably the vocal works of Monteverdi and Caccini, and instrumental works of Carissimi). Italian musicians were heavily recruited by the monarchy following the Restoration, and worked as colleagues of English organists including Locke, Blow, and Purcell. Composers apparently had ready access to both print and manuscript sources of Italian keyboard repertoire, many of which survive today. In the organ repertoire, English composers easily adopted certain elements of Italian keyboard writing, including the durezze e ligature style and Italianate toccata figuration, and incorporated these elements into characteristically English forms such as the two-movement voluntary and the voluntary for double organ. Altogether, these sources of inspiration greatly contributed to the blossoming of English organ composition following the Restoration, and they establish a firm link between English Restoration organ repertoire and the Italian school of composition in the 17th century.
CHAPTER 5

SYNTHESIS OF FRENCH AND ITALIAN STYLES

The most significant contribution made by English Restoration organ composers is their synthesis of diverse French and Italian musical elements into cohesive works to form the foundation of an English school of organ repertoire. Composers, most notably Matthew Locke, John Blow, and Henry Purcell, incorporated Italian canzona and toccata writing into their work, overlaid with French-inspired ornamentation, motivic writing, and formal influence. Three works which best exhibit this fusion of styles are analyzed here in greater detail: Locke’s Voluntary in A Minor (*Melothesia*, 1673), Blow’s Voluntary in G, for Double Organ, and Purcell’s Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ (Z. 719). Each composer draws upon both French and Italian influence, and each synthesizes the two styles in a unique way, displaying a progression in the type of synthesis as compositional style evolved throughout the Restoration period. Initially French influence was predominant, as seen in the ornamentation and motivic writing of Matthew Locke. John Blow’s compositional style includes more contrapuntal writing and written-out figuration in the Italian style, even featuring direct quotations from the works of Frescobaldi, but remains consistently overlaid with ornamentation in line with French practice. Purcell, in contrast, adheres much more strongly to the influence of Italian style, with French influence occurring indirectly via established ornamentation practice, form, and registration. Together, these English composers demonstrate great aptitude for synthesizing distinct elements of French and Italian national styles, as seen in the following examples.

**Voluntary in A Minor (Matthew Locke)**

Locke’s first Voluntary in A Minor, arguably his most significant organ work from *Melothesia*, is constructed in the bipartite form of a French overture, featuring dotted rhythms
and slow and quick fugal sections. Both French and Italian elements are present in the work.\textsuperscript{337}

Aside from the form, French influence is most evident in Locke’s ornamentation and his slow fugal writing (Caldwell deems the opening fugue to be of “fundamentally French inspiration”\textsuperscript{338}), while Italian traits are most evident in Locke’s free toccata-like writing and \textit{canzona}-like fugato passages in the second section (“a mixture of the Italian canzona and toccata styles such as one encounters in the music of Michelangelo Rossi and Bernardo Pasquini”\textsuperscript{339}).

The slow fugal opening with dotted rhythms and French ornamentation can be seen in Figure 58, while the opening of the second fugue can be seen in Figure 59. For a discussion of Locke’s ornamentation and its derivation from the French style, please see Chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{337} Caldwell, \textit{English Keyboard Music before the Nineteenth Century}, 160.

\textsuperscript{338} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{339} Ibid., 164.
Voluntary in A Minor

Figure 58. Locke, Voluntary in A Minor, *Melodhesia* (1673), m. 1-12 (first theme).\textsuperscript{340}

Figure 59. Locke, Voluntary in A Minor, *Melodhesia* (1673), m. 22-25 (second theme).\textsuperscript{341}

\textsuperscript{340} Locke, *Organ Voluntaries*, 4–5.

\textsuperscript{341} Ibid.
The most pronounced toccata style found in the work occurs in m. 34-37, where highly active figuration is supported by a chordal texture in the other voices (see Figure 60). The figurative lines are each preceded by a mordent-like figure (first seen in LH, second half on m. 32), which then appears in diminution as a motive passed between voices in m. 37-40 (doubled in m. 39). Cox points out that the practice of devolving an imitative texture into a toccata-like passage is commonly found in Frescobaldi’s canzonas, especially nos. 1-4 from his *Second Book of Toccatas* (1627).  

---

Voluntary in A Minor

Figure 60. Locke, Voluntary in A, *Melothesia* (1673), m. 31-42.343

Voluntary in G, for Double Organ (John Blow)

While Locke’s Voluntary in A incorporates specific Italian compositional techniques, John Blow progresses one step further to incorporate quotations directly from the organ repertoire of Girolamo Frescobaldi. His Voluntary in G, for Double Organ is an exceptional example of a work featuring both French and Italian musical influence, while expanding the form of the English Double Organ Voluntary. Blow’s work is in roughly the form of an Italian

canzona, with two imitative sections based on related themes. The two sections are separated by fourteen measures of contrasting material, nearly entirely drawn from m. 18-24 of Frescobaldi’s Toccata ottava (First Book of Toccatas). The opening of each passage can be compared in Figure 61. Although the basic harmonic frameworks are equivalent, Blow adds ornamentation and motives derived from French practice, and slightly alters the voicing and rhythmic patterns.
The outer imitative sections, which bookend Blow’s Frescobaldi quotation, feature two clearly related themes (see Figure 62 and Figure 63). This thematic variation technique first originated in the Italian canzona, and quickly traveled northward into German baroque forms.

---

Blow’s scoring for double organ allows him to highlight several thematic entrances on the more prominent registration, a very effective technique that also allows the solo hand to delve into increasingly virtuosic figuration. This figuration, when heard against the accompanying manual, frequently creates a toccata-like texture that Blow successfully combines with the basic imitative form. See m. 22-32 in Figure 64: the left hand enters with the subject and figuration on the “Great Organ”, while the right hand settles into a complementary chordal texture. Both hands resume on the “Little Organ” in m. 29, with thematic entrances in m. 30 (soprano) and m. 31 (bass). The continuation of Frescobaldi’s original toccata (following the passage of borrowed material) also features toccata figuration. In Frescobaldi’s toccatas, however, he moves quickly from one imitative motive to another, rarely returning to one previously heard.

XXIX. Voluntary in G, for Double Organ

Figure 62. Blow, Voluntary in G, for Double Organ, m. 1-4 (Entrance of first theme).345

Blow, Complete Organ Works, 59–63.
XXIX. Voluntary in G, for Double Organ

British Library Add. MS 34695, f. 10v. A Double Vers. Dr Blow.

John Blow

Figure 63. Blow, Voluntary in G, for Double Organ, m. 54-61 (Entrance of second theme in m. 58). ³⁴⁶

XXIX. Voluntary in G, for Double Organ

British Library Add. MS 34695, f. 10v. A Double Vers. Dr Blow.

John Blow

Figure 64. Blow, Voluntary in G, for Double Organ, m. 22-32. ³⁴⁷

³⁴⁶ Ibid.

³⁴⁷
Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ, Z. 719 (Henry Purcell)

Purcell’s largest and most virtuosic contribution to the organ repertoire, the Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ (Z. 719), synthesizes both French and Italian characteristics in a highly engaging work. The voluntary’s solo voice alternates between bass and treble registers in the style of a French récit, while Purcell’s toccata-like written-out figuration is more in line with Italian style than French. As Caldwell summarizes, “the novelty of the design, the subtlety of the tonal argument, and the fiery brilliance of the writing, combine to make this a uniquely fascinating work of its period.”

Purcell effectively combines the form of the double organ voluntary with refined toccata writing, triadic figuration in the batalla style, and the use of pedal points to provide harmonic foundation. Purcell displays both French and Italian styles to full effect, presenting a striking contrast between the ornamented exposition of the theme and the virtuosic figuration which follows, yet seamlessly integrating the two dissimilar styles to form a cohesive and musically convincing work.

The Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ begins with an exposition of the theme on the Chair Organ, as shown in Figure 65. The theme itself is heavily ornamented, and includes both dotted rhythms and Lombardic reverse notes inégales rhythms as discussed in Chapter 3 (denoted by slurred sixteenth notes). The imitative entries reach their climax in a stretto in all voices (m. 10-16), preparing the entrance of the theme on the Great Organ in m. 14. The theme then dissolves into elaborate left-hand toccata figuration. Purcell’s sophisticated toccata style incorporates a variety of figuration, not merely scalar figures, and suspensions add color and harmonic tension to the accompanying texture (m. 18-19). Purcell also incorporates triadic

---

347 Ibid.

348 Caldwell, English Keyboard Music before the Nineteenth Century, 171.
figuration, as seen in Figure 66 beginning in m. 40, which Geoffrey Cox links to the *batalla* style found in Giovanni de Macque’s *Toccata a modo di Tombette*.\textsuperscript{349} As mentioned above, Macque’s organ works are found in British Library Add. MS 30491, a collection of works from the Neapolitan school copied in 1617 that may well have been available to English organists in the $17^{th}$ century.

\textsuperscript{349} Cox, *Organ Music in Restoration England 1*, 1:192.
Figure 65. Purcell, Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ (Z. 719), m. 1-19.\textsuperscript{350}

\textsuperscript{350} Purcell, \textit{Organ Works}, 7–12.
Purcell introduces a second theme in m. 47 (Figure 67), which is subsequently heard in four solo entrances before the two hands join on the Great in m. 65-66 for the work’s fiery conclusion (Figure 68). Purcell ends the work with figuration supported by dominant and tonic pedal points (dominant in lowest voice in m. 75-77; tonic in highest voice in m. 77-81). The technique is also found in Frescobaldi’s toccatas, particularly those with indicated pedal, often supporting a basic chordal texture with motivic interplay between voices to add interest (see Toccata quinta and Toccata sesta from Frescobaldi’s Second Book of Toccatas, both marked “sopra i pedali.” The opening of Toccata sesta is shown in Figure 69). Examples in earlier Restoration organ repertoire include Blow’s Verse in G Minor and Voluntary in D, as well as his Voluntary in G, for Double Organ, a double voluntary which shares many features with Purcell’s contribution to the same genre. Purcell’s technique far surpasses that of his predecessors, however, as he integrates Italianate contrapuntal writing and figuration into a French-inspired form and ornamentation practice to create one of the most noteworthy organ works of the Restoration period.

---

351 Ibid.

Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ


Figure 67. Purcell, Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ (Z. 719), m. 47-52.\(^{353}\)

\(^{353}\) Purcell, *Organ Works*, 10.
Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ


Henry Purcell

Figure 68. Purcell, Voluntary in D Minor, for Double Organ (Z. 719), m. 65-81.\textsuperscript{354}

\textsuperscript{354} Ibid., 11–12.
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Summary

In the three works highlighted above, Locke, Blow, and Purcell each integrate diverse French and Italian musical elements, synthesizing them into new forms and developing a unique English body of repertoire from the Restoration period. Together, these three composers blend Italian canzona and toccata styles with formal structures drawn from composers such as Louis Couperin and Nivers, overlaid with motivic writing and ornamentation analogous to contemporary French practice. The three chosen works reveal a chronology of style which corresponds to a general shift in English musical taste, from Charles II’s desire to imitate French practice to a later popular preference for music of Italian composers. The culmination of this stylistic shift is manifested in the fiery, virtuosic figuration and durezze e ligature writing of Henry Purcell, which marks the peak of English organ composition through the end of the

---

Restoration period and sets the stage for the development of the English voluntary in the 18th century.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

*Performance Practice Applications*

Knowledge of the influence of French and Italian national styles provides a significant advantage to the performer of Restoration English organ music, particularly in the realm of performance practice. The synthesis of French and Italian styles sheds particular light on ornamentation, registration, and rhythm that may otherwise be disregarded as irrelevant in an English context. In particular, performers would benefit greatly from considering primary sources such as the widely available French ornamentation tables and Frescobaldi’s preface to each book of toccatas. Greater awareness of the underlying musical styles in Restoration English organ repertoire allows the performer to hear audible connections with more commonly known French and Italian repertoire, and consequently illuminates opportunities for insightful recital programming highlighting the shared elements in English, French, and Italian organ works.

In addition, the impact of French styles of organ building on English instruments and compositional genres may influence a performer’s choice of instrument. The relationship between the French and English styles helps to demonstrate the importance of conserving the limited surviving historic instruments and pipework in England, and comparing them to their French counterparts built during the Commonwealth period. In addition, it highlights the need to construct new instruments with a historically informed approach, in order to make instruments which are ideal for the performance of this repertoire more widely available.
Opportunities for Further Research

It is interesting to note that a similar confluence of French and Italian styles is present in another musical area dominated by Locke, Blow, and Purcell: musical theatrical works, especially early English opera. On the surface, there are few connections between late 17th-century English organ repertoire and the theater. Organ works are generally perceived to be liturgical in function, and there is no currently known evidence of the organ utilized in stage productions in the 17th century. (Unlike during the time of Handel, when there was a strong connection between the organ and the theater, and oratorio performances featured organ concerti performed by Handel himself during intermission.) Despite there being no direct connection between the organ and opera, the two musical genres share the same primary composers, as well as stylistic techniques, forms, and the confluence of French and Italian styles. Indeed, many opera movements and other theatrical excerpts already exist in keyboard transcriptions, or otherwise would be naturally idiomatic to the solo organ or harpsichord, particularly airs, grounds, and dance movements. Of the three primary composers discussed above, the most notable musical-theatrical works are Matthew Locke’s Cupid and Death (a masque; music written in collaboration with Christopher Gibbons), John Blow’s Venus and Adonis (entirely set to music, and arguably the first English opera), and Henry Purcell’s Dido and Aeneas. Future research could explore the influence of French and Italian musical styles on Restoration-era English theatrical music, including early English opera, and demonstrate links between organ and theatrical repertoire (including keyboard transcriptions of operatic music and related works). There is little to no existing writing discussing the organ in the context of early English opera before Handel’s years in London, and these two areas of repertoire are rarely considered in the same context. As such, it presents an intriguing area for future research, with the potential to
demonstrate links between these two genres in terms of musical style, ornamentation, subgenres idiomatic to the organ, and overlap between musical theatric works and the broader keyboard repertoire.
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