



that is central to their ethic. The songs are a case of music being made meaningful through identity – a people’s powerful connection to an artistic expression that they consider ‘theirs’. Of course, says the *Cosmopolitan*, the connection of music and (Scottish, or any other) identity is a connection produced in the imagination (there is, again, no authentic core of the art-work onion) – but that is not to say that such connections are not real. On the contrary, connections through identity are among the most real connections we have. At the same time, the *Cosmopolitan* wants us to be mindful of other connections as well. These are connections, not through identity, but despite difference. With the publication of this edition, we not only gain a model of this sort of engagement – respecting, even celebrating identity while simultaneously tempering and even decentralizing it – but we also gain the opportunity to exercise this kind of double-barreled engagement ourselves.

SARAH DAY-O’CONNELL



Eighteenth-Century Music 5/2 © 2008 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570608001577 Printed in the United Kingdom

THOMAS ROSEINGRAVE, COMPLETE KEYBOARD MUSIC

MUSICA BRITANNICA 84

ED. H. DIACK JOHNSTONE AND RICHARD PLATT

London: Stainer and Bell, 2006

pp. xliii + 130, ISBN 0 85249 888 8

Thomas Roseingrave was a prominent figure in the musical life of Dublin and London. As a friend and passionate advocate of Domenico Scarlatti he was directly responsible for the ‘Scarlatti cult’ in England. He had met Scarlatti in Venice in 1709. Then only eighteen or nineteen, Roseingrave had been sent to Italy ‘to Improve himselfe in the art of musick’ sponsored by the dean and chapter of St Patrick’s Cathedral, Dublin, where his father Daniel was organist. Invited to a concert at a nobleman’s house, Thomas had improvised, unaware that Scarlatti was in the room. Scarlatti then took to the harpsichord and made such an impression on Roseingrave that he did not touch an instrument himself for a month. Nevertheless, the incident initiated a friendship and Roseingrave’s devotion to Scarlatti eventually bore fruit in his edition of *XLII Suites de Pieces pour le clavecin . . . composées par Domenico Scarlatti*, an edition to which Arne, Avison, Boyce, Greene, Loeillet, Pepusch and Stanley were subscribers. Published in 1739, it is the principal source for some of the pieces and was used by Avison for his set of twelve string concertos arranged from Scarlatti sonatas and published in 1744.

Roseingrave was also renowned as an improviser on the harpsichord and organ, and this skill in 1725 secured him the job as the first organist at the newly built church of St George’s, Hanover Square, London. After performing their chosen pieces, each candidate was required to extemporize a fugue on subjects provided by the panel of judges; Handel, who lived in the parish, sent a fugue subject but was not present. According to Burney, Roseingrave ‘treated the subjects given with such science and dexterity, inverting the order of the notes, augmenting and diminishing their value, introducing counter-subjects, and turning the themes to so many ingenious purposes that the judges were unanimous in declaring him the victorious candidate’ (Charles Burney, *A General History of Music* (London, 1776–1789), ed. F. Mercer (1935, reprinted New York: Dover, 1957), volume 2, 704).

Burney appears to have included an account of Roseingrave’s life in his *General History of Music* in large part for its colourful details, for as he writes, ‘[Roseingrave’s] intellects being a little deranged in the latter part of his life rendered him so whimsical and eccentric a character that he is too prominent to be overlooked’ (Burney, *General History*, volume 2, 704). Roseingrave suffered a mental breakdown sometime in the mid-1730s, which, according to Burney, was the result of being rejected by ‘a lady of no dove-like



constancy' (705) who was one of his pupils. After this misfortune he was never able to bear any kind of noise: 'If, during his performance on the organ at church, any one near him coughed, sneezed, or blew his nose with violence, he would instantly quit the instrument and run out of the church, seemingly in the greatest pain and terror, crying out that it was *old scratch* who tormented him' (705).

By March 1744, following complaints from the parishioners, an assistant organist was appointed, but the vestry very generously decided that Roseingrave should still receive £25, over half of his salary, due to his 'Innability to Support himself' (Vestry Minutes, Westminster Public Library MS 768, pages 90–92). This must have been a difficult time for Roseingrave, who had once been capable of earning £1,000 a year through teaching alone. He had certainly been considered a skilled teacher and his pupils included Henry Carey, John Worgan and John Christopher Smith, the son of Handel's amanuensis. In 1749 he returned to Dublin where he was taken in by his nephew, and although he never fully recovered, there were moments of lucidity during which he was able to perform in public. He died in 1766.

Roseingrave's published keyboard music comprises fifteen *Fugues and Voluntaries* (1728), six *Double Fugues* (1750) and eight harpsichord suites (1728). The preponderance of fugues reflects an interest in counterpoint that apparently stemmed from a passion for the music of Palestrina; Sir John Hawkins, visiting Roseingrave on one occasion, claims to have found his bedroom walls decorated with extracts from Palestrina's works. In Roseingrave's contrapuntal works however the influence of Palestrina is wholly absent. They are not written in a fixed number of parts but flit between two-, three- and four-part writing. Thematic interest is concentrated in the treble and bass while the fragmentary inner parts sketch in the harmony, creating a texture which often sounds orchestral in conception and which presumably reflects the genesis of these pieces in improvisation. To this mix, which is in many ways Handelian, Roseingrave adds a large amount of spice. His fondness for harmonic intricacies, chromaticism, false relations and augmented-fifth chords have led to comparisons with Purcell and Blow. When successful, the casting of this seventeenth-century substance in an eighteenth-century mould produces some fascinating results (Nos 1, 2, 12 and 13 in the present edition) that attracted the admiration of Constant Lambert in the 1930s (he even made use of Roseingrave's voluntaries as incidental music for a play). Roseingrave is also very fond of extravagant modulations, which, though criticized by Burney, are very effective when under control (as in No. 3). Roseingrave's individuality is also evident in the irregular phrase-lengths of Voluntary No. 8. His unconventional use of successive 6/4 chords and of the augmented second as a melodic interval produces very odd results, perhaps the sort of thing that Hawkins considered 'harsh and disgusting' (see No. 9, bars 14–15 and bar 36) (John Hawkins, *A General History of the Science and Practice of Music* (London, 1776), reprinted with an introduction by Charles Cudworth (New York: Dover, 1963), volume 2, 824).

Voluntary No. 7 is perhaps the best example of Roseingrave's contrapuntal ingenuity, with its effective use of inversion and stretto; there is however no example in either set of fugues of the augmentation and diminution of note values mentioned by Burney. Roseingrave is very free with his material, altering the intervals and the rhythm of his subject and leaving out notes from the beginning or the end. These procedures, which have been described as 'pleasantly unscholastic' (J. D., Review of 'Ten Organ Pieces by Thomas Roseingrave', ed. P. Williams, *Music and Letters* 43 (1962), 387), are successful when the fugue subject is distinctive (as in No. 8). However, many of the subjects are far from distinctive and these freedoms, combined with a tendency to integrate entries into a continuous three-part texture, make the statement of the fugue subject almost impossible to perceive. The result is fluent but rather featureless.

Roseingrave's habit of harmonizing the initial statements of fugues with sketchy counter-subjects or continuo-style chords can have the effect of obscuring the entry of the answering phrase (see No. 5; the same is true of the gígues Nos 27d and 28d). In some pieces, the subject is introduced with its counter-subject right from the start (Nos 9 and 12). This appears to have become Roseingrave's favoured practice, for it is the defining characteristic of the *Double Fugues* that were published near the end of his career. Although less individual than the 1728 set, the clarity of part-writing in the double fugues makes their structure easier to perceive and a better use of tessitura gives them more textural variety.



The harpsichord suites contain surprisingly little of Scarlatti's influence. On the other hand, the influence of Handel is clear, both in the nature of the musical material and in the elegance and poise that Roseingrave achieves (22b, 26a, 28c). Roseingrave's personality is evident in details such as false relations (No. 23c), odd voice-leading (No. 23d), and a French overture whose opening section is in triple time, but in general these works are not as individual as the fugues. Several movements are marred by tedious sequences and inconsequential modulations. The arrival on the supertonic instead of the dominant at the mid-point of binary structures (27b, 27e) suggests that he is not entirely in control of his faculties.

As with the organ music, Roseingrave is extremely free in his attitude to part-writing, thickening the texture momentarily to create larger gestures (No. 23c, bar 22; No. 24a, bar 17) and sprinkling the staff with isolated notes which do not belong to any of the contrapuntal lines but which add texture or harmony or maintain the rhythmic flow. Indeed, the desire to achieve perpetual motion (which characterizes much of his music) and the lack of clear punctuation between phrases can leave the listener breathless.

The genesis of Roseingrave's keyboard music in performance is evident in its notation. Roseingrave goes to great lengths to notate exactly how long to hold down each note (see No. 26c, left hand), frequently notating the phrasing of a melody (for example the holding-over of harmonic notes as in No. 10, bar 27 and No. 26a, bar 3). From one point of view it is a fascinating insight into the practice of overholding and of articulation in general. Visually, however, this attention to detail has the effect of almost totally obscuring the part-writing, which can be very disconcerting for the performer. While recognizing that these notational complexities are integral to Roseingrave's keyboard music, the editors have whenever possible sought to clarify the visual appearance of the music; indeed, this appears to be central to the purpose of this new edition. They place on a single stem notes that were separately stemmed in the original publications and realize dots which straddle the internal divisions of beats within the bar as tied notes. A comparison of their edition of Voluntary No. 4 with the original of 1728 (reproduced in the Introduction) reveals that the critical commentary does not mention every change in notation. (For those who wish to consult the originals, modern facsimiles are readily available as Performers' Facsimiles, volumes 5, 19 and 105.) However, the editors' approach is restrained and, importantly, respects Roseingrave's own inconsistency, for example in the notation of fugue subjects (compare their edition of No. 10 with Denis Stevens's of 1964 in which the notation of the subject is standardized).

Although published under the authorization of Roseingrave himself, the original editions are clearly corrupt at times and require the intervention of the editors to create a text that makes some sort of sense (Nos. 27e, bars 23–25). Johnstone and Platt make use of readings from an eighteenth-century manuscript copy of the harpsichord suites, which, although apparently copied from the original edition, contains corrections to a number of errors. They also consult a manuscript copy of two of the organ voluntaries made by John Alcock around 1740, which provides a few missing rests, ties and occasional accidentals. But for the most part the music survives only in the original printed editions. When dealing with such idiosyncratic music it is often difficult to distinguish between errors in the source and moments of intentional transgression or colour. Johnstone and Platt wisely change as little as possible while offering solutions to moments of 'impropriety' in the critical commentary. There are moments which on first hearing sound like mistakes but which are clearly intentional since they return later in the movement (the 'saucy wink' in No. 23b, bars 5 and 21–22, and an extraordinary passage in No. 27b, bars 13–15, 52–55).

The miscellaneous pieces and the appendix in this volume are particularly welcome for the insights they afford. The concerto, which may be one of the first British keyboard concertos ever written, is quite unlike Roseingrave's other works. The texture and harmonic language is much simpler, with Roseingrave's fondness for harmonic and melodic twists confined to a single solo section (No. 33, bars 86–100). Both the manuscript and the shorter printed version of the concerto are reproduced, the former supplied with editorial orchestration for strings, trumpets and drums. The Allemanda (No. 30) displays a finesse and lucidity not present in the published harpsichord works, while the 'additions' Roseingrave made to a Scarlatti sonata (K37) reveal something of his brilliance and enthusiasm as a performer. The editorial notes include much useful information, including the specification of the organ at St George's, Hanover Square in



1725, and details concerning the interpretation of the ornament symbols (including the mordent or English beat).

Roseingrave's output is uneven and his style eccentric. If his reputation has suffered in the past as the result of judgments based on a partial knowledge of his work, then this volume should set the record straight. This publication will be welcomed by enthusiasts of Roseingrave's music as well as its sceptics.

SILAS WOLLSTON



RECORDINGS

Eighteenth-Century Music 5/2 © 2008 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S1478570608001589 Printed in the United Kingdom

LEOPOLD ANTON KOZELUCH (1747–1818)

MOISÈ IN EGITTO

Simone Kermes (soprano), Linda Perillo (soprano), Markus Schäfer (tenor), Tom Sol (bass), Rheinische Kantorei, Das Kleine Konzert, Hermann Max Georgsmarienhütte
CPO, 999 9482, 2003, two discs, 103 minutes

Following the splendid set of Dittersdorf's *Giob*, CPO continue their exploration of the Italian oratorio in Vienna with Kozeluch's *Moisè in Egitto*. The same team is used, 'Das Kleine Konzert' under Hermann Max, with some of the same excellent singers. Kozeluch's *azione sacra* (1787, revised 1790) was written for the Tonkünstler-Societät founded by Florian Gassmann in 1771. Given at the Burgtheater in the year following the first public performances of *Giob*, it is considerably smaller in scope than *Giob*, which has nearly an hour more music. In this respect *Giob* follows Haydn's revised 1784 version of *Il Ritorno di Tobia*, which lasts for over three hours.

A striking feature of the Metastasian oratorio in this period is that the texts lack drama. Dittersdorf's *Ester* (1773) derives from Racine's least exciting play. His text for the story of Job (1786), with one tribulation after another, is not immediately compelling. Dittersdorf's glorious, cheerful music is necessarily often at odds with the sense of the text. In plot-related terms Haydn's story of Tobias curing Tobit's blindness (*Il Ritorno di Tobia* 1775, revised 1784) is hardly riveting, and all that happens in Part 1, after an hour of music, is the arrival of Tobias and his bride. Following Jommelli, J. C. Bach and others, Cartellieri's *Gioas Re di Giuda* (1795), recorded on Dabringhaus and Grimm MDG 338 0748, at least has the more promising stimulus, via Metastasio, of Racine's wonderful final play, *Athalie* (1691), so explosive in its theme of deposition and regicide that it was suppressed before the first performance. Kozeluch's anonymous text for *Moisè in Egitto* is elegant but hardly dramatic; indeed its subject could be summarized as 'Will the Israelites leave Egypt?'. However, it is compact and skilfully put together with a pleasing symmetry in the two parts. In his study *A History of the Oratorio: Volume 3, The Classical Era* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), Howard E. Smither catalogues the characteristics of the Metastasian libretto and notes the changes wrought in the late eighteenth century. (Oratorio veered more to the condition of opera, with librettists adding ensembles.) Smither analyses *Il Ritorno di Tobia* but mentions neither *Giob* nor *Moisè in Egitto*. Kozeluch's unknown librettist has followed Haydn's poet, Giovanni Gastone Boccherini, in permitting more than just single arias, and has included a duet, a trio and a quartet. In Haydn's *Il Ritorno di Tobia* the only duet comes towards the end of Part 2, after more than two hours of music. In Kozeluch's oratorio there are four principals and a chorus: Moisé (tenor) and his brother Aaronne (a soprano role), Egypt's ruler, Faraone (bass), and his daughter Merime, Moisé's foster mother (soprano). In both parts each singer has one aria. In Part 1 these arias are followed by a quartet augmented by the chorus; in Part 2 a trio (Merime,