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Abstract

This thesis is an extended examination of a lithograph, dated 1826, purporting to show a meeting of the Canterbury Catch Club—a musical society which flourished in the early nineteenth century. A very large collection of documents relating to the Club, now held in the Cathedral Library and Archives and the city Library, is used extensively to interrogate the print in order to assess what it tells us about the social, historical and cultural context within which the Club members and musicians promoted, performed and consumed the music which was, ostensibly, the Club’s raison-d’être.

The thesis begins with an iconographical study comparing the image with other representations of convivial song of the period, and with contemporary written accounts of such evenings to be found in diaries and other literature, to ascertain how accurate it might be in its depiction of gentlemen at such an evening as this. After this, the archival evidence is then used to scrutinise, in Part I, that which is clearly visible; in Part II, that which is less clearly drawn—the musicians; and finally, in Part III, those elements conspicuous by their absence.

Part I thus makes clear that the image is intended to assert the professional and socio-cultural identity of the gentlemen shown in the picture, by dint of careful composition and adherence to matters of dress, consumption, gender definition, and cultural association. Part II uses both Club and Cathedral records to investigate the extent to which the musicians employed by the Club may—as was often the case—have sung in the Cathedral Choir, and contributes to scholarship on this subaltern group of men by the use of detailed reference to hitherto unseen archival records. Part III—not for the first time in the thesis—notes the absence of women, whether as audience or performer, and then proceeds to a searching analysis of the musical repertoire itself, discussing the instrumental and vocal music which made up the programme of a Club evening, arguing that the musical taste evidenced here speaks volumes for the process of aspirational embourgeoisement at work in this print and in society at large. This work is substantiated by extensive transcription, cataloguing and documentation of the Club’s archive and repertoire. Further reference is made to the clues herein about another aspect of Club culture noticeably absent from this print: the libertine revelry of the later evening singing. This speaks to a central point of the thesis: that this “after-evening” behaviour is a fascinating relic of the manners and mores of the Georgian period which gave it birth, offering Club members an opportunity to indulge in convivial behaviours which were unacceptable in more public environments.

The thesis argues that the image is a telling assertion of socio-political identity at a turbulent point in British history, proclaiming an emerging certain social and economic status but also testifying eloquently to the continuation of an older, alternative, convivial culture.
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Editorial Practice

Late eighteenth and early nineteenth century punctuation and typography seems quaintly idiosyncratic to modern eyes. Shorter quotations retain original punctuation and, for example, the use of capital letters—either for nouns or for emphasis—and italic font; in longer quotations punctuation (usually only a matter of removing surplus commas) has been modernised for ease of reading.

---
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Assistant Organist and Director of the Cathedral Girls’ Choir: gratitude for some much-needed proof-reading and encouragement, and lots of excellent coffee and enjoyable conversation. To the students of CCCU who, in the last few years, have found themselves singing a very odd repertoire they could never have imagined—and have done so with gusto: delighted appreciation.

To Dr Richard Hall, whose knowledge, intelligence, sensitivity, and understanding I can never hope to emulate or reciprocate: love and thanks for forty years of music-making, book-swapping, motorcycling and friendship. This would not have started without him.

For my wife Sonia, without whom there would be little point: the most profound gratitude. This would not have been continued, let alone finished, without her love, wit, and wisdom. Every day.
Dedication

For Sonia
The application of the following slight anecdote, may, perhaps, be in favour of the work:—it happened, that Messrs. Boyce and Arne met one morning in Mr Garrick's parlour, before they acquired academical degrees. Talking of music, Mr Arne remarked, that, when he took up a score, he looked for the faults in the first place, and, if they were numerous, he laid it aside. “You may be right,” said Mr. Boyce, “although I differ from you; where I find many beauties, I wish to see no faults.”

Stafford Smith, John, Remarks on the Various Compositions;

Musica Antiqua (Preston, 1812), p. 11.
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The subject of this thesis is a picture: a lithograph entitled *The Canterbury Catch Club*, dated 1826. Three copies survive in the city today: one, apparently acquired entirely without record, is in the care of the city library; another is in the possession of the Cathedral Archives; and one, serendipitously rescued from the detritus of a house about to change hands, is in the private possession of a long-standing Canterbury resident: a GP who spent almost his entire professional life in the city. Nowhere is the print on public display. At first glance, there would seem to be no reason for any such attention. Hardly anyone would now recognise much of the information the print offers about itself: names, mostly, of the Club and its chairman, and those responsible for its production—artist, printer, and commissioning newsagent. On the face of it, it is an odd choice of topic.

Its origin, discussed in the Prologue, is mercantile bourgeois: inspired by entrepreneurial speculation rather than any urge to memorialise, it seems to have been an imaginative commercial proposition inviting Club members to subscribe to a keepsake, with not the faintest nod to longer-term posterity. And if, for present-day observers, that image were our only glimpse of the Canterbury Catch Club, we might simply note it as another snippet of evidence of a phenomenon known to music historians but little regarded: the sociable singing club. In fact, however, our view of the Canterbury picture is illuminated with quite startling brilliance by a remarkable archive.

On 21 October 1915, the Beaney Institute—Canterbury’s city library—received a bequest. Most of it was music: over 70 volumes of vocal music containing about 3,000 pieces by over 300 composers, and about 200 instrumental part books: hand-written volumes containing separate orchestral parts for over 700 pieces by 200 composers. Brian Robins describes this as “the largest and most important collection in existence,”¹ but for anyone interested in the socio-cultural milieu which generated this extraordinary archive, there is much more. In addition to the music, there was a motley assortment of artefacts. There were a number of paintings, by an artist or artists unknown: individual portraits of half a dozen worthy gentlemen in early nineteenth-century dress along with pictures of the rather better-known George Frederick Handel and Arcangelo Corelli. There was also an impressive representation of Saint Cecilia at a keyboard, accompanied by a verse from Dryden and a couple of cherubs. There were beautifully bound books, most hand-written in the copperplate script of the age: one gives a record of
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the concert programmes between September 1825 and February 1837—almost twelve seasons’ worth—but most significantly, four splendid volumes record the minutes of committee meetings covering a period of activity from 1802 until 1865. And there was a desk, and a chairman’s gavel.

All this, meticulously inventoried in the final pages of the last of the Minutes Books by the Beaney Librarian in 1915, had been the property of the Canterbury Catch Club. By then, the Club had been defunct for half a century, all but gone from living memory. Without wishing to over-romanticise what might be described as a bundle of old music and some bric-a-brac, the preservation of this eclectic collection of artefacts in the dark days of the Great War might wonderingly be called an act of some faith—an assertion, perhaps, that something of our national heritage was in here, somewhere, if it could but be found, and that it should be preserved, at a time when so much was imperilled.

Whatever the archivists’ motive, the material clearly had an interesting story to tell. The records show that the music had originally been the property of those musicians who made up the very first Canterbury Catch Club Orchestra in the late 18th century—an early example of an artists’ cooperative, though they would have been puzzled if anyone had suggested that. As far as they would have been concerned, it was their club’s music; they simply played it. In 1802, the Club took possession of it, and added to it in the following decades to create the substantial collection which now survives. When the Club folded in 1865, it loaned the music to the “new Catch Club”, of which no records survive. Ten years later, in 1875—and there is no clue as to where it had been for that decade—all the property of the “old” Catch Club was given in trust to the St Lawrence Amateur Musical Society, “on the understanding that should a Catch Club be revived here, it [the property] will be handed over to it”.2 No new Catch Club appeared, despite the confident statement reported in the same newspaper article that “there would be little or no difficulty in reviving the musical evenings which were so regularly celebrated in the winter months from 1779 down to a comparatively recent date.” In 1905, the last surviving Trustee of the Society—one George Johnson—bequeathed the entire archive by Deed of Gift to the “Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of Canterbury”.3 Once again the trail goes dark until that day, ten years later in 1915, when the Beaney gave it shelter. In their storage it stayed, through another war and beyond. Later, in 1989, the books and music were taken under the wing of the Cathedral Archives and Library, while the artefacts remained at the Beaney; two of the
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portraits are on permanent display today.

The result is a wealth of evidence with which to scrutinise the print, but the relationship is reciprocal: the print becomes a window through which the world of the Canterbury Catch Club may be scrutinised.

Every picture is a work of fiction, carefully constructed to show what the artist and/or commissioners want to advertise. But the much, much more interesting matter is what is let slip in the showing, or not included in the first place, or actively concealed, perhaps even hidden from the consciousness of the originators themselves. This unpeeling, in part, dictates the structure of the thesis: Parts I, II and III proceed from that which may be clearly seen, to that which is only indistinctly sketched, to those things which are conspicuous by their absence.

Before the unpeeling, however, there is comparative work to be done; this print is by no means an isolated example of sociable singing pictorialised. Hence the Prologue: a brief look at earlier examples of visual representations of convivial music-making. This iconographical study is guided largely by the writings of Richard Leppert, whose insights on the ideology and meaning of pictures were invaluable. It has to be admitted that most of the time his work is concerned with art of more serious intent, for the representation of sociable singing before the Canterbury print of 1826 usually takes the form of caricature: groups of gentlemen (they are always male) gathered at or round a table upon which sit glasses, bottles, and punch-bowls. The singing, in such visualisations, is obviously a very secondary matter. This genre of artistic endeavour relates more closely to the satirical print whose period of popularity closely matches that of the English glee—a genre of music which formed an increasingly important part of the repertoire being sung at these convivial evenings. These prints have been for some years the subject of study by Vic Gatrell, who perfectly matches the prints’ earthy vitriol (they can be very rude) with his vigorous writing. His focus is not so much on the artwork as on the fact that such “tacitly seditious graphic expression”, showing “scant respect for royalty”,⁴ suffused with “an ironic scepticism about power and high-minded affectation”⁵ could be produced and consumed in the first place. Evoking the history of “mentalities”,⁶ Gatrell positions his work firmly in
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a tradition “concerned with customs and tacit understandings as they are woven into the fabric of popular traditions”? Patrick Hutton argues that such historians “dealt more successfully with issues of collective psychology”8 than narrative history generally had; in any case, such historical methodology certainly serves this thesis as it looks at one of “the most poignant issues of modern culture: … the appropriation of an aristocratic code of manners by the bourgeoisie.”9 The point is that the longevity of the Canterbury Club is something of a puzzle, for the music which lay at the heart of it was going out of fashion even as the Club set about putting its affairs in order more formally in 1802. There must have been other forces in play to ensure the longevity of a somewhat anachronistic institution.

Part I begins with a search for the “truth” of the print, as a necessary foundation for any consideration of that which is clearly visible in the picture. The facts of the matter, partly thanks to a lively local press—ever supportive of cultural confections like the Catch Club—are reasonably easy to ascertain, though no-one has until now. Always conscious of its antiquity, the Club’s 1779 starting date seems surprisingly certain even though it actually wrote nothing whatever about itself for twenty-odd years; then, from 1802 onwards, the Club becomes ever more garrulous about its affairs. It all makes fascinating reading, except when the records are infuriatingly silent.

Close scrutiny of the Canterbury Club takes place, of course, in the wider context of recent musicology relating to the production, consumption, and reception of music in the country at large during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: much has been done, both on the factual detail of concert life and the socio-cultural interpretation of it. Simon McVeigh’s Calendar of London Concerts 1750–180010 is now the starting-point for any scrutiny of activity, but it is worth noting that events taking place under the auspices of “Societies” (usually meeting in taverns, as with the Canterbury Club) account for only 300 of the 4000 listed at the time of writing. In his 1993 book, McVeigh himself largely excludes “Glee clubs and other convivial groups … from detailed discussion”,11 though he is quick to note the appearance of the repertoire:
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In succeeding decades [the 1770s onwards] glee[s] played an increasing role at English public concerts—a striking change of social function—and in the 1790s this repertoire even invaded the fashionable sphere. The genre mixed several social strands: a popular bawdy tradition, gentlemen’s post-prandial entertainment, ancient antiquarianism. Increasingly, too, it contributed to ladies’ domestic amusement.  

There are good reasons for this relative disregard: clubs and societies felt far less need to advertise their activities, so left less trace than public concerts; and they recorded very little of themselves. McVeigh mentions three music societies which are extremely important in any history of this activity “whose meetings were not advertised”: the Academy of Ancient Music, which met fortnightly at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, and two others, also founded in 1720s, which met at the Swan Tavern in Cornhill and the Castle Tavern in Paternoster Row. And so what we do know of an evening’s sociable music-making is often a result of the scavenging which must needs be done amongst more casual writings: diaries, letters, and the occasional newspaper report. This thesis makes frequent reference to the diaries of both John Marsh (edited by Brian Robins) and R.J.S. Stevens (edited by Mark Argent); Marsh’s oft-quoted description of a Canterbury Club meeting in 1783 is the most detailed account in the literature, and although Stevens never set foot in the city, his descriptions of convivial evenings serve as useful comparative accounts.

This is not to say that such evenings have never been given serious attention: John Hawkins’ account of the Madrigal Society meeting predates Marsh’s diary entry by some years:

The meetings of the Society were on Wednesday evening in every week; their performance consisted of Italian and English madrigals in three, four, and five parts; and, being assisted by three or four boys from the choir of St. Paul’s, they sung compositions of this kind, as also catches, rounds, and canons, though not elegantly, with a degree of correctness that did justice to the harmony; and, to vary the entertainment, Immyns [the founder of the Society] would sometimes read, by way of lecture, a chapter of Zarlino translated by himself.

This makes clear that such societies—at least, those that espoused noble aspirations relating to the place of music in civilised society—were worthy of serious consideration. That argument, articulated in more and more pleading tones, becomes a leitmotif of the writing on this topic. An early iteration is an article by one William Nettle:

The Parliamentary Catch [Baildon: Mister Speaker, Tho’ ‘Tis Late, Example 1-3, page 13] was popular at these meetings, sung with an imitation of Parliamentary procedure that is thus described by Gardiner:
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The first voice begins the catch by standing up and addressing the Chair, and at the end of the first strain sits down, when the second voice commences and does the like; then the third voice, and so on till the whole company are drawn in to the different parts. The rising up at ‘Order! Order!’ and “Sir, I shall name you, if you stir”, and resuming seats, renders it laughable and uproarious.\textsuperscript{15}

The skill with which the parts are arranged, so that the interruptions get more exciting as the catch proceeds, giving a parody of a stormy debate in the House, is the essence of the wit.

And it is the wit of these compositions that constituted their charm. They were written for men’s gatherings in a convivial atmosphere: the absence of women encouraged a certain freedom of reference to sexual life sufficient to condemn these compositions in the 19th century, but with the loss of catches has gone much of the wit that was inherent therein.\textsuperscript{16}

Nettle’s reference to the opprobrium heaped upon both the content and the alcoholic context of this repertoire by nineteenth century writers is represented in this thesis by William Makepiece Thackeray, whose serious treatment of such conviviality took the form of withering dismissal.

More recent musicology, however, has been far more sympathetic to this culture, and it has not all been centred upon the capital. Rachel Cowgill and Peter Holman boldly assert that “it was arguably the vibrant, complex, and in many ways self-sufficient cultural life of the British provinces that made the nation so distinctive musically in the context of 18th- and 19th-century Europe.”\textsuperscript{17} Many of the comments in their overview have resonance with the Canterbury context: successive organists were indeed “the focal point of secular musical life as the directors and promoters of concerts and festivals”;\textsuperscript{18} Canterbury was indeed “the regular and most accessible gateway to fashionable social life”\textsuperscript{19} for the rural elite (personified in this account by John Marsh); and the Club itself, though not held in the Town Hall, welcomed the Mayor, Aldermen, and Members of Parliament to their meetings for the very reasons Cowgill and Holman offer: to infuse those meetings “with the authority and pomp of the Corporation, and the moral, cultural, and political gravitas to which the citizenry aspired”.\textsuperscript{20} And of course, the Canterbury Club itself serves as another case study of the kind of network they mention, with all the dynamism and tension that implies.

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 4.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 3.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 6.
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It is also worth noting in passing that Peter Horton’s case study of Samuel Sebastian Wesley’s extra-curricular music-making alongside several of his cathedral posts has further resonance for this study, although Canterbury’s main musical personality lies just outside its purview. William Henry Longhurst sang and played at the heart of the city’s music-making in both cathedral and Catch Club, personifying the kind of organist Horton describes:

200 years ago ... [they] restricted themselves to their professional duties, teaching (to augment their generally inadequate salaries), and participation in the activities of local glee club or private concert society ... In the main, cathedral organists (whose twice-daily duties kept them more fully occupied than their present-day counterparts) were primarily local church musicians, trained as articled pupils and content to follow in the footsteps of their masters.21

S.S. Wesley’s “peripatetic career”22 at five different cathedrals is in stark contrast to Longhurst’s one (his cathedral service, as chorister, Lay Clerk, Assistant Organist and, finally, Organist, was unbroken from 1831 to 1898), but otherwise the comparison is valid, and the depiction of a lively secular musical career holds for other Canterbury organists for whom there are any records: to take three other examples, the Catch Club Minutes Books clearly show the involvement of two of Longhurst’s predecessors, Thomas Jones (Organist 1831–1873) and Samuel Porter (1757–1803); and Rebecca Herissone’s scrutiny of the manuscripts in the possession of Daniel Henstridge (Organist 1698–1736) indicate that he taught not only the choristers of the cathedral (as would have been expected) but the offspring of local families, and that he joined in with music-making of both more and less formal character in the city.23

For students of the club culture surrounding the catch and glee repertoire, however, one core text is Brian Robins’ Catch and Glee Culture in Eighteenth-Century England. His careful tracing of the loose associations which formed around this sociable singing is a remarkable piece of detective work, depending as it does on the kind of incidental records noted above. Having quoted one of Shakespeare’s several mentions of catch singing, Robins’ story begins in earnest in the mid-

22. Ibid., 268.
seventeenth century:

Some of the earliest recorded evidence of music clubs comes not from the inn or tavern, but the Oxford colleges. By 1656 [Anthony Wood (1632–95)] was a member of a weekly music club run for profit and held at the house of William Ellis. ... The principal occupation of Ellis’s club was the performance of instrumental consort music. ... Instrumental performances were leavened by songs and catches. ... Ellis’s club is probably therefore one of the earliest organised music clubs at which catches were regularly performed.24

Robins’ second and third chapters are devoted to a description of the important associations in London, including the Academy of Vocal Music and the Madrigal Society, though he also notes other clubs beyond the capital: one particularly noteworthy example of a club apparently formed solely for vocal music (as opposed to one expecting instrumental music with some vocal contributions) is in Edinburgh, where “although originally an offshoot of the city’s music society, an independent Catch Club appears to have been established by at least the 1740s.”25 Later chapters considerably develop his concern with the diffusion of the club culture throughout the kingdom, but a long central chapter first scrutinises the London Noblemen and Gentlemen’s Catch Club which, by that mimetic process ever at work in British society, became the model for provincial versions. It deserves the attention, if only for its decision from 1763 to award prizes for new compositions of glee, catch and canon—a commitment it sustained for some thirty years. The result was a blossoming of what became proudly touted as a distinctively English repertoire. The study is very slightly hindered, however, by a want from which the Canterbury Club does not suffer: as with other societies, there are no “detailed programme records”26 showing exactly what went on at a ‘Nobs and Gents’ evening. The Canterbury programme records scrutinised in Part III, therefore, covering a dozen years from 1825 and another four from 1857, offer a precious insight into the tastes of this time and this culture.

Robins’ examination of other London clubs and those further afield in the provinces (chapters 4 and 5) is exhaustive scholarship, and he makes the point that the period of his study—the latter part of the eighteenth century—coincides with the heyday of the glee. One other substantial contribution to the musicology of this subject is entirely in accord here: Emanuel Rubin’s encyclopaedic work (which had not been published when Robins wrote his book; Robins refers to the PhD thesis which was the

25. Ibid., 27.
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precursor) traces the trajectory of the glee by volume of publication.27 Rubin acknowledges the hazards of simply reading too much into statistics, but its message is clear:

The graph in fig. 14.1 and its projection onto the idea of a trajectory of influence affirm that the popularity of the genre, as measured by the number of published anthologies and collections, increased more or less steadily up to the turn of the century, after which it began to fall off. At the height of the arch the glee was almost the normative expression of English music for the urban sophisticate, one that was recognised as a uniquely British idiom at home and, to a great extent, abroad. The curve traced in fig. 14.1 convincingly illustrates that the working lives of the third and fourth generations of glee writers corresponds to the period of the glee’s greatest popularity, widest dissemination, and greatest influence. After that came a long decline into the eventual twilight of obscurity, misunderstanding, and eventual neglect.28

Both Robins and Rubin also agree that the “long decline” of the glee—which had superseded the catch as the primary genre for public consumption—nevertheless included an interesting variety of afterlives. Robins puts it thus:

The rapid development of the glee to the status of a popular genre with a specific appeal to English audiences ensured that such restricted performance conditions [as were to be found in a catch club] were soon breached. Before the end of the 1760s both the glee and, to a lesser extent, the catch found entry into the wider spheres of domestic music making and the concert platform, while during the following decade the glee would also be taken up by theatre composers.29

Rubin goes further and claims that the glee became “an almost obligatory requirement for success of stage plays by 1790,”30 and Robins notes that Bishop included some 150 glee’s in his stage works before the end of his career.31 This migration is further discussed in Part III.

Such formidable scholarship creates the context for this much more narrowly-focused study, looking at one single catch club. It all illuminates this work, as do the other more tangential writings of Thackeray and his contemporary, Charles Dickens, whose account of a “harmonic meeting”—a masterpiece of knowing satire—is an amuse bouche of a piece. Other writings have come to light in the course of the study: the article by Scholes, quoted in a 1943 Cathedral Friends magazine which identified the source (now held in the British Library), is directly relevant to this study, and forms a perfect counterpoise to the Marsh description of half a century previously. As a result, Mr Welby’s

28. Ibid., 380.
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voice rings strong and clear across the two centuries which divide us with a stridently political message which unites us; may he rest in peace. And in all of it, there is a sense of lively conviviality which sets a tone for the topic.

It is a tone which cautions warmly against such a thing as seriousness, and another writer, Lawrence Sterne, has a contribution to make which chimes with this exploration of “mentailities”. Sterne describes gravity as a “trick to gain credit of the world for more sense and knowledge than a man was worth; ... a mysterious carriage of the body to cover the defects of the mind”, and the kindred spirituality of his writing with this repertoire and its culture is explored later in the thesis. It is worth foreshadowing here because the rest of Part I owes much to Linda Colley. She exemplifies a character of which Sterne would probably approve in her exuberant dissection of the making of our nation (in summary, a definition of national identity largely by what we decided we were not—Catholic, French, serious about democracy, etc.). Her splendid history offers a historical framework which complements Gatrell’s emphasis on mentalities articulated in an exuberant writing style which illuminated, with wonderful lucidity, the Catch Club narrative. Most enjoyably, her hints about dress were the cue for an examination of some of the externalities visible in the print.

It may be that the section on habits of dress and consumption is a little self-indulgent, but so were the habits. The point about the performance of class is made simply by placing on display something as ridiculous as The Whole Art of Dress!, but Matthew Hilton’s excellent monograph on smoking provided a robust conceptual framework for the discussion. For what it all meant, however, David Cannadine’s pithy examination of class in Britain was invaluable, and his use of Cruikshank’s Bee Hive is apt: it serves as a visual representation of the negotiations which are the subject of Part II.

Enjoyable as the discussion might have been, the entirely serious intention throughout was to set up the discussion which concludes Part I in Chapter 6: A Performance of Class. By this stage, there is a wealth of intellectual ordnance to hand: Linda Colley’s “primacy of the polite view of things”, Cannadine’s reference to Cobbett on the deferential streak in Britain’s DNA, and Gramsci’s theoretical construction of the hegemonic elite. We leave the clear surface of the print prepared to inspect its murkier recesses with a keener acuity.

Introduction

Part II focusses on the scene at the back of the room. Here, the musicians toil away, largely unnoticed by the artist, by the Club membership, and by the casual viewer of the picture. But anyone working as their successors in cathedral and city music-making is drawn to them in sympathy: the music is the Club’s raison d’être; the Club could not exist without the musicians to play it. That they are not given the prominence they deserve is the argument at the heart of the work of Cyril Ehrlich and, following in his footsteps, Deborah Rohr, who create the framework for the discussion of the Canterbury Catch Club musicians. Chapter 7 looks both backward and forward from the print of 1826—a liberty it shares with Chapter 8—partly because the records allow it, partly because the doing so clothes the dry historiography with a wealth of contextual evidence, and partly because the case study which crowns Chapter 7—following the fortunes of Thomas Goodban, Junior, from his time as a choirboy to his later career as music educator—serves so strikingly to illustrate the social dynamics at work in this time and place.

Although the association of cathedral singing men with all-too-secular music-making is very well known and quite well documented, the connections between the church and the tavern have never been so clearly drawn as can be seen with the help of the invaluable primary sources available in Canterbury: when the Catch Club Minutes Books are read alongside the Cathedral’s Deans’, Precentors’ and Treasurers’ Books, the interlocking worlds of sacred and secular music-making become clear. The Club Minutes Books, it should be noted, have hardly got into gear in 1826, though it’s not long before they yield much greater detail which, to an extent, we can read back into the print; but the cathedral collection of archival records is a largely untapped goldmine covering many centuries with much treasure yet to yield, not just for musicologists, but for social historians in general. The brief reference to the Eleemosynary payments is but one example of the ways in which the world beyond the Precincts is brought into painfully sharp relief in these records.

The first part of Chapter 8 covers ground which is familiar territory: the Grand Narrative of nineteenth-century church music has largely been written, but it is worth revisiting for the sake of the detail Canterbury has to offer. Cathedral life and reform in this period have been the subject of millions of words in both fact and fiction, and some authorities have done an astonishing job of pulling together countless strands of information to write a narrative which tells a convincing grand tale: Philip Barrett’s *Barchester*, for example, covers many hundreds of miles in any one paragraph. By contrast, there is much to be gained by standing still for a while and letting the world hurtle by from a
Introduction

fixed perspective. It turns out to be quite a long while at times, especially at the start of Chapter 8, but this central section—so rich in archival evidence which sets the context within which cathedral musicians lived and laboured—demanded the long view: the terms and conditions of Lay Clerks’ employment only make sense in the context of statutes dating from 1541, and the transactional relationships between clergy and lay musicians to be seen in the Cathedral’s Deans’, Treasurers’, and Precentors’ Books—and in the Lambeth Palace archives, and the Church of England Records Office—are too rich a mine of archival evidence to allow a superficial treatment. It had to stop somewhere, however, and the overview reluctantly draws to a close as the thunderous clouds of cathedral reform are about to change the nation’s Precincts for ever. The full story of the Canterbury Lay Clerks’ Parliamentary Petition of 1848 will have to wait for its proper treatment.

The focus in the latter part of Chapter 8, on the thirteen men who sang in the cathedral choir at the time of the print, serves the same function as Goodban did in the latter half of Chapter 7: this time as a prosopographic case study, illuminating and testing the more generalised assumptions and conclusions which usually cloud our dim view of these musicians. The Lay Clerks of a cathedral choir are the gentlemen singers—the men who stand in the back row and provide the alto, tenor and bass lines. The number of these men may vary from one cathedral to another, but Canterbury, by ancient statute, has always had twelve—four on each of the three lower parts. Thanks to one change of personnel in 1826, there are thirteen men who served as Lay Clerks in the brief period—the few months of the Catch Club concert season from late 1825 to early 1826—which falls under the purview of this thesis; their combined service spans nearly a century, exceeding the Catch Club’s span of time as it does so. Those thirteen encourage a view of cathedral singing men which, while it coincides essentially with that of Ehrlich, Rohr, and many other writers, enables them to emerge with perhaps a little more substance than they may have been accorded hitherto. Most startlingly, the discovery that one of them had been sitting right at the front of the Catch Club print, looking for all the world as if he could not possibly have had any association with the artisans at the back, was a shock. The dapper gentleman taking snuff at the very front of the picture is separated from his fellow musicians by a gulf far wider than the few tables between them, and his prominent wealth and social standing was a cathartic challenge to the usual preconceptions—until, that is, it became clear how he had probably made his money. What other stories await, the historian can only wonder, as he abandons the detective work for now.

xxvi
Part III of the thesis recalls what was in fact the origin of the whole project: the music. But in temperament, humour, and mode of expression this repertoire is as far removed from us now as the old Punch cartoons, and so it is problematic. To understand its appeal—its meaning for its time—we need to ask what it says about those who composed, performed and consumed it. Superficially, this is a challenge: by definition, music is entirely absent from a picture. Although its purveyors are visibly effortful, it cannot be seen; an image is utterly silent. But—to borrow Richard Leppert’s trenchant phrase—it is the most powerful “present absence”. There are others—I discuss them, briefly—but none so vital as the music.

Derek B. Scott’s work shows how this is done, when he borrows an ideological framework from Marx—filtered through Gramsci and others—to set the intellectual mis-en-scène for his discussion of bourgeois tastes and consumption. The concept of a “subject position” is important to this section, as we wonder what such-and-such a piece says about the habitus of the men—and women, it should be added—who composed, performed, and consumed it at the time. Scott draws heavily on Bourdieu, who coined the term habitus. In Bourdieu’s own words, the habitus, “as the word implies, is that which one has acquired, but which has durably been incorporated into the body in the form of permanent dispositions”.

For Bourdieu, a crucial aspect of habitus is that the “schemes” it generates, “the primary forms of classification, owe their specific efficacy to the fact that they function below the level of consciousness and language (my italics).” The “schemes” of “classification” mentioned refers to our “apparently incommensurable ‘choices’, such as preferences in music and food, painting and sport, literature and hairstyle”—and our consumption of cultural products is, therefore, both direct consequence and clear marker of our habitus. Thus, matters of taste acquire a political dimension: “Taste classifies, and it classifies the classifier”, and:

Nothing more clearly affirms one’s ‘class’, nothing more infallibly classifies, then tastes in music. This is of course because, by virtue of the rarity of the conditions for acquiring the corresponding dispositions, there is no more ‘classifactory’ practice than concert-going or playing a ‘noble’ instrument.

This is a process McVeigh observes at work in London’s concert life in the later half of the eighteenth century.
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century:

Even if top bankers and overseas merchants attended Hanover Square concerts, the reins of taste were firmly in the hands of the higher aristocracy. ... It was a period when the relatively closed ranks of the nobility were attempting to reassert their position in society, with (for example) active involvement in the commercial world. Music they cultivated not so much for its commercial potential as for its role in defining less tangible cultural status and leadership.

Certainly the principal concerts were aimed at the bon ton, and the entire system, to William Jackson’s regret, was built on an ‘exclusive principle’. 38

This, then, is the theoretical framework which helps to understand the popularity of this music for this Club, at this period in time.

After the review of the archive, the thesis inspects a few actual pieces, with—finally—the shade of Sterne for company. As with Gatrell’s prints—which make a welcome reappearance in this part of the discussion—the central point is that this is a music and an institution which was born of an earlier period, with mores and manners very different from that of the Victorian age which superseded it. These manifestations of that period help us to understand it.

Nothing lasts: the Catch Club withered and died, and the process of gathering dust and being consigned to a museum happened quite quickly, which rather begs the question as to how it managed to survive for as long as it did. The music discussed in Part III is an eloquent part of the answer: a mighty range of expressive subject matter embraces the most tasteful, sentimental literature set to music which vigorously massaged the bourgeois aspirations of the Catch Club membership at one end of the aesthetic spectrum, while at the other the repertoire plumbs the depths of transgressive excess. This latter stuff belonged, we may be sure, to the bawdy, post-concert “after evening” of which the print shows us nothing, but it must have been a major part of the Club’s appeal. Here, music and thoroughly disreputable social behaviour were knowingly entwined in an outstanding example of what Edward Dannreuther called “a truculent male element”. 39 It is not difficult to see why that would have been popular in a social milieu which otherwise frowned sternly upon it. But Ian Bradley offers an intellectual methodology which gives the Epilogue rather more weight, in considering what a thing might be reacting against. In a study which owes a lot to Linda Colley’s consideration of British identity as being more a matter of what we are not than what we are, this fits nicely.

38. Simon McVeigh, Concert Life in London from Mozart to Haydn, 12.
The thesis ends on a note which is curiously upbeat, considering it set out to discuss what looked like a wake to start with: calling in some new contributors, even at this late hour, 21st-century philosophy and neurophysiology contribute to an understanding that such strangely anarchic, “anti-structural” (Victor Turner’s word) behaviour as was all too evident at a Catch Club makes perfect sense when the world beyond the walls was every bit as fraught with uncertainty as we may find our own time to be. Consider the following features of nineteenth-century Britain: the monolithic forces of corporate avarice—all too evident in nineteenth-century Britain’s satanic mills—allied to bewildering technological change; a seismic shift in the economic base of the nation’s wealth; the loss of a sense of close-knit community for much of the population; the increasing secularisation of society against which, in the nineteenth century, the established church could not offer a unified front, riven as it was with schisms of its own; and the keenly felt decline of Britain as an international power, with—then—the loss of the American colonies and the terrible threat from France. In passing, mark how very closely they pre-echo our present-day challenges; now ponder their effects on the well-being of both individuals and society at large.

In the context of all this, the Catch Club may seem blithely naive, but its earnest attempts to create a supportive community of its own—one of those “networks” to which Cowgill and Holman refer— with a music which self-consciously shored up a sense of cultural and national identity and which crucially depended on members’ participation for its strength and longevity, have a remarkable resonance now. The Epilogue introduces Charles Taylor, whose celebration of the “festive”—acknowledging his debt to Victor Turner—asserts a sense of individuality-within-community, while Robin Dunbar explains that singing and dancing together is good for us at a physiological level so innate that we do not have a clue it’s happening. Our forefathers may not have been consciously self-medicating, but that was, essentially, what they were about.

CHAPTER 1:

PROLOGUE: MR WARD’S COMMISSION

On 6 December 1825 the following advertisement appeared in the Kentish Chronicle:

Shortly will be published
a view of
Canterbury Catch Club,
Dedicated by permission to Charles Delmar, Esq., President and to the Members of the Club.

Henry Ward, Stationer, Sun Street, Canterbury, respectfully announces to the Public that he intends publishing a VIEW of CANTERBURY CATCH CLUB, with correct and striking likenesses of several of the Members, Gentlemen of the Orchestra, &c.

The Style in which the Publisher intends submitting this View to the Public, will be such as he feels confident will give the greatest satisfaction.

Mr Ward’s typically entrepreneurial idea was an innovative but risky piece of marketing. The finished article makes it clear that he had commissioned the best men for the job: the artist T.M. Baynes was in great demand at the time as illustrator of landscapes and architecture, and Hullmandel, the engraver, enjoyed a reputation as one of the best craftsmen available. Both were London-based; the execution of this project would not come cheap.

In style, then, it needed to be a safe bet, and here Ward must have been keenly aware of a problem. He and his potential customers would have known very well the sort of treatment convivial songsters had always endured, and were continuing to suffer, in the caricatures of Hogarth, Cruikshank, Gillray, and Rowlandson—to name but a few—so Ward’s coy reference to a representation “which he feels will give the greatest satisfaction” is a coded assurance that the print they might order would not look like any of those. This would have been a legitimate concern for anyone considering a commitment of 12 shillings (15s. for a coloured version) to support the project. Figure 1-1 shows what they got; a larger reproduction is visible as Appendix A, p. 283.

To 21st-century eyes, this plays on very familiar 19th-century visual tropes: although the serried ranks of gentlemen are not all turned squarely to face the viewer, their orderly arrangement is reminiscent of the interminable parade of Victorian photographs produced in the latter half of the nineteenth

1. Kentish Gazette, 6 Dec 1825, 1.
century. Its construction is solidly formal: rules of perspective are studiously observed, as seen in the straight line running through the centre of the scene between the trestle tables either side of the viewpoint and by the lines of the tables leading to the vanishing point in the unseen distance; the perpendicular lines of the walls and proscenium arch enclosing the orchestra are reinforced by the parallels of the chandelier, the portraits, the screen on the right, the chimney-breast on the left, and the alcove housing the organ, dead centre at the back of the picture. The focus of attention is the crowd of faces—those in the foreground drawn with exquisite detail. The solidity of structure encodes a significance: the intention here is to convey a strong sense of socio-political order. The formality of the image serves to underline the assured respectability of this cultured assembly.

Prologue: Mr Ward’s Commission

In fact, this image represents a dramatic break with representations of sociable singing from the
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previous century. There is a coincidence here with a point made by Vic Gatrell in his examination of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century political caricature. His identification of a turning-point in the 1820s could almost be describing the social context of the Canterbury Catch Club print, as he notes “the transformative force in the middle ranks of life that was called ‘respectability’.” This print of the Canterbury Catch Club, compared to the images of convivial singing which preceded it, is a visual illustration of that transition.

Of these earlier examples, Gillray’s Anacreontick’s in Full Song (1801) is probably the most revolting (Figure 1-2). It presents a scene of inebriated anarchy whose focal point is the punch-bowl. There are, ironically, features in common with the Canterbury image: pipes (including some broken on the floor); a chandelier; a portrait (this of Bacchus, to whom the Anacreontics appealed for their classical credibility in song); glasses and bottles; and hats hung on pegs on the walls. Here, however, the overall effect is chaotic, emphasised by the apparent disregard for formal structure. This is more illusory than actual: in fact, with the exception of the figure slumped in a chair, behind—and partially obscured by—the two men on the left of the picture, the faces are carefully placed to show various poses: slumber, slavering mouths agape, caterwauling, and short-sighted inspection of the one piece of music visible in the picture. This is presumably the Anacreontic Song penned by John Stafford Smith, from which the caption across the top of the image is drawn. The consumption of alcohol appears to be the prime purpose of the gathering; the singing of anything, even the Club song, is relegated to a very minor role. The overall effect is not an edifying spectacle; however carefully-positioned the characters might be, the image is clearly intended to convey a scene of thoroughly transgressive behaviour, and its superficial lack of formal design pummels the point home.

---

2. Vic Gatrell, City of Laughter, 575.
The Catch Club print is the very antithesis of this both in structural formality and in the behaviour of the figures in the image. The Canterbury gentlemen, for the most part sitting erect in their places, appear to be entirely sober. Furthermore—and crucially, in view of the fact that this is a picture of a Catch Club meeting—they are not singing anything. What music there is in the image comes from the orchestra at the back of the room: twenty-five players crowded into a somewhat inadequate space are apparently working their way through a piece, though few members seem to be paying it any attention. The absence of singing, in a picture of a catch club, is a significant artistic decision.

Although Gillray’s image is probably the worst of its kind, it is not alone. Richard Leppert sums up the iconography of informal music-making: “The wretched playing [he might also have said, “singing”] of amateur musicians was a standing joke so widely appreciated as to produce a virtual sub-genre of visual satire.”3 In fact, within this sub-genre, there is a further sub-group of pictures which draw their inspiration very directly from actual pieces of music. A pair of examples must serve to illustrate this point.

These two scenes of alcohol-assisted disorder and effortful amateurism are to be found in the British Museum (Figures 1-3 and 1-4). Drawn by one Robert Dighton (1752-1814) and dated 1786, they claim to represent a catch (Une Chansonette) and a glee (Une Allegresse). Both pieces appear in the Canterbury collection. Dighton’s French titles seem to be a piece of whimsy, since both pieces are by an English composer: the words are reproduced beneath the picture. The catch is The Comical Fellows by William Bates, and the glee is by Thomas Arne: Which is the Properest Day to Drink? The choice of subjects (i.e., pieces of music) for each image is worth consideration: even by that relatively early stage in the development of the English glee, there were many examples of more serious pieces available to the artist for visual realisation. Arne (who had died eight years previously, in 1778) had penned the miniature gem, The Emperor Adrian, Dying, To His Soul, and Samuel Webbe’s mighty Discord had won the Catch Club Prize in 1772. Fifteen years before that the earnest ambitions for the English catch articulated by William Hayes in the Preface to his First Book of Catches, Glees and Canons in 1757 had
made great social claims for this diminutive genre: “I found [them] to be productive of the most desirable effects: viz., Cheerfulness and Good Humour, Friendship and a Love of Harmony,” he said, of his genteel Oxford gatherings.

So the selection of two of the more idiotic examples of these closely-related English genres would appear to be a deliberate excuse for caricature.

In fact, the resulting pair of prints is relatively benign, especially compared to Gillray’s treatment of the Anacreontics. In keeping with the charming absurdity of the catch (Example 1-1), in which the three singers hurl abuse at each others’ physical deformities, the general tenor of Dighton’s image is quite good-humoured: although catastrophe may be imminent, given the spaniel’s grip on the tablecloth and its proximity to decanter and punch bowl, it is held in abeyance for this frozen moment of time, apart from the disaster which has befallen the central gentleman’s wig. No wine has yet been spilt, and the clear majority of the participants seem to be engaged in the singing—from memory, it would appear, since they seem able to gesture at each other in the accusatory manner demanded by the piece without too much reference to the music lying on the table. Lest the text beneath the image be insufficient clue, music books are strewn about, one of which is closed so that the cover may be seen to be displaying the title “Catches and Glees”.
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The Comical Fellows
[Vol. 11, p. 139]
This gain’d a Prize Medal 1770
William Bates
(p. c. 1750-1780)

Example 1-1: William Bates: The Comical Fellows

Arne’s glee (Example 1-2, p. 9) is one of his more frivolous: the ostensibly earnest discussion concerns the most appropriate day on which one might engage in drinking (the inevitable conclusion is, all of them). Dighton’s representation of this piece is remarkably similar to the first; the only differences to be found are in the dog—a different breed, and calmer—and the fact that the six gentlemen
Prologue: Mr Ward’s Commission

apparently engaged in the singing are taking the enterprise slightly more seriously, giving more attention to the music, as one would expect from the more technically demanding nature of the glee.

Dennis Rose puts the two pictures in context:

[These prints] are a humorous depiction of the Glee Club which used to meet in Mr Robert Smith’s house in St. Paul’s Church Yard where Dighton’s publishers had their offices. The Glee Club used to meet informally from 1783 until it was founded officially in 1787. At the Club’s meetings the members sang gleses, catches and canons between the drinking of wine punch... It was probably Dighton’s involvement with the theatre that introduced him to the club.5

It is clear from the various accounts of contemporary and later writers (notably Thackeray) that sociable singing of this nature was a popular pastime amongst the literate strata of British society throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—Pepys mentions the singing of catches several times, for example. So Dighton’s involvement with the theatre, which was extensive, may not have been absolutely necessary to bring him into contact with this convivial company. The rest is speculation: neither Rose nor the British Museum can offer any further detail about the subject of these pictures. But it is tempting to wonder whether the characters shown would have been as instantly recognisable to contemporary viewers as Ward claims his will be. For now, we should note that a glimpse through the window of Une Chansonnette shows a city skyline, complete with church spire, and the modest scale of the room reinforces the impression of an essentially domestic scene in which friends may or may not participate in some sociable singing, as they wish.

None of this mockery—however gentle, as in Dighton, or savage, as in Gillray—encourages serious regard for either the activity or the repertoire of sociable singing. The most conclusive evidence for this argument is a drawing by Thomas Rowlandson. It does not stand alone: when the publishers of The Lyric Repository decided to commission an artist to provide the definitive, signature image with which to preface their book, it was to Rowlandson they turned (Figure 1-5, p. 10).

Chapter One

*Which is the Properest Day to Drink?*

[Vol. 23, p. 44; transposed down a tone]

*This gain'd a Prize Medal 1765*

Thomas Augustine Arne (1710-1778)

---

Example 1-2: Thomas Arne: *Which is the Properest Day to Drink?*
What they got was a re-affirmation of the by-now-familiar stereotype of the catch and glee club meeting: although none too detailed, it is clear that an all-male group sits in relaxed pose around a large table, each with a goblet before him whilst a waiter hurries in with a punch bowl to replenish the supply of alcohol. Hats once more adorn the walls, yet another member of the company has his back to the scene for some unexplained reason, and more faces are captured in expressions of effortful song. The point to note is that, as the title page visible in the image above (Figure 1-5) makes clear, this serves as a Preface to what was intended as a serious publication, for an audience which regarded the words as being of equal importance—for their intrinsic poetic merit—as the music to which they were set. In other words, this is a book of lyrics celebrating the literary quality of this genre. It is a fine collection, embracing a range of style and subject, from the poetry of Shakespeare, Sheridan and Jonson to deft nonsense verse, of which the following must serve as a brief example:

Tho’ I can’t walk quite straight
And in figures of eight
Still circling my legs do their duty;
You’ll always observe
That a regular curve
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Is reckon’d the true line of beauty.\(^6\)

All that notwithstanding, the disjunction which seems obvious to modern eyes—between the serious intention of the collection and the disrespectful informalality of the caricature chosen to give it visual expression—seems not to have concerned the publishers of this small volume.

Gatrell’s account of this genre of satirical print has uncanny resonance with the trajectory of the catch and glee clubs of Georgian society: having enjoyed a heyday of untrammelled license for several decades, the caricaturists found, by the 1820s, that they had to change their tune and tone quite dramatically, in the face of “a more improving, decorous and ordered world.” For Gatrell, this is disappointing: Georgian culture, he argues, happily embraced the libertine, the lewd and lascivious. At all levels of society, Georgian taste saw nothing wrong with a celebration of good spirits in the raw: “You’d have to dig deep and hard into texts to find comparably explicit evidence of the reflexive knowingness of libertine male culture in this era, or of the simple pleasure that could be extracted from an anti-royal joke so cheeringly offensive.”\(^7\) In fact, taking Gatrell’s cue, there is no need to look particularly hard in the catch repertoire for exactly that transgressive humour.

This is the point at which Gatrell’s invocation of the history of “mentalities” is recalled. Crucially, this mode of enquiry does not need to concern itself with the extent of a behaviour manifestation, but with the simple fact of its existence: “the historian of mentalities is concerned with what was thinkable and doable in the past, regardless of the assumed numbers of people involved or its assumed normative standing.”\(^8\) Historians of mentalities, in other words, do not need much encouragement before they start to take an interest in a cultural feature; a few manifestations of transgressive behaviour is a subject for inquiry. In fact, there is no doubt, from the evidence of contemporary accounts and later (albeit usually disapproving) commentators, such as Thackeray, of the widespread popularity of both satirical print (in Gatrell’s study) or the catch (in this one). The inconsistency which bothers us—the juxtaposition of the lewd with the respectable—seems not to have been a concern for the Georgians.

Although satire is rare in the catch repertoire—though not entirely absent—what seems to be shared


\(^7\) Vic Gatrell, City of Laughter, 14.

\(^8\) Ibid.
between these examples of the musical and visual culture of the age is a cheery contempt for the pompous and overblown:

Through the prints runs an ironic scepticism about power and high-minded affectation that was almost reflexive then, and that luckily still is, here and there. Peculiarly English, if metropolitan, products, they remind us where we come from. In 1791, Pastor Wendenborn remarked that ‘the respect paid to people of rank’ was weaker in England than it was elsewhere.”

The occasional piece of political satire found in the catch repertoire, such as Baildon’s *Mister Speaker*, *Tho’ ‘Tis Late* (Example 1-3) and Atterbury’s *A Canvassing Squire* (Example 1-4) show something of that cheery disrespect. That said, Gatrell’s narrative is forced to record that the qualities of the satirical print which he clearly wants to celebrate fell from favour as the eighteenth century turned to the nineteenth. ‘Polite’ values came to the fore, evidenced in the cultural revival of provincial towns and cities—such as Canterbury—and the proliferation of associations and improving societies, as recorded so diligently by Peter Clarke.⁹ The “modestly growing prosperity, confidence and articulacy of middle-ranking people” went hand-in-glove with a “rush to respectability” which sounded the death-knell of the publicly lewd, salacious and erotic print—and song.¹¹ It did not, however, eradicate the less public behaviour possible in the private club, and the catch and glee seem to have given permission to the members of the Canterbury Club to exercise their more libertine tendencies for a little longer.

---

Mr Speaker, Tho’ ’tis Late

[Vol. 1; p.4]

Joseph Baildon
(1727-1774)

Example 1-3: Baildon: Mister Speaker, Tho’ ’Tis Late
Prologue: Mr Ward’s Commission

A Canvassing Squire

[Vol. 6 no. 19]

Luffman Atterbury
(1735-1796)

As the opening quotation from the newspaper advertisement made clear, Henry Ward was perfectly well aware how his potential subscribers might want to look. And so it is not surprising that the artefact claiming a “likeness” is highly selective in its representation of the convivial music-making of the Canterbury Catch Club. The unsubtle implication of that statement is that the print is not entirely trustworthy, but at least we now know why: the worthy members of the Canterbury Catch Club did not want to look like their amateur, inebriated forbears. Theirs was an altogether more serious intent.
As Richard Leppert puts it:

The representation of music itself is always already and necessarily ideological. In other words, the representation in visual art of music as a socialised activity is specifically informative of a group’s or society’s perceptions of music’s cultural locus and its ideological use value, conscious or unconscious.12

The members of the Canterbury Catch Club have a social and political point to make.

PART I:

CLEARLY VISIBLE
2.1. Print, Sketch, and other evidence

The provenance of the print seems clear: apart from the newspaper advert referenced at the start, the date, artist, publisher and printer are identified at the foot of the image. There is, however, interesting corroboration. The Club’s extant records testify to its genesis: Henry Ward was a member, and took his turn, throughout the nineteenth century, with the other printers in Canterbury to produce the Club’s programmes and publicity. The Canterbury Catch Club Minutes Books record that on the 28 November 1825, “Permission was given to Mr. Ward to publish a lithographic print of the Catch Club Room and to dedicate it to the president and members.” The print itself is dated 1826. Given the names and the masterful workmanship of both artist and printer—T.M. Baynes and Hullmandel respectively, both highly reputable London-based craftsmen—it seems clear that Mr. Henry Ward wasted no time in commissioning the best he could find for the job.

Rather more mysteriously, the print has for some time been accompanied by a hand-drawn sketch (Figure 2-1) with printed names identifying 42 of the 125 figures (that number includes the 25 orchestral players) in the picture. Regrettably, the provenance of this piece of evidence is almost completely unknown; the only attribution which has so far come to light is to be found in The Canterbury Cathedral Chronicle of September 1943, in which it is claimed that “the key … is supplied

---

by Mr Charles De Lasaux, whose grandfather was Chairman of the Club at the time (No. 21).\(^2\) Sadly, this cannot be accurate, founded as it is upon the mistaken impression that the image dates from 1856, and so the origin of this sketch remains a mystery. However, many of the names are corroborated by the records of the Club itself, by Canterbury’s Electoral Roll for 1826, by Stapleton’s Directory of 1838, by the Register of the King’s School, and by Freemason’s records of Lodge membership in Canterbury at this time (see Appendix B, p. 285), which offers a compilation of all this information along with the names of Club members noted in the Minutes Books who are not named on the print. It seems reasonable, therefore, to accept this strange document as good evidence.

Henry Ward appears in the print, seated at the nearest end (to the viewer) of the table to the right of centre, offering snuff to the bespectacled gentleman opposite: a dapper gentleman, very clearly drawn, identified as Mr Pillow, Hoyman, of “Cock, Pillow and Co.”. Ward was clearly an entrepreneurial tradesman: in 1843 he published one of the earliest tour guides to the city of Canterbury, whose title page illustration may be seen at the start of Chapter 8.\(^3\) In this respect, he is representative of the other ninety-nine members depicted in the picture; here are the bourgeoisie of the city in a setting which clearly offered what would nowadays be recognised as networking opportunities.

The artist Thomas Mann Baynes, on the other hand, has no recorded connection to Canterbury, which makes his appearance in the print (sitting on Ward’s right; no. 30 in the sketch) all the more enjoyable—whilst at the same time emboldening a view of the print as a reflexively knowing fiction in itself. In the annals of art history Baynes merits barely a footnote: the Dictionary of British Watercolour Artists up to 1920 notes that he exhibited at the Royal Academy and the ‘Old’ Society of Painters in Watercolours (founded 1804) in 1820, and mentions a book he illustrated.\(^4\) This pitiful record seems curmudgeonly, given the alacrity with which 21st-century search engines respond to his name with a plethora of images drawn from the books of travel and curiosity which were a feature of the Victorian age; he was undoubtedly a most sought-after artist whose finely crafted illustrations may readily be found in antiquarian sources. Baynes was to be commissioned again by Henry Ward four years later for what became one of his best-known works: a set of drawings of the first Canterbury to Whitstable railway journey in 1830, commemorating the opening of the first passenger railway in England, using

---
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Stevenson’s ‘Invicta’—the immediate successor to the ‘Rocket’—to pull the cheery travellers in their carriages.

Similarly, the émigré German printer and businessman Charles Hullmandel was recognised at the time as a master of the recently developed lithographic process: James Hamilton quotes Michel Faraday’s fulsome praise: “[I] should expect your process to possess the superiority which the testimony of Artists, competent to judge, assure me that it has.” Clearly, Ward spared no expense in the commission, and the result would seem to justify his investment: the members of the club are drawn with exquisite detail, and the surroundings are rendered with great care. Details of the room are clearly visible: chandelier, portraits of Corelli and Saint Cecilia—still in the possession of Canterbury city library—and statuary, on either side of the archway. These, it turns out on a close inspection of the Minutes Books, are the “figures of fame” which, in 1827, were ordered to be placed on either side of the west window—so they should be out of sight from this viewpoint; the fact that they have been moved for this print is a clear indication that this reference to classical allegory was an important feature of the club room, at least in the members’ minds. Even the wickerwork on the chairs may be clearly seen, as can the broken fragments of clay pipe strewn about the floor and the glassware on the tables. It is a fine piece of work.

The Catch Club Minutes Books make no further mention of the print, and no details have yet come to light as to the number of prints made, fees for the craftsmen, or Mr Ward’s profit margin. There is evidence of the subscription process: the advert of the 6 December 1825 appealed for funds:

The work will be executed by persons of first rate talent; and as no expense will be spared in producing a correct, as well as an interesting and well executed representation of the Club, the publisher humbly appeals to the public for support and encouragement in the undertaking. The size of the drawing will be 18 by 24 inches. Price 12s. plain, 15s. coloured.

As only a limited number of coloured ones will be published, persons desirous of becoming subscribers, are requested to forward their names as early as possible; and as a view of this description cannot be completed without a very considerable expense, the Publisher trusts it will not be considered intruding in requesting payment on delivery of the prints.5

The emphasis here on the “striking likenesses” will have appealed to his potential audience; in a city whose entire length may be traversed on foot in 20 minutes and whose Catch Club membership lived,

---


6. Kentish Gazette, 6 Dec 1825, 1.
Provenance and Corroboration

for the most part, within ten minutes’ walk of each other (see Figure 4-1, p. 43), the prospect of seeing self and friends recognisably immortalised in print must have been a strong incentive to subscribe. And any concerns about what, exactly, may be exposed to public scrutiny must have been assuaged by that coy assurance that the “style” of the print would “give the greatest satisfaction”; this representation was obviously going to show the membership as they would like to be seen, both by themselves and by the wider world. Mr Ward understood his audience. So he should: he was himself part of that stratum of society which was striving to strengthen its tenuous grip on respectability and recognition.

Four copies are known still to be in existence, three of them in the City. Other archive sources offer further information about the activity depicted in the image.

2.2. Minutes Books and Henry Ward

Amongst the archival treasures now held in the Canterbury Cathedral Library and Archives are the Catch Club Minutes Books, in which the Club kept careful and increasingly detailed records from 1802 until its demise in 1865. Alongside this, it had been collecting music (vocal and instrumental) since its foundation in 1779. There also survives a complete set of concert records—hand-written, week by week, in a notebook entitled “Order Book”—for over twelve years from the start of the 1825-6 season up to February 1837.

The Minutes Books show that the newly re-formed Committee decided that membership should be more tightly controlled from 1802 than it had been in previous decades of its existence. Following the death of Thomas Goodban Senior—a Cathedral Lay Clerk and the landlord of the pub in which the club met—a membership fee of half a guinea was levied, with an additional entry fee of one shilling for each attendance on a club night (every Wednesday, throughout a season from October to March). This was partly to pay off the Club’s debts and partly to raise funds to purchase the music and instruments which had been the property of the members of the orchestra. This transfer of ownership is, in itself, a clear statement of intent to control, but it seems likely that another motivation was to exclude a lower stratum of society: this cost would have been prohibitive for most artisans and all labourers. In clear imitation of its London model—the Noblemen and Gentlemen’s Catch Club—the Canterbury Catch Club wanted to go up in the world, and, as Simon McVeigh points out, a subscription charge was one mechanism by which this could be effected: "Exclusivity could be
engineered in a number of ways. The subscription system in itself was essentially designed for this purpose.”

Needless to say, the publication of a print showing such a cultured assembly could only assist this process of aspirational gentrification.

Canterbury’s geopolitical context was favourable to this process: the ravages of the industrial revolution left the city largely untouched. Its major economic activities remained agricultural, despite the coal mining which erupted in east Kent in the later nineteenth century. The city maps show little development in the century from 1800; it remained a quiet, provincial cathedral city, with its fairs and street markets touchingly evoked by such luminaries as the artist Thomas Sidney Cooper:

Under the windows of the nave, between the buttresses, the vendors of whips displayed their goods, and they, joining with the purchasers of their wares in cracking, snapping and hooting, raised the most discordant concert. This, and the hubbub caused by the swinging-boats, the merry-go-rounds, and other amusements, the shouting, kissing and screaming of the crowds, all took place under the lofty spires and pinnacles of Christ Church Cathedral.\textsuperscript{8}

As far as the rest of the country was concerned, it was a negligible backwater; when the London organist and composer Richard John Samuel Stevens travelled to Margate for his health in 1805, he felt no inclination whatsoever to stop off at Canterbury.\textsuperscript{9} In that connection, this print might be seen as part of Henry Ward’s campaign to change all that, continued in 1843 when he published Ward’s \textit{Canterbury Guide}, extolling the virtues of the city, in which the Catch Club itself (by then comfortably housed in more spacious premises just off the High Street) becomes part of the attraction: “The old established Catch and Glee Club, so frequently visited by strangers passing through Canterbury on Wednesdays, is also held under this [Guildhall tavern] roof.”\textsuperscript{10}

2.3. Local Newspapers

The surviving records indicate that the club was formed in 1779. Several references in the Minute Books make this clear—for example, when the club sets about planning the fiftieth anniversary dinner in 1829. It is also clear that the Club was administered by a committee of some sort; several of the early

\textsuperscript{7} Simon McVeigh, \textit{Concert Life in London from Mozart to Haydn}, 12.
\textsuperscript{8} Thomas Sidney Cooper, \textit{My Life} Vol. 2 (London: R. Bentley, 1890), 24–25.
volumes have the names of the Club secretary, president, or librarian inscribed at the back. It seems reasonable to take the Club’s word for the date of its own foundation, though it should be noted that no mention of it appears anywhere else until 1781, when the local paper, whilst advertising a performance of The Beggar’s Opera (in a hefty concert also including a favourite scene from King John, a musical interlude called The Virgin Unmask’d, and the “Burletta”—an Italian comic opera in translation—Midas) notes that:

The Instrumental Performers of the Catch Club have kindly offered their Assistance on the above Night, by going into the Orchestra and conducting the whole of the Entertainments, therefore those Ladies and Gentlemen who intend on honouring the Theatre with their Company, may be assured that the utmost Care and Attention will be paid to render the Night’s Amusement perfect and compleat [sic].”

Clearly, the reputation of the Catch Club Orchestra was good enough to be used as an attraction.

From the 1780s onwards, it had become routine for Mr Goodban Senior to announce the first, last, and Ladies’ nights of the season in the local paper, as well as the annual St Cecilia’s Dinner, held on or around that Saint’s Day, November 22. By 1791, the local paper was reporting that in some detail:

Tuesday last the members of the Catch Club at the Prince of Orange, in this city, held their annual meeting in commemoration of St Cecilia. At 3 o’clock, a company of upwards of 60 members and visitors sat down to dinner. On removing the cloth, the Grace of Non Nobis Domine was sung by the gentlemen of the orchestra; after which were drank the healths of their majesties, and the royal family; also to the immortal memory of St Cecilia, and success to the Catch Club. The Occasional Ode, in commemoration of the day, composed by Mr W Flackton, was next performed by an excellent band, the vocal parts being in a style perfectly correct.

After the Ode, the healths of the Members for the County and City, and many neighbouring Gentlemen, were drank. The company did not disperse till a late hour, and expressed much approbation at the regularity and festivity of the meeting.

This says much for the extent to which the Club had become well established in its first decade or so of official existence. It also speaks to what Peter Clarke has called “the age of association”: “under George III, voluntary associations of all sorts became an essential part of the social and cultural language of urban life.” They may, in some quarters, have been the objects of caricature, but there is no doubting their pre-eminence nor, in the case of the Canterbury Catch Club, the seriousness with which they took themselves and their intentions, activities, and swiftly invented traditions like the St

---

11. Brian Robins, Catch and Glee Culture in Eighteenth-Century England, 111.; he observes in his footnote that "among a number of such burlettas, Pergolesi’s La Seraa Padrona was one of the most frequently performed”.
12. Kentish Gazette, 1 September 1781, 4.
13. Ibid., 29 November 1791, 4.
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Cecilia dinner. The Canterbury Catch Club serves as an excellent example of a distinctive trend in this period.

And so there is no doubt that the Canterbury Catch Club actually existed, and that it has its place in the wider context of national life at the time. Nor is there any doubt that the visible elements of the picture really were a part of the Club’s outward appearance, even if they have been re-arranged a little, as in the case of the statuary. But just as the composition of the image encodes order, status, and power—most notably by relegating the musicians to the back of the room, thereby robbing them of the individuality which is accorded the membership—so other elements of the picture carry meanings clearly communicating much about the Club. As Leppert says of the domestic scene in Nollekens’ *A Musical Party*, “the room presses in on those assembled. This closeness is of the utmost significance for it was by this means that the beholder recognised a closed community: … this is an image about space or, specifically, access to space in time.”¹⁵ Not everyone could join the Canterbury Catch Club. And although the orchestra is indistinctly drawn, it is vital that it is there: the consumption of music denoted thereby is a powerful signifier of the members’ social standing. Such an expensive “item”—especially when it includes its own pipe organ—speaks volumes for the affluence of the club. Furthermore, “the oxymoron of posed informality”¹⁶ noted in the affectedly relaxed postures—and disinterest—of the figures in the foreground imposes a veneer of serenity which yet more deeply encodes the superior respectability the Club is clearly so anxious to communicate both to itself and the viewer.

If, then, the image can said to be “true” up to a certain point, questions are begged as to ways in which it isn’t. Some clues might reside in the earlier visual caricatures mentioned above, but their intention was to entertain, at the expense of respectability; such is satire. It is entirely appropriate to turn to other sources which may shed more disinterested light on the convivial reality of such a club.

¹⁶. Ibid., 176.
CHAPTER 3:
EVIDENCE IN WRITING

3.1. John Marsh

Peter Clarke notes the social inclusivity of many clubs. Although they were primarily male (a feature to which the Canterbury Catch Club offers several distinctive and carefully managed exceptions) they drew their membership from “a wide spread of age-groups and backgrounds: from young unmarried men as well as more established married figures; from not only landowners, merchants, and professional men, but also shopkeepers, master craftsmen, artisans and some of the lower classes.”

This reading of the Canterbury Club certainly obtains in its first few decades, as is witnessed by the only written account of those early years which is not a newspaper report or advertisement: that of the contemporary diarist, John Marsh, who lived at Nethersole, near Canterbury, for a few years. Although his account predates the print by some forty years, the evidence suggests that not much had changed, and he serves very well to set the scene.

Marsh exhaustively observes the musical world of his time and places—London, Salisbury, Chichester and Canterbury. Robins makes extensive use of him in describing three of the five clubs in his study of the provincial catch club scene (the other two—Bath and Bristol—are perforce more sketchily treated). Chichester claimed Marsh in the end, but in his time in Canterbury (1783-7) he acted as secretary to the Canterbury Concert Society, frequented the Catch Club evenings, and wrote various pieces for the cathedral choir. He clearly became a well-known figure about the city. His copious diaries (one wonders how he had time to study for the bar, or indeed, write so much music) are a fascinating glimpse of the age, albeit through a somewhat narrowly focused social lens, as in his description of a typical Catch Club evening in the Prince of Wales tavern. Written with Marsh’s trademark patrician disdain, it describes the club evening of Wednesday, 12 November 1783; here it is, in full:

About half past 6 an overture was played by the band (in a small orchestra railed off at one end of the room). After which followed a glee; then a quartetto, trio or concerto; after which follow’d another glee & then a catch, which constituted the first Act; the second of which after a short cessation began with another overture, next to which Mrs Goodban [the publican’s wife] generally made her appearance & sung a song, after which another glee and a catch or chorus concluded the concert. The generality of the audience & performers, however, commonly remained till 11 or 12 o'clock, smoking their pipes (which
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they did all the time of the concert, except during Mrs Goodban's song, immediately preceding which the company were always desired by the president to lay down their pipes) during which time single songs were sung, as called for by the president.

The price of admission to this club was only 6d. for which, besides the music, an unlimited quantity of pipes and tobacco and beer was allowed, in consequence of which many of the members, amongst the lower kinds of tradesmen, etc., used by way of having a full pennyworth for their penny, to go at 6. and smoke away till 11. or 12. On account of this fumigation from 40 or 50 pipes (which was always enough to stifle a person at first entering the room and was very disagreeable to the non-smokers) there were three ventilators in the ceiling in order, in some degree, to get rid of the smoke, but the room was so low-pitched and bad that notwithstanding this, it appeared as if we were all in a fog there. The terms of admission being so low it will naturally be wondered how the landlord could possibly help losing instead of profiting by it, but the fact was that every member of the Club (of whom there were 50 or 60) paid his 6d. whether he came or not, and a great many were always absent (the club being on every Wednesday throughout the winter) besides which many that were present, instead of drinking beer, had spirits and water, and particularly gin punch (which Goodban was famous for making particularly palatable) which were paid for extraordinarily.²

It is worth noting that only a month or so later, the room was to undergo the first of a series of improvements. Marsh writes at the end of the year:

At the opening of the Catch Club room in its improved state there were, as might be expected, a great many people ... The improvement consisted of the ceiling being raised 2 or 3 feet, a chimneypiece and projection into the room at one corner taken away and put back, and a neat orchestra railed off from the rest of the room at one end, which was not the case before and made it more convenient for the performers, who now could not be crowded upon by the audience, as used to sometimes be the case before when the room was very full. As however there was a vacant space behind one end of the room it was now lamented that the room has not been lengthened when they were about it, which was soon afterwards done by taking the whole of the orchestra into the room for the audience and carrying the orchestra farther back into the yard behind, where it stood upon pillars...³

With his dismissal of "the lower kinds of tradesmen" in mind, it is interesting to note that when Marsh went to Chichester he formed a club aimed at a more exclusive clientele. Of that society, Robins notes:

"The strict rules formulated are closer to London models than the more open atmosphere prevailing in Salisbury and, especially, Canterbury. Professional instrumentalists were still hired, but expected to leave after being given supper, itself a more ambitious affair than the bread, cheese and porter served at the Salisbury club. Additionally, Marsh's new club departed from provincial tradition in admitting only those capable of taking part in the singing, thus adding a qualification barrier that provided greater exclusivity than that pertaining in the other clubs under discussion."⁴

Other features of Marsh's account deserve attention.

---

3. Ibid., 307.
3.1.i. Canterbury: a sure foundation for a Catch Club

It is not surprising that Canterbury should host a Catch Club which became so very well established as to survive well into the nineteenth century, far beyond the point at which the fashion, usage and spirit of the times was in sympathy with such an institution. The twin pillars of such a club were music and alcohol; Canterbury had both in abundance.

The city had a musical foundation in two senses of the word: Canterbury Cathedral had maintained its choral tradition with a musical “Foundation” of twelve Lay Clerks, six Substitutes, six Minor Canons (ordained men recruited for their musical ability) and ten Choristers since its re-constitution as a new Cathedral Foundation on 8 April 1541, following the dissolution of the Priory the previous year. The Lay Clerks and Substitutes are of particular interest to this study. Their cathedral work brought these men into Canterbury’s enclosed Precincts only twice a day, for the morning and evening services, and at the end of Matins and Evensong they removed whatever quasi-clerical garb they had donned (though by nineteenth-century accounts that garb did little for the dignity of either singers or liturgy) and left. For the rest of their time they lived and worked—at whatever trade they were able to ply—in the city beyond the Cathedral. The Catch Club would have been a welcome additional outlet for their musical talents, whatever other occupation they might find.

Canterbury has one other claim as a prime location for a catch club: its chief economic activity was hop-growing. “In the nineteenth century, hops were grown in just about every parish in Kent,” one history testifies, accounting for the claim that “Kent’s share of the total national hop acreage from 1850-1900 was about 60%.” This, then, was fertile acreage for alcohol-assisted conviviality, offering plenty of choice for the musical drinker.

3.1.ii. The Club at The Prince of Orange; Thomas Goodban (Senior)

The association of convivial song with drinking-houses of one order or another was very well established by the eighteenth century, so it is safe to assume that whatever formalisation of the Canterbury Club took place in 1779, it simply reflected a practice that had been sustained for some time. The Prince of Orange Tavern in Orange Street, however, was a prime candidate for this activity because the tavern-keeper—one Thomas Goodban—was a Lay Clerk of the Cathedral. He had been

admitted at Michaelmas 1770, according to the Cathedral’s Deans’ Books: “The place of one of our Singing Men being vacant by the death of John Houghton we do choose and appoint Thomas Goodban to succeed in his place.”6 The Dean and Chapter knew him well: his association with the Cathedral had begun ten years previously, as a boy: “Agreed that Thomas Goodban, Charles White and William Smith shall be admitted into the place of choristers at Christmas next in the room of [i.e., in place of] Thomas White, George Martin, and Safferys who are then to be dismissed.”7 Six years later the young Thomas required further discussion: “Agreed that Thomas Goodban be continued a chorister of this Church for one year from this time, and that his Stipend be paid to his Master, John Baskerville.”8 The reason for this odd arrangement is not made clear; one can only surmise that the boy’s voice had broken and this was the Chapter’s parting gift to set the lad on an apprenticeship to a trade (that of wig-maker) which would earn him his keep for the rest of his adult life. The Dean and Chapter did this occasionally in recognition of a boy’s particularly good service, though for most of the time they seem to have had no great aspirations for their choristers; the school at Canterbury which had been founded by statute after the dissolution of Christ Church Priory was kept quite separate from the provision made for the choristers, and remains so today. However, the name which leaps off the page at this point is that of Baskerville: one William Baskerville acted as the Catch Club Secretary and Treasurer for decades in the next century, and the master-servant relationship hinted at here speaks volumes for the class divisions which mark the relationship between Club Committee and Orchestra throughout that time.

3.1.iii. Canterbury Catch Club Personalities

The other people in Marsh’s accounts drop in and out of his narrative as cameo performances in his personal drama, so their appearances—albeit lively—are a little sketchy. That account of the Catch Club evening, for example, is inserted almost as an afterthought in his stream-of-consciousness recording of 12 November 1783, which launches precipitously into a more detailed description of one of the items in the concert before drawing back to give his overview. That description recalls three singers already mentioned in his diaries: Messrs Gore, Shrubsole, and Jagger, all of whom, as is clear from Cathedral records, were Lay Clerks in the cathedral choir. It seems Marsh had provided them

8. Dean’s Book 4 (1761-1770), 106.
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with some new repertoire: “Having given the singers the curious stammering glee [Goody Groaner] of Dr Harington’s, it was here very well sung,” he records in a rare compliment. Indeed, most of his cast of characters are defined by their level of musical competence. Thomas Goodban’s wife does not score highly in this regard. Her brief dismissal in the account above is partly accounted for by the fact that Marsh has already dealt with her in an earlier entry: on Monday 13 October that year she had sung at a concert Marsh had organised. In passing, Marsh makes a couple of relationships clear:

“Mrs Goodban (wife to the person who… kept the Prince of Orange opposite… who was also sister to Mr Saffery) not a very tasty singer but with a powerful voice and sufficient execution. She had however so little musical knowledge that she was not to be trusted to sing, except in a very simple ballad that she well knew without her brother or husband standing behind and playing softly in unison with her upon the fiddle.”

It would appear that the members of the Catch Club—who at other times were not slow to make changes in their musical personnel when necessary—suffered her contribution in recognition of the fact that her husband provided the premises for their meetings. In a particularly painful reminder of the difference between capital and provincial cities, Marsh later records (20 September 1786) her attempts to sing a glee in honour of the visit of Stephen Paxton, cellist and composer:

In the course of the evening the singers meaning to pay Mr Paxton a compliment, perform’d his celebrated glee “How sweet, how fresh” but the upper part being sung by Mrs Goodban instead of a countertenor, & having some long holding notes lying very high, she scream’d them out so that I pitied poor Mr Paxton who sat looking down on the floor all the time, as if he was ashamed of his own composition (which to be sure was finely marr’d) & probably wish’d himself a mile off.”

Marsh seems not to have appreciated that social inclusivity Peter Clarke had identified. Noting that Canterbury society was “not being much to our mind,” he eventually wends his grumpy way back to Chichester.

3.2. Richard John Samuel Stevens

The diaries of R.J.S. Stevens are particularly rich in description of convivial music-making in both societal and domestic contexts. London-based, Stevens’ writing can only offer a point of comparison, and the most obvious contrast immediately apparent is the social stratum within which he found himself moving. This is also a contrast with Marsh’s experience of Canterbury: whilst Marsh was

10. Ibid., 385.
11. Ibid., 350.
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probably one of only a relatively few gentlemen the Catch Club may have had at the time, Stevens
found himself rubbing shoulders with the most elevated echelons of London society—up to and
including the Prince of Wales. Much in demand as keyboard player and singer, and recognised (not
least by the prizes awarded by the London Noblemen and Gentlemen’s Catch Club) as a composer,
Stevens moved freely amongst London high society, "spurred on," as Robins puts it, "by the avid
predilection for social climbing revealed in his Reminiscences".12 He is a keen, occasionally merciless,
observer of the kind of convivial gathering seen in the Canterbury print, and the verbal pictures he
paints are no more flattering than the caricatures mentioned in the Prologue. Of one group, the
“Friendly Harmonists”, he has this to say:

We forfeited our right to our title, for we were neither Friendly nor Harmonious. Aylward had no voice;
Dinwoody no ear; Aylwood [sic] reflected very sarcastically upon Dinwoody’s want of Ear; and
Dinwoody retorted very tartly upon Aylward’s want of Voice: this occasioned a quarrel. The gentlemen
belonging to the Excise Office (of whom four were members of the Friendly Harmonists) took the part of
Dinwoody, and absenting themselves from the meetings, the consequence was, that the Society
dwindled, and at last expired very quietly.13

But it is in his accounts of the sociable drinking and singing that the ring of authenticity might be
heard. Much of that resides in the detail:

At twelve, or sometimes one o’clock when we are all heated by the excess of Wine, Enthusiastic
Conversation, and Singing; Hunt (the master of the Tavern), and a train of Waiters, used to make their
appearance with small dishes of highly seasoned broiled mutton rumps, broiled beef bones, broiled
mutton kidneys [sic.], and Oiled biscuits seasoned with Cayenne Pepper. The company then adjourned
from the drinking table, and devoured these beastly stimulants with the greatest eagerness at a small
side table. They then returned to the large table which had been cleared, and put in order; and again
began drinking in the same astonishing and disgusting manner.14

Stevens’ delicate constitution finds this sort of gluttony thoroughly reprehensible—even more so in
the future King, George, Prince of Wales, as he was in this decade of the 1790s, who is recorded
crashing to the floor in a drunken stupor at one point.15 Most of the dreadful behaviour described in
this part of his diaries takes place at the London Je Ne Sais Quoi Club, in which the songs sung were
“very disgusting, disgraceful, and horrible to hear."16 He blames the actors who were part of the club

14. Ibid., 76.
15. Ibid., 77.
16. Ibid., 75.
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for this, in the main, but it becomes clear that the assembled company took full part.

Stevens’ accounts bear out Thackeray’s later remark that the furious singing on these tavern-based occasions was accompanied by “prodigious amounts of fermented liquor”. But music-making in private houses emerges from his accounts with no greater distinction; in particular, one dismal evening at the home of the “intolerable miser” Mr Blencowe recalls the caricatures Richard Leppert described. Invited by a former pupil, one Mrs Hughes (whose husband, Stevens explains with his usual fastidious attention to social status, was the Revd. Thomas, of Westminster Abbey and St Paul’s), Stevens attends as requested, and is greeted by a cadaverous butler. The concert room proves to be “intoleringly full of a mixture of company: all devotees at this miserable miser’s shrine. Poets, Painters, Musicians; all were crowded together: we were absolutely in an Oven.” Given these unpromising circumstances, Stevens is pleasantly surprised to find enjoyable conversation with “Cumberland the Poet” and “Lawrance [sic] the Painter”. Things take a turn for the worse, however, when he is asked to sing and direct one of his own compositions:

A Miss Bruton (an Apothecaries [sic.] daughter in Duke Street, St James’s) kindly undertook to sing the Soprano part; Stephen Groombridge (now president of the Glee Club), undertook the Base [sic.]; I was to sing the Tenor; and a gentleman (who I afterwards found) did not know a note from an Oyster, was to sing the Alto. … How we got to the end I scarcely know: but of all the execrable Music that was ever howled by any set of infernals, the discord, yell, and grumbling, in this exhibition could never be exceeded: I never in my life heard anything so very diabolical and detestable.

His torment was not over, and it is worth sticking with him through a little more of this ordeal for the sake of the anecdote which follows. Mercifully released from expectation of participation, he is a spectator for an episode which really could be the literary counterpart to Gillray’s Playing in Parts (Figure 3-1, p. 31):

…A short fat Girl mounted the music stool to entertain us with a Harpsichord Lesson; Mr Peter Denys … was to accompany her on the Violin. I … had the Honour of turning the Book for her. … Little Fatty could not play in time; her face, naked elbows and neck, were soon as red as a boiled lobster: while Denys (who is an admirable performer on the Violin) was pale with vexation and disgust. … Lawrance the painter, sat in a place where he observed all the objects of this group, excepting myself, to advantage: and from the ludicrous appearance (which no doubt struck his mind most forcibly at the time) he made

18. Ibid., 92.
20. Sir Thomas Lawrence, Royal Academician, 1769-1830.
a drawing from memory, which is most admirable. Fatty, Denys, Blencowe, and his man Cain, who is seen at a distance, are all capital likenesses in this group: they are by no means caricature.\footnote{Ibid.}

![Fig. 3-1: Gillray: Playing in Parts](image)

A key point in Gatrell’s \textit{The First Bohemians} is that the artists of a given time and place—in this case, Soho in the eighteenth century—knew each other. They lived in close proximity, met in the coffee-houses, and knew the people of the social circles who liked to adorn themselves and their gatherings with the ornamental celebrities of the day. This is what Gatrell calls the “social utility of taste” put firmly on display: collections of people as well as the beautiful things they created was always one way in which the upper classes differentiated themselves from the lower.\footnote{Vic Gatrell, \textit{The First Bohemians: Life and Art in London’s Golden Age} (London: Penguin, 2014), 207.} Stevens is here recording another moment which was captured for posterity by a gifted artist, taking real-life characters at an actual event and making this the narrative in a work of art, just as the Canterbury print does.
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The main point to take away from this exercise in comparative literature is that the chaos of the amateur music-making described by Stevens, fuelled as it was in some circles by ferocious drinking, is at odds with the sobriety of the Canterbury print. Either the Canterbury Catch Club members are the Methodists of convivial music-making (which, given Marsh’s account, is doubtful) or the print is highly selective in what it is choosing to show.

Stevens’ writing claims authenticity on grounds of empirical fact; the next writer would acknowledge an element of fiction but has very probably experienced the scene he describes at first hand. It is a delicate balance to strike, reconciling the conflicting demands of entertainment and documentary, but in a passage exemplifying the twin pillars of wit and judgement in *Tristram Shandy*, Charles Dickens manages it.24

3.3. Charles Dickens

This account by Dickens of a “harmonic meeting” such as that represented in the Catch Club print first appeared in his *Sketches by Boz*, which were serialised in the mid-1830s. One of the very first shows *London by Night*.25 That chapter ends with the following:

One o’clock! Parties returning from the different theatres foot it through the muddy streets; cabs, hackney-coaches, carriages, and theatre omnibuses, roll swiftly by... The more musical portion of the play-going community betake themselves to some harmonic meeting. As a matter of curiosity let us follow them thither for a few moments...

In a lofty room of spacious dimensions, are seated some eighty or a hundred guests knocking little pewter measures on the tables, and hammering away, with the handles of their knives, as if they were so many trunk-makers. They are applauding a glee, which has just been executed by the three “professional gentlemen” at the top of the centre table, one of whom is in the chair—the little pompous man with the bald head just emerging from the collar of his green coat. ...

“Pray give your orders, gen’l’m’n—pray give your orders,” says the pale-faced man with the red head; and demands for “goes” of gin and “goes” of brandy, and pints of stout, and cigars of peculiar mildness, are vociferously made from all parts of the room. ...

That little round-faced man, with the small brown surtout, white stockings and shoes, is in the comic line; after a considerable quantity of coughing by way of symphony, and the most facetious sniff or two, which afford general delight, [he] sings a comic song, with a fal-de-ral-tol-de-rol chorus at the end of every verse, much longer than the verse itself. It is received with unbounded applause, and after some aspiring genius has volunteered a recitation, and failed dismally therein, the little pompous man gives another knock, and says “Gen’l’m’n, we will attempt a glee, if you please.” This announcement calls

24. The way in which Tristram Shandy offers a literary kindred spirit in the consideration of the catch and glee culture discussed in this thesis is further explored in Part III.
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forth tumultuous applause, and the more energetic spirits express the unqualified approbation it affords them, by knocking one or two stout glasses off their legs—a humorous device; but one which frequently occasions some slight altercation when the form of paying the damage is proposed to be gone through by the waiter.

Scenes like these are continued until three or four o’clock in the morning; and even when they close, fresh ones are open to the inquisitive novice. But as a description of all of them, however slight, would require a volume, the contents of which, however instructive, would be by no means pleasing, we make our bow, and drop the curtain.

Some details are persuasive: Dickens heralds this passage by noting the lateness of the hour. One o’clock in the morning is the point at which this segment of his narrative begins, and his withdrawal from it recognises that such scenes as he describes will continue for some hours. Gillray’s Anacreontick’s had a clock on the wall showing 3.40 am. The hammering on the tables may not be a particularly resonant sound at this stage in the examination of the Canterbury print, but it will be: there were some items in the repertoire of the Catch Club which warmly invited such participation as this, and there were mutton pies in Canterbury which had to be cut up with something, so knives are plausible, albeit conspicuous by their absence in the print. The “pewter measures” now come as no surprise. In short, there would have been plenty of percussion to hand.

Brief reference should be made to Cruikshank’s illustration of this passage (Figure 3-2), if only to note that when he came to illustrate this particular scene (having started with a dozen or so illustrations, the successive reprints of the book resulted in about 40 in total) Cruikshank chose to focus on the chaos, and the hapless waiter, rather than the music. Once again, neither the rumbustious behaviour nor the musical content of evenings such as this emerges with much credit.

The “professional gentlemen” (and those quote marks are Dickens’, to give the phrase that dubious aura which instantly casts doubt on the musical competence of the performers) who are being applauded also have the ring of truth about them: clubs such as these, however informal, depended on the inclusion of more competent singers if the music on offer was ever to get beyond the competitive bellowing of simple catches. Gles were the more sophisticated fare expected, and they were, in turn, more demanding of vocal technique and musicianship. The club Dickens describes seems to be of a less formal nature than others, but that does not alter the fact that most people would be unable to hold a part in a glee, so still would need to import some more able gentlemen, however cheaply. The London “Nobs and Gents” recognised this and engaged professional singers to sing for
This was especially necessary when the time came to judge the submissions for the prizes they awarded from 1763 onwards, and this is worth a brief digression for the sake of one of the most charming stories in the Canterbury collection. A passage in William Horsley’s biography of his beloved father-in-law, John Wall Callcott, describes an episode for which Callcott is now justly famous:

In 1787 he was admitted among the Honorary Members of the Catch Club, and sent in nearly one hundred [italics original] Compositions as candidates for the prizes. “I was determined to prove,” he would often say, “that, if deficient in genius, I was not deficient in industry.” On that occasion, his Canon, Thou shalt shew me the path of life, and his Glee, Whann Battayle smethynge, were, each of them, honoured with a Medal.

The members of the Club, however, were astonished at such an influx of compositions; the Honorary Members [the professional singers], whose business it was to practise and sing them, stood aghast at the toil to which they were doomed; and, in consequence, it was resolved by the society that the pieces presented for the prizes should in future be limited to three of each description.27

Dickens’ evening proceeds, after the interruption for drinks orders, with a comic song. No such song

---

26. It still, for its annual dinner, hires Lay Vicars from St Paul’s.
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is anthologized in the Catch Club music archive at Canterbury, but the twelve years’ worth of concert records show quite clearly that the membership could expect to be treated to three or four songs as part of the concert programme each week, ranging from comic to sentimental in expressive intent. One example of a comic song, The Steam Arm, makes an appearance on the 17 February 1836 (though it does not appear in published form until later in the century28), and happens to fit Dickens’ description perfectly, so there is no need to appal the reader with a reproduction of the music and lyrics. Suffice it to say that whilst this particular example does not quite bear out Dickens’ assertion that the chorus exceeds the verse in length (the verse wins by 8 bars to 6), it would have felt like it if all you did was sit and listen as the thirteen tedious verses tell the nonsensical tale of a prosthetic limb which takes on a life of its own. The likelihood of that (simply sitting and listening) being the case, however, is slim: it becomes very clear in Chapter 11 that a key criterion for the inclusion of a piece in a Canterbury Catch Club evening was the potential for participation. Dickens does not record audience involvement in this comic song, but there is little doubt that the Canterbury crowd would have supplied it. Whatever the truth of that matter, the popularity of songs such as these at the time is beyond doubt: one arranger, Mr T. Westrop, was clearly capitalising on this when he fitted another lyric on a similar theme—The Cork Leg, attributed to one R. Gaythorne in the copy in the British Library—to the same banal melody of The Steam Arm.29 And according to the Canterbury records, the song was encored that evening.30

This all testifies to the high spirits of a Catch Club evening. Only one of Dickens’ ingredients is missing from the Canterbury records: no mention is ever made of a “recitation”, successful or otherwise. The spoken word does not figure in the Canterbury programmes. Otherwise, the heady combination of exuberant chorusing demanding enthusiastic participation, declamatory narrative song, overt sentimentality (especially effective when delivered by a youngster, as is evident from the discussion of the programme in Chapter 10), and plentiful liquid refreshment would credibly result in the kind of scene Dickens describes. Once again, a correlation of 18th-century visual image and literary representation is provocative. Even when allowance is made for the imperatives of the popular periodical for which Dickens was writing31, the disparity between his pen portrait and the

30. Canterbury Catch Club concert records, (1825-1837); GB-CA: Ca Ca Cl ‘Order Book,’ 17 February 1836.
31. The Monthly Magazine from 1833-35, then the Chronicle.
Evidence in writing

Baynes lithograph is glaring.

3.4. Percy Scholes

By the most remarkable sequence of serendipities, one other first-hand account has come to light.

Writing in 1920, in *The Music Student*, Percy Scholes records how he visited Canterbury one day and happened upon the Catch Club print in the Beaney Institute. Upon enquiry, he was directed by a helpful librarian to the house of an elderly gentleman who turned out to be one of the last surviving members of the club, one Mr John E. Wiltshire—a member whose name appears on the deeds of the Music Hall Company whose fortunes were closely intertwined with the last days of the Catch Club. In the nick of time—for Mr Wiltshire died very shortly afterwards—Scholes was given the only other first-hand report of a club evening in existence, written by a Mr Welby some 45 years before Scholes’ visit. One Mr Welby is named in the sketch of the print, as number 19, playing the bassoon in the orchestra. Whether or not this is he, the account offers a perfect counterpoise to Marsh’s account of almost a century before. In the interests of scholarship, it is reproduced in full at Appendix C, p. 289; for now, it need only be noted that Mr Welby’s description of the Club corroborates other evidence concerning its relatively exclusive membership, its renown, and the Club song composed by Thomas Goodban (see Appendix D, p. 292). However, Mr Welby takes particular care to note the “beneficial effect on the city” of an institution which gave young musicians invaluable experience: “…vocalists and instrumentalists were constantly in practice. A full rehearsal always took place on Saturday evening for the Wednesday concerts, of which 30 were given from the first Wednesday in October to the last in March,” he asserts.32 He also lets slip a description of the “after-evening” which has the ring of authenticity, given the testimony encountered above from Stevens, Dickens and Thackeray:

When the program was concluded the early birds retired, and for some forty years the after evening was celebrated by amateur free and easy singing, the mirth growing fast and furious till the small hours. No Bruce [police] being then in existence, our grandfathers made a night, and often, too, a morning of it.33

Much of this information prefigures the study of the Club and the musicians (Chapter 7), so suffice it to say for now that the recollections of Mr Welby—whilst not entirely accurate in some small details, as noted in the footnotes to Appendix C, p. 289—accord with the Club’s own records and with
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Cathedral and newspaper archive sources. Goodban’s composition is an inclusive opus: the assembled company may join in, in the choruses which punctuate the piece, reminiscent of a late Renaissance or early Baroque verse anthem. But Goodban so constructs his piece as to allow the audience to hear the musical material before they are invited to sing it themselves; they simply repeat the soloists’ music. This gives musical form to the ideals of social fellowship articulated in the words. As Emanuel Rubin notes, this alternation of soloists and chorus is rare, but he considers its effects as he explains how the assembled company of the London Glee Club—a rather less elitist counterpart to the slightly older Noblemen’s and Gentlemen’s Catch Club—would sing Samuel Webbe’s Glorious Apollo immediately after grace at the start of each meeting:

... While the alternation of solos and chorus was not in any sense a novelty introduced by Webbe, still, in the context of the musical club, the texturally contrasting sections served as a new symbol of social consolidation ... It must have been an emotional, unifying experience, not unrelated to that of congregational hymn singing, and served a function quite different from the elite separation of a few chosen solo voices implied by the original practice of the Noblemen and Gentlemen’s Catch Club. In calling for soloists in the verses and a choral refrain, Webbe successfully united the two modes of concerted singing in a way that was to influence many glee composers of his own and succeeding generations.34

For the Canterbury Catch Club, Goodban’s Charter Glee offered exactly that experience. In this sense, there is a political level of meaning in an association such as this. Rubin notes that Webbe’s piece “inspired the composition of an increasing number of glee calling for the massed voices of all those present”;35 there is a metaphor here for the political world of Britain in the late eighteenth century.

3.5. William Thackeray

The last writer in this brief collection of literary witnesses looked back at this convivial activity from a much later vantage point. In The Four Georges, Thackeray undertakes a character assassination of George IV so complete there is little left but the “bow and a grin” with which he starts.36 Describing the man variously as a “fribble”, a “dribble”, an “old mummy” and “poor game”, Thackeray attributes part of the man’s downfall to the fact that he could sing:

It was an unlucky thing for this doomed one, and tending to lead him yet farther on the road to the deuce, that, besides being lovely, so that women were fascinated by him; and heir apparent, so that all the world flattered him; he should have a beautiful voice, which led him directly in the way of drink:

35. Ibid., 104.
and thus all the pleasant devils were coaxing on poor Florizel; desire, and idleness, and vanity, and drunkenness, all clashing their merry cymbals and bidding him come on.\textsuperscript{37}

For Thackeray, the Prince’s fate was inevitable, given the ubiquity of such temptation: “Singing after dinner and supper was the universal fashion of the day. You may fancy all England sounding with choruses, some ribald, some harmless, but all occasioning the consumption of a prodigious deal of fermented liquor.”\textsuperscript{38} This echoes the testimony of Marsh, Stevens, and Dickens.

It is, of course, risky to read too much into an account which had nothing to do with the Canterbury Club. But the written evidence suggesting that a Catch Club evening had the potential to reach a level of alcohol-fuelled exuberance not shown in the picture seems reasonably conclusive; such lively enjoyment was, it would appear, an important part of the evening. Whilst there is nothing inherently transgressive in such behaviour, it does recall the manners described by Gatrell as “libertine male culture”\textsuperscript{39}; only a closer inspection of the actual songs would suggest that things could, in fact, get pretty bawdy.

Be that as it may, an image is silent, and no clue as to the more licentious content of the repertoire leaks out of this picture of the Canterbury Catch Club. Knowing that the repertoire exists, however, supports the conclusion that this is a middle class membership anxious to represent itself as a group of men ready to make the transition from political margin to parliamentary responsibility and social respectability.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 95.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 96.
\textsuperscript{39} Vic Gatrell, City of Laughter, 14.
CHAPTER 4:

THE MEMBERSHIP

4.1. From Inclusive Tavern to Exclusive Club

There are 100 members, all male, shown in the print, and 25 players in the orchestra. Although Baynes has done a remarkable job of differentiating features, postures and aspects of dress with skilful definition, one of the most striking aspects of the image is the presentation of a most conformist appearance amongst the assembly. Whatever rules are being applied, whether written or tacitly understood, it seems here that there is no questioning them. On the face of it, this is a gathering of men on equal footing. The truth of the matter is more complex.

There is a clue in the enclosure depicted in the image: the 100 members packed tightly into the room are clearly a closed community. “This is an image about space or, specifically, access to space in time,” writes Richard Leppert.¹ A close reading of the Minutes Books makes it clear that the Club’s apparent socio-political homogeneity is a result of carefully controlled management of its membership dating, not from its inception in 1799, but its reformulation in 1802. This is the point at which the written records begin, when the club faced a difficult situation in which decisive action was needed. Thomas Goodban, in whose tavern, the Prince of Orange, the club had met since its inception 23 years previously, had died in April. His death, incidentally, is marked most strangely—and poignantly—in the cathedral records: for centuries, successive Precentors have recorded the absences, of minor canons and lay clerks, in the Precentor’s Books now in the cathedral archives. In the later decades of the 18th century it is difficult, at times, to tell whether he is recording absences or attendance, so frequent are the lapses, but for two weeks in April 1802, Thomas Goodban, lay clerk of the cathedral, is recorded in CCA-DCc-PB4 as having missed both services (Matins and Evensong) every day. No reason is ever given; the record simply shows the surname. On the morning of 23 April 1802, his name is written for the last time – and then crossed out. He had died in the night, at the age of 50.²

This loss seems to have given the club committee something of a jolt: apart from the necessity of securing the venue and associated refreshments, there were other matters to attend to, for the club’s

finances were in a most parlous state. The first committee meeting, having decided that a club was to be formed once again for the ensuing season, took matters in hand; new terms of membership were agreed which mark a departure from the genial informality Marsh had observed. The seriousness of intent is slightly subverted by the fact that there appears to be no Rule 10, but there is no doubting the sense of urgency in those rules which actually made it into the Minutes Book:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>That a Catch Club be established for the ensuing season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>That every gentleman wishing to become a member of this club do on his submission subscribe half a guinea towards the liquidation of the present debts incurred by the purchase of the organ, other musical instruments, books, etc., in consequence of which the gentleman of the orchestra, in whom the property is at present vested, do agreed to transfer their rights in the said property to the members of the club at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>That every member do on his entrance each evening pay one shilling for which he will receive a six-penny token ‘the other sixpence to be appropriated towards the necessary expenses of the club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>That every member be subject to the forfeiture of sixpence for non-attendance on the club evening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>That non-residents be admitted on paying one shilling and being introduced by a member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>That a committee be appointed to regulate the whole concerns of the club and take care of the property belonging to it. The said committee to consist of 35 members of which number 14 shall be nominated by the gentleman of the orchestra and 21 by the other members of the club…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>That the Members of the Old Club be at liberty to become Members of the New Club without being balloted for if they deliver in their names within one month from the commencement of the new club. That the resolutions of this meeting be sent by circular letter to every member of the Old Club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>That no President be admitted unless he is a member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>That the following gentlemen are unanimously chosen into the undermentioned situation which they have accepted: Delmar, President Buckton and Browne, deputies Baskerville, Secretary Saffery, Treasurer Burgess, Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Rule 10 missing!]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>That the first meeting of the Club commence on Wednesday, 20 October 1802.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>That no articled clerk or apprentice or any person under the age of 21 years can be admitted a member of this Club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>That Gentlemen becoming Members of this club be considered as such and liable to forfeits until they signify their resignation to the President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourteenth</td>
<td>That a Compliment be made to the Secretary of two guineas and one guinea to the Librarian at the end of the season for their attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td>That no Gentlemen of the Orchestra or Member of the Club shall take away any musical instrument or Book without acquainting the Librarian and shall be subject to the forfeiture of two shillings and sixpence if not returned previous to the commencement of the concert on the next club evening.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The half-guinea subscription intended to offset debts and establish ownership of essential assets is interesting. Possession of music and instruments is a necessary prerequisite to a musical club’s

---

3. to be spent in the hostelry to subsidise the evening’s drinking and smoking.
activities, but the fact that the members of the orchestra appear to have owned it before 1802 is indicative of the nature of the club in the early decades of its existence: amateur and co-operative; dependent upon the hospitality of a sympathetic tavern-keeper for a venue; and—much of the time—barely solvent, although the acquisition of an organ by that stage suggests a degree of prosperity.

However, the size of the subscription is also significant: half a guinea in 1802 is roughly equivalent to £43 of purchasing power today. It is clear that the “lower kinds of tradesmen” (Marsh’s dismissive phrase) may have been discouraged by this joining fee. In addition, the charge of one shilling per club evening (sixpence for the club, sixpence towards tobacco and ale) with a charge of sixpence for non-attendance, make the serious intentions of the committee to put the club on a more secure financial footing—whilst raising the social tone—still clearer. ‘Non-residents’, it may be noted, were welcome, upon payment of one shilling, as long as they were introduced by an existing member—but “no articled clerk or apprentice, or any person under the age of 21 years” was to be admitted. From this point onwards, the membership of the Club was altogether more carefully controlled, and correspondingly less inclusive; the aspirational gentrification of the club required a self-selecting, self-perpetuating group of men whose membership was an important part of their public persona. It is the gentlemen themselves who take centre stage in this print, as they did on a club night: here was a gathering at which a worthy citizen needed to be seen.

The strategy seems to have worked: the financial position of the club became more stable, and in the early years of the nineteenth century the club flourished. The print seems to represent a high point in the club’s fortunes, which lasted for some decades more: if the fulsome newspaper reports are any guide, the club became—at least for the social class able to join it—a much-loved institution of which the city of Canterbury became remarkably proud and possessive.

The fines demanded sixpence of members if they failed to attend. This rule appears to have been difficult to enforce. In 1810, the Treasurer plaintively notified the club that “much trouble is occasioned not only in keeping the account of forfeits incurred by absentees but also in the collection of them at the end of the season, many members doubting the accuracy of the demands made upon them and consequently refusing to pay”. Recalcitrant members had reneged upon their financial obligations to the tune of £19.11s.6d. in total, leading him to propose that members in future be
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required to pay their annual subscription in two instalments, in advance. Whether or not that worked, the club continued to meet at the Prince of Orange until 1831, when the membership took the momentous decision to move from there to the more spacious premises afforded by the Guildhall Tavern, on the corner of Guildhall Street and the city’s High Street. The more prominent, central position suited a club which had become an indispensable part of the city’s social and cultural environment. As Mr Welby’s account testified, it regularly welcomed the mayor and other city councillors, aldermen, and—notwithstanding the unwritten rule that politics should not intrude into Club proceedings—the occasional Right Honourable Member of Parliament to its weekly meetings. The speeches of these venerable gentlemen—little more than complimentary platitudes, studiously avoiding political comment—are extensively reported in the local press which adopts, around this time, the phrase “far-known” to describe the club. With the clarity of hindsight, this institutionalisation may be seen as a seed of the club’s own demise; it came to be run as a private fiefdom, tightly bound up with the city’s prominent citizenry, which had little to offer a wider public for whom, in a consumer culture which was becoming ever more developed, public entertainment was a commodity to which all might have access, given the necessary financial resources.

For the two or three decades following the print, however, the membership would have been entitled to feel secure in their social and political position. This was a stratum of society which, in the nation beyond Canterbury’s city walls, was beginning to flex its economic and political muscle. They proved resilient in the face of obstacles, whether arising from the difficulties with the musicians examined in Chapter 7 or the existential crisis of accommodation which struck in 1854, recorded in the Epilogue; this was a body of men whose place in mid-Victorian prosperity seemed assured.

The tightly packed room is indicative of another reality, which would have counted for much in the members’ developing sense of socio-economic identity: the Canterbury community was small in number and geographically close-knit. A map of the city (Figure 4-1) showing the location of those named members (in the sketch/key) whose addresses can be identified with reasonable certainty makes it quite clear that many were neighbours, and very few lived more than ten minutes’ walk away from most others. Moreover, the most densely-populated streets were, then as now, the main commercial thoroughfares of the city; the business activities of the members were sustained in close proximity to one another.

Although the image does not make these economic relationships visible, it says quite clearly that these men have various networks in common. Given the absence of women, one thing in particular merits
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discussion.

4.2. Masculinity Matters

The assertion of gender in this image is palpable. To begin with, it is a statement by omission: the Minutes Books make it quite clear that ladies were always welcome, as gentlemen’s companions, in the audience, and that women were frequently hired as performers—and better paid than the men. Thus, the absence of women from the image, of itself, begs the question of gender. As always, this leaves the thoughtful viewer wondering why such a statement is felt to be necessary. Asking much the same question, Linda Colley makes a pertinent observation when she considers the role of women in the late eighteenth century: noting the appearance of the Duchess of Devonshire in electioneering in 1784—and the stridency of the opposition she encountered—Colley sees evidence that “in Britain the boundaries supposedly separating men and women were, in fact, unstable and becoming more so [her italics].” Whatever their perceptions of such socio-cultural fluidity, the gentlemen of the Canterbury Catch Club clearly feel moved to take an emphatic stand against something. Nowhere is this more evident than in the control exerted in the act of consumption.

4.2.i. Conspicuous Consumption

There are three things being ostentatiously consumed in the picture: tobacco, alcohol, and music. None requires intense activity on the part of the consumer—which, in any case, would be difficult both to undertake in a crowded room and to represent in a still image. Besides, a concert is an event during which an audience is normally required to sit and be attentive. In that respect, most of the members of the Catch Club are doing what is expected. Apart from listening, the only activities available to them would appear to be conversation (presumably within certain limits dictated by the demands of the music and the inclination of the interlocutor), drinking, and smoking. All these activities, however, are undertaken at the discretion of the individuals; each member has complete control over his involvement in them. This is a clear signifier of status.

It seems that some conversations are taking place, discreetly, so as not to disturb the attention of those nearby who would prefer to listen to the performance. Remarkably, almost no drinking is to be witnessed; despite the abundance of receptacles on the tables, only one of the 100 members present is
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to be seen raising a glass to his lips—the gentleman on the left of Mr Dorman (no. 8). The only other person paying any attention to his drink is Mr Furley, banker (no. 23), who is stirring his glass with a spoon. The slightly bizarre impression thus created is of a somewhat masochistic temperance meeting: all the trappings of drink tempt the members but the actual alcohol, connoted by the usual signifiers of tankard and glass, is denied them. This lack of thirst and/or interest in their glasses defies statistical probability. It is also, possibly, the most emphatic statement testifying to the dominant character of the membership and its rigorously respectable self-control.

The only other activity being overtly pursued is that of smoking.

There are 39 distinctive, long ‘churchwarden’ pipes to be seen, and a shorter pipe being sported by Mr T.T. Delasaux as he gazes directly back at the viewer. Evidence of used pipes abounds—on the floor, in pieces. These were cheap, disposable items, and prone to breakage simply by virtue of their unwieldy shape. Publicans provided them free, as part of a culture of hospitality which partly explains the popularity of smoking; while no statistics are available for the 1820s, in 1871 the “Tobacco Trade Review” estimated that each publican gave away “80 to 100 gross [11,520-14,400] of pipes per annum”.

If the print is anything to go by, tobacco claims the attention of the members more than the music does. That is not the only oddity: the smoke from those pipes caused the Committee a great deal of trouble. From 1802 onwards, the air pump becomes a recurrent theme, for it appears to have been woefully inadequate for its task. A first mention of it appears in the Minutes for 2 Oct 1826, when Mr John Elvey is paid £10 “for the front air pump” —which seems to suggest it is a new addition to others already in use. The Committee’s concerns are made more evident when, on 4 December that year, they resolve to “take the management of the pump into their own hands, on condition that Mr Small pays 15 shillings per season towards the expenses of the same.” Mr Small was the landlord of the Prince of Orange, as noted in the print and key, no. 27. A couple of years later, it needs altering, and when the Club moves into the new premises, they purchase new equipment for that room; for the rest of their time in the Guildhall Tavern, they pay someone to “turn” the air pump.

The smoke must have been intense. An early social history of smoking appeared in 1914: G.L.
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Apperson’s *The Social History of Smoking* traced its rise, fall, and inexorable rise again, and in support of the habit he summons to his aid a roll-call of inveterate smokers. “The greatest of clerical ‘tobacconists’ of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century date was the once famous Dr Parr,” who apparently “was capable of smoking twenty pipes in an evening, and described himself as “rolling volcanic fumes of tobacco to the ceiling” while he worked at his desk.” Apperson continues: “The fear of the odour of tobacco-smoke was extraordinary. Mr. J.C. Buckmaster in his reminiscences describes the famous debating society at Cogers’ Hall, and says that “after one night at the Cogers’ it took three days on a common to purify your clothes’ from the smoke.” This recalls another of John Marsh’s comments: “On account of the strong impregnation of smoke our clothes always reeked at this club (which was very unpleasant on the next day). Mr Knowler used to keep an old drab coat to put on those occasions which he used to call his Catch Club coat.”

Despite all this unpleasantness, the “empathetic fraternity of smoking companionship” was clearly an overwhelming cultural imperative. There is more to this than addiction; Apperson’s enjoyable monograph, though mostly descriptive, hints at the libertarian political principles embodied in the activity:

Thackeray, as the satirist of the foolish social prejudices against smoking, was naturally an inveterate smoker himself. He died in 1863, and so hardly saw the beginning of a change in the attitude of society towards the pestilent weed; but he was one of the many men of letters and artists, who, despising the conventions of society, were largely instrumental in breaking down stupid restrictions, and in overcoming senseless prejudices, and were thus heralds of freedom.

This was mild compared to the 6,000-word diatribe printed, with an apologetic introduction, in *The London Magazine* in 1826. The editors distanced themselves from this vitriolic outburst (“Mr. Dustington’s style is peculiar to himself”) in reply to an article which had appeared in *The Times* a few months previously, in which a “Medical Examiner” had warned of the possible dangers of snuff-taking:

11. Ibid., 159.
I advocate the cause of tobacco, yes, sir, of pulverized, of comminuted tobacco; … sir, I advocate the cause of my own nose, I am engaged in the general cause of suffering humanity; I advocate, sir, the great nasal cause. A more important cause, mi lud, I will venture to say, never came before this court. … But I find, sir, that I must put it off till to-morrow: the Medical Adviser has acetified my gastric juice; I feel that my nervous function is in a state of agitated debility. I am not cool: I shall be cool tomorrow.16

Although such prose is rather more heated than is normal in literary discussion of tobacco in the nineteenth century, Matthew Hilton finds in these many articles liberally scattered around the gentlemen’s magazines of the period an attitude to smoking which may surprise us: “consumption [was raised] to an act of playful, yet sophisticated appreciation.”17 He places this argument firmly in the context of a discussion of the ways in which the use of tobacco helped to define an essentially masculine culture: one which paid great attention to the rational (i.e., intellectual, skilful and purposeful) aspects of smoking; which valued the more ephemeral virtues of smoking activities which “formed retreats from the reality of the world”; and which rationalised it within a broader bourgeois-liberal outlook. This outlook was promoted by a rapidly expanding periodical press whose price and style “were well within the reach of an expanding middle class at whom [it] was targeted”, and it had a powerful political message: “the understanding of smoking put forward in the periodical press stressed the central tenets of this national political, economic and cultural creed: individuality and independence.”18 Hilton’s argument that his monograph is “a contribution to the study of the construction of femininity and masculinity, a field which is increasingly realising the importance of consumption to any understanding of gender”19 has telling resonance here, in an image in which intelligent seriousness is applied to a leisure pursuit.

Hilton’s persuasive argument that smoking may be viewed as an important marker of masculinity makes reference to a telling definition of a ‘gentleman’: “a social being clearly encircled by just a few commodities of explicitly graduated taste.”20 The clay pipe in company was as emphatic a statement of gentlemanliness as might be made without words—apart, perhaps, from the consumption of music. Apperson’s friend Colonel Prideaux makes a pertinent point here: “churchwardens were smoked, but the latter of course were not adapted for persons engaged in active pursuits and were essentially of
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16. Ibid., 368.
18. Ibid., 3.
20. Ibid., 27.
The Membership

what I may call a sedentary nature. You could not even walk while holding a long churchwarden in your mouth.”21 This is an activity, then, for the man with time to spend in contemplative relaxation.

In the context of this discussion, the persistence of smoking in such a Club as this—notionally dedicated to singing—is itself a strong argument in favour of Hilton’s assertion that the pipe was no mere adornment but a very important part of the culture being performed here. This object, speaking so strongly to the members’ sense of masculine identity, need for sociable fraternity, and aspiration to gentility, clearly takes precedence over the whimperings of a few singers, whose views in any case counted for little unless one of them happened to be the publican’s wife. The pipe, in short, was worth a malodorous coat once a week.

Talking of coats...

4.2.ii. Dress and Display

Dress is the other visible aspect of the Club membership singled out for special mention in an article which appeared in 1900 in the Kentish Gazette; the writer’s eye is drawn to “the dress coat and white “neckcloth” of the period”.22 Even by 1876, this fashion was regarded as quaint and amusing: the writer of The Gentleman’s Art of Dressing with Economy (whose pseudonym is “A Lounger at the Clubs”) characterises it thus:

The saying that midshipmen dress with a needle and undress with a pocket-knife might be applied to the costume of that day. The … buckram-stiffened cravats were literally stocks. Wellington boots were donned by pulleys, and not doffed without machinery. … The coat, which was entered by hand-to-hand fight, was purgatory to wear, and deliverance thence was little short of a miracle. It consisted chiefly of collar and brass buttons, and … was neither useful, ornamental, nor reasonable in price. Obviously, on these grounds, it held its own, for years, against all comers, according to true Conservative principles.23

Even allowing for the imperatives of satire, it might be asked, as of smoking: if the attire caused such discomfort, why was its use perpetuated? In a very real sense, it was a matter of appearances: Colley notes that before the end of the eighteenth century “more subdued and functional male dress” had resulted in a ruling class which looked as if it “had work to do”.24 The result was, as in the print and in

the above description, a somewhat formal, sober attire. Anyone who wished to be taken seriously—to be seen as a gentleman—had to start by looking like this; hence the slim volume referenced above, recommending patterns of dress with a budget in mind. It was not the first of its kind.

Colley makes reference to one of the guides to economical dress churned out in the early nineteenth century, *The Whole Art of Dress!*, published in 1830, by another anonymous author who calls himself “A Cavalry Officer”. Since it is more directly contemporary with the 1826 print, this volume may offer evidence of the process of aspirational gentrification in action.

Fig. 4-2: Artist Unknown: *The Whole Art of Dress!* Frontispiece

The writer is most concerned to emphasise that the mode of attire he recommends need not cost a fortune: the full title of his slim volume is *The Whole Art Of Dress! or, The Road to Elegance and Fashion at the Enormous Saving of Thirty per Cent!* Facing this title page, with its immediate appeal to the upwardly mobile on a budget, is a picture of a man in cavalry finery (Figure 4-2). Bearing in mind the discussion of masculinity immediately preceding this section, this is notable here not so much for its
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representation of the splendour of military uniform but for the repudiation the author immediately feels compelled to offer at the bottom of the title page:

I cannot but be aware that there will not be wanting those who at the first sight of my Title Page may imagine my pen verging in the promotion and defence of Dandyism. Far from it!—while I would uphold a smart and manly exterior, I repel, with merited contempt, the effeminate foppery of the other; and, on perusal, it will be found that the rules and advice here laid down as well apply to the old as young.”

This disclaimer is undercut somewhat by the image, but it remains an assertion of masculine values. Clearly, in what follows, there is no contradiction between male identity and fastidious care in matters of external appearance.

The writer aims his exhaustive exhortations at those who need to exercise a degree of thrift in their sartorial decisions: “How to array the person to the best and most becoming advantage at the least possible expense, is the chief design of the following work,” he asserts. Egalitarian credentials firmly established, he distributes his advice generously. Of coats he pronounces: “a dress coat should never be made to button. It should, if anything, be even too small to meet across the waist and chest, so that it may sit open and display the waistcoat, shirt, and cravat to the utmost advantage.” Display, it would appear, is very much a matter for consideration.

Passing over the Officer’s comments on waistcoats, which are in disappointingly short supply in the Canterbury image, Chapter 3, Cravatiana, next claims attention. Neckwear was popular in Canterbury, it would seem, and Baynes has differentiated a number of cloths, collars and neckties. It is also worth recalling that this was one item of attire which was singled out for special mention in the retrospective newspaper article of 1900. The Cavalry Officer is adamant that this is “a portion of dress, in the selection and method of wearing which taste and neatness is pre-eminently to be distinguished.” His argument is littered with both history and advice:

His Majesty and his Royal brothers were always remarkable for wearing [the Royal George, or Full Dress stocks] extremely high on the cheek … Though this certainly gives a very noble and fine effect to some countenances, the rage for it has passed away and is now deemed singular.

---

Practical, thrifty, and sensitive to the fashions set by the upper echelons of society, there is a resonance with the Canterbury Club membership. The 1826 Electoral Roll shows that only 22 of the 42 actually named in the key had the vote—and the Great Reform Bill of 1832 did little to alter this. It seems safe to conclude that the advice and concerns in The Whole Art of Dress! were those very much to the fore in the minds of the Catch Club members as they dressed for the evening: anxious to prove to themselves and to the world at large that they were respectable citizens, it was obviously entirely necessary that their attire should support their endeavour.

There are 55 hats in the Canterbury Catch Club print, hanging on the walls around the members, not counting a couple of ghostly images at the far end of the row on the left which are probably a product of the printing process. This is nowhere near enough for all 100 members present, but they are clearly as important as the Cavalry Officer believes they should be to the members. For that author, the importance of the hat cannot be overstated:
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It is almost impossible to be conceived, by a person inexperienced in dress, the immense influence exclusively this department of dress has over the countenance and figure in regard to shape and method of wear. It affects both the appearances of age and stature, sobriety and rakishness in the individual.31

It must be conceded that Baynes may not have been as sensitive to the varieties of hat style as the Cavalry Officer might have wished, since the top hats in the Canterbury print look about as uniform as the uninitiated might expect. This in itself may be a cue for withdrawal from this close study, not least because, detailed as the Canterbury image is, it is not possible to relate this writer’s advice to the figures in the print any more closely than with respect to coats, hats and “neckclothiana”. The Cavalry Officer’s pronouncements, which can only be read with growing incredulity, on other matters such as the sadly ludicrous characteristics of short men (pp. 65-68), deportment (chapter 8), and toilette and manicure with particular reference to skin, hands, soap, nails, hair and teeth (chapter 10), may well have been observed by the members of the Canterbury Catch Club, if their more obvious externalities are anything to go by, but that level of intimate detail has not so far come to light in any archival evidence.

To be fair to the Cavalry Officer, he begins his survey with a cautionary note which, in the light of the Kentish Gazette editorial 70 years later, is oddly prophetic:

And, now, as we look back upon past centuries, and can scarce repress our laughter at many of the absurd fancies in costumes our ancestors wore with such dignified gravity, inspiring respect around them, it is accompanied by the moralising reflection that our present beloved fashions, equally in their turn, and perhaps with more justice, may become subjects of wonder and mirth to our future descendants. So much for the force and contrast of custom.32

So much, indeed. But his keen observation on the point of dress—to achieve that “dignified gravity, inspiring respect around them” is unerringly pertinent here. It is precisely for this reason that the Canterbury members look as they do in the image. After all, they could not claim rank or stature by virtue of high birth or propertied wealth. They were all “men with work to do”.

4.3. Occupation and Class

The members’ work cannot, of course, be seen in the print. But as mentioned above, the key which has always accompanied it lists the occupations of all but six of the forty-two members named. Two of those are “gentlemen” and the other four are in the orchestra; three of those four have no clue given as

31. Ibid., 42.
32. Ibid., 1–2.
to what they do, and Thomas Goodban is identified only as “Leader of the Orchestra”. Below is the bald version of the members and their occupations as given in the original sketch and key; a fuller version, with further information (addresses from Stapleton’s 1838 Directory, numbers from the 1826 Electoral Roll, information from the King’s School Register and Freemason’s records, and the names of members appearing in the Minutes Books during the season 1825-6 whose names do not appear on the print) may be seen at Appendix B, p. 285:

Table 4-1: Members and their occupations as given in the sketch and key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr. Charles Delmar, Brewer</td>
<td>22 Mr. Ruglys, Malster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alderman Brown, Coach Builder</td>
<td>23 Mr. J. Furley, Banker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alderman H. Cooper, Tanner</td>
<td>24 Mr. Wilkinson, Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mr. Baskerville, Sen., Billet master</td>
<td>25 Mr. John Wood, Poulterer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mr. Ridout, Grocer</td>
<td>26 Mr. Pillow, Heyman, “Cock, Pillow, and Co.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mr. Arnold, Auctioneer</td>
<td>27 Mr. Small, Landlord, “Prince of Orange”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr. Marseille, Gentleman</td>
<td>28 Mr. W. Beer, Old Palace Brewery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mr. Dorman, Draper</td>
<td>29 Mr. E. Holtum, Chemist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mr. G. Johnson</td>
<td>30 Mr. T. M. Baynes, Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mr. C. Cottrell, Chemist</td>
<td>31 Mr. R. Fill, Sun Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr. Jenkins, Manager, Halford’s Bank</td>
<td>32 Mr. T. H. Wood, Boot Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mr. Roberts, Wool Stapler</td>
<td>33 Mr. H. Ward, Publisher of the Print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mr. Stringer, Tailor</td>
<td>34 Mr. John Pout, Auctioneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mr. Hollingbury, Gentleman</td>
<td>35 Mr. H. Lepine, Silversmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mr. Hart, Wine Merchant</td>
<td>36 Mr. Linford, Chemist, “Weeks &amp; Linford”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mr. Goodban, Leader of the Orchestra</td>
<td>37 Mr. Shindler, Plumber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mr. J. Harrison</td>
<td>38 Mr. Mourylan, Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mr. Mount</td>
<td>39 Mr. Bellingham, Tailor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mr. Welby</td>
<td>40 Mr. G. Neame, Grocer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mr. W. Lepine, Sen. [Vicualler*]</td>
<td>41 Mr. R. Sankey, Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mr. T. T. Delasaux, Coroner</td>
<td>42 Mr. W. Dombrain, Wine Merchant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, the creator of the key cared about occupation, which means that the Club did, too. This is not surprising; then, as now, a man was defined by his place in the economic order. David Cannadine, in *Class in Britain*, credits Adam Smith with advancing the proposition “that social status and social identity were primarily determined, not by honour or prestige ranking, and still less by religion or politics or gender or family or leisure or locality, but by occupation and relation to the means of production. … So far as is known, this is the first systematic attempt to argue that it was work which
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provided the key to social identities. In a long discussion about the ways in which class identity has been conceptualised with respect to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century British society (both at the time and by later historians of the periods), Cannadine debates the relative usefulness and primacy of those views which saw society as a two-tier system (“the most simplified of all, … gentlemen and non-gentlemen, superior and inferior, polite and common, learned and ignorant, rich and poor, nobility and commoner, ‘laced waistcoats’ and ‘leather aprons’, and so on.”) as opposed to the “increasingly popular tripartite social categories” — as visible in politics, the law, and education as they were on the railway which, as soon as it had been invented, divided its carriages into first-, second-, and third-class accommodation. His point about education is pertinent here as an indicator of where in the social hierarchy the Catch Club might feel itself to be:

Teaching, learning and literacy were intrinsically hierarchical. There was an elaborate ladder of places of learning, from Oxford and Cambridge universities, via Eton and Harrow, Manchester and Leeds grammar schools, to the humblest parish school. The higher up the social scale, the better, the longer and the more expensive the education that was available. … People from three basic social backgrounds went to three basic types of institution: public schools and Oxbridge for the aristocracy and gentry, grammar schools and professional training for the middle classes, and parish schools (or nothing) for the rest.

In Canterbury, the King’s School had been a part of the Cathedral Foundation, under statute of Henry VIII, as it still is. Then, as now, it is separate from the choristers’ education. Three members named on the key — Cooper, Ridout, and Stringer — attended the King’s School in Canterbury, putting them firmly in the higher stratum of Canterbury society. The keenness of other Club members to join them there is indicated by the number of them who sent their sons to the school: thirteen men in the picture saw the value in that.

34. Ibid., 30.
35. Ibid., 46.
36. Ibid., 47.
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Fig. 4-4: George Cruikshank: The British Bee Hive
George Cruikshank’s *British Bee Hive* of 1840 (Figure 4-4) offers a visual representation of the social strata. Cannadine calls it a “picture of society as a graded, interlocking hierarchy.” In this context, it performs two functions: it pictorialises the social exclusivity exemplified in 1802, when the Club closed its doors to the lower levels of the beehive, and it suggests the elusive fluidity of class identity throughout the long nineteenth century. Cannadine’s discussion of the conceptualisation of class is keenly aware of the inadequacies of any model propounded at any point; the best example of this difficulty in action was “the elaborate tables drawn up by R.D. Baxter in 1867, in which he listed 69 occupational groups in the hierarchy of labour.” In the mid-nineteenth century, Cannadine argues, “It was still not clear who was a gentleman who was not … The only sure way of knowing that you were a gentleman was to be treated as such. But that was something about which it was often not possible to be sure at all. Another great divide … was between those who were respectable and those who are not. But once again, there were different views” as to where the lines should be drawn.

The occupations shown in the key to the print (Figure 2-1, p. 17), and corroborated in many cases by Stapleton’s Directory of ten years later and/or the Electoral Roll, are largely a roll-call of middle-class occupation. Canterbury did not have high numbers of the gentility or aristocracy, as did the London clubs; these denizens were essentially aspirational. John Rule writes tellingly of the middle-class experience in the early nineteenth century: fear of debt, he argues, was never far away in an economic environment in which “for as small a debt as £2 on the oath of a single creditor a small master or shopkeeper could be moved from his business and his family”. The threat of imprisonment “much increased the general insecurity of the small and middling trading classes”, he notes. The prospect haunted many for whom “everyday business … was enmeshed in a matrix of credit, even if only in the simple form of book debts owed to suppliers and, usually, longer-standing ones due from customers.” Economically, then, being middle-class was a perilous existence. Susie L. Steinbach puts figures on this discomfort: “To comfortably maintain a family in a middle-class lifestyle required an income of between £300 and £1,000 per annum. However, a large number of middle-class families—probably the majority—actually lived on only £100 to £300 per annum. Most families struggled to

maintain the appearances that were necessary to their class status; men worked to earn money, while women strove to make it go as far as possible.”41 Appearances, in this culture and society, mattered, and the Catch Club was one of several institutions which validated a social position. As Steinbach goes on: “Upper middle-class families often socialised with the local gentry, especially in provincial areas, and together these two classes formed a single social group, “polite” society.”

Such associations were various and interconnecting. Electoral registration and Stapleton’s Directory have already been recorded, and the King’s School has been mentioned as another focal point of relationships. One more was Freemasonry. Five names on the Canterbury print—Cottrell, Delasaux, Pillow, Beer and Lepine—crop up in Masonic records for the years 1818-34, and a further three whose names appear in the Minutes Books but who are not pictured—Stacey, Frend, and Bone—were also admitted to the Canterbury Lodge.42 Yet another network of relationships may be seen in the surnames: Canterbury had had a sizable Huguenot community since 1567, when French Protestant refugees settled in the city. This community was enlarged after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, when profession of Protestant faith in France was punishable by execution, at which point a second wave of immigration occurred. The immigrants brought consummate skills of woollen and silk weaving and established themselves as important parts of the local economy, and their French surnames are distributed throughout the Catch Club records: Dombrain, Lepine, Lansbery, Miette, Marseille, Delasaux, Mourylan, and Delmar43 are Canterbury’s testimony to a terrible period of religious discrimination.

The resulting networks of acquaintance and association are shown in the image below (Figure 4-5).

43. Catch Club Minutes Book 1 (1802-1840), 59-63.
Class identity—then as now—was a complex and shifting construction: built upon not only education and occupation but allowing for subtle re-definition as a function of one’s “deportment, mode of dress, patterns of recreation, type of housing and style of life”. In other words, for the Catch Club members, there was everything to play for.

In any discussion of class conception, there is an important caveat to insert. Along with Linda Colley, Cannadine recognises the fact that the hierarchical view of society would be espoused by the dominant elite, since it served their purposes so well:

> The model chosen, and the picture of society it conveyed, often tells us as much about the perspective and position of the beholder as they do about the society he was beholding. Anglican clergymen and Tories like Samuel Johnson were enamoured of the hierarchical view of society, and of the divinely ordained subordination of some individuals to others.”

The fact that the view persisted so strongly throughout the nineteenth century—to the detriment, by the end of that century, of genuine electoral reform, as other European countries overtook Britain in extensions of the franchise in this period—is a reflection of the continued dominance of that elite.

As the members of the Canterbury Catch Club struggled to join them, membership of the Club may have offered a curiously contradictory attraction: the opportunity both to perform one’s social status on a weekly basis during the winter months and to forget it in the late-night revelry. Both these features help to explain the enduring popularity of the Club in the half century following the

---

44. David Cannadine, *Class in Britain*, 22.
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publication of this print.
CHAPTER 5:

THE CLUB ROOM

The building in which the club was meeting in 1826 is the only one of its three homes still standing in the city now, 200 years later. The Oddfellows bought the premises formerly known as the Prince of Orange in Orange Street in 1876, and it has since undergone extensive remodelling. However, it seems likely that the room depicted in the print is the one on the first floor now known as the Lodge Room of the Oddfellows’ Hall; although the orchestra’s raised area at the far end has been blocked off to create a larger upper room in the adjacent premises, the address and the description largely agree. The strongest evidence are the three large holes in the ceiling, of over a foot in diameter; they must have been cut for the air pumps which caused the Committee such concern. However, even allowing for Marsh’s description of the improvements in December 1783, the print is flattering: a room of very generous size is shown in the image, except where the cramped orchestra is concerned, when in fact the room purchased by the Lodge in 1876 was, according to a written report, “38 feet long by 20 feet 6 inches at one end and 18 feet 6 inches at the other, that does not include the present stage.” Artistic license is clearly at work in the print, which makes the room look about three times the size it actually is.

The favourable reading of all the records—including the picture—is, of course, that a well-filled room all contributed to an atmosphere of cosy conviviality, and it is clear from contemporary newspaper reports that this was usually the case. At the end of the 1826-7 season, the Kentish Chronicle reflected as follows:

There have been no less than 30 meetings; and if possible, each successive evening, the exertions of the orchestra, appeared to impart greater delight. The County of Kent is extremely popular, in promoting societies of this description; but we believe none rival the present in regard to the support it experiences, and certainly not one in England is possessed of a greater share of musical talent; nor one where “harmony and unanimity prevail” in a greater degree. It is usual to allow such of the inhabitants of Canterbury, as are non-members, to share the enjoyment of the last evening; and probably between two and three hundred persons, qualified by age and respectability, embraced this kindness.

Pausing only to note the requirement that visitors be “respectable”, it is appropriate to consider the

1. Loyal City of Canterbury Lodge Hall Committee Report, 21 Feb 1876.
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extent to which the room may actually have looked as it does in the print in other respects.

5.1. Decoration and Ornament

The Minutes give a great deal of attention to the appearance of the room. The Club motto is a prominent feature of the print, and it seems its pride of place is accurate: in 1821, it was resolved that “a scrole [sic] be painted in front of the orchestra with the words ‘Harmony and Unanimity’ in gold letters.” The previous month, it had been resolved that “the Catch Club Room be painted a salmon colour by members of the club who are painters”, though it is not clear how many of them there were. Various ornamental accretions are introduced in the following pages, all testifying to the gradual gentrification of the Club. These decorations—which, as with the Cavalry Officer’s exhortations on dress, did not preclude softer features—are added for some years after the print had captured its moment in time: a curtain for the west window (behind us, from the print’s viewpoint) in 1824; “the figures of fame” on each side of the west window in 1827; and the bust of the (by then late) President, Charles Delmar, who had died only a couple of years after the print had immortalised him, in August 1828. Drapery and curtains are refurbished in 1830, and a curtain pole donated by Mr Goodban obviously comes in useful for something. Two chandeliers—not one—are installed in the Club room in 1820, and the deputies’ chairs are enhanced in stately fashion by the placement of curtains behind them in 1835. Lamps are cleaned, candlesticks lacquered or bronzed (exactly which is not clear), the ceiling is coloured, the front and back rails of the orchestra and the chairman’s platform are painted, plain glasses are replaced with six ground glasses—with someone employed to clean them—in 1839. The Queen’s coat of arms (see below) and the musical trophy (the latter never mentioned elsewhere, or explained) are gilded at the end of that year, and clothes pegs make their useful appearance in the lobby at the start of 1840. Carpet arrives beneath the seats of the President and officers in 1841, and the President gets a new chair to put on it later in the year. Pictures are ‘varnished and chained’ in 1843. Later, in 1849, little touches include a piece of green baize placed round the table to the left of the president and a rail with a flap placed in front of the secretary’s seat.

A few of these ornamental trappings of bourgeois respectability should be discussed in greater detail.

---

3. Catch Club Minutes Book I (1802-1840), 38.
5.2. Chandelier, Motto, and the Royal Arms

In reality, the splendid chandelier occupying the central ceiling space was one of a pair. When gas lighting was adopted for the Club room, in June 1820, it was ordered that “two chandeliers like the pattern now produced be provided by Mr Gostling,” along with two Argent lamps for the orchestra. Baynes obviously made the decision to use only one as the central pillar of the picture, no doubt conscious of the need to have the Club motto clearly visible. Mr Welby recalled this (see Appendix C, p. 289) as the “famous motto” of the club, which explains why Thomas Goodban set it to music at some point as a duet for two tenor voices with piano accompaniment, in what is probably one of the most embarrassing items in the music archive (Appendix S, p. 510). The encrolement of the motto adds a fine neo-classical flourish to the words. As time went by, where the orchestra was concerned, it was honoured more in the breach than in the observance, and the seeds of this disunity are visible in the picture, in the pictorial positioning—and corresponding gradation of clarity—between gentlemen and players, but this must wait until Part II for proper treatment. No doubt, as Goodban’s Charter Glee was bellowed to the rafters on the last night of every season, it all felt harmonious enough.

The Royal Arms hanging on the wall above Corelli, on the left, should be noted: this was a most loyal assembly. Mentioned above as having been gilded in 1839, with Victoria only two years on the throne, it is worth pausing to reflect on the avowed patriotism of the assembly even though, in 1826, it was one of Britain’s most despised and ridiculed monarchs who sat on the throne. Thackeray was simply echoing the contempt felt at the time for George IV when he demolished him in retrospect, but even that hatchet job has an overtone of pity, tinged with self-recrimination, as he wonders how anyone could ever have thought anything of him: “He sleeps since thirty years: do not any of you, who remember him, wonder that you once respected and huzza’d and admired him?” In fact, attitudes to the monarchy were undergoing something of a tidal shift. George had bribed a most influential caricaturist when he bought off George Cruikshank in what Gatrell calls “The Silencing”: “A Windsor receipt records that the king paid Cruikshank £100 on 19 June 1820, ‘in consideration of a pledge not to caricature his majesty in any immoral situation’.” Gatrell records thousands of pounds’ worth of

---
5. Catch Club Minutes Book 1 (1802-1840), 32.
7. Vic Gatrell, City of Laughter, 530.
8. Ibid., 538.
bribes to other artists, publishers and print-shops in a determined drive to succeed where prosecutions had failed: to eradicate a trade the king loathed. In fact, for a change, the temper of the times was on the king’s side: the rush to respectability which is the leitmotif of this thesis had begun its work of altering the social temper in favour of a monarchy which epitomised stability and an old order, however risible the incumbent. So it is not surprising that the Royal Arms are to be seen on the wall in this picture—and the patriotism this betokens was probably genuine.

5.3. Portraits

The two paintings shown in the print survive to this day, in the care of the Beaney House of Art and Knowledge (Canterbury’s city library and museum), so are open to close scrutiny and identification of provenance.

These two pictures hardly constitute an art gallery, much less the kind of “Kunst und Wunderkammer” (“room/cabinet of art and curiosities”) beloved of renaissance collectors, but as with those earlier showcases, the presence here of these portraits has more than decorative value and purpose. The smaller painting (5-1) is of Arcangelo Corelli (1653-1713), and is clearly based on an earlier portrait by the Irish painter Hugh Howard (1675/1676–1738). Several copies of this are in
existence; one is held at the Stirling Smith Art Gallery & Museum. Their notes on the picture, after a few introductory comments on Corelli, are as follows:

Hugh Howard (1675-1737) Artist:
In 1697, Howard accompanied Thomas, Earl of Pembroke on a ‘Grand Tour’ and studied drawing & painting in Italy. In Rome he was drawn to the sophisticated circle of connoisseurs including Corelli. The portrait was painted in Rome and the artist took it back to Dublin in 1700 and in 1711 to London where he used it in his studio to attract portrait commissions as his ‘master-work’.

Hugh Howard was born in Dublin. His father was President of the College of Physicians and his mother was the daughter of an M.P. In 1714 he married the heiress Thomasina Langston, the daughter of a General. He abandoned portraiture when he was appointed Keeper of the State Papers and later in 1726 Paymaster of the Royal Palaces. Howard collected books, prints and medals and parts of his collection eventually entered the British Museum. He died in 1737 and is buried in Richmond.

Howard was an Irish portrait painter who moved in the highest social circles. He painted portraits early in his career, the most famous being this one of Corelli who he met while on Grand Tour of Italy.9

The copy held at the Royal College of Music enlarges upon the connection between Howard and Corelli:

[Corelli (1653–1713)] was a friend of the artist Carlo Maratta (1625–1713), who painted a portrait of Corelli which it is thought was brought to England in the late seventeenth century by Corelli’s gentleman-student Lord Edgcumbe.

The Edgcumbe portrait is known to have been exhibited as late as 1938 but is thought to have been destroyed during the Second World War. The Royal College of Music’s (RCM) version has been attributed to Hugh Howard (1675–1737), who produced many portraits of Corelli, including a chalk drawing in the RCM collection. It is unclear whether these were based on studies made in the presence of Corelli, or were entirely based on Maratta’s work.10

Uncertainty is compounded with regard to the provenance of the painting belonging to the Club, in which the pose in both SSAGM and RCM copies is reversed. Who actually painted that copy is not known at all; the Catch Club Minutes are silent on the matter, and the Beaney House of Art and Knowledge (Canterbury’s city library and museum) can offer no further attribution.

The provenance of the other picture, that of Saint Cecilia (5-2), is similarly uncertain: the Beaney catalogue has only this attribution “Carlo Maratta (1625–1713) (style of)”.11 However, what is more important is the point of the picture: Richard Leppert describes this patron saint of music as “an old
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and continuing topos resurrected for use in a secular genre”. This is apt here as, in neo-Baroque manner, St Cecilia is shown seated at the organ with a couple of cherubs looking on and a verse by Dryden hovering over her head:

At last divine Cecilia came,
Inventress of the vocal frame;
The sweet enthusiast, from her sacred store,
Enlarg’d the former narrow bounds,
And added length to solemn sounds,
With nature’s mother-wit and Arts unknown before.

The excerpt is taken from the end of Alexander’s Feast, or the Power of Music. An Ode in Honour of St Cecilia’s Day, written in 1697. The 180 lines of the poem tell how, in the course of the celebrations following the defeat of Persia, Timotheus, court musician to Alexander, roused his sovereign to various passions with his music, with the help of Jove, Bacchus and, eventually, Cecilia, whose reputation for having invented the organ is referenced here.

The picture appears in the Catch Club Minutes in 1821:

Mr W Cullen made a communication to the committee from Mr Burnby, stating that the picture of St. Cecilia could not actually be given to the club but that he begged the acceptance of it as a loan, during the existence of the club: and if the club should be dissolved, the picture then to be returned to him or his family.

Resolved unanimously that the Picture of St Cecilia be accepted on the above terms … that the thanks of the Committee be given to Mr Burnby for the handsome manner in which he has offered the loan of the Picture of St Cecilia.

And Mr Burnby is promptly made an honorary member of the Club as a token of the committee’s appreciation. Serendipitously, in time for St Cecilia’s feast day (November 22) a frame is found; the delight of the Committee can only be imagined:

Mr Buckton begged permission to present as a free gift a picture frame to the club.
Resolution that the same be accepted.
Resolution that the painting of Saint Cecilia be placed in the aforesaid frame, and that it be hung up in the Club room, from and after Thursday next, being the anniversary of that Saint and Virgin martyr.

As part of the process of aspirational gentrification, this sort of iconography brings a gravitas very much in keeping with the socio-political ambitions of the Club. The classical allusions referenced by
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the image and the poem and the benediction of an old master such as Corelli reflect for the Club members—and anyone of the outside world looking in—precisely the respectability they crave. In this respect, the two pictures shown in the print serve a function beyond mere ornament; they enhance the demonstration of culture and sophistication, rooted in an illustrious past with classical references, in which the Club wishes to situate its own cultural narrative. Writing about the genre of painting which depicts an entire art gallery (‘Kunstkamers’), Ben Bros discusses the subliminal meanings such depictions may wish to convey:

Opinions vary on the nature of pictures of galleries. On the one hand they are straightforward depictions of contemporary collections, also known as ‘Kunst und Wunderkammer’ (rooms of art and curiosities). On the other they are allegories on the art of painting or painted encyclopaedic collections reflecting the status and universal interests of the collector. In addition, they may contain whole constellations of symbolic allusions derived from Neo Stoic philosophy.\(^{15}\)

It seems that Corelli and St Cecilia started something, Baynes had few paintings to choose from in 1826: St Cecilia made her appearance in 1821, and although there is no similar record heralding the arrival of the Corelli portrait, a later Minute suggests that it had been in the possession of the Club for a while by 1830: at the Committee meeting on 13 September, a letter was read from Mr William Delmar:

I hope you and the Members of the Canterbury Catch Club will do me the favour to accept a portrait of Handel. As a painting it is not so good as I could wish, but as the Portrait of the most eminent musical composer of his time, I trust it will be considered worthy of a place by the side of Corelli, with my best wishes for the prosperity of the Catch Club, believe me,

Yours truly,

William Delmar.\(^ {16}\)

The Committee accepted his offer with alacrity, and at the meeting on 22 September made him an honorary member too. By then, however, it would seem that the Club had started to amass a small collection of portraits of its own accord; on 27 October 1826 the Committee had resolved “that a Portrait be painted of the president the expense of which to be defrayed by a voluntary subscription”.\(^ {17}\)

No other reference to the commissioning or execution of the further portraits is to be found in the


\(^{16}\) Catch Club Minutes Book 1 (1802-1840), 91.

\(^{17}\) Ibid., 66.
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Club Minutes, but there are, now residing in the Beaney collection, about a dozen portraits of The Great And The Good of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Canterbury. A parade of dusty senators, they show Mayors, Aldermen, other worthy citizens—and some Catch Club committee members—gazing sternly at the viewer.

The similarity of technique and composition may suggest that they were painted by the same, unknown, artist, and it is a form of painting Thackeray was later to deride in The Artists when writing (under the whimsical pseudonym “Michael Angelo Titmarsh”) about a painter he calls Claude Carmine:

There is a great deal more said here about Carmine—the man, than Carmine—the Artist; but what can be written about the latter? New ladies in white satin, new Generals in red, new Peers in scarlet and ermine, and stout Members of Parliament pointing to inkstands and sheets of letter-paper, with a Turkey-carpet beneath them, a red curtain above them, a Doric pillar supporting them, and a tremendous storm of thunder and lightning lowering and flashing in the background, spring up every year, and take their due positions “upon the line” in the Academy, and send their compliments of hundreds to swell Carmine’s heap of Consols.18

Thackeray concedes the popularity of this genre and style, and that it serves a market demand: “He is a fashionable painter, and preserves the golden mediocrity which is necessary for fashion,” he says, in withering dismissal.19 In fact, this is probably Thackeray on fine satirical form: no painter by the name of Claude Carmine is to be found in any present-day dictionary of national biography or of artists, and the Royal Academy Library drew a blank, suggesting that the alliteration within the name (which echoes that of one of the great landscape painters, Claude Lorain) and the reference to the gaudy colour carmine suggest a fictional satirical character.

---

19. Ibid., 172.
Reviewing the dozen or so portraits sitting in storage in the Canterbury museum’s holding-places, however, one cannot but concur with Thackeray’s art criticism. In style and execution, they are stultifyingly sycophantic. The stern gentlemen eye the painter, as if daring any hint of mockery: Delmar, President for years until his death in 1828, obligingly sits in front of that red curtain Thackeray mentioned; Baskerville, founder member of the Club in 1779 and its Secretary and
Treasurer for many years until he died in 1851, is given a scroll and a quill in an ink-stand by way of props; Saffery holds a viola and Burgess a piece of music with “Violino primo” helpfully visible, to explain that these two were of that class of performer who were not paid for their participation in the orchestra—in other words, they were gentlemen. With the clarity of hindsight, the one other portrait in the Club’s collection is a surprising inclusion in the pantheon: Thomas Goodban was not a gentleman. He was a tavern-keeper’s son.

In fact, his presence here is a remarkable testimony to the esteem in which he was held in this period of the Club’s history. The Minutes record a most unusual gift, by subscription, in 1819—of which more in Part II—but they also record that he resigned, thoroughly hurt, in 1845 when he found he had been left off the Committee. His name never appears again in the Club Minutes.

It seems likely that this flurry of immortalisation took place around the turn of the century. Several are attributed to one Stephen Hewson (active 1768–1812), so it may be that the Catch Club Committee took their cue from their grand civic acquaintances. Such mimetic behaviour would be entirely consistent with the “rush to respectability” Gatrell describes.

That much is informed speculation; what is recorded is that on 26 September 1831, Mr. Delmar was requested to arrange the portraits of the Concert Room, which suggests that there were at least a few to play with by then. The only other reference to the collection comes towards the end of the Club’s life: on 12 March 1860, “the Treasurer reported that the following paintings had been removed to his house: St Cecilia, portraits of Corelli, Handel, Burgess, Saffery, C. Delmar, W. Baskerville and T. Goodban.” This list distinguishes the Catch Club pictures from the others in storage in the Beaney today. He also reported “that several of the frames had been slightly damaged before their removal.”

Rather like Thackeray’s Carmine (if indeed he ever existed), all but two of those formulaic nineteenth-century artworks have now disappeared from public view. But in an ironic and appropriate testament to his work for the Club, the Beaney keeps on permanent display, beside St Cecilia, the portrait of Thomas Goodban. The tavern-keeper’s son has become the face of the Canterbury Catch Club for

21. Vic Gatrell, City of Laughter, 421.
present-day visitors who visit the top floor of the Canterbury museum, while those social superiors who so summarily put him in his place in 1845 languish in dust-covered obscurity. Canterbury posterity has afforded Thomas Goodban the recognition he deserves.

The spaciousness of the room shown in the print, and the various trappings adorning it, are designed to encode the message that this is an affluent assembly. John Dixon Hunt considered the importance of the surroundings in a popular genre of painting in his discussion of London’s garden theatres:

It is clear that gardens acquired the status of ‘sets’ or social stages in the conversation pictures which became such a favourite genre in the 18th-century. In these relaxed and often intimate scenes from daily life, however, we should not ignore the self-consciousness of both artist and sitters. The former is concerned to flatter both his patrons, their status and their public and private roles (father, daughter, sister, etc.). The sitters are usually seen in some room or garden belonging to them, so that pride of place and social status at once become part of the painting’s subject matter. Their surroundings, seen in the most attractive light, are quite literally their stage, the theatre where they play their roles, however those are conceived.24

So, too, do the members of the Catch Club expect to be judged approvingly by the decorations and appurtenances enfolding their cultured consumption.

CHAPTER 6:  
A PERFORMANCE OF CLASS:

It should be clear by now that although much of the image is a representation of reality, there is much which is noticeably lacking. Some has already been noted—the smoke-filled atmosphere for instance—but the records show that there is much more upon which the print is reticent. The orchestra, composed of local musicians, are frequently mentioned in the Minutes, for reasons usually to do with pay and (poor) behaviour; here, they are simply the cultural backdrop to a scene of assured affluence. Women, it is also clear from Minutes and newspaper records, formed part of the audience and—exceptionally for this culture in the country at large—were frequently heard performing (often better paid than the men) in this provincial gathering. Contrary to the impression created by the print, vocal music actually comprised the larger part of an evening’s formal concert, and some of that involved audience participation. Finally, the ribald, transgressive nature of the post-concert communal singing of catches into the early hours of the morning—many of them lewd in the extreme—is wisely ignored here.

These absences are hardly surprising. There is, after all, no point in depicting a smoke-filled room, nor would one want to advertise the running disputes with the purveyors of one’s entertainment; musicians were not highly regarded, and in this respect their position in the Club was not entirely dissimilar to that of the women who were, here as elsewhere, denied a voice. Finally, and most significantly of all, the late-night, alcohol-fuelled, convivial sing-song would most certainly not represent the individual or collective identities of the club and its members particularly well. Like all cleverly-composed advertisements, this self-representation by, of, and for the Club is highly selective. With all the trappings of nineteenth-century upper-class culture clearly on display, then, this representation of the Canterbury Catch Club is a masterclass in the performance of national, gender, and class identity.

And that might be all that needs to be said about it. It is, however, more problematic than that. As Vic Gatrell points out, at this point in the history of catch and glee clubs there was enough of the old humour to permit the most remarkable marriage of solemnity and subversion:
Close reading of the print, the Minutes, and all the other evidence makes it clear that a Club evening concert began with great seriousness—even when the musical fare on offer encouraged rowdy participation—after which, in uproarious fashion, the “after-evening” would erupt into the libertine behaviour so beloved of their forbears. It seems to have been a remarkable juxtaposition of earnestness and fun, springing from a vibrant cultural and intellectual lineage. Yet the dominant mode of the print is sober and thoughtful. The complete absence of any reference to the exuberance of a club night remains a puzzle.

Once again, Dickens offers some understanding of the social processes at work in the shift of mood. In another of the Sketches by Boz he muses upon the demise of May Day traditions. It is a whimsical passage, wistfully recalling an expression of community in dancing, yearning for a return to an Arcadian age in which such activity was enjoyed by all, and wondering why all that disappeared from the nation’s communal life. By way of answer he says, “Well; many years ago we began to be a steady and matter-of-fact sort of people, and dancing in spring being beneath our dignity we gave it up…”.

Lightly as ever, Dickens points to a truth about the cultural and social milieu of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The Catch Club was an institution born of the Georgian period, and in 1826 its day was nearly done. Thackeray draws a similar comparison, and articulates it in similarly elegiac tones:

I fancy it was a merrier England, that of our ancestors, than the island which we inhabit. People high and low amused themselves very much more. ... They played all sorts of games, which, with the exception of cricket and tennis, have quite gone out of our manners now. In the old prints of St. James’s Park, you still see the marks along the walk, to note the balls when the Court played at Mall. Fancy Birdcage Walk now so laid out, and Lord John and Lord Palmerston knocking balls up and down the avenue! Most of those jolly sports belong to the past.

A hundred and twenty years ago there were not only country towns in England, but people who inhabited them. We were very much more gregarious; we were amused by very simple pleasures. Every town had its fair, every village its wake. ... Dancing bears went about the country with pipe and tabor. Certain well-known tunes were sung all over the land for hundreds of years, and high and low rejoiced in that simple music.

---

1. Vic Gatrell, City of Laughter, 17.
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Although Thackeray may be falling prey to that great addiction of the English, nostalgia, this reading of history chimes with that of Dickens. Closer to Canterbury, Thomas Sidney Cooper’s recollections of the Michaelmas Fair echoes them both—and, ominously, the Michaelmas Fair was banned from the Cathedral Precincts in 1814.4 The new sobriety had no room for the old revelry.

Gatrell regretfully agrees with Dickens about the change which overcame English society in the 1820s: “something happened to English manners which left a contrary legacy”, says Dickens, in his musings upon the decline of May Day traditions.5 Gatrell’s explanation for this change in tone and temper—from the “bawdy carnivalesque of the old laughter [to] a humour that was domesticated and tamer”6—draws on eclectic evidence: doubt as to the continuity of the old order, fed by the growing clamour for political reform which encouraged, in the middle classes, that rush to respectability; and the shift in manners as such people acquired greater confidence and prosperity in which bourgeois identity was “affirmed and remoralised”.7 The social aspirations of the Catch Club membership are firmly situated in this improving narrative.

Other evidence supports this view, though with caveats: the table in Appendix B (p. 285) shows those named in the print who had the vote, but it also shows that almost half didn’t. In 1826, the right to vote depended, as it continued to do for many decades more, upon the ownership of property. So apart from the socio-economic pressures mentioned above, middle-class existence was politically perilous, in an age when political power, instantiated in the right to vote, was something to aspire to. Similar tensions were felt in the spiritual realm: this period of increasing secularisation was to see schism in the established church between the Oxford Movement on the one hand and Dissenters on the other. With these corrosive tensions at work in English society, it is not surprising that the members of the Canterbury Catch Club wanted to present an assured, sophisticated façade to themselves and the outside world. Rubin’s remarks above about the “emotional, unifying experience” of their communal vocal pastime (to whose psychological benefit modern research will testify in the Epilogue) suggests that members may have been only too happy, relieved, and reassured to let off steam as their elders, forefathers, and social betters had done—and continued to do—in the safe space

7. Ibid., 421.
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provided by a Catch Club. It may be that the longevity of the catch and glee clubs of the nineteenth century—long outstripping the life and times which had given them birth—was a reflection of and/or a response to the peculiar psychosis which was the Victorian frame of mind.

The great imperative, then, was to emulate those classes of society deemed most respectable: i.e., the ruling elite. Here, Cannadine’s consideration of the ways in which hierarchy was enacted is pertinent:

Hierarchy was constantly being dramatized and the established order made visible. Royal entries, progresses, birthdays, weddings, coronations and funerals provided the most magnificent displays of the formal hierarchy ... local celebrations and mimetic observances ... replicated order and reaffirmed degree.⁸

That last point is significant for this analysis of the Catch Club. The fact that the enactment of hierarchy was mimicked on a smaller scale, at lower levels of society, in the provinces as well as in the capital, shows the extent of its reach:

...the rites of passage of local notables ... the formal entry of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland into Dublin, the state opening of Parliament, the installation of a University Chancellor, the beginning of a legal term, the processions marking the entry of electoral candidates into their constituencies: all these were opportunities for the pomp and circumstance of order and degree to be made public. And as Britons were confronted by, or participated in, these transcendent social dramas, it must have been easy to believe that this ritualised depiction of social gradations was indeed the real version of the natural order of things.⁹

Cannadine might also have mentioned the ways in which the ruling elite disported themselves in their leisure time: the less formal rituals of sociable singing allied to consumption of food and drink were just as powerful a model for the aspirational classes to emulate. And education was recruited to the cause, as was seen in the fact that more Canterbury Catch Club members sent their children to the Kings School than had actually attended it as Scholars themselves; the right schooling was a socio-economic marker of respectability.

All this exemplifies what Linda Colley calls "the primacy of the polite vision".¹⁰ This is such a rich conceptualisation of the processes at work in the Canterbury print that it begs some discussion. Colley points to a process of assimilation and adoption of a dominant ideology which has become so complete that it is accepted and enacted with no sense of there being an alternative world view. There

---

⁸. David Cannadine, Class in Britain, 48.
⁹. Ibid., 48-49.
¹⁰. Linda Colley, Britons, 80.
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is a strong intellectual heritage to this analysis, which Derek B. Scott sums up neatly:

The seeming consensus actually conceals the workings of a dominant ideology. This idea appears in its most direct form in Karl Marx’s statement “the ideas of the ruling class are in every age the ruling ideas” (Die Deutsche Ideologie, 1845-46). It was reworked by Antonio Gramsci as a theory of hegemony (Quaderni del Carcere, 1929-35), by Louis Althusser as a theory of ideological interpellation (Lénine et la Philosophe, 1969), and by Michel Foucault as a theory of power operating through legitimising discourses (Surveiller et Punir, 1975).¹¹

In other words, the way the elite class looks at things becomes the socially, culturally, and politically dominant way in which everyone looks at things. Hence the dress, the exclusive association, the ostentatiously aesthetic genesis, and the libertine behaviour of the Canterbury Catch Club: all reflect the manners and deportment of the contemporary British elite. This mimetic behaviour was not merely the most sincere form of flattery; it became the mode of being for the aspirational bourgeoisie.

Cannadine quotes William Cobbett’s analysis of the British habit of deference: “Cobbett … denounced the ‘chain of dependence running through the whole nation which, though not everywhere seen, is everywhere felt’”, he says.¹² Here, the Catch Club print is deference incarnate: apparently unnoticed by the participants, who have signed up to the supremacy of the elite hegemony with an enthusiasm viscerally fuelled by communal singing, Colley’s ‘primacy of the polite vision’ is clearly on display. Bourdieu’s judgement on such behaviours is unflinching: characterising the petit bourgeois’ “clutching at” culture as “avid but anxious, naïve but serious”,¹³ he finds the effort essentially unsuccessful:

The petit bourgeois is indeed a bourgeois ‘writ small’. Even his bodily hexis [i.e., demeanour, bearing, and gesture], which expresses his whole objective relation to the social world, is that of a man who has to make himself small to pass through the strait gate which leads to the bourgeoisie: strict and sober, discreet and severe, in his dress, his speech, his gestures and his whole bearing, he always lacks something in stature, breadth, substance, largesse.”¹⁴

Meanwhile, the musicians at the back of the room had their own socio-political struggle to engage. Their circumstances, their desire for professional (and social) recognition, and their representation of a nation divided, form the subject of the next section.

¹¹ Derek B. Scott, Sounds of the Metropolis (OUP, 2011), 58.
¹² David Cannadine, Class in Britain, 65.
¹³ Pierre Bourdieu, Distinction, 327.
¹⁴ Ibid., 338.
PART II:

INDISTINCTLY SKETCHED

The growing good of the world is partly dependent on unhistoric acts; and that things are not so ill with you and me as they might have been, is half owing to the number who lived faithfully a hidden life, and rest in unvisited tombs.

CHAPTER 7:

“A TRIVIAL AND DEGRADING BUSINESS”

A phrase coined to describe an early nineteenth-century cricket match is entirely appropriate here: the distinction between gentlemen and players is very clearly drawn in this print. As with the game, the distinction is between the leisured class and those paid to supply the labour upon which their indolence depends: in both cricket match and print may be seen “the ultimate declaration of social realities.”

Whilst the members claim the viewer’s attention, not only by virtue of their sheer number but by the clarity and individuality of their depiction, the orchestra, crammed into that alcove at the back of the room, is notably less distinct. To a great extent, this is a function of their distance from the viewer: careful observance of the rules of perspective dictate that the physical space available on the canvas means that those at the back of the room can only be sketched more faintly. So no facial features are discernible; only a few instruments may be confidently identified; and the organist is completely invisible, though the instrument forms a prominent central feature to that scene-within-a-scene; every bit as secure an “icon of social distinction” as Leppert claims for harpsichords, spinets and pianos in the domestic scenes of English gentry.

The glaring discrepancy in clarity of representation encodes a message of crucial importance: it becomes obvious from Club and other records that this relatively blurred representation of the musicians reflects very clearly the attitude of the Club to its musicians—at least, to most of them.

2. The organ, incidentally, is the only known physical remnant of the orchestra still in existence, now residing just north of Nantes at the home of Martin Renshaw, the organ-builder who bought it in 2001. The following history has been provided by Tony Eldridge (Past Master, United Industrious Lodge No. 31 and Director, Canterbury Masonic Estate, 1989-2010): “The Hugh Russell Organ, marked on inside of case “Hugh Russell London 4th July 1789” [was] formerly in the private house of Robert Hales of Tenterden, then at a Unitarian Church Tenterden, then "brought from a butcher's yard in Tenterden" to Canterbury Masonic Temple in 1935 by Past Masters of “United Industrious Lodge No. 31”, who have been meeting in Canterbury since the lodge was Consecrated in 1755 (on 2nd December 1776, ‘a belated’ 200th Anniversary Meeting of Lodge 31 was held in the Chapter House at Canterbury Cathedral). Also known to have been in earlier use by the Canterbury Catch & Glee Club. Owing to the impossible task of preserving the fabric of the instrument due to temperature & humidity issues [it was] sold by Canterbury Masonic Estate in 2001 to Martin Renshaw (organ builder) – and now used on tour, [and] for recordings of period music.”
Deborah Rohr notes in her study that “The newly affluent members of the middle-class ... were sometimes eager to emphasise status differences,” and the Catch Club print offers visual affirmation of that socio-cultural tendency.

The one distinction which cannot be seen in the picture is the one the Club consistently made in its dealings with the orchestra: between those who were paid for their services, and those who were not. The latter were, of course— as in the cricket— gentlemen. As Hilton remarked on the essentially masculine approach to smoking: “Just as thousands of public school educated sportsmen opposed the professionalization of sport, the essence of the ‘gentleman’ was that one engaged in one’s vocation or recreation as an amateur.” The Catch Club Committee recognises this at several points in the Minutes Books. In 1813, it was noted that the President was “to choose his deputies and the committee— to consist of 15 members and those Members of the Orchestra who do not receive any pay for their services [my italics].” Those men, then, were not only members but were automatically included in the Club’s governance. In 1817 they benefitted from another perk: “those gentlemen of the orchestra who do not receive any pay for their services, shall have the privilege of two tickets of admission on each Club evening.” No such special treatment is mentioned for the regular orchestral members.

In the various studies of musicians in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, such lack of esteem for jobbing musicians is a recurrent theme. Early on in his ground-breaking study, Cyril Ehrlich quotes Samuel Wesley: regretting that his father ever relented and allowed him to become a musician, Wesley described the profession as a “trivial and degrading business to any man of spirit or of any abilities.” Wesley was famously dissatisfied wherever he was; a slightly more detached view— though no more encouraging—is found in Campbell’s London Tradesman, published in 1747:

If a parent cannot make his son a gentlemen, and finds that he has got an Itch of Music, it is much the best way to allot him entirely to that study. The present general taste of music in the gentry may find him better bread than what perhaps the art deserves. ... but I cannot help thinking that any other mechanical trade is much more useful to society than the whole tribe of singers and scrapers.

7. Ibid., 22.
9. Ibid., 8–9.
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And Ehrlich prefaces the entire section on “Making a Living” with these grim words from William Herschel, in a letter to his brother dated 12 April 1761:

It is very well, in your way, when one has a fixed salary, but to take so much for a concert, so much for teaching, and so much for a benefit is what I do not like at all, and rather than go on in that way I would take any opportunity of leaving off music. … Musick ought not to be treated in that mercenary footing. 10

Small wonder, then, that Herschel gave it up and turned to astronomy—though not before writing one catch which appears in the Canterbury collection (The Echo Catch, Appendix E; p. 304).

More importantly for this “collective biography” (Ehrlich’s phrase11) is his characterisation of this period as a “transitional period from rakishness to sobriety.”12 Although the different careers of two of the most successful Canterbury musicians—Thomas Goodban (Junior) and William Henry Longhurst—show that it was possible to establish a professional standing in the city, there is no real evidence here to gainsay the general truth of Ehrlich’s conclusion:

Even if one accepts the unproven proposition that successful musicians in 18th-century England had enjoyed high economic and low social status, the early 19th-century instrumentalists did no more than continue that tradition. They neither achieved, nor perhaps did they seek, embourgeoisment. They ranked, as the learned Dr Maurice had remarked,13 ‘scarcely above an ordinary artisan’. Yet the emerging shape of the new industrial society entailed a class structure in which the status of occupations was clearly defined. Where was the profession of music to fit?14

Both Ehrlich and Deborah Rohr (2001) describe with uncomfortable clarity the process of trying to fit into a shifting, unstable class structure. Musicians, Ehrlich notes, had a particularly difficult time of it:

…lacking firm career lines of accreditation and advancement, … the need to piece together an income from diverse sources imposed a sense of vulnerability which tended to encourage mercenary behaviour, and the increasing influence of market forces required attitudes and skills more common amongst tradesmen than artists. … For those with bourgeois ambitions there was also the matter of social attitude and adjustment. … Few occupations offered so many opportunities to cross frontiers of wealth and class which were closed to most people: entering rich households to play and teach, sometimes mingling with the company or even achieving a degree of intimacy with one’s betters. … Such emigrations were hazardous, for few places are less familiar or welcoming than those occupied by an elevated social group, eager to identify and exclude intruders.15

10. Ibid., 30.
11. Ibid., 2.
12. Ibid., 31.
15. Ibid., 31–32.
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For Rohr, this social uncertainty is compounded by the mentality of musicians, who wished to assert the professionalism of music by reference to those same distinguishing marks which guaranteed the status of the old elite professions—i.e., “their presumed theoretical bases, classical educations, and links with church, state, and university.”¹⁶ She identifies a tension between an ideal of social standing which was based on that of the landed gentry and a business model resembling that of tradesmen: “The uneasy combination of such ideals ... is particularly characteristic of musicians, whose careers often combined both relatively low social and economic conditions with direct dealings with wealthy patrons.”¹⁷ Whilst not exactly what Rohr may have had in mind, the Catch Club Committee’s dealings with the members of the orchestra certainly exhibits something of that class-consciousness.

The result, for Rohr, is a minefield of fluid social attitudes, prejudicial perceptions (relating, for example, to matters of national identity, class, and gender, none of which is a particularly substantive concept), and unflattering assumptions held and made with respect to musicians through which musicians had to navigate with little socio-cultural guidance to hand. It is hardly surprising, then, that at the end of her study, Rohr reaches much the same conclusion as Ehrlich:

The achievement of professional status required a regular affirmation of larger cultural values, and a soothing of underlying anxieties about the stability of the political and social order, which depended in turn on preserving British mores, specifically in relation to gender roles and behaviour. This complex of competing professional and cultural ideals and realities may help to explain the paradox presented by a century of British musical life, in which enthusiastic pursuit of music coexisted with a fragmented, often demoralised, and creatively depressed musical profession. A more confident generation of musicians would emerge only in the later Victorian age.¹⁸

This socio-cultural context needs to be borne in mind in a study of the Catch Club musicians.

The improvement to the Catch Club room noted in Marsh’s account dated 31 December 1783 (see p. 24) mentions “taking the whole of the orchestra into the room for the audience and carrying the orchestra farther back into the yard behind, where it stood upon pillars.” The phrasing is unfortunate, but the impression that the orchestra was regarded as, at best, an unpleasant necessity to be tolerated by a musical club is consistent with other records. In fact, Marsh’s diaries offer an important perspective on the musicians of the Club in the first quarter-century of the Club’s existence, since his

---
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account (apart from some brief newspaper reports) is the only written record of Canterbury’s music-making in those years between its semi-formal foundation in 1779 and the appearance of the Minutes in 1802, when Goodban Senior died.

7.1. John Marsh accounts

As noted earlier, other characters feature in Marsh’s accounts as ancillary characters in his narrative whose worth and significance is directly related to their musical usefulness. In this context, the names which populate his account of his Canterbury years become familiar, and are usually corroborated by Cathedral records, for they are the names of Minor Canons and Lay Clerks.

The world of the Cathedral’s music is the main concern of the next chapter; for now, be it noted that the Cathedral music “Foundation”, as laid down under oft-quoted statute by Henry VIII, provided for six Minor Canons, twelve Lay Clerks (one of whom is paid a little extra to be the Organist) and six “Substitutes” who would swell the ranks of the back row of the Cathedral choir when required. All were chosen for their musical ability. The crucial difference between the Minor Canons and the others was that the former were ordained, which immediately placed them in a higher social stratum. Marsh, however, is only concerned with their musicianship, and calls upon any of them for their company, their singing, or their playing with no apparent social discrimination. So one “Jagger” is introduced as “a very lazy player” of the double bass, though he does have “a very good countertenor voice.”

The Cathedral Treasurers’ Books name John Jagger (Marsh only ever refers to him by his surname) as a Lay Clerk from 1774 until he died in 1809. Other musicians include Israel Gore, Thomas Goodban (Senior), Thomas Saffery, James Shrubsole, and John and Thomas Halsey; Marsh gathers them for the Canterbury subscription concerts, the organisation of which had fallen into his hands, though he notes that only Jagger would venture to sing “some simple songs at this time.”

For the musicologist, there are revealing glimpses of both standards of cathedral music at this period and of performance practice, such as in the following passage with respect to glees:

As to the boys they were so badly taught by Porter, their master, that out of so many it was always difficult to find one or two fit to sing a single song and even the upper part of a glee without another to support him, on which account when we came to try over the glee of Dr Harrington’s for a treble, tenor

and bass [“Gentle Airs”] at the rehearsal, Mr Porter brought three boys to sing the upper part, saying that if they were not enough I might have more, to which I replied that as it was for a glee not a chorus that I wanted them, one or at most two would be sufficient.

Samuel Porter was the Cathedral Organist from 1757 to 1803. He does not emerge with much credit from Marsh’s memoirs. In 1784 he features at a concert held “upon the plan of the old catch club” at the George public house, apparently set up in opposition to the original Catch Club as a response to the poor conditions of Goodban’s room—though that had, apparently, been refurbished. Local politics reared their acrimonious head, and give a glimpse of that struggle for existence to which Ehrlich and Rohr drew attention: Mrs Goodban was Saffrey’s sister, so the George event had to do without the musical services of the Goodban/Saffery clan, since they were by definition in opposition to them. “…But though they were deprived of the Safferys, etc., they had the assistance of Porter the organist and his son, who had it seems been long upon bad terms with Mr Saffery owing to his [Saffery] becoming, by his own industry, a teacher of the harpsichord and thus dividing the business with Porter.” According to Marsh, the appearance of the George concert gave Porter an opportunity to throw in his lot with an alternative musical offering: “On however this new one being set up Mr Porter went immediately to it and played on a little organ they had got up, which afterwards his son Samuel generally played.”

Porter, clearly, was not above petty rivalry, though he is not alone in that regard, according to Marsh; one of the Minor Canons of the Cathedral, Mr Dix, never forgives Marsh the failure to invite him to join a sing-through of a new anthem. However, Porter’s musicianship is also called into question; the organ having recently been rebuilt, Marsh “hinted to Dr Dering [a Prebendary of the Cathedral] of restoring the voluntaries [before the lessons] now they have so fine an instrument, which he said they should like very well had they an organist of discretion, but that not being the case they should be entirely at his mercy and have the service lengthened at his pleasure, which was the reason the voluntary was some time ago abolished, except those preceding a verse anthem.”

Marsh has more to say about Cathedral musicians, but these glimpses of Canterbury’s music-making in his time suggest a world in which amateur and semi-professionals come together in some sort of

22. Ibid., 308.
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effortful harmony: “as to Mr Burnby, he neither played [the cello] in time, tune or had any tone or execution and only therefore added to the apparent strength of the orchestra, in which I therefore allotted him a place in the rear.”

Marsh’s social standing is generally higher than most people he meets in Canterbury, and roughly on a par with the Prebendaries, with whom he dines—though as Howard Irving points out, he “was not able to maintain the lifestyle of a country squire for long because certain expenses exceeded his budget.” His dealings with them are representative of that fluidity of musical relationships Ehrlich and Rohr note, but not all his acquaintances are as socially inclusive in their outlook. When the composer Stephen Paxton comes to visit, an alternative attitude is in evidence: Marsh introduces the young Saffery to Paxton, expecting to find encouragement for a promising violinist, but Paxton, “finding that young Saffery was apprenticed to a carpenter and not bred to the musical profession, seemed to think he had better attend to his proper business.” Marsh’s tone is disappointed, and if he shared anything of the spirit of the Catch Club already witnessed from Mr Welby, who clearly valued the fact that “it was a school for vocal and instrumental practice” (see Appendix C, p. 289), it is not difficult to see why: whatever Marsh’s own social attitudes (and he was as quick as any snob to dismiss “the mob” from consideration), he might be credited with some appreciation of the necessity for a more socially inclusive ethos in provincial music-making.

There is only one other source for contemporary accounts of the Catch Club in its early period.

7.2. Newspaper accounts

Evidence here is somewhat fragmentary, especially in the early years of the Club. Advertisements in 1779 testify to the existence of a subscription series of concerts, but the Club itself goes unnoticed until that performance of 1 September 1781 mentioned above (p. 22) which testifies to the reputation of the

25. Ibid., 299.
28. In January 1785 Marsh went to Dover to witness a balloon flight performed by the French aeronaut Jean-Pierre-Francois Blanchard (1753-1809): “As soon as I got to Dover I put up my horse at the first inn that could take her in and walked up to the castle, where I found it would be more than an hour at least before the balloon would be quite filled. It was however a very pleasant though cold-ish morning and I met many of my neighbours and acquaintances there, the mob being kept out of the territories of the Castle.” - Robins, John Marsh Journals, 337.
“A Trivial and Degrading Business”

Club orchestra.

Illuminating as all this is, no record corroborating the Club’s assertion that it was founded in 1779 has yet come to light, so that must still be taken on trust. Otherwise, the sporadic reports in these early years bear out the account given by Marsh. Specifically, there is a brief announcement in the Kentish Gazette on 27 Dec 1783, of the re-opening of the room after its improvements for the concert Marsh describes as taking place on the last day of the year, quoted above (p. 25):

   CANTERBURY, Dec 27
   Canterbury Catch Club, held at the Prince of Orange, Prince of Orange Lane.
   The members thereof, are respectfully informed that their music room is now completely finished, and will be opened on Wednesday evening next at 7 o’clock. 29

For the next few years, the occasional opening night and the St Cecilia Dinners are the only things which get the attention of the Kentish Gazette. These amount to little more than tantalising glimpses of music-making and feasting:

   Mr Goodban respectfully acquaints the members of the Catch Club, that their Annual Dinner will be held on Thursday, the 22nd Inst., being the anniversary of St Cecilia, at his house in Orange Street. Those gentlemen who it may please to favour him with their company, are requested to give their names as early as possible. 30

This (1787) is the first such account of the St Cecilia dinner, and it sets the tone for those which follow for the next eighty years:

   Yesterday being the anniversary of St Cecilia, the same was celebrated by the members of the Catch Club at the Prince of Orange, in Orange Street, where an exceeding good dinner was provided, and near 70 gentlemen were present for the occasion. The toasts, music, and songs were all conducted with great propriety, and the after-evening was truly spent in harmony, cheerfulness, and festivity. The Anacreontic, The Festive Bowl, and other songs were sung with great applause, and Mr Pope’s celebrated Ode on St Cecilia’s Day, with music by Mr Flackton, of this city, preceded by an Overture, was performed, and gave infinite satisfaction to the company. 31

Flackton’s composition is performed on at least one other occasion, in 1791, “by an excellent band, the vocal parts being in a style perfectly correct.” 32

The local newspapers give occasional useful perspectives on the musicians’ relationship with the

30. Ibid., 6 November 1787, 1.
31. Ibid., 23 November 1787, 4.
32. Ibid., 29 November 1791, 4.
Catch Club, either in its uniformly approving editorial tone or by giving space to a wider variety of views from its correspondents. The picture thereby brought into sharper focus is keenly illustrative of the negotiations described by Rohr and Ehrlich which put musicians in a socio-cultural no-man’s land between a nascent bourgeoisie eager to establish its political credentials and the artisan class to which, as far as that bourgeoisie was concerned, the musicians belonged. Of course, there are times when the papers delight in reporting strife; at these points, they fit Ehrlich’s description (relating to the spat between Herschel and Lindley senior) of “a tattling press which catered to a readership uncommonly diverted by gossip about musicians”. It is worth noting here, however, that the papers seldom show the sympathy articulated by Ehrlich in their accounts of the musicians, whose insecurity of social situation recalls Bourdieu’s maxim: “Art and cultural consumption are predisposed, consciously and deliberately or not, to fulfil a social function of legitimating social differences”. As the Catch Club’s century progresses, this looks more like a process of entrenchment and attrition than legitimation. If the musicians were to survive the skirmishing, Ehrlich notes with some irony, they “required more than musical talents: sensitivity to niceties of social behaviour and confidence to brazen out solecisms, an eye for the main chance, and careful bookkeeping.” These, he argues, were precisely the characteristics of the artisan class musicians would rather leave behind. The next chapter shows that, rather regrettably, in their negotiations with the Catch Club Committee, the musicians needed such worldly pragmatism.

CHAPTER 8:

MUSICIANS AT THE CATCH CLUB

The class divide represented so clearly in the Catch Club print was characterised with some irony by the Revd. Peter Maurice, DD, of New College, Oxford, writing in 1856: “The great barrier to music advancement is ‘the disrespect it meets with from that very class which ought to be best able to appreciate its desserts’”. The relative disregard shown by the membership for the musicians’ exertions in the picture would seem to bear out his judgement. Such aloof control is itself an affirmation of superior social status. This chapter sets out evidence for that assertion.

8.1. The Early Years

Division is first evident, thanks to the newspapers, in 1796. The Kentish Gazette reported on Tuesday 4 October that at an ordinary meeting called only to pass the accounts and choose officers, “several new and extraordinary Propositions were brought forward by the Gentlemen of the Orchestra, aiming, as appears to the Members then present, at the complete overthrow of their usual rights and customs.” The paper notes that a “General Meeting of the Members is therefore particularly requested on Wednesday, October 5, at 7 o’clock in the evening, to take the same into consideration.” The impression here is one of urgent, swift response to a perceived threat: the reference to “rights and customs” seems to touch on matters of power and position, and the alacrity with which the members seem to be expected to muster suggests very strongly that such threats have been ever present. The ensuing reports—in both the Kentish Gazette and Kentish Chronicle—imply that the very existence of the Club was at stake:

At a MEETING of numerous SUBSCRIBERS to the CATCH CLUB, held this 5th Oct. 1796, the following Resolutions were unanimously agreed upon:

Resolved, that the Catch Club is not dissolved.

Resolved, that the Orchestra have acted with great impropriety, viz.

First, in proposing a string of Resolutions to the Society, and then declaring they would not abide by the Majority of Votes.

Second, for declaring the Society dissolved, without the concurrence of the majority of the Members, and

2. Kentish Gazette, 4 October 1796, 4.
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Third, for partially convening a Meeting of a few Members, by printed cards, to sound particular Resolutions on.

Resolved, that it is the duty of the President, to deliver into the Club, an inventory of the Books and Instruments, and every other article belonging to the Society.

Resolved, that the above Resolutions be printed in the Canterbury Papers next Friday.³

As, indeed, they were. It would seem that the question was one of ownership, not only of the various items of property belonging to the Club but, by extension, of the Club itself. The inventory demanded of the President is an assertion of pre-eminence; those who own the material possessions of the Society control it, and this resolution anticipates the decision of 1802 to raise enough money to purchase the instruments and music from the Orchestra as the Club put itself on a more secure footing.

There is no record other than the terse dictats reproduced above as to how the resolution of this dispute was achieved, so the only conclusion to draw is that the members of the orchestra were put firmly in their place. The season most certainly proceeded as usual, and by the time the customary Ladies’ Night is advertised in the Gazette on March 14, 1797, at the end of the season, all seems to have returned to normal—whatever that might mean.

The last mention of the orchestra before the watershed year of 1802 is to be found in a letter to the Editor of the Kentish Gazette, signed “An Observer of Modern Country Manners” and dated January 24, 1799. This correspondent has nothing but praise for “what, by every lover of harmony, ought to be viewed as one of the greatest elements of your ancient city—the Canterbury Catch Club.” It is a dewy-eyed testimony to the Club’s musical and social success: “a company of more than 100 persons, apparently of all ranks of life, seated in groups at various tables, paying the most implicit obedience to the President, and bestowing their applause and attention to as exquisite a concert as ever I witnessed out of the Metropolis.”⁴ As the century turned, the 20-year-old club is credited with high musical standards by this cosmopolitan gentleman.

As noted above, when the Minutes Books begin to give a far more detailed insight into the inner working of the Club in 1802, the first item of business was the raising of subscriptions in order to settle “the present debts incurred by the purchase of the organ, other musical instruments, books, etc., in consequence of which the gentleman of the orchestra, in whom the property is at present vested, do

³. Ibid., 7 October 1796, 4.
⁴. Ibid., 25 January 1799, 4.
agree to transfer their rights in the said property to the members of the club at large.” The possession of an organ says something for the prosperity of the Club, so it may be no coincidence that the organ is the one part of the orchestra which is very clearly identifiable in the print; it may well be the most valuable thing in the picture. It is certainly worth more than the musicians who, with the notable exception of Thomas Goodban, are rarely mentioned by name. Those who form the separate “orchestra committee” are recorded in the Minutes, but otherwise they are mentioned only as a collective, as here in 1814: “the health of Mr Osmond Saffery, Mr Goodban, and the gentlemen of the orchestra was drunk with thanks to them for their promise of their exertions for the ensuing season.”

8.2. Thomas Goodban

In a remarkable departure from that attitude, the Committee decided, in March 1819, to recognise the untiring efforts of the Orchestra’s leader, Thomas Goodban. The full text of the entry in the Minutes Book is given as Appendix F.1, p. 307, and Goodban’s response (also recorded in the Minutes) is Appendix F.2, p. 308. They show that the 34-year-old Thomas Goodban was being given exceptional recognition. The Special Meeting called on March 15, 1819 is in itself some indication of the esteem in which he was held, and the fulsome praise publicly heaped upon him—not to mention the silverware presented, thanks to the subscription, by a grateful membership—would appear to betoken full acceptance into the upper echelons of Canterbury society:

[The Committee] further and more particularly [bring him to the notice of the members generally] in consequence of his disinterestedness, in declining to accept the usual annual compliment for his attention and trouble, at a time (some years since) when the finances of the club were in an involved state; also from a full conviction that but for his most strenuous exertions since he became the head of the Musical Department this Club could not have maintained its pre-eminence if even it could have continued to exist.

Knowing what happened twenty-five years later, when Goodban was summarily dropped from the Committee, this rings hollow. Class attitudes then had hardened to the point where lines needed to be drawn. In 1819, however, a more inclusive spirit—more in tune with the Club’s “Harmony and Unanimity” motto—seems to prevail.

8.2.i. Orchestra management

6. Ibid., 17.
7. Ibid., 28.
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Less than ten years later, a rather different impression is created. Given the Club’s evident desire to regulate itself properly in the early part of the nineteenth century, there may well have been rules for the governance of the orchestra before September 1828, but only at this point do they appear in the Minutes Books. They make rather grim reading:

The Orchestra to assemble at a ¼ before eight o’clock, and the concert to commence at eight precisely; any member of the Orchestra not in his place at five minutes before eight o’clock to be fined one shilling: and if not present at the commencement of the second Overture to forfeit the whole of his pay.

Any Member of the Orchestra absenting himself from the Orchestra, without permission of the Conductor during the Concert, is to be fined one shilling.

Any Member of the Orchestra absenting himself during part, or the whole of the time, required for his attendance at rehearsals, without permission of the Conductor, to forfeit his allowance for such rehearsal.

Any Member of the Orchestra refusing (unless from some indisposition) to take the part assigned him in the performance of any vocal or instrumental piece, during the concert, to be fined one shilling.

All Fines and Penalties incurred by the Orchestra (except forfeitures of pay) to be the property of the Orchestra generally, and to be disposed of at the termination of the Season, as the majority of them shall direct.\(^8\)

The overall impression is of a group of players prone to tardiness (which may on occasion extend to the entire first half of a concert), abrupt departure during a performance, failure to attend some or all of the rehearsals, and/or whimsical refusal to play (or sing, it would seem) an allotted part. All these misdemeanours are subject to fines and, in more extreme cases, forfeiture of fees.

The very existence of the regulations is indicative of a need for them, and this raises quite serious doubts as to the professionalism of the players. Alongside these rules sits further elaboration of the duties of the Librarian (who, since 1813, has been paid 2 guineas per annum for his labour) and it is clear that there is some policing to be done against missing music and the intrusion of “persons not belonging to the Orchestra”.\(^9\) At this stage in their relationship, however, the Committee is quite happy to delegate responsibility for the management of this potentially unruly lot to Thomas Goodban. This was probably a shrewd strategy, for two reasons: as a matter of principle, the committee members may well have wanted to keep their distance from a group of men they regarded as their social inferiors, whilst in terms of purely pragmatic management they may have felt there was a better chance of maintaining stability if the musicians were answerable to one of their own. This put

\(^8\) Ibid., 81.

\(^9\) Ibid.
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Thomas Goodban in a position which must have been particularly difficult for the musicians of a catch club.

8.2.ii. A Transactional Relationship

J. S. Bratton, writing about the Victorian Music Hall, draws attention to the cultural production processes at work in a space in which an entertainer does his or her job. Her characterisation of the music hall as something akin to the Restoration playhouse has resonance for the environment of a catch club: in similar ways, a crowd is gathered in which some distinctions of rank and degree may be blurred in “a constantly shifting audience” whose attention has to be commanded.10 It has become clear, partly thanks to Dickens and partly to Mr Welby, that the President of the Catch Club (or his Deputy) had a role to play in maintaining order, but as far as the performers were concerned, in Bratton’s terms, the fundamental relationship was economic; they were paid to play and sing.

And so the increasing formalisation of the Catch Club sustained and developed a transactional relationship which drew ever-thicker lines of demarcation between the purchasers of the cultural artefact and those whose labour supplied it: between the Club members and the performers. The commercialisation of British society had begun in the eighteenth century. With that had begun the commodification of entertainment as simply another item to be bought and sold and, as Part I discussed, the emerging bourgeoisie was quick to appreciate the social value of aesthetic appreciation:

The increasingly prosperous middle classes eagerly adopted the practices of cultured elite—attending concerts, purchasing instruments and sheet music, and taking private lessons. As one periodical reported in 1821, ‘there are... the strongest proofs that it [Music] is becoming the ornament and the solace of other classes beside the most affluent’.11

The evolution of such a relationship was never going to be easy, but the invasion of such brutally material processes into the Club Room must have been particularly painful for the musicians. Apart from the fact that their collective memory was of a club in which such divisions were forgotten for an evening passed in shared ownership of this cultural experience, they had their own socio-economic realities to face: Catch Club employment once a week for thirty weeks of the year constituted appreciable additional income for a musician whose other employment, in the early nineteenth
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century, would probably have been a manual trade and cathedral singing. The disconnection between a remembered legacy of social inclusivity and the dawning appreciation of economic marginalisation must have been a bitter pill.

For Thomas Goodban, the socio-economic dialectics were probably less pressing than the weekly management of an orchestral body whose disenfranchisement might at any point turn to embittered resentment or even mutiny. The minutiæ of the arrangements he had to make may be inferred from occasional references in the Minutes: in 1823, the Committee ordered “That Mr. Goodban’s bills be paid accounting interest at 5 per cent until discharged,”12 though that allowance of interest was rescinded in a later decision, at the same time as it was ordered “that Mr. Goodban be paid £10 for music and use of the piano.”13 Early the following year, a figure is finally put on the bills of Mr Goodban and Mr Small (whose role in the Club is unclear) when three of the committee members come to the financial aid of the Club—and they do get the interest on their loan: “Messrs Baskerville, Marseille and Ridout to pay off the bills of Mr Goodban and Mr Small, totalling £60, for which they are to receive interest at 5 p.cent.”14 Exactly what services have been rendered to accrue this expenditure is never clearly explained, beyond the annual agreement that Goodban be paid £20 for his services to the Club. It is entirely possible that when he booked musicians, he paid them and reclaimed the money, as for example when it was ordered that he should be “empowered to engage Miss Goldsmith for the concert on Wednesday next at 7s.6d. and that the same terms be offered to Miss Adams.”15 He may have charged some fee for music copying; many of the instrumental part books are in hand-written manuscript. Whatever the detail, the Committee felt able to place a great deal of confidence in Thomas Goodban, and their gratitude is evident “The Committee resolved to keep the present arrangement re. confidence in Mr Goodban conducting the business of the orchestra. Vote of thanks for Mr Goodban’s efficient management of the orchestra.”16

Other tasks are delegated: in 1812 it was “Resolved that the old pianoforte be sold and that Mr Goodban be empowered to purchase another of £20 value”17 (and it is worth noting that this was an

13. Ibid., 48.
17. Ibid., 14.
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item well beyond the financial means of the average household this early in the century, very roughly equivalent to some £1,000 in today’s money. In 1820, Goodban was “empowered to treat with Mr Moss to build a recess for the organ, the sum not to exceed £10.” In 1831, he was even requested “to simplify and revise the club’s rules.” Only occasionally does the Committee make specific musical requests, by which means they venture to suggest both approval and criticism: in 1833 they order Mr Goodban “to engage Mr Knight for the rest of the season, sum not to exceed 7s per night,” but make a particular point later that year that he should “not make any permanent engagement with a female singer”—an injunction whose magisterial dismissal is only surpassed in 1844, when the then conductor of the orchestra, William Longhurst, was directed “that Mr Smith should not sing solos except in cases of emergency.” These entries offer evidence for the point made earlier that women, when hired, were usually paid more highly than the men: in 1839, for example, Mr Goodban was encouraged “to make occasional engagements with Miss Jarrett at 7s. per night.” A Mr Mount (who may well be the musician named in the print) is one of many local musicians who meet with their approval: “Secretary to inform Mr Goodban that the committee will feel obliged by him engaging Mr Mount to play a harp concert[.]” and Mr Henry Palmer, who was later to play such an important part as leader of the orchestra, is courted assiduously from 1840 onwards: the Secretary was ordered to write to him “to request his terms for engagement subject to the orchestral regulations” and, following that, Mr Goodban was “requested to engage Mr. H. Palmer for the season at 10/6 per night.” This was a considerable sum for a single member of the orchestra, as the following table—reproduced from the Minutes Books—shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Violin</th>
<th>Mr Goodban</th>
<th>13.0</th>
<th>Flute</th>
<th>Mr W. Palmer</th>
<th>7.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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The date here, September 1844, is the first point at which the accounts are written out in full (Table 8-1) in the Minutes, when, following the orchestral mutiny described in the next section, the committee took a more direct interest in the management of the orchestra. Of the thirty players listed, almost half are paid only three shillings, and two more only get 2s.6d. A handful of players get four or five shillings; two (including one Mr Longhurst, Lay Clerk and future Organist of Canterbury Cathedral) are paid 6s.; and only the top two first violins, Goodban himself and one Mr Jones (who was almost certainly the Cathedral Organist at the time) get into double figures with 13s. and 10s. respectively. In total—not counting Mr W. Palmer’s 7s.6d., which he declined—the orchestra costs the Club £6.19s.6d. per evening; this equates to £209.5s for a 30-night season, but the Minutes following that calculation record a number of additional arrangements with individual singers and players which make the final tally difficult to calculate: Miss Goldsmith, 5s per night; Mr Nettleton and Mr Pillow, 3s. each, for example, and Mr Reignolds 10s.6d. per night. On top of this, the piano cost the Club £10.10s that year, and quite considerable sums could be paid for visiting artists: that season, an astonishing £4.4s. was paid for a single performance by a Mr Sporle. The following season (1845-46) the orchestra costs the Club £7.11s.6d. per evening: a considerable £196.19s. for the 26 nights envisaged that year. This is

---
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cheaper than the £215.3s. spent in 1837-8 (the only year pre-1844 for which any figure is given in the Minutes).\textsuperscript{31} Finances appear to have been tight in 1845; the committee meeting (8 Sept) at which the sub-committee on the orchestra reported decided to discontinue free tickets of admission to the Ladies’ Room.

The fact that all this makes it possible to put a price tag on the cultural confection which was the Canterbury Catch Club is interesting in itself, but the real point of all the excruciating detail is to emphasise the intricacies of negotiation in which Thomas Goodban was obviously embroiled. As the Committee’s representative to the orchestra, he was required to enforce the regulations created for them and had the power to dismiss any member of the orchestra who refused his direction.\textsuperscript{32} It is the unenviable position of the middle manager, and the view of the socio-cultural collisions at work in the transactional relationship between gentlemen (of the Committee) and players must have been rather clearer from his vantage-point than from that of the musicians; as far as they were concerned, the messenger may have been an entirely appropriate target. That there were sensitivities here is clear from the Minutes which, although tantalisingly short on detail, record enough of the events to build a convincing narrative describing the socio-cultural microcosm which illustrates so clearly the forces at work in the society of the time. Although it post-dates the print by some years, one particular protracted episode and its aftermath serve as a case study of the collisions which occasionally resulted.

8.2.iii. Orchestra Mutiny

Rumblings of unease within the Orchestra briefly appear in 1838. The minutes fail, once again, to tell the story properly, but malicious whisperings had, apparently, reached Thomas Goodban’s ear. Their effect is all too clear, and in the letter he writes, faithfully reproduced in the Minutes, his bitter disappointment is painfully noted:

“Judging from what has occurred in the late committee meetings that the confidence hitherto reposed in me, with regard to the management and direction of the Catch Club is not what it has been, nor what it ought to be to enable me to continue the same with satisfaction to the members, much as I deplore the necessity of coming to the determination under such circumstances, after 30 years faithful and

\begin{flushleft}
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disinterested exertions in the performance of the arduous duties imposed upon me, I beg you will consider this as my resignation.”

Consternation, clearly, reigned. The members of committee were baffled, and abandoned their meeting for a week to allow time for the secretary to seek an explanation, in a puzzled letter written that day: “In consequence of your letter addressed to the Catch Club Committee on the 3rd instant, I am directed by the Committee to request that you will have the goodness to explain the grounds of your supposition, that the confidence hitherto reposed in you by the Committee has been withdrawn, they not being aware that any cause has been given for such a supposition.” Thomas’ reply settled the matter: whatever impression he had been given, he now realises, was erroneous, and he would be glad to resume his duties.

Only seven years later it was to be a very different story. Perhaps the seeds of the eventual parting of the ways may be seen in the most serious crisis to afflict the club in that first half of the nineteenth century, for in 1843 the orchestra reached a point of actual mutiny. The root of the problem was, as usual, financial: however successful the system of subscriptions and fines had been, the Club often had to appeal to the generosity of the members at the close of a season to help it out of its recurring financial difficulties. But in 1843, for the second year running, they seemed on the point of even greater collapse than normal, and the biggest expense they faced at the start of the new season was the employment of the orchestra.

In the previous year the deficit had been mitigated by cutting the pay offered to the players. The members of the orchestra now feared a repetition of this strategy, and in their account they claimed to have discussed this with their conductor before the committee met, and to have proposed an alternative which they thought should prove more attractive to the committee whilst preserving the value of their services: they suggested that they play for three Club evenings free of charge.

The Minutes of the meeting on 28 September do not record the terms of the offer laid before the committee by Thomas Goodban. Unfortunately, this became the crux of the matter, for the orchestra found themselves on the receiving end of a peremptory demand from the committee that they accept
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the terms of a new contract which had not changed from the previous year—i.e., at reduced terms once again:

“The arrangements entered into last year were not made without due consideration: the Committee feels they cannot under the present circumstances make any other offer of engagement for the present season, they therefore request Mr Goodban will immediately confer by letter with the different members of the orchestra and submit their answers to the committee on Monday next.”36

The orchestra, it appears, resented the tone of this communication as much as they did its content; and so the lines were drawn, in a plaintive letter dutifully copied into the Minutes Book (and re-printed in the Kentish Gazette, so desperate were the musicians to have their collective voice fairly heard):

We the undersigned members of the Orchestra having conferred together and reviewed the offer made by us to the committee through the medium of Mr Goodban, resolve (that that offer not having been made without due consideration) not to accept the engagement at the Catch Club on any other terms than those thereon named.

The committee call upon us a second time to pay off the debts of the club. We conceive we have a right to do so in the most creditable way to ourselves; we consider it to be more respectable to give our services for two, three, or four nights gratuitously than to play through a whole season on reduced terms, and why the committee object to this, we are at a loss to imagine seeing it is in favour of the club funds; it likewise appears to us, that the circular received is completely void of gratitude, and even common politeness, as we have never been thanked for the sacrifice made last season, or for the liberal offer made this.

Signed Sept. 30 1843


The resolution to the dispute is unclear. Some facts are recorded: as in 1796, the membership closed ranks against the musicians. A General Meeting of members of the Club was called, and on Wednesday 4 October 1843 the committee was duly empowered “to make such arrangements as may seem most judicious to them.”38 Thus it was that Mr Goodban was dispatched to Dover “to make arrangements with the professional gentlemen in that neighbourhood in order to procure an Orchestra to perform at the Club by Wednesday next” while the President was “requested to wait on the Colonel of the 1st Regiment (or the 41st) to ask his consent to allow the band to perform at the Catch Club on Wednesday next.”39 Meanwhile, a Mr Major was “requested to wait on Mr Sidney

37. Ibid.; Kentish Gazette, 10 October 1843, 3.
39. Ibid., 32.
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Smith and Mr Thomas Jones [the Cathedral Organist at the time] to solicit their assistance in the Orchestra.”  

In the event, the Band of the First Dragoons was engaged to play for the club’s first concert night, 11 October, of the 1843-4 season. This was reported in The Kentish Express as very successfully completed, though there is a hint of a slightly tense atmosphere in which “The whole party appeared to make more than ordinary exertions to please.”  

Later entries in the Minutes Books, over the following few weeks, note the engagement of individual players who seem to have fallen back into line. Whatever the truth of the matter it would appear from newspaper advertisements and reports that there was, by mid-season, an orchestra once again, and at the start of the following season the Kentish Gazette could confidently report “We are happy to state that this year all the differences with the members of the orchestra have been arranged, and there is every promise of a very excellent season.”  

The ramifications of this episode must have been keenly felt, however little is recorded in the Minutes or the papers. One telling comment seems to suggest that the Committee quickly reviewed the position of Thomas Goodban: on October 12 it was resolved that “in future all engagements with the orchestra be made solely by the committee.”  

Letters had appeared in the press: one, sympathetic to the orchestra’s position, raises the most pertinent question at the heart of this matter:

I saw with regret that there was too much irritation in the minds of some of the Committee, and that they would not see that the dispute was ended ... The only difference, after all, is that the orchestra wish to give three services [performances] for the requisite number of nights, to save the sum desired by the Committee, instead of performing for a lower salary per night. Their Time and talents being their stock in trade, they preferred giving away their goods to selling them below their value. What tradesmen would not do likewise?"  

This is perceptive on two counts: the correspondent (who only signs himself “An old Member of the old Club”) has observed the patrician annoyance felt by some members of the Committee, whose tone certainly seems to have been one of lofty arrogance; and he raises the question of the commodified worth of the musicians’ contribution to the Catch Club, accurately identifying the professionalism they seek to protect in negotiating a resolution to the dispute. The following week, one correspondent

40. Ibid.  
41. Kentish Gazette, 10 October 1843, 3.  
42. Ibid., 15 October 1844, 3.  
43. Catch Club Minutes Book 2 (1840-1860), 32.  
44. Kentish Gazette, 17 October 1843, 3.  
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(“A Member of the Club, and a Lover of Harmony and Unanimity”) offers a blunt rebuttal of both the account and the analysis. It is the latter which most clearly articulates the voice of the capitalist free-marketeer, reminding the musicians that they are only worth what anyone is able and willing to pay them:

The commodity which the orchestra deals in, varies in its value according to the state of the club’s funds. Six or seven years ago the orchestra received something like £170 only, in the course of the season. The year before last they had nearly £290. Now that the Exchequer is again in a less prosperous condition, they must, of course, receive a smaller remuneration for their services, and be content to rely, as they have done aforetime, with confidence upon an increase, whenever the funds of the club will allow its committee to indulge their acknowledged spirit of liberality.

More fundamentally still, this writer rejects the principle of collective bargaining—apparently oblivious to any irony, given that the strike had been broken by solidarity on the part of the Club membership and committee. The invocation of the musician’s calling is a particularly piercing sting:

“Combination in trade generally is bad, and combination of the dispensers of harmony, is as derogatory to the profession as it is to the character and interests of the individual.”

The committee had one last insidious weapon to deploy: in what can only be seen as a final punishment to the strike leaders, they ordered, at the end of the 1843-4 season “that gratuities be given by the treasurer to the following members of the orchestra: R. Bridgewater 4s/8d., Mr Shoulbridge 5/3, Mr Gann Senr. 6/-, Mr W Gann 35/- [though this must be a clerical error!], Mr Irons 5/3, Mr Gann Jnr 11/-.” This gesture is very rare in the Club Minute books, and is usually reserved for the waiters at the Christmas dinner. It can be no coincidence that only one of those here named—Irons—had signed the letter of protest quoted above; one can only speculate as to what obsequies he had had to perform to regain such favour.

As a case study of the negotiations for socio-economic status in the early nineteenth century, this unedifying example of the power of the hegemonic elite is surpassed only by the manner in which Thomas Goodban was cast out in 1845.

8.2.iv. The Fall and Rise of Thomas Goodban

Once again, the minutes are muted in their account of the matter. On 15 September 1845, only a week after he had been appointed leader of the orchestra at a salary of £20, Goodban took umbrage at what

45. Ibid., 24 October 1843.
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he felt to be a diminution in his status: “At the commencement of this latter period the privilege of continuing a member of the Committee was denied to me, and by the tenor of the official communication now made to me, it appears that this was but the prelude to depriving me of all the remaining privileges attached to my position in the Orchestra”.\textsuperscript{47} This time, the committee gives him short shrift: an amendment proposed by Mr Hamersham—“that Mr Goodban meets the committee to discuss his letter and make such amendments as may be agreeable to both parties”\textsuperscript{48}—is voted down, and a terse letter acknowledging the receipt of his, “with many thanks for the important services he has rendered the club, during the 40 years he has acted as leader of the Orchestra, and regret that he does not comply with the regulations the committee have thought it their duty to adopt for the interests of the club”\textsuperscript{49} is all Goodban receives in reply. The records make no further mention of him. Carrah Wright deftly recalled the eulogy of 26 years previously when she drily noted: “this time there is no silver salver”.\textsuperscript{50} That reminder encapsulates Thomas Goodban’s dramatic fall from Catch Club poster boy to untouchable pariah, and sets this as a stark example of mid-nineteenth-century class attitudes. Marxist dialectics would describe the tavern-keeper’s son, whose father had been apprenticed to the Catch Club Secretary and Treasurer, William Baskerville,\textsuperscript{51} as collateral damage in the confrontations which form the turbulent undercurrent of that period’s social and political history.

Thomas Goodban does not disappear completely from view; the local papers record his appearance as conductor, singer, and violinist at other local catch and glee clubs, and he features in the roll-call of musicians in other concerts organised by, for example, the Apollonian Glee Club—which flourished in the city for many years alongside the Canterbury Catch Club—and by other leading local musicians such as the man who eventually succeeded him as conductor of the Catch Club Orchestra (and who also became Cathedral Organist), William Henry Longhurst.

He had already been quite entrepreneurial: in 1833, he advertised “Subscription Concerts”—four per season, from December through to March, at a guinea for the lot (for which two tickets of admission per concert are purchased). The one in November 1834 is the most eye-catching, for it features one of

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 49.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{50} Carrah Wright, The Canterbury Catch Club (1779-1865); ‘Harmony and Unanimity’. Unpublished Lecture for The Friends of Canterbury Cathedral (Sept. 2001).
\textsuperscript{51} Dean’s Book 4 (1761-1770), 106.
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the most significant musical personalities of the day—and his wife:

BELRINGHAM’S ASSEMBLY ROOMS, on MONDAY 17th November 1834, to begin
precisely at half past seven o’clock.

Principal Vocal Performer,
MRS H.R. BISHOP,
From the Philharmonic and Ancient Concerts.

Instrumental Solo Performers,
Harp…MR BOCHSA
Who will introduce his admired new Harp Effects, and new Metallic Basses.

Grand Pianoforte…MR C. GOODBAN

Conductor… MR. H.R. BISHOP

The programme looks a lot like a Catch Club evening, each half starting with an overture (Auber’s Fra Diavolo and Romberg’s Don Mendoze) with another as the finale (Mozart’s Figaro) and including songs and arias from the distinguished soloist (Mrs Bishop) and glee. Bochsa’s appearance as soloist, performing his own Grand Fantasia (“introducing the march from Otello, Auld Robin Gray, and the market chorus from Masaniello”) and his Panorama Musciale (“A fantastic sketch, intended to give an idea of the various styles of music, from 1500 to the present time”) should not be ignored; he would have been a big draw. It is a remarkable musical offering, and attracted “nearly 350 of the neighbouring and resident gentry,” according to the local paper.52 These concerts ran as a small series each year, apparently quite successfully, until 1838, after which Charles Goodban (Thomas’ son) is credited with their organisation for a few years more.

8.2.v. Thomas Goodban, Music Educator

There is one more aspect of Goodban’s work which deserves attention here, even though it is understandably ignored in the Catch Club Minutes Books and receives little attention in the press beyond the occasional advert: he was clearly a most active teacher. “Mr Goodban begs to inform his friends and the public that he continues to give instructions on the pianoforte, violin, and singing, by the quarter, or lesson, on reasonable terms. Pianofortes tuned, repaired, and lent on hire. 12, Bridge Street, Canterbury,”54 runs the advert in 1852.

52. Kentish Gazette, 11 November 1834, 3.
53. Ibid., 25 November 1834, 3.
54. Ibid., 13 January 1852, 2.
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There is some remarkable evidence to show for this aspect of his life and work. The most striking dates from 1818: Goodban’s *Game of Musical Characters* is a musical game, played with a teetotum—a dice on a spindle—and counters on a most elaborate board measuring 531mm x 399mm. It is reproduced in much reduced size as Figure 20. To modern eyes, it’s a daunting conflation of Snakes and Ladders™ and the Associated Board Theory exams, with a system of randomly awarded fines and rewards to tempt—or goad—the young musician on. Goodban’s Preface shows an awareness of musical pedagogy which arguably puts him some way ahead of his time: without compromising on the need to understand the semiotics of musical notation, he is responding to a keenly observed appreciation of its challenges:

As the difficulties of adapting a species of entertainment for such a purpose, suited to the capacities and dispositions of all classes, have been anticipated, no pains or exertions have consequently been spared in the arrangement and formation of the game, to combine an amusement with instruction, in the use and application of it; and by the assistance which it is intended to enable learners, imperceptibly, as it were, to afford to each other—to create a spirit of emulation amongst them, without injuring their morals.\(^{55}\)

It’s an attractive product: musical signs and symbols adorn the border, and a couple of merry little rhymes brighten the players’ progress down the board, such as:

If Praise you seek take care of Time
And never from it stray;
By crotchets or by quavers count
In ev’ry Bar you play.

---
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Fig: 8-1: Goodban’s *Game of Musical Characters*

Some 230 subscribers are listed at the front of the booklet. Most are local, but the list includes music and book sellers as far afield as Marlborough, Stockport, Norwich, Newport, and Hull. Beyond this, it is difficult to tell how much success the venture brought him, though one contemporary periodical recommended it: the *Quarterly Musical Magazine and Review* devoted over four pages to an article about it. To be more accurate, the writer takes Goodban’s game as the stimulus for a lengthy discussion (two and a half pages) of current pedagogy, mostly concerned to situate his views in a narrative emphasising stern adherence to the maxim of Horace: “‘Nil sine magno / Vita labore dedit mortalibus’ ['Life grants nothing to us mortals without hard work'] is a maxim as true as it is trite, and indeed a maxim is rarely trite that is not true,”56 he pronounces, coining a trite and true maxim of his own in the process. Marker emphatically laid down, the writer concedes that more innovative strategies designed to increase a child’s attention span may be justified by their efficacy, and having begun his brief essay with an early example of sports science, the writer returns to sport later on, citing it as a means to “accustom the mind to the contemplation of the same object for a longer duration of time without weariness.”57 Still concerned to impress upon the reader that he allows no substitute for hard work, he cautions against any idea “that it can supersede a regular course of study,” but agrees that “it has, however, its uses and its moral uses.” Apart from establishing the anonymous writer’s credentials, this caveat-laden diatribe seems designed to ensure that the opinion about to be handed down on Goodban’s game—which in the writer’s view risks the fate of previous unsuccessful attempts to inculcate knowledge “by rendering the remembrance of the elements of science the means of entering into the amusement”58—is firmly positioned in a rigorous pedagogical perspective which is itself validated by its reference to moral improvement. This is only 1818, but the shades of the Puritan work ethic which was to inform Victorian values so strongly are clearly felt here.

By this time, Thomas Goodban must have been reading with increasing trepidation, but his anxiety was about to be assuaged:

> The game before us has its origin clearly in “The Royal Game of Goose,” which has beguiled some of our youthful hours, and was amongst the earliest causes of our hopes, anxieties, and disappointments. Mr
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Goodban has adopted the principle and a good many of the expedients of this noble invention with success, for the inculcation of the first dry elements of musical instruction.59

Thus the writer places the game itself in a noble lineage before allowing Goodban to speak for himself with a lengthy quotation from the game’s Preface. Final judgement then is swift and almost entirely approving:

In looking over the whole, we see nothing wanting to render this game equal to the objects it professes, and it appears to us eminently calculated to assist schools and families in fixing knowledge previously acquired. We therefore recommend it, and if it be not found useful, we should be disposed to attribute its failure rather to an injudicious employment of its powers than to any defect of its construction. Indeed we have tried its efficacy with success upon a very little girl, whose attention it was exceedingly difficult to fix. A few sugar plums and the delight of victory did wonders. If anything stops its introduction it will be the price. Twelve shillings and sixpence seems to us to be enormously too dear. The inventor will find his advantage, we are persuaded, in making it more easily accessible to numbers.60

There is no evidence that Goodban did this, though the game had a successor. Much later, in 1845, he produced another game-based method of music instruction: a set of music cards. He admits in the Preface that he had made an attempt at this twenty years previously, “but becoming perplexed in the formation of the cards so as to make them sufficiently simple for general application, it was then abandoned and the manuscript laid by. A recent discovery of this manuscript has, however, induced [me] to make a fresh attempt.” The component parts comprise 4 diagrams, and 48 cards (four sets of twelve) showing notes, rests, and rhythm values, which can be used in various ways in any of the seven games he’s devised. The game was advertised in the local press:

NOVELTY IN MUSIC
Just Published a PACK of FIFTY-TWO MUSIC CARDS and BOOK containing a concise explanation of the rudiments and fundamental principles of the Science of Music, with Rules and Directions for Playing, from characters only, the following instructive and entertaining Games, viz.: …

Written, invented and designed for the purpose of combining instruction with amusement by
THOMAS GOODBAN
Author of a complete Guide to playing the Violin, Instructions for the Pianoforte, the Rudiments of Music, with progressive Exercises to be written upon Slates, &c.61

59. Ibid., 476.
60. Ibid., 478.
61. Kentish Gazette, 9 December 1845, 2.
And the advertisement goes on to explain that the pack, in its box, costs 5s. and is available from various booksellers. Similar adverts are to be found in the Spectator and the Athenaeum. The only actual review found to date is a few approving words from the Kentish Gazette appearing alongside the advert: “exceedingly clever and altogether original … we recommend the “music cards” to every family,” say the editors, after which nothing more comes to light until the Musical Times mentioned the game in its obituary in 1863, along with fulsome praise for Goodban’s work in musical education:

As an author Mr. Goodban was formerly well known to the musical world by his instruction books for the violin and pianoforte, and his “Rudiments of Music,” than which no other works of the kind have ever been more extensively used, for at the time they were published (some forty years since) there were none to equal them in attractiveness, clearness of explanation, and adaptability to the powers of the young. He also invented a “Musical Game” for teaching the elements of the art in an amusing form, and “Musical Cards” for imparting knowledge of the theory of music in the same manner, which have been much used and approved of. Many of his pupils, especially his sons, have risen to high position in the profession, and owe much of their success in life to his kind encouragement and discriminating judgement. We may also add that for integrity, uprightness of character, and kindliness of disposition, no man was ever held in higher estimation by his fellow citizens and all who knew him than Mr Goodban.

There are other nineteenth-century examples of creative attempts at music education in the British
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Library, but Goodban’s may lay claim to be amongst the most attractive and rigorous examples of such work.

In between the Game and the Cards, as the *Musical Times* records, Goodban had been most industrious. The title page of the Music Cards booklet claims him to be the “Author of a complete guide to playing the violin; instructions for the pianoforte; the rudiments of music, with progressive exercises to be written upon slates; etc.” This is true; copies are in the British Library. In 1840, a second edition of the Piano tutor, with an additional “variety of exercises for forming the hands, acquiring independence and facility of action, and contracting and changing them, &c., &c.”, meets with an enthusiastic reception from the home crowd: the Kentish Gazette recommends it as tending “more than any perceptive book we have ever seen, to perfect the student in the rudiments of the science.”

The last published contribution to music education by Thomas Goodban appeared in the *Musical Times and Singing Class Circular* in 1853. Entitled *Round on the Diatonic Scale*, it’s a clever little three-part treatment which wraps two extra lines around the tonic sol-fa scale, first ascending then descending, even managing to insert some chromaticism (b. 10) and a couple of suspensions (bb. 5 & 6, lower part) into the music. The advice offered is clearly more interested in rhyme than in sense—what exactly might be meant by “the voice suppress” is not clear—but as a simple teaching piece, it is charming. In print for the first time since 1853, it is reproduced as Example 8-1.

Thomas Goodban sang in the cathedral choir as a Lay Clerk from 1808 to 1824, and no reason is recorded in the Cathedral records for his departure. A reasonable assumption is that his work as a music educator was providing a good living. On the evidence above, it’s not surprising. The material may seem rather earnest to modern eyes, and as densely written as most prose of its day, but it shows a keen awareness of the need to engage the attention of young people, is thorough-going, and is clearly deeply committed to the education of the next generation of musicians. In this respect, it belongs to that humane, liberal tradition which is the best of British education. As part of the broader narrative of the aspirational professionalism of musicians in this period—and of music education—Thomas Goodban may deserve more attention than he has had thus far.

---

64. *Kentish Gazette*, 6 October 1840, 3.
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Round
On the Diatonic Scale

[Musical Times]

Thomas Goodban

Example 8-1: Goodban: *Round on the Diatonic Scale*

Meanwhile, the Catch Club continued to sing the song he composed specially for them, with no apparent embarrassment. And perhaps, by the end of his life, Goodban himself had got over the hurt he must have felt at his treatment in 1845: the gift of the silver bowl, with salver and spoon, is the first
thing mentioned in his will.
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Goodban has become a case study in this thesis, standing for the kind of musician who spent his professional life between cathedral and more secular music-making. It seems appropriate to let him have the last word. Below is a letter whose gentle humour and quiet diplomacy still sounds authentic at a distance of almost two centuries. Goodban pours oil on troubled waters after some intemperate language from one of his orchestral players—they were still his, in 1843—caused offence:

To the Editor of the Kentish Gazette

Sir,—I was not aware, until referred to your Notice to Correspondents in last Tuesday’s Gazette, that any member of the Orchestra had misconducted himself at the Catch Club in the manner there represented, and, as all were concerned in a charge so general, I have felt it my duty, as Leader and Conductor, to make enquiries into the subject; and am sorry to acknowledge that there were just grounds for the complaint. But as the offender has expressed his regret to me that he should, under excited feelings for a petty annoyance to which he was at the time subjected, have unguardedly made use of improper language, and promises that it shall never occur again, I trust that your correspondent, and the ladies particularly, will consider the exclamation he made use of as a slip of the tongue and not as emanating from the heart, for after hearing him sing a few evenings previously with so much feeling and apparent sincerity his love for Fanny Green, I must confess that I think he has too much regard for the fair sex to intentionally give offence to any of them.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Thomas Goodban.
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Canterbury, March 3, 1843.66

8.3. William Henry Longhurst

Longhurst is the other significant figure in any study of Canterbury music in this period. The print of 1826 does not show him, but the concert records make reference to his relatives, so he may be briefly shoehorned in to this discussion here. A young “Master Longhurst” performed five times in the 1825-26 season, singing songs such as Fly Away Dove by John Whitaker (1776-1847), The Marriage Act by Sidney Waller (dates unknown, and he merits no mention in either Sainsbury’s Dictionary of Musicians of 1827, Stratton’s 1897 Biographies, or the 1st edition of Grove, 1890), and Fanny was in the Grove by Thomas Moore (1779-1852). That young man was probably John Longhurst, elder brother of William Henry (1819-1904). Moreover, a “Miss Longhurst” performed for the Club no fewer than 36 times in the course of the 1825-6 season which is the focus of this study. Herbert H. Nelson, writing WHL’s biography for The Precentor in 1903-4, just a few months before WHL died, mentions only one female relative: an older sister who, like their brother John, was “in the profession” and gave the young William Henry “his first lessons” in music.67 Although Nelson notes that WHL was “the youngest of a family of eight” and that the father was an organ-builder, no other musical members of the family are mentioned, so it seems safe to presume that the Miss Longhurst in the concert records is the same older sister. Of the 109 performers named in the concert records that season, her 36 solo appearances far outstrip the popularity of any others: the nearest rivals are Mr Beckwith (15) and Mr Tilley (11). Such popularity makes her omission from the print a particularly pointed decision.

WHL’s career, in brief, spans the heyday of the Canterbury Catch Club and very visibly straddles the musical worlds of cathedral and city. He spent his entire working life, from the age of nine to that of seventy-nine, in the service of the Cathedral as chorister, Lay Clerk, Assistant Organist and, from 1873, Organist, and played a major role in the music-making of the city, becoming conductor of the Catch Club Orchestra in 1848 and promoting innumerable concerts of his own all his life. In 1828, however, at the age of six, precociously talented as he undoubtedly was, it was probably his older brother who graced the Catch Club concerts; Nelson notes that when the family moved to Canterbury in 1821, his elder brother, John, “possessed a fine treble voice, and was well known in London as a singer, he

66. Kentish Gazette, 7 March 1843, 3.
being the celebrated “Master Longhurst” who sang in all Bishop’s operas at Covent Garden—so Bishop’s celebrity appearance in Goodban’s concert of 1834, mentioned above (p. 100), must have given an opportunity for an enjoyable reunion. John Longhurst and their unnamed sister thus provide the 1826 connection with William Henry, whose first appearance in the Catch Club Minutes Books only occurs nearly twenty years later, in 1843, as one of the signatories to the mutinous letter quoted above (p. 96).

8.4. A Collective Conclusion

Apart from the Longhursts and Goodban, precious little is known about the other musicians in the print. Before 1826, the only mention of players’ names in the Minutes Books is to be found in 1802, when the Club is newly re-constituted and busily putting its affairs in order, and those players who form the Orchestra Committee are named: “Osmond Saffery, John Jager, Shrubsole, Burgess, Marseille, Fowler, Goodban, Baskerville, Loop, James Saffery, Rob Jager, Marrable, Cullen, C. Lepine.” Notwithstanding the absence of most Christian names, it seems safe to say that four of them—John Jager, James Shrubsole, William Loop, and Charles Lepine—were Cathedral Lay Clerks at the time.

Of their daily existences practically nothing is known. Ehrlich and Rohr make frequent allusion to this problem: “The typical family of musicians engaged in activities which were humdrum and little noticed. We therefore have scant records: few lineages; usually only a shared name, with the occasional individual emerging momentarily from obscurity.” In the writing of prosopography, therefore, the voices of the patrons—in this case, Catch Club and Cathedral—accrue undue prominence; no personal accounts of the kind discussed by Howard Irving (see above, p. 83) survive for any Canterbury musician. Indeed, all that is left of Longhurst and Goodban are their music and their wills. Records are all but silent on the other four members of the orchestra identified in the print, apart from the names Lepine and Mount: Lepine was a member before 1825-6 and one Mr R.M. Mount was elected that year. Absolutely nothing has come to light regarding Mr Harrison, and Mr Welby can only be related—with a high degree of certainty—to the description of the Catch Club quoted in Part I.

68. Ibid.
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And so it is only as a collective that this account of the musicians at the Catch Club can be drawn to a conclusion. Individuals’ names appear more frequently in the Minutes after 1845, when the Committee has to field the disgruntled requests from the players for an increase in fee every season; some take on extra duties such as Librarian, Check [sic.] Taker, and Attendant to the Ladies’ Room, at a small additional remuneration. The Committee’s judgements are patrician and peremptory as they grapple with thorny questions such as where the orchestra should sit when not playing (answer: at an unwanted table by the door of the Ladies’ Room71), whether they should applaud other performers from their positions in the orchestra (no, they shouldn’t72), or whether a member of the Orchestra should be allowed to be a member of the Club (again, no73), they demonstrate with painful clarity that little had changed in two hundred years of social, cultural and economic negotiation. In the main, the players are seen as little more than that amorphous group playing, largely unnoticed, at the back of the print. Christopher Marsh, writing of musicians in the early modern period, puts it succinctly:

Musicians have always found it difficult to establish reputations for respectability. They seem to enjoy themselves for a living, and they keep unusual hours. Their product is difficult to police and slippery in meaning. … They seem evasive and they attract suspicion.74

The later, more fulsome records of the Club show little amelioration of the relations between committee and musicians. As the thunderous financial clouds gather around the Club in the early 1860s, William Henry Longhurst (by then the Orchestra’s Conductor) is loftily “summoned to attend” a meeting to discuss how the Orchestra’s costs might be reduced.75 Fines are imposed, disputed, and upheld, as in the Secretary’s letter to Longhurst following the committee meeting on 6 February 1860:

Mr Nicholson in the course of his statement mentioned that he had long considered the rule as regarded these fines a dead letter, as he had on several occasions taken engagements within the limits of 7 miles and had never been fined. The Committee desire me to say that this infringement of the Rule has been entirely unknown to them and to request that you [Longhurst] will in future invariably enforce the Fine whenever the Rule shall be infringed.76

There is concern about performance quality: even as some members are asked to perform a variety of roles (Mr Manning is engaged “to play trombone, sing duets and glee and to act as Librarian” in

72. Catch Club Minutes Book 1 (1802-1840), 129; Catch Club Minutes Book 2 (1840-1860), 12.
73. Catch Club Minutes Book 1 (1802-1840), 120.
75. Catch Club Minutes Book 3 (1860-1865), 37.
76. Catch Club Minutes Book 2 (1840-1860), 171.
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September 1860\textsuperscript{77} the Committee make their reservations known with regard to other musicians: “The Committee wish to suggest to Mr Longhurst that he avail himself of the services of Messrs Eastes and Manning in singing as seldom as he can find it convenient.”\textsuperscript{78}

It has to be conceded that the musicians’ professionalism seems to have been questionable. Apart from the somewhat cavalier attitude demonstrated by Mr Nicholson in his objection to the fines, above, some behaviour necessitates a stern response from the Committee which Mr Longhurst is required to communicate:

It having been stated by a member of the Committee that some members of the Orchestra had attended the concerts in a state of intoxication and unfit to perform their duties the Secretary was directed to inform Mr Longhurst that in each case the pay of such should be stopped and in the event of its again occurring that the Librarian be directed to return such members as absent.\textsuperscript{79}

In the same way, Longhurst was requested “to intimate to the Members of the Orchestra they do not address their friends in the Lady’s [sic.] seats during the concert.”\textsuperscript{80} Nevertheless, some resolutions seem unnecessarily draconian: in September 1861, Newsome, Eastes, Plant and Rhodes decline to accept an engagement without an increase in salary. The Committee resolves that Eastes should be offered no more, whilst the other three get an extra one shilling per night, “upon this condition, that whenever they are absent from a concert (except through illness) they shall be fined one night’s salary, as well as losing the salary for the night they are absent.”\textsuperscript{81} Clearly, the Committee is anxious to retain its control over the musicians.

Against a backdrop of tortuous negotiations about the rooms in which the Club might or might not meet, along with the clarity of hindsight which shows that the enormous fees being offered to visiting ‘stars’ could never be sustained and that both the musicians and the members were becoming increasingly decrepit, it is all too easy to see the signs and portents of the Club’s demise. But Christopher Marsh sounds a cautionary note: “Our ears are drawn to discord,” he notes, “and its extent is probably exaggerated by the nature of the surviving sources.”\textsuperscript{82} Whilst it is disappointing to have to record the failings of Canterbury’s past musicians, a wider perspective makes it clear that

\textsuperscript{77.} Catch Club Minutes Book 3 (1860-1865), 8.
\textsuperscript{78.} Ibid., 11.
\textsuperscript{79.} Ibid., 12.
\textsuperscript{80.} Ibid., 11.
\textsuperscript{81.} Ibid., 17.
\textsuperscript{82.} Christopher Marsh, Music and Society in Early Modern England, 105.
successive generations of these musicians had served the Club for as long as their energies and talents permitted, at the heart of eighty-four years’ worth of music-making, in thirty weekly concerts per annual season. The surviving records emphasise the discordant notes, but the magnitude of that achievement would suggest that harmony and unanimity prevailed, at least for most of the time.

The Catch Club print shows the membership and musicians enclosed in a rigid box. Walled in, hatches metaphorically battened against society at large, the men within the room have created their own microcosm of social, political and economic relationships which, to an extent, recall and reflect the wider world from which they have entered. There is one significant institution, however, which even the Catch Club had to acknowledge when it drew up the revised rules for the orchestra in 1847. Rule 2 says:

The vocal performers and accompanyists [sic] to attend rehearsals of Glees, Duets, &c., on the Wednesday Afternoon at 4 o’clock precisely; anyone, (unless detained at the Cathedral, or prevented by illness,) who shall not be present by a quarter after four, or leaving before the Rehearsal is terminated without consent of the accompanyist, to be fined Six Pence; and if absent during the whole time of Rehearsal, to be fined One Shilling.83

In 1802, when the “orchestra committee” was formed, four of the fourteen members were Lay Clerks in the Cathedral Choir. In the last orchestra list in the Minutes Books, for the 1856-7 season, nine of the cathedral’s twelve gentlemen singers were playing and/or singing for the Catch Club, including the then organist, Thomas Jones, and his Assistant Organist, William Henry Longhurst, whose task of calling fellow musicians to order when the need arose cannot have been made any easier when they were colleagues in the Cathedral.84 The Minutes list the names of the musicians for the twelve years preceding that season, and it is consistently the case that most of the Lay Clerks are supplementing their incomes with work for the Club. So it seems safe to say that some, at least, of the players in the orchestra at the back of the 1826 print had only just divested themselves of their choir robes after that Wednesday’s Evensong to attend their duties at the Prince of Orange. No discussion of the musicians at the back of the print would be complete without an understanding of the working conditions of the Canterbury Cathedral Lay Clerks at that time.

83. Catch Club Minutes Book 2 (1840-1860), 64.
84. Ibid., 140.
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Fig: 9-1: Artist Unknown: Title Page for Henry Ward’s Canterbury Guide (1843)

It is a five-minute walk from the Prince of Orange to the Canterbury Christ Church Gate—the entrance
to the Cathedral—an image of which featured strikingly in Henry Ward’s *Canterbury Guide* of 1843.¹

As far as the Cathedral Lay Clerks would have been concerned, this is heading the wrong way: ever since Thomas Goodban (Senior) created for himself a most admirable work/life balance by combining tavern-keeping with his Cathedral singing, the direction in which he and his fellow Lay Clerks would have travelled after any Evensong—especially on a Catch Club night—would have been westwards, down Sun Street and Prince of Orange Street, to the pub. In this respect, they would have been conforming to a set of expectations with respect to cathedral singers which had held sway for a very long time; for centuries, such men had been renowned more for their bawdy singing, accompanied by excessive drinking, than for their work in the cathedral. In part, this chapter seeks to interrogate that stereotype.

Having paid such close attention to the pay of the Catch Club musicians, it would be appropriate to start with a consideration of exactly what material rewards Canterbury Cathedral offered its singing men.

### 9.1. Lay Clerks’ Pay and Conditions

In 1826, the Lay Clerks (gentlemen singers) at Canterbury Cathedral were—and still are—employed as members of the Cathedral Foundation, laid down by statute under Henry VIII when the new Cathedral was re-constituted following the dissolution of the old monastery in 1541. Thus was created the staffing levels of the cathedral which survived the following three hundred years, negotiating the vicissitudes of Tudor and Jacobite reigns, civil war, Commonwealth, Restoration, Glorious Revolution, and Hanoverian rule. If that disposal of three centuries of history seems dismissive it is because, for the cathedral, nothing much changed between 1541 and 1840, despite the cataclysmic interruption of the Commonwealth. One reason for this remarkable stability—which has a direct bearing on the position of Lay Clerks in 1825-6—is the fact that the Cathedral’s statutes, originally handed down by Henry VIII, created an entity which enjoyed a great deal of independence by royal decree which could, it transpired, be re-launched in 1660 under the patronage of Charles II to sail magisterially into the next century and beyond.

#### 9.1.i. Statutes

---
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The statutes, counter-intuitively, become more important, not less, as the centuries roll by, partly as a response to those vicissitudes mentioned above. In brief, they provided for a governing body consisting of thirteen ordained men: a Dean and twelve Prebendaries. Patrick Collinson summarises the remainder of the staffing provision as follows:

The royal charter creating what Cranmer called the ‘new establishment’ of Christ Church, Canterbury, was sealed on 8 April 1541. The financial basis of the monastic foundation was substantially preserved, and permitted the erection of the elaborate superstructure defined in detail [my italics] in the accompanying statutes and handsomely remunerated. … [This] included six preachers, twelve minor canons (later reduced to six and the savings used to secure two cornett players and two sackbutters), a full musical establishment of lay clerks and choristers, and a variety of lesser functionaries, down to the two porters who were to double up as barbers, and the school.²

The devil, as usual, turns out to have been in that “detail” to which Collinson refers. In 1848, it fell to a Canterbury notary, Charles Sandys, to grapple with it when he was charged with preparing a Memorial to present to Parliament in support of the Lay Clerks’ pay claim. Sandys’ work is invaluable here, for he clarifies exactly how the statutes fared in the centuries following Henry and Cranmer: with scrupulous annotation, he shows that Henry’s statutes, “made and delivered, but not indented,” were declared void by Mary and again by Elizabeth, both of whom arrogated powers to themselves—although he notes that “these powers were never exercised”. They were superseded by statutes handed down by Charles I, “without any Parliamentary sanction to support them.” Their status was finally settled by an Act under Anne which declared that “In Cathedral churches founded by Hen VIII, such statutes as have been used since the restoration of K. Car. II [Charles II], and to the observance whereof the Dean and Prebendaries are sworn: shall be good, and adjudged to be the statutes of the said churches.”³

By this point in his fastidious narrative, Sandys has noted the financial resource base preserved from the monastic foundation. Henry VIII specified the vast amount of land to be given to the new foundation:

“We give and grant to the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral and Metropolitical Church of Christ, Canterbury, all the Manors, &c., in our County of Kent, and the Manors in the counties of Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk, Bucks, Surrey, Sussex, Oxford, and Devon, &c., &c.
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To have, hold, and enjoy, all and singular, the aforesaid Manors, Lands, Rectors, Portions, &c., &c. to the aforesaid Dean and Chapter and their successors for ever."

From the rents paid to the Dean and Chapter by their tenants, the cathedral was able to dispense handsome stipends to the Dean and Prebendaries, and rather less handsome ones to everyone else. In fact, as Collinson notes, the Dean and Chapter received far more than their salaries, taking dividends from all the ‘fines’—capital sums paid in return for the long-term leasehold of property by tenants. Other expenses revealed in Sandys’ researches include salaries ‘if there be a common table in the public hall, [for] one caterer, two Butlers, one Cook, one Under–Cook.’ In addition,

\[\text{…every Minor Canon and Head Grammar Master shall receive four yards of cloth for his gown, the price of each yard five shillings. The Master of the Choristers shall receive for his clothes three yards of cloth, the price of the yard five shillings. Each Lay Clerk and the Under Grammar Master shall receive for his clothes three yards of cloth, the price of the yard four shillings and sixpence.}\]

This is class distinction made material in both figurative and literal senses. Finally, as one might expect from the precision of the above stipulations, the salaries of all were laid down in 1541. Lay Clerks were to receive £4.5s.10d per annum. In return for this they were to sing twice a day, every day throughout the year, at the morning and evening services (Matins and Evensong) of the Church of England.

9.1.ii. Pay, Pensions, Penalties, and a Parliamentary Petition

It never was a great deal of money for obligations which made it difficult to take on other work. For the Lay Clerks, for centuries before 1826, some form of trade had usually been a necessary addition to their income, leading S.S. Wesley to remark exasperatedly in the middle of the nineteenth century that "the constant vibration of the lay clerk between his shop and his cathedral, as at present, is productive of serious results; rendering him, but too often, a tradesman amongst singers, and a singer amongst tradesmen." The very few clues in the Canterbury records—consisting mostly of dismissive references in the Deans’ Books to the trades to which ex-choristers were consigned when voices had broken, or newspaper references to parents’ occupations when their offspring marry—bear out this somewhat impressionistic view. In that respect, little changed in 300 years. For the Canterbury Lay

4. Ibid., 13.
5. Ibid., 16.
6. Ibid., 25.
Clerks, however, salaries had risen slightly by 1848. As Sandys notes, whilst hammering home the concern about musical standards which prompted Wesley’s famous polemic the following year:

... if the cathedral choral service be not efficiently maintained, or be suffered to fall into desuetude, the Cathedrals themselves will speedily degenerate into mere parochial churches. ... To prevent so lamentable a catastrophe, the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury have, from time to time, increased the stipends of the “Clerici Laici”; and your Memorialists have been informed that, in the year 1770, their annual stipend was £25; afterwards £30; and, in 1810, was raised to £40.8

In fact, this simplifies things. A record in the Deans’ Book for 1846 makes it clear that the Dean and Chapter still felt hidebound by the statutes as they assert “that in the future all Lay Clerks be informed on their admission that their suitable stipend is £4.5s.10d.”9 However, other records make reference to what becomes a ramshackle collection of discretionary payments and “augmentations”, and stipulate various salaries at times: as noted below (Table 9-1), in 1826, it was agreed “that in consideration of the attention & creditable performance of their duties as Lay Clerks of this Cathedral an increase of £20 per annum to their present stipends be granted to Messrs. Elvey & Dobson,”10 and Thomas Dyson and George Eastes were sworn and admitted Lay Clerks” at £50 a year in 1848 when most of the others were earning £40.11 The result is a page of the Treasurer’s Book for the financial year 1848-9 which gives this list of payments to Lay Clerks and Organist:

Table 9-1: Payments to Lay Clerks and Organist, 1848-912

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christmas Quarter</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Jones, Organist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halsey</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempton £10, do.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irons</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denne</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longhurst £10, do.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching £2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon, Probationer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Ibid., 37.
11. Ibid., 371.
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Other payments, such as fifteen shillings to Eastes for (unspecified) music and £4.3s. to Kempton for copying some more, are also included. Meanwhile, pay is obviously used as both incentive and threat. Apart from the occasional gratuities noted above, in 1830 it was “resolved that £10 a year each be given during pleasure to Shoubridge & Longhurst Lay Clerks” for some unspecified commendable performance. Finally, it should be noted that apart from odd jobs such as music copying, a Lay Clerk might supplement his cathedral salary with another post: Stephen Elvey, Thomas Jones, and Castle Kempton were appointed to teach the Choristers in swift succession (Kempton “in one of the rooms in the old Registry appropriated as a school for them,” until he finally retired as a Lay Clerk in 1855); Joseph Plant, another Lay Clerk, took over from Kempton for the next thirty years.

The statutes made no provision for a pension. Lay Clerks, like the ordained clergy, had a job for life if they were appointed to the cathedral choir—which must have been one of the main attractions, offsetting the onerous requirement that they sing twice a day every day of the year. In practice, they didn’t anyway; the Precentors’ Books have been recording absences since the Restoration, and they make it clear that attendance was consistently poor. Of the twelve Lay Clerks and six Minor Canons expected to sing the daily offices, it is rare to find them all present—noted with a surprised “All well” on those few occasions. In 1810, in response to one of the several requests for an increase in salary, the Dean and Chapter took an inventory of the previous year’s absences. Their tally was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr Burgess had been absent in all</th>
<th>48 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shrubsole</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loup</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halsey</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillow</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Ibid.
14. Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 111.
15. Ibid., 120.
In response to which, “five guineas each was given to Mr Burgess, Shrubsole, and Halsey for their regular attendance.” Such recognition was unusual, as was any assiduous application of whatever penalties—i.e., fines—which might notionally be levied in cases of absence:

Then it was resolved that the order of Chapter respecting the fines of Lay Clerks made at the November audit in the year 1775 should be strictly enforced, namely “That when there shall be fewer than six lay clerks at church each of the absent ones shall be fined sixpence of course by the Precentor, and that this order shall be placed in the minor canons vestry.

It is likewise agreed that the money arising from these fines shall be brought by our Precentor to our general chapter in order that it may be disposed of by the Dean and chapter among those Lay Clerks who by their attendance have deserved consideration.

Despite the draconian tone the Lay Clerks did, on this occasion, get a salary increase:

Resolved also that £10 per annum be added to the stipend of each Lay Clerk, but whenever they shall be absent from Divine Service (except in cases of sickness) they should pay for each absence a fine of three pence beyond the fine to which they are liable by the above order, and that these fines also shall be disposed of in the manner above directed.

Reasons for absence are never recorded, so the historian can only ever surmise as to whether it was illness, general age and/or decrepitude, family matters, or other professional engagements in whatever role which compromised their attendance. Other evidence occasionally sheds some light: in 1802, Thomas Goodban (Senior)’s absence is recorded for two weeks continuously, up to and including the Matins after he had died; illness, clearly, had been the reason there, since he was only 50 years of age.

9.1.iii. A brief digression on dismissal

Dismissal was, of course, the ultimate sanction at the Chapter’s disposal, and it was deployed on occasion. It was rare. To take a very long view for a moment: of the 195 men who sang in the choir from 1694-1900, only nine Lay Clerks were dismissed, though a tenth man seems to have jumped
before he was pushed. They are as follows:
Musicians in the Cathedral

Table 9-3: Lay Clerks dismissed 1695-1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reason(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Blogg</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>“…living with Mary Morris as his wife and having a child by her, and being addicted to cursing, swearing, and obscene talking, was presented and complained of to the Archdeacon’s Court, 1718. The facts were proved and as follows: That he has shuffled and given different places of his marriage. This proved by 5 witnesses. That he is very much addicted to cursing, swearing and filthy talking. Proved by 8 witnesses. That he has had a child by the said Mary. Proved by 3 witnesses. That he has boasted of his lewdness. Proved by 7 witnesses. That he owned he had thrice lain with a whore in Christ Church Canterbury [i.e., the Cathedral Precincts]. Proved by Mr Thomas Bevertan.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel Gore</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>“Vacated” his place in 1784, but John Marsh gives the impression that he resigned before he was sacked: “Mr Gore who (in consequence of an intrigue [of] which the Chapter thought proper to take notice) was going to leave Canterbury and go into the choir at Windsor.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jones</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>“no further occasion for his Services”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah Carter</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>“on account of his continued neglect of duty”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Marsh</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>“immoral conduct and neglect of duty”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Newington</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>“continued absence”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Dean’s Book, Vol. 6 (1777-1792); GB-CA: CCA-DCc-DB/6, 110.
24. NB: not to be confused with the Organist, Thomas Evance Jones.
25. Dean’s Book 7 (1793-1822), 239.
26. Ibid., 255.
27. Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 22.
28. Ibid., 162.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Shoubridge</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>“misconduct”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lyon</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>“inefficient in the choir”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Newsome</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>“immoral character,” but helped on his way to Yorkshire with £5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Higgins</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>“repeated acts of drunkenness”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has to be admitted that the first singing man on this list, Charles Blogg, is the most outstanding example of a thoroughly atrocious character to have appeared thus far in any cathedral records, anywhere in the country, at any point in cathedral history. Philip Barrett, in *Barchester: English Cathedral Life in the Nineteenth Century*, gives an impressive overview of reprehensible Lay Clerks, and although he includes various examples of bad behaviour, they all pale into insignificance next to

---

29. William Shoubridge had only lasted a year in the choir before this dismissal. His appearances in the local press are noteworthy: in 1836 he writes a letter in the Kentish Express addressed to Mr Cooper, Surgeon, to “add my name to the list of those who have derived the greatest benefit from your Electuary for piles. When I was a Lay Clerk of Canterbury Cathedral, I was severely afflicted with that disorder, and often prevented attending to the duties of my office.” After thirteen years of suffering, Mr Cooper’s remedy offered him “immediate ease”, he assures us (*Kentish Gazette*, 11 October 1836, 1). His death many years later in strange circumstances was reported in the *Canterbury Journal*, *Kentish Times and Farmers’ Gazette* of April 1, 1871: “Some of our musical friends in Canterbury will recollect Mr William Shoubridge [brother of James, according to this report] who was a Lay Clerk of our Cathedral, and who used to be very effective in the alto parts of glee at the Catch Club and Apollonian Club, in the “good old days of the Clubs.” He had been for many years lately residing in the neighbourhood of Tunbridge [sic] and met with his death, at the age of 70 years, in the way thus narrated.” The report goes on to explain that at about 10.00 p.m. on the night of 17 March Shoubridge “wandered off the path onto the road” and was knocked over by a horse and cart “going at a moderate rate, certainly not a fast trot,” according to witnesses. “The front part of the horse struck him and knocked him on his face,” says the report, which goes on to note the dismissal of the charge of causing death by furious driving brought against Edwin Wells, the carter. The inquest later recorded a verdict of accidental death. The newspaper report ends with another “painful circumstance in connection with the Shoubridge family ... A very promising young man, the son of Mr James Shoubridge ... who will be recollected as one of our leading Canterbury professors of music for many years, and who is now a Lay Vicar of St Paul’s and of the Temple Church, died last week.” (*Canterbury Journal*, *Kentish Times and Farmers’ Gazette*, 1 April 1871, 2).
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Charles Blogg. That conceded, it is a pity that this one man so badly blots Canterbury’s copybook; overall, this relatively short litany of regrettable lapses in professional behaviour shows a modest dismissal rate of only 5% in almost two centuries.

Of any lower-level misbehaviour which may have given the Dean and Chapter cause for concern, there is very little mention. Occasionally, exasperation surfaces in the Deans’ Books—in 1770, “The Lay Clerks were summoned before the Chapter, and admonished by the Dean for neglect of duty”—but such outbursts are rare in the extreme, and the Lay Clerks seem to take whatever admonition and approbation comes their way with compliant deference.

This background of relative stability and calm puts the Lay Clerks’ pay claims in a certain perspective. The records relating to Canterbury—many of which now reside in the Church of England Records Office—are a remarkable archive, revealing a number of requests for pay rises in the nineteenth century, so it is clear the men were painfully aware that, despite their best efforts, their salaries were

35. It should be recorded to the Dean and Chapter’s credit that they showed a deal of Christian charity towards this man: they gave him an opportunity to redeem himself by suspending him “till he had purged himself of the crimes alleged against him, or until further order” (Dean’s Book 2, 1). Only later did they feel constrained to impose the dismissal above, but with this caveat: “upon his suggesting that he has appealed from the Archdeacon’s court to the Arches [the Archbishops’ court, the highest ecclesiastical court in the land] where he doubts not but he shall clear his character, we do at his petition defer filling his place to the next Chapter” (Dean’s Book 2, 19). At the hearing quoted above he was given the opportunity to speak; the Deans’ Book can take up the story: “The said Blogg being assigned to plead in his own justification, gave in a plea, wherein he never pretended to prove his marriage; but only alleged that he is reputed to be an orderly person, and that the women who were laid to his charge have been gone away some years ago. [One is reminded of Christopher Marlowe’s eponymous Jew of Malta, Barabas, admitting the charges of his accusers: Friar Barnardine splutters “Thou hast committed...” and Barabas spares him the embarrassment: “—Fornication,” he replies, “But that was in another country, / And besides, the wench is dead.” (Marlowe, Jew of Malta, Act IV, Sc. 1). For both Blogg and Barabas, such justification lacks conviction.] Upon this, the court pronounced against him, deprived him of his parish clerkship, gave him penance as for fornication, and condemned him in costs. He appealed to the [Court of] arches where (not offering to plead his marriage) he had no relief, but the sentence given against him in Canterbury was confirmed” (Dean’s Book 2, 22). The D&C duly replaced him as Lay Clerk with another singing man. With impressive self-confidence, Blogg then petitioned the Chapter: “That your petitioner on his sincere repentance, being received again into the communion of the church, doth with the same unfeigned contrition and in all humility implore your pardon and forgiveness of his many offences and misdemeanours he was guilty of whilst a member of the choir and doth beseech you in compassion and charity to his wife and children (in the most destitute and afflicted condition) to admit him into a singing man’s place now void, as a probationer for a year, and if his future conduct and deportment shall not be answerable to his duty and hearty humiliation, will justly deserve to be rejected as the vilest of men” (Dean’s Book 2, 30). The Chapter’s patience, however, was clearly exhausted: at the November Chapter meeting, 1720 “A petition of Charles Blogg lately expelled from the place of Lay Clerk in this church was read and rejected” (Dean’s Book 2, 49). They did not, however, visit the sins of the father on any relatives: other Bloggs appear in the records. One William Blogg, whose period of service suggests he could have been Charles’ younger brother, was a chorister in the early 1690s, became a Substitute in 1701 and then a Lay Clerk in 1716 until his death in 1758, and his son—another Charles—was a chorister in the 1720s.

36. Dean’s Book, Vol. 5 (1770-1776); GB-CA: CCA-DCc-DB/5, 4.
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not keeping up with the “the great depreciation in the value of money”, as Sandys puts it in the Memorial. By the late 1840s—the point at which they employ Sandys to formulate their claim—their arguments are fuelled by resentment at the inequalities between clerical and lay terms of employment, and by a perception that the seismic change being forced upon cathedrals at this period by the recently formed Ecclesiastical Commission meant that the Cathedral’s wages bill was being massively reduced as Prebendal “stalls” were “suppressed” and incomes re-distributed. In a long-running saga beyond the scope of this thesis, these arguments—which at one point resorted to the Parliamentary petition, fruitlessly—were to resurface several times throughout the nineteenth century.

9.1.iv. Lay Clerks and Minor Canons: Class Distinction in Statute and Pay

Although the Dean and Chapter frequently expressed grave concerns about attendance, the Lay Clerks were by no means the only offenders: the clergy were, notoriously, absent in droves from the daily Offices. Arguably the worst abuse in cathedrals at this time was that of “pluralities”—the practice by which Deans and Prebendaries held multiple posts in different dioceses and cathedrals. One of the most spectacular examples is that of Richard Bagot—appointed Dean of Canterbury in 1827, he also became Bishop of Oxford in 1829 and held both posts until 1845—but throughout the period under discussion here, virtually all Cathedral clergy took the emoluments associated with other benefices and paid subordinate clergy to be the resident curate (the word is derived from the ‘cure’, or care, of souls) in their place. Most of these livings were local parishes, but by no means all. In 1832, according to the Cathedral’s responses to the Archbishop’s Visitation Articles of Enquiry, the other posts held by the cathedral staff were as follows:

---

38. Archbishops’ Visitations were always preceded by a set of written questions to which the Cathedral clergy were required to submit written replies. They follow a pattern, enquiring about cathedral governance, other offices held by Deans and Prebendaries, the keeping of residences, the character and integrity of Minor Canons and Lay Clerks and their attendance, the frequency of the celebration of the Eucharist (and attendance thereat on the part of Minor Canons and Lay Clerks, as a measure of their piety), the assiduity of preaching, the care and education of Scholars and Choristers (notable differences between which form the subject of a later brief study), and the upkeep of the building. The answers, across the centuries, vary little.
Table 9-4: Additional posts held by Prebendaries and Minor Canons, Canterbury Cathedral, 1832

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prebendaries</th>
<th>Posts held</th>
<th>Miles from Canterbury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Levett Sutton</td>
<td>Prebendal Stall, Collegiate Church of St Peter, City of Westminster</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rector, High Halden, Kent</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicar, St Peter, Isle of Thanet</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Reeve</td>
<td>Perpetual Curate, Maidstone</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry John Todd</td>
<td>Rector of Letterington, York</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerrard Thomas Andrewes</td>
<td>Rector of all Hallows and St John the Evangelist, London</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerkship in Orders, St James, City of Westminster</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Eden</td>
<td>Rector of Harbledown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicar, Bequesbourne, Kent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hamilton</td>
<td>Vicar (with a portion of the Great Tythes), St Stephens, Hackington</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rector, Stapleford Abbots, Essex</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Canons</th>
<th>Posts held</th>
<th>Miles from Canterbury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Bennett</td>
<td>Vicar, Milton near Sittingbourne, Kent</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Metcalfe</td>
<td>Vicar, Stone, Isle of Oxney, Kent</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Parry Mariott</td>
<td>Prebendal Stall, Oshaldwick, Cathedral Church of York</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rector, Hayeleigh, Essex</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicar, Eynesford, Kent</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Stratton</td>
<td>Vicar, Halstow, Kent</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Rouch</td>
<td>Rector, St George the Martyr with St Mary Magdalen, Cby</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Spencer Harris Braham</td>
<td>Vicar, Willesborough, Kent</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However near or far the other responsibilities, this situation gave rise to ludicrous consequences, as John Marsh had noted in 1787:

On Tuesday the 16th our landlord Doctor Storer [one of the Prebendaries of Canterbury Cathedral] came to us to stay a month and keep his residence [i.e., fulfil his statutory attendance at daily office] which he set about immediately, being obliged by the statutes to attend the service of the cathedral once a day for 21 days in succession [Marsh’s italics], of which should he miss any one, he would have the whole to go over again. He therefore took care to live very temperately and abstemiously, and to only water gruel for his supper during that time lest a fit of the gout should happen to come on and confine him to his room…. Owing to the rigidity of this statute it had now and then happened that on a Prebendary’s being taken ill a few days before the end of his residence he had been carried into the choir in a sedan
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chair and sat down there during the service as the only means of preventing his having to set about his 21 days residence afresh.\textsuperscript{40}

Marsh had already noted that this requirement was in fact a rather more stringent version of the statutory regulations concerning Prebendaries’ residences. It had been discussed at dinner the previous year, and the passage is worth quoting in full for two reasons: it offers a glimpse of cathedral life which shows that Trollope, fictionalising this world some eighty years later in the \textit{Barchester Chronicles}, had his finger firmly on the pulse of ecclesiastical politics, and it makes Marsh’s sympathies clear as he notes the disparity of status and obligation between Prebendary and Minor Canon. The discussion is prompted by an Archbishop’s “Visitation”—the occasion on which the Archbishop attends in person to perform an examination and review of the Cathedral’s governance.

At this visitation [1786] the Archbishop made an alteration in the mode of residence of the Prebendaries, who by the statutes were enjoined before they could receive their yearly emoluments to certify that they had attended the service at the cathedral for at least 21 days in immediate succession, but the time of the year being left open they generally used to come 4 or 5 together at each of the 2 yearly audits, when they made one journey to receive their cash (which they spent perhaps in some distant county) and keep their residence so that at these particular times there were therefore generally half the 12 Prebendaries in residence and all the rest of the year only those in office such as the Vice Dean, Treasurer etc., (which were annual ones) except perhaps a single residency who might mostly live at Canterbury or might accidentally pass a month or two at his prebendal house there. The alteration now therefore made by the Archbishop was that each of the 12 Prebendaries should in future take a separate calendar month for his residence (without regard to the time of the audits) so that besides those in office, there should at all times be at least one Prebendary in residence. This matter having been known sometime before the visitation I remember it was discussed at Dr Lynch’s when I dined there last, on which one of the company observed that some of the Prebendaries would find this new regulation to be a great inconvenience and that he should not be surprised if Dr Buckworth (\textit{who as well as two or three others lived in Lincolnshire} [my italics]) should resign his Prebend; to which Dr Lucas dryly replied, he did not think that; he had never heard of a Prebendary of Canterbury resigning [Marsh’s italics]….unless by way of exchange for something better still. In the same conversation, in speaking of the salaries of the different offices of the cathedral it was observed by Dr Lynch that the low salary of £40 a year for the Vice Dean, who was to reside nine months in the year, whilst the Dean’s (who was only required to reside three months) was £600 must have been owing to a mistake in framing the statute, as he that did most duty ought certainly, he said, to be paid best. I however could have observed that by a parity of reasoning the Minor Canons ought to change salaries with the Prebendaries who were only required to keep a month’s residence (and this thought much of) whilst the former were liable to be called to account for every day in the year that they missed attending service…\textsuperscript{41}

Marsh’s scornful aside (“and this thought much of”) makes him less of a participant and more of an observer of the world of Deans and Prebends; he is more at home in the company of the Minor Canons. This group of men—educated and ordained, but on a lower level of the cathedral hierarchy—

\textsuperscript{40} Brian Robins, \textit{John Marsh Journals}, 394.
\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Ibid.}, 378–79.
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has now appeared several times in this chronicle, and needs a moment’s further attention.

As noted above, the re-constitution of the Cathedral under Henry VIII in 1541 provided for a Dean, twelve Canons (Prebendaries), six Preachers, six Minor Canons, twelve Lay Clerks, ten Choristers, and six Substitutes—men who were to stand in for either Minor Canons or Lay Clerks if absent. The crucial difference between Minor Canons and Lay Clerks was that the former were ordained, and that suggested a level of education which belonged to a higher social stratum than that from which the Lay Clerks were normally drawn. In various ways, the Statutes make this distinction clear—those fine gradations of cloth given to the staff for their gowns, for example (p. 117), encode the subtle distinctions of the hierarchy. More obviously, the Minor Canons were paid more from the start: under Henry VIII’s Statues, as quoted by Sandys, the Minor Canons were paid £5.2s., while the Lay Clerks got £4.5s.10d.42 By 1830, however, the Treasurers’ Books make it clear that although the basic pay of both groups had increased so that Minor Canons received £18.6s.8d. per annum as against the Lay Clerks’ £40, the pay gap had widened considerably by dint of two strategies favouring the Minor Canons: their salaries were “augmented” by additional payments totalling £47.3s.6d. per annum; and they had, by then, also been awarded the sum originally allocated for Substitutes, who had gradually fallen out of use in the years since the early 1720s when John Gostling had been awarded one of the Substitutes’ salaries in addition to that of a Minor Canon43—presumably to tempt him from London, though his duties to the King still occasionally necessitated his absence from Canterbury.44 By 1728, three Minor Canons were benefitting from the additional allowance (Gostling, Devereaux and Cumberland45) and the practice was established. By 1830, this netted the Minor Canons an additional £14.10s. per annum—a total of £80.0s.2d.; double a Lay Clerk’s salary.46 This alone calls into question the integrity of the Dean and Chapter as they plead the sanctity of cathedral statute in their resistance to requests for Lay Clerks pay rises throughout the nineteenth century.

In the context of the process of embourgeoisement at work in the nineteenth century, it’s worth pausing to look back and see how far the Minor Canons had come. In 1560, Archbishop Parker had

43. Answers to Archbishop’s Visitation Articles of Enquiry, 1724. GB-Llp: VG 5/3
44. Answers to Archbishop’s Visitation Articles of Enquiry, 1720. GB-Llp: VG 5/2
45. Answers to Archbishop’s Visitation Articles of Enquiry, 1728. GB-Llp: VG 5/4
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enquired as to the character and reputation of cathedral staff in his Articles of Visitation:

You shall enquire of ... the above named members, officers and ministers of this your said church; whether you know or suspect any of them, to obtain his room or living by money, or unlawful covenant, gift or reward... whether any of them be known, or suspected to be a swearer, an adulterer, a fornicator, or suspected for any other uncleanness. Whether any of them do use any suspect house, or suspected company of any such faults, any tavern, alehouse, or tippling houses, at any inconvenient season. Whether any of them be suspected to be a drunkard, a dicer or carder, a brawler, fighter, quareller, or unquiet person; a carrier of tales, a backbiter, slanderer, batemaker, or any other ways breaker of charity or unity, or cause of unquietness by any means.47

It is a revealing passage, listing as it does, in remarkable detail, the potential misdemeanours of cathedral staff—and, once again, the need for such an inquisition is in itself indicative of their prevalence. The expectation seems to be that ordained clergy were as susceptible to the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil as their lay colleagues. Parker’s questions are repeated in some form or other at every visitation over the next three centuries, and they apply to everyone, but at this stage in the cathedral’s history it is interesting to note that there was no discrimination made between ordained and lay staff in such matters.

Less than a century after Parker, it seemed that the archbishops’ concerns were justified, and cathedrals had paid the price: they were certainly the most visible objects of Puritan wrath, as statues were smashed, windows shattered, and music burned. The most infamous Canterbury figure from that period is Richard Culmer, one of the Six Preachers who, in the topsy-turvy period of the Commonwealth, ruled the ravaged cathedral. His Cathedrall Newes from Canterbury of 1644 is memorable for his description of a Puritan (probably Culmer himself) “Rattling down Becket’s glassy bones” in an orgy of stained glass destruction, but the Minor Canons were the subject of some of his most withering scorn. Most of Cathedrall Newes is a catalogue of the Cathedral’s misdeeds, but in one relatively neglected passage, Culmer focuses on this particular group of musicians:

The Cathedrall Prelates to maintaine their Quire Consort, doe get their Singingmen into the Ministry, and provide them Benefices with Cures of soules in divers Parishes, in, and about the said Citie, they being many of them onely reading-Priests, as Mr. &c. late Weaver, now reading-Priest, and Parson of St. Mary Bredman, and Peticanon of that Cathedrall, Mr. &c. late Tobacco pipe-maker, and reprieved from the Gallowes [my italics], now reading-Priest and Parson of St. Martins, and Peticanon of that Cathedrall. Mr. &c. late Taylor, Servingman and Butler to the Deane of that Cathedrall, now reading-Priest and Curate of St. Mary Bredin, and also of St. Mary Magdalen, and Peticanon of that Cathedrall. Mr. &c. late Serving-

47. John Strype, The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, the First Archbishop of Canterbury in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (1711), 73.
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man, now reading-Priest, and Curate of St. Johns, and Parson sine cura, and Peticanon of that Cathedrall.⁴⁸

His accusation—that the Minor Canons were disreputable men, cloaked by means of ordination and various parish benefices with a veneer of respectability to enable them to sing in the cathedral choir—is of a piece with the corruption against which the Puritans level their fury, but the allegation that one man had been saved from the gallows for the sake of his singing is one of the more extreme examples.

Culmer’s evidence is hardly impartial, but even if the testimony is more impressionistic than factual, the evolution from such a reputation to the status enjoyed by the Minor Canons in the early nineteenth century is quite a remarkable achievement of respectability. To be fair, they had to earn it: in 1810 the Minor Canon John Marsh had hated, Dr Dix, had died, and the Deans’ Books record the careful audition process for a replacement:

Four gentlemen offered themselves.
The Revd. Mr Spencer
The Revd. Mr Down
The Revd. Mr Metcalfe - from Ely
The Revd. Thos. Bennett from Westminster, who had offered himself twice before.
They performed the service of the church in order, viz.
On Monday morning June 25 Mr Spencer sang the Te Deum, Jubilate, and anthem, and Mr Bennett chanted the Service.
On Monday afternoon Mr Down chanted the Service and Mr Metcalf sang the anthem.
On Tuesday morn – Mr Down sang the Te Deum, Mr Metcalf chanted the Service, Mr J Bennett sang the Anthem.
On Tuesday Evening Mr Spencer chanted the Service & Mr Down sang the Anthem.
On Wednesday Morning June 27 Mr T. Bennett was elected Minor Canon, took the Oaths, & was admitted.⁴⁹

This emphasis on their ability not only to “chant” the service—which may simply be a matter of intoning mostly on one note—but to be able to hold a part in settings of canticles and anthems suggests very strongly that the Minor Canons formed part of the regular back row of altos, tenors and basses—which is in accord with Marsh’s use of them to sing through his pieces. The implications for questions of balance between the parts, given the resulting preponderance of men’s voices and an

⁴⁹. Dean’s Book 7 (1793-1822), 157.
SATB ratio of 10:6:6:6, is an interesting glimpse of sacred performance practice in this period.

9.2. On Choristers

Brief mention should be made of this small group of singers, if only because some of them turned into the Lay Clerks introduced below. Brief mention is all they usually get; they are certainly generally neglected—taken on, expected to sing, taught a little, and disposed of—throughout the Deans’ Books of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries. But slightly greater attention is paid as time goes by, which may be partially attributed to more enlightened attitudes pervading the Cathedral Precincts. For this, however, the Chapter deserves little credit; the extent to which choristers’ treatment improved in the 1800s would almost certainly have been less noticeable were it not for the untiring efforts of Maria Hackett, ‘The Choirboy’s Friend’, who campaigned for decades for improvement in the conditions in which they were kept, and especially for improvement in their education. In 1827, she published A Brief Account of Cathedral and Collegiate Schools; with an Abstract of the Statutes and Endowments. Page vii of that book gives a “Comparative View of the number and present state of the Endowed Choristers educated in the different cathedral and collegiate schools”, in which Canterbury does not emerge with any particular credit: in common with another 8 of the 40 institutions examined, Canterbury choristers are taught reading, writing and arithmetic. By contrast, 16 other places offer the choristers a “classical education” either at the cathedral school or another nearby. Later in her account, having recorded the relevant statutes, Hackett makes this observation about the Canterbury provision:

    The Archiepiscopal Cathedral is one among the few instances where a Royal Grammar School subsists, under the patronage of the Dean and Chapter, from which the young members of their choir are entirely excluded. …

    It does not appear that the Choral School of Canterbury has hitherto produced any person of distinguishing eminence.50

Hackett’s tone is one of slight disappointment and perplexity, as if she expected better of Canterbury. She goes on to give information which is not corroborated in the Deans’ Books: “The Choristers are taught singing three times a week in the Church, where there is a musical school-room; and learn reading, writing, and arithmetic at private schools, at the expense of the church. The latter is a new regulation since the year 1812, and for which they are indebted to the present Dean and Chapter.” This does not tally with the attention paid in the Deans’ Books to the appointments of Elvey, Jones,

50. Maria Hackett, A Brief Account of Cathedral and Collegiate Schools (London: J. B. Nicholls, 1827), 12.
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Kempton and Plant to the post of “Master or Teacher of the Choristers” in the course of the nineteenth century. Whatever the shortcomings of her research, the Dean and Chapter would have cited, as they always did, the Statutes, which draw a clear distinction between the provision of a school for 50 scholars and the education of the choristers. And so, as Rohr notes in relation to “some of the provincial cathedrals”, Canterbury chorister work “became merely a benign form of child labour that could also provide rudimentary education.”\(^\text{51}\) To be sure, some choristers’ names reappear later as Kings Scholars, but they are the exception rather than the rule in this period. Thus, regrettably, did the cathedral perpetuate the low socio-economic expectations of its musicians.

For one early cohort of choristers, the response had been a brief foray into crime. In 1756, five choristers were brought before the Dean and Chapter:

> Choristers of this church were complained of to the late Vice Dean and such Prebendaries as were then residing here, who then summoned them to appear before them and found them guilty of stealing lead from the church, and other high crimes which they confessed to be true: and whereas the said boys were this day summoned before the Dean and Chapter and confessed they had been guilty of the offences charged against them, we decree they all shall be forthwith expelled from the several offices in this church, & receive no profits from hence from 27 July last.\(^\text{52}\)

By the standards of modern-day cold cases, this one is locked beneath arctic ice, so who might have put them up to all this can never be known. They do seem to have been a particularly bad lot that year; earlier in 1757 another chorister had already been expelled “for frequent misbehaviour in time of divine service and many other gross misdemeanours.”\(^\text{53}\) Once again, however, attention may be drawn to such misbehaviour when in fact it seems to have been the astonishing exception in a group of children characterised by mute obedience in the face of deadening servitude. There is no reason to believe that the life of a Canterbury chorister would have been any more exciting than that of one just up the road in Rochester: Barrett records how James Field, accompanying Charles Dickens there, noted “how sleepy and inane were the faces of many of the singers” and described the cathedral services as “a sickening monotony of repetition”.\(^\text{54}\) To their credit, though, the Canterbury choristers occasionally show a bit of spark: with a charming lack of embarrassment, John Marsh records his disappointment at the want of enthusiasm they showed for his compositions when the boys voted

\[\text{51. Deborah Rohr, } The\ Careers\ of\ British\ Musicians,\ 66.\]
\[\text{52. Dean’s Book 3 (1742-1761), 115.}\]
\[\text{53. Ibid., 108.}\]
\[\text{54. Philip Barrett, } Barchester:\ English\ Cathedral\ Life\ in\ the\ Nineteenth\ Century,\ 164.\]
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with their fleet feet at the prospect of an extra rehearsal:

On the Thursday following I went to the 4th private concert at Canterbury; and on the next morning intended having another rehearsal of my anthem [O Praise God], for which the gentlemen of the choir were so good as to stop, but not having got Mr Porter to order the boys to stay the instant they saw me (as they came out of the choir after service) away they all ran and were out of sight before anyone could come near them.55

The class distinction attendant upon King’s School Scholarship already noted in relation to the aspirations of the Catch Club membership surfaces explicitly in the Deans’ Books later in the century: in 1865, the future of the Chorister School is under discussion:

The subject of the future education of the Choristers was brought under notice by the Dean in consequence of the dismissal of the Grammar master Mr Fellowes at the Special Chapter held the 17th day of July last. The Dean stated three plans which he had considered having taken counsel with the Precentor and also with the Headmaster of the Kings School.

The first of these which contemplated the incorporation of the Choristers into the Kings School appeared open to serious objection. 1st because there was fear lest the prosperity of the Kings School might be affected by such incorporation. 2nd because it may be doubted whether an education based like that given in the Kings School on the Classics is the proper one for our Choristers generally. 3rd Because the necessary attendance of the Choristers at Church, at musical lessons, and practice would materially interfere with their obtaining a worthy share of such education.56

The first betrays an anxiety to preserve the elitist nature of the Kings School; the third is a feeble excuse. The second is the clearest statement of social engineering one might find in the unedifying history of nineteenth-century British education.

Confronted with such depressing evidence, one might ask why men and boys—often related, as Lay Clerks set their sons to choristership—toiled so thanklessly, for so long, in cathedral choirs up and down the country. The answer was on the local and national doorstep: in the country at large, where boys were concerned, there was little or no educational opportunity available to an artisan family. As Alan Mould notes:

“Henry Brougham, in introducing his abortive Education Bill to Parliament in 1820, estimated that only one child in fifteen in England underwent any form of schooling. The charity school movement initiated by the SPCK about 1700 was in decline before 1800: the Church of England’s National Schools did not begin to be operative until 1811. Hence a choristership that offered even vestigial education and an annual wage was, for a tradesmen parent, a straw to be clutched at.”57

In Canterbury, the Cathedral Treasurers’ Books strike an even more chilling note. Here, the poverty in the world beyond the Cathedral Precincts is all too clearly in evidence, which was probably one of the reasons the Cathedral employed a Constable to patrol them. For over a century after the Restoration there is copious evidence of vagrancy and destitution in the “Eleemosynary” (charity) payments made to those who came begging at the gate tucked away in the street of Northgate, on the western edge of the Precincts, dedicated to this purpose. Each donation is scrupulously recorded, and it is a litany of human misery: shattered soldiers,90 diseased widows and orphans,90 men broken by injury,69 and victims of piracy61 are sent away with sixpence or a shilling. In the same Treasurers’ Books, the organ blower is given sixpence every time he catches a rat. Employment for life in the care of the Dean and Chapter, however meanly treated, offered some insurance against such destitution; small wonder, then, that those generations of men and boys clung on to their singing work while they could. True, by the early nineteenth century, this charitable activity had declined to a much smaller number of donations, and the socio-economic environment which gave rise to it had, for most of the country, changed for ever as the industrial revolution worked its seismic transformation; but the stability of cathedral employment in 1826 remains a startling exception to the norm beyond the Precincts, and certainly represents a preferable alternative to anything British society generally had to offer for boys aged seven to fourteen.

Some of their experience might even have been enjoyable. It has become clear that cathedral choristership in Canterbury almost certainly included experience of the Catch Club, and there is no reason to suppose that this was exceptional for a cathedral city in eighteenth and nineteenth century Britain. As noted below, Sir George Elvey’s first recorded performance was as a ten-year-old treble singing the traditional Irish ballad Kate Kearney, at the Canterbury Catch Club evening on Wednesday 29 March 1826, and it may be safely assumed that this was a not infrequent feature of the Catch Club concerts. The passage in Henry Palmer’s The Gypsies discussed in Chapter 10 (see Appendix I.3, p. 355)

58. “To 3 lame soouldiers that had but 3 legs between them”: Treasurer’s Book, Vol. 10 (1673–74); GB–CA: CCA-DCc-TB10, 40v.
61. “To a hansom youth about 15; had his tongue cut out, as by his signes I understand he had been a slave in Turkey”: Treasurer’s Book 10 (1673–74), 39.
is the strongest piece of evidence in the actual music for the appearance of trebles in a Catch Club evening. Cathedral choristership may not have offered much of an education, but the musical experience that came with it could be eclectic.

9.3. Cathedral Music in 1826

By contrast, the cathedral repertoire in this period merited no such approving remark. Nor could standards of performance in cathedral choirs receive the praise so often lavished upon a Catch Club performance by visitors and local press. In books, journals and periodicals across the nation in this period there were howls of dismay about the state of Cathedral music which combine a dewy-eyed profession of nostalgic love for one of England’s (it is, usually, ‘England’s’) cultural glories with a regretful dismissal of the men labouring in these forgotten vineyards (resort to metaphor is infectious) as beings who, given their lowly social origins and meagre stipends, cannot be expected to achieve the technical and expressive standards of bygone generations. This sort of thing—a letter to QMMR almost exactly contemporaneous with the 1826 print—is typical:

The nature of the appointment of vicars choral, whether ordained or laical, as they are constituted for life, at first sight might be supposed naturally to issue in supineness, and that this is the case we have continual examples; but as a discretionary and castigatory power is vested in the Dean and Chapter to admonish, and having fruitlessly admonished to reject, on them alone lies the blame of the decay of church music, and to them alone must be imputed the slovenly manner in which it is too often performed.

Another cause of the [declining standards of church music] is the liberty conceded to the organist of instructing people on the Cathedral organ, and for the sake of his own ease deputing this raw and unfledged musician to perform the duty, whether in staccato or correct style; the consequence is, that the services must be accommodated to his progress in the science, and the more beautiful anthems selected from Handel, Haydn, Graun, or Pergolesi be entirely omitted. This originates in the beggarly salary given to the organist, who cannot afford his time for the compensation. …the devotion and elevation of soul which this music is calculated to induce thus degenerate, into that which is irreverent and ludicrous.62

“Moysikos”, as the correspondent signs himself (using the Greek alphabet), fastens his claim firmly to the pillars of antiquity by way of validation: “Our liturgical system of choral harmony is the grand point of difference between orthodoxy and schism: history, pregnant in fact, proves it, and the daily examples verify and attest the veracious and fatidical voice of past ages on the subject.”63 Taking up the epic tone, another correspondent launches into his diatribe with “The state of church music among

---

63. Ibid., 328.
us at present is most lamentable. As was asserted in your last, the throne of music was wont to be in the house of God, but now, alas! how fallen! We may write upon it, Ichabod, the glory is departed.\textsuperscript{64}

Confronted with such polemic, it may be helpful to separate opinion from fact. That last correspondent quantifies the problem, pointing out—with a justification which is familiar from the Canterbury chronicles—that the pay of a cathedral musician has not risen since the original statutes fixed it; he asks how they might be expected to afford any further training or achieve any respectable recognition from this position. “What wonder,” he insists, “that the singers are frequently taken from the lowest order of society? What wonder that they unite some handicraft business with their profession, in order to eke out a scanty subsistence?” The solution, he argues, is for the Chapters “to fix the salary at the same proportion to their own, at which it was originally settled.”\textsuperscript{65}

That would certainly have satisfied the Lay Clerks of Canterbury. There is a limit, however, to what an anonymous correspondent (writing under another Greek pseudonym) can achieve, especially when he simply leaves it to the Deans and Chapters “to give the subject a serious consideration.”\textsuperscript{66} The evidence from Canterbury is that they did so, occasionally, but changed very little.

Few authorities, then or now, would disagree that cathedral music had fallen into desuetude, nor with the diagnosis: a lack of funds allocated by cathedral governing bodies (Deans and Chapters) to attract good-quality musicians resulting in low standards of musicianship; minimal financial reward for the composition of church music, leading to a paucity of repertoire, exacerbated by the few pieces actually circulating in print; and the resulting tedious reliance on a small repertoire available to cathedral choirs in their hand-copied part-books.

9.3.i. Catalogue evidence

Of the three correspondents who contributed lengthy reflections on the state of cathedral music to QMMR in 1824, the first, who signs himself “X.A.P.”, in No. 21, concentrates on the limitations of the repertoire. In direct response to his own criticism he helpfully provides lists of the repertoire of ‘Services’—that is, settings of either the Morning (\textit{Te Deum, Beneficit}, and \textit{Jubilate}) or Evening

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{65} Ibid., 459.
\item \textsuperscript{66} Ibid., 460.
\end{itemize}
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*(Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis*) canticles—then held in the part-books of twenty-four of the cathedrals in existence at the time, which *QMMR* proceeds to print, in this and a subsequent volume. That record may be found in its entirety in the form of a spreadsheet at Appendix G, p. 309 showing exactly what compositions were held where; below are two tables showing, first, a bald count of the compositions and an indication as to whether the cathedral had purchased the Boyce, Arnold, and Alcock collections of cathedral music:

**Table 9-5: Canticle Settings held at 24 Cathedrals (Source: QMMR 1824)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cathedral</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Boyce</th>
<th>Arnold</th>
<th>Alcock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llandaff</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St David's</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* nothing is recorded at Llandaff since it had neither choir nor organ, apparently

This second table shows the most popular of the 140 composers named by number of copies in use:

Table 9-6: Popularity of 140 composers by number of Services in use (Source: QMMR 1824)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Clarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Boyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Ebdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Creighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Nares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dupuis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Corfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Camidge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ferabosco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Alcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fussell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Skews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beckwith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humphries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Batten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall &amp; Hine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Langdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mudd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Randall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sargerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tichway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henstridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inglott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rodgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broderip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gibbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moseley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porter (Rev. W. J.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brailsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hallet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heathcote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hempell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hudson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nalson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smyth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tomkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aylward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bennet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark, Jer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooke (R.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coombs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gibson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall &amp; Broderip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heathcote (Rev. G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herschell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latrobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linley (Revd. O.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swarbrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tozer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tripp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wallond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wesley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worgan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, two published collections of church music held by many cathedrals were those of Boyce (published 1760) and Arnold (pub. 1790). For the sake of completeness, the following table shows what canticle settings were included in those publications [NB: “M=Morning Service; E=Evening Service]:

Table 9-7: Contents of Boyce and Arnold Collections
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boyce</th>
<th>Arnold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Aldrich G</td>
<td>M&amp;E Aldrich A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Bevin Dm</td>
<td>E Aldrich Em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Bird [sic] Dm</td>
<td>M&amp;E Bryan G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Blow A</td>
<td>M Boyce A (Full)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Do. G</td>
<td>M&amp;E Child Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Do. Em</td>
<td>M Croft Bm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Child D</td>
<td>M&amp;E Goldwin F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Do. Em</td>
<td>M&amp;E Green C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Farrant Gm</td>
<td>M Hall &amp; Hine Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Gibbons F</td>
<td>M King A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Purcell Bb</td>
<td>M&amp;E King A (Verse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Rogers D</td>
<td>M&amp;E King C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Tallis Dm</td>
<td>M&amp;E King F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E: G</td>
<td>M&amp;E: Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E: Em</td>
<td>M&amp;E: Nares F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E: Am</td>
<td>M&amp;E: Patrick Gm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E: F</td>
<td>M&amp;E: Travers F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Deum</td>
<td>Travers D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concern here is with Canterbury's musical life, so here is the detailed list given by the QMMR of the canticle settings held at Canterbury:

Table 9-8: Canticle Settings in the Canterbury Cathedral Music Library
(Source: QMMR 1824)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Portman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Amner</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Priest F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Brailsford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Bishop D</td>
<td></td>
<td>M&amp;E Porter D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Boyce A (Verse)</td>
<td>M&amp;E Porter B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Bacon A</td>
<td>M&amp;E Rogers Em</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Child Am</td>
<td>M&amp;E Rogers F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Child C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Rogers Am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Child F</td>
<td>M&amp;E Raylton G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Child G</td>
<td>M&amp;E Raylton A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Croyghton E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Raylton E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Cook A</td>
<td>M&amp;E Richardson C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Croft A</td>
<td>M&amp;E Surgerson Bb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Corfe Bb</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Smith C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Ebdon C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Stephens Eb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most striking characteristic of this repertoire list, at both national and local (Canterbury) level, is its conservatism, especially when one compares it with the eagerness of the Canterbury Catch Club to consume the new music of its day. The second awful realisation is the shortage of very much music of quality. The complete absence of anything from the treasure-trove of music earlier than the mid-eighteenth century is dreadfully typical of the period, but it is also painful to note the lack of any music by two of the best recognised composers of the then relatively recent English Baroque, Purcell and Blow.

9.3.ii. Samuel Wesley

For a musical appreciation of this repertoire, the judgement of one of the best known composers of the nineteenth century carries some weight. Samuel Sebastian Wesley might be thought an unlikely ally in any argument: famously intransigent, he fell out with most of the church authorities for whom he worked—at Hereford, Exeter, Leeds, Winchester and Gloucester. The Exeter Chapter Clerk described him as “the most to be avoided man I ever met with!” There is no arguing, however, with his musical stature, and his is a reformist voice which could not be ignored quite so readily as many others (one monumental example of neglect in this period is discussed below). His most famous diatribe is the 1849 *A Few Words on Cathedral Music and the Musical System of the Church with a Plan of Reform*, written when he took up the post at Leeds. For the purposes of this discussion, however, the more powerful piece of testimony is to be found in an earlier document. *The Musical Times* introduced it thus in 1907:

> On February 5, 1845, Samuel Sebastian Wesley sold the copyright of his masterly ‘Service in E’ for the sum of fifty guineas, to Martin Cawood, an ironmaster of Leeds, who had requested Wesley to compose

---
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The work was published, in instalments, in 1844 and (possibly) early in 1845. For the original edition of his Service Wesley wrote an exhaustive Preface which does not find a place in modern editions. This remarkable contribution to the subject of English Church Music is too important to remain in oblivion. We therefore reprint Wesley’s trenchant Preface - his church-music creed, in fact - in the hope that it may interest our readers. 69

The 5,500-word Preface is in effect a rehearsal for the later monograph, but it is notable for the more musical reasons Wesley offers to account for his disdain for the church music of his day. Comparatively little-known today, the complete Preface is reproduced as Appendix H, p. 321, but the following extract gives a flavour not only of Wesley’s argumentative style but of the focus of his criticism:

[It is] impossible to recognize, in the unvarying syllabic accentuation, the monotonous undescriptive expression, of those artists who flourished at a period immediately subsequent to the Reformation, any satisfactory fulfilment of the demands of this exalted subject…

In support of what is here advanced, the following extracts may be adduced from the Services of Tallis, Aldrich, and Rogers 70: they are characteristic of that style of Service which is regarded as among the best of those in general use. Such works may very well be presumed to have escaped the attention of connoisseurs; but as their demerits, however great, will not be found without advocates, or even professed admirers, the writer does not venture to say all that might be said concerning a musical taste so defective as that which can sanction the almost general use of such music in the daily performance of the Cathedral Service. If constrained to declare his own opinion of their comparative inferiority, it is not without support from the highest authority of the time. He claims in aid the evidence of Spohr, and of Mendelssohn, when he ventures to assert that such works as those from which the present quotations are made are as unworthy of the words to which they are set as they are ill-calculated to excite interest in any congregation acquainted with music at the present day.

Example 1: An extract from Rogers’ Creed

Example 2: An extract from Dr. Wilson’s Glee ‘From The Fair Lavinian Shore’

---


70. [The extracts which Wesley gives are as follows:
1. Tallis Gloria in Excelsis (Boyce’s Cathedral Music, vol. i, 36). From ‘Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father’ to the end of the movement.
2. Aldrich Te Deum in A. From ‘When Thou hadst overcome’ to ‘We believe that Thou shalt come to be our Judge.’
3. Aldrich Creed in G. From ‘Is worshipped and glorified’ to ‘And the life of the world to come.’]
In the two specimens marked No. 1 and No. 2, it will be considered that the passage which Dr Wilson considered sufficiently expressive of a ridiculous allusion to avarice, Dr Rogers applies to the most solemn and awful declaration of belief which it can enter into the heart of man to conceive! Nor is the quotation, ‘We believe that Thou shalt come to be our judge’ any better.

It is impossible to hear these compositions performed and not feel that their composers have been fettered in the development of their ideas, no less by the necessary attention to what they believed to be prescribed limits in point of time for performance than by the deficiencies of imperfect art. 71.

Wesley’s concern is, quite clearly, not only with the paucity of compositional imagination at work in the repertoire of the day but with its lack of sensitivity to the liturgical texts it is setting.

9.3.iii. John Jebb

The Reverend John Jebb is another significant figure in the movement for choral service reform. He offers criticism emanating from a greater concern for the liturgy than Wesley’s—but with acute musical awareness. His magisterial review, The Choral Service of the United Church of England and Ireland of 1843 travels the length and breadth of the nation in a critique of the performance of the liturgy in cathedrals and collegiate churches. Canterbury emerges with some plaudits—“In the chanting of the Psalms there both the choir and organist show a most religious discretion”72—but does not entirely escape censure. In fact, nowhere does. Dreadful clues emerge as to the standards of performance of the day—for example, as to what the recitation of the Lord’s Prayer might have sounded like in Jebb’s time:

1. The choir and Minister should be agreed as to the time in which this prayer is to be repeated.

71. Ibid., 663.
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2. The choir, in each clause, should... keep exactly with [the minister].
3. An equality of enunciation ought to be observed throughout.\(^73\)

He records services which start in shambolic fashion, as clergy and singers drift in at different times,\(^74\) choir vestments in poor condition,\(^75\) and many cathedral canons unable to fulfil their musical duties.\(^76\) In a wide-ranging consideration, Jebb even has room for social critique. His concern here is for proper religious and musical concern for children: “I heartily wish we heard less of classes and more of families. The real study of human nature has been comparatively overlooked, in the indiscriminate zeal for school mechanism. But this is an age of mills: and education mills, on enormous scales, are now the fashion.”\(^77\)

His is a powerful addition to the voices calling for reform, and for Jebb, this needs to be located firmly in the ancient English principles and practices of post-Reformation theology made relevant to a present age. His final clarion-call is a stirring challenge:

A thousand signs are warning us on every side. The recollections and examples of past times, now rescued from forgotten annals: the requirements of the present times, demonstrated by means of the most minute statistical scrutiny: the appliances of wealth unparalleled, committed to our stewardship by Him who will require an account at our hands; the awful exigencies of a widely spread dominion; the welfare of half the globe; the well-being of ages that are to come; the eternal interests of the illimitable Kingdom of Christ.\(^78\)

To modern ears, it is an uncomfortably nationalistic exhortation: few can read “all these motives call upon this queen of the nations to worship her God in the beauty of holiness, to approach Him with gifts of gold, frankincense, and myrrh, and to show to mankind in all places of His earthly dominion, how above all worldly honour it is the privilege of this nation to be the handmaid of the Lord” without hearing something of Kipling-esque colonialism in the words. But there is no doubting where Jebb places responsibility, whatever the motivation. Of those who minister, he says:

It is their part and bounden duty to complete the plan designed by their Church, which has suffered mutilation, through no authoritative prescription, but through the indolence and timidity of an age, the most somnolent and secular of any since the days of the Reformation. ... If the example of that age be allowed as prescriptive... we must suffer the church to remain the timid minion of what is called the

\(^{73}\) Ibid., 254.
\(^{74}\) Ibid., 229.
\(^{75}\) Ibid., 225.
\(^{76}\) Ibid., 239.
\(^{77}\) Ibid., 303.
\(^{78}\) Ibid., 549.
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state; for all these appalling sins of omission and commission were the characteristics of times, when ... the choral voice of praise, heretofore emulous of angels, was enfeebled, the table of the Lord forsaken, and his courts untrod.79

The music which is to serve this great purpose is a subject of concern for Jebb, as for everyone else in this period. His love for older masters—“I must avow a conviction that the early composers of England, Bird, Farrant, Gibbons, are at least [Palestrina’s] equals in every essential quality”80—leads him to dismiss more recent composers: “of Nares, Kent, (a noted plagiarist from Croft), and some other names of inferior note,” he says “the tedious lengths to which they protracted the services, and the needless repetitions in which they indulged, have caused much of that censure which has been cast upon the English musical service.”81 The eighteenth century saw “a feeble and effeminate style” which he thinks persists, with the notable exception of Dr Boyce. Ebdon, Jackson and Nares are dismissed with very little comment.

9.3.iv. A Canterbury contribution

As with most of the writing of this period, there is a great deal of diagnosis with respect to the music but little attempt at curative prescription. There is, however, one document in the Canterbury Cathedral Archives which makes more of an effort than most. It is entitled Memorial addressed by Cathedral Organists and others to the Deans and Chapters of England and Wales proposing a reform of Cathedral Choirs and is thought to date from 1841. It is signed by 23 cathedral organists, 30 other members of the musical profession, and 115 clergymen, including William Hoskins, Rector of St Alphege, Canterbury, and both Frederick Rouch and Joshua Stratton, two Minor Canons of Canterbury Cathedral. In the interests of scholarship, a transcription of the complete document is appended at Appendix M, p. 471. Those three local names may have ensured its survival at Canterbury; Alan Mould records one other copy at Westminster Abbey,82 but no other copy has so far come to light apart from these two. It begins as usual by lamenting “the imperfect manner in which the Service is at present performed in our Cathedral Churches” but swiftly proceeds to recommendations relating to such matters as the number of singers, the need for a practice room and regular rehearsals, a more rigorous musical education for choristers, and a pension fund for “those

79. Ibid., 545–46.
80. Ibid., 339.
81. Ibid., 340.
82. Alan Mould, The English Chorister, 185.
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members whose voices fail them”. The benefits, they argue, would be a greater ability to provide properly for the antiphonal singing of so much cathedral music, and the assurance that a piece performed in a service would have been rehearsed beforehand.

It is, it has to be said, a somewhat ramshackle document, showing signs of having been designed by a committee. Only at the end does the role of the organist come under consideration: he “should be bound personally to attend every Service, unless prevented by illness or other urgent cause. He should also devote a portion of his time to arranging music for the Choir, who ought to look up to him (under the Dean or Precentor) as their Musical Director.” 83 This, and the fact that it was addressed to everyone, probably ensured that it would be heeded by no-one—which is regrettable, since there was considerable weight to its genesis and sense in its suggestions.

9.4. “Between the Church and the Play-house”

At the start of this chapter, it was noted that cathedral singers had a very poor reputation, associating them with reprehensible behaviour involving bawdy secular singing in tavernous contexts—exactly the sort of behaviour pictorialized in the caricatures examined in the Prologue. Attempts to allay such poor expectations are frustrating: despite the fact that, by comparison with the Catch Club records, the musicians of the cathedral seem to be well documented, it is still difficult to achieve a clear impression of the lives of this subaltern group of men. None kept any diaries which have so far come to light; there is certainly nothing like the unusual document detailing the remarkable lifestyle of one Thomas Cocks, the Cathedral Auditor from 1607–1610:

In his declining years he kept what its editor calls a ‘diary’ but which is really a set of running accounts, detailing the life of this man-about-town. … Few days passed without expenditure on a quart of claret, and careful account was taken of money won or lost at cards or bowls. Cocks went both to the theatre and the sermon, bought tobacco-pipes, and rape-seed for his pet bird, and opportunistically purchased lobsters, fish (including a ‘Fordwich trout’), prunes and gooseberries, strawberries and cream, and marmalade, as these good things became available.

Surveying that exhaustive description of Cocks’ latter-day habits and behaviour, Patrick Collinson reflects ruefully “It would be good to know half as much about the rhythm of everyday life in the Cathedral.” 84 He may as well have been talking about the Lay Clerks. Prosopography is a jigsaw with
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no picture to help.

The most oft-quoted slander of singers’ reputations was supposed to be funny; inevitably, its persistent repetition over the last 400 years has cost it some of its humorous bite. John Earle was an Anglican cleric who wrote—anononymously, at first—a set of witty caricatures of the men and manners of his day called *Microcosmographie, or, A Piece of the World Discovered; in Essays and Characters* in 1628. His treatment of “The Common Singing Men” appears as No. 69 in this litany of scorn; here are edited highlights:

[They are] a bad society and yet a company of good fellows, that roar deep in the Quire, deeper in the Tavern. They are … distinguished by their noyses much like Bells, for they make not a Consort but a Peal. Their pastime or recreation is prayers, their exercise drinking, yet herein so religiously addicted that they serve God oftest when they are drunk. … Upon worky days they behave themselves at prayers as at their pots, for they swallow them down in an instant. Their gowns are laced commonly with streamings of ale, the superfluities of a cup or throat above measure. Their skill in melody makes them the better companions abroad, and their Anthems abler to sing Catches. Long-lived for the most part they are not, especially the bass, they overflow their bank so oft to drown the Organs. Briefly, if they escape arresting, they die constantly in God’s service; and … now they keep the church a great deal better, and help to fill it with their bones as before with their noyse.\(^{85}\)

The connection—at least as far as musicians are concerned—between church and tavern is firmly established here. Writing a hundred years later, Thomas Brown fell in with this stereotype when he invented his imaginary epistolary exchange between Henry Purcell and John Blow in *Letters from the Dead to the Living, and from the Living to the Dead* in 1720. The conceit is that messages may be exchanged between this world and the afterlife, and Purcell had written to his old friend John Blow, left behind on this mortal coil in 1695, with an account of how things were in “these infernal Shades” which is, apparently, a riotously musical place: “all the year round the whole Dominion is like a Bartholomew Fair.”\(^{86}\) Blow’s invented reply claims that nothing has changed at either Westminster Abbey or St Paul’s:

…for both the Choirs continue just [as] wicked as they were when you left them; some of [the singers] daily come reeking hot out of a bawdy-house into the Church; and others stagger out of the Tavern to Afternoon Prayers, and hiccup over a little of the Litany, and so back again.\(^{87}\)

\(^{85}\) John Earle, *Microcosmographie, or, A Piece of the World Discovered; in Essays and Characters* (Editio princeps, 1628; London: Alex Murray & Son, 1868), No. 69.


\(^{87}\) *Ibid.*, 300.
And Blow/Brown goes on to make the point which underpins this part of the thesis:

You know men of our profession hang between the Church and the Play-house,\(^8\) as Mahomet’s Tomb does between the two Load stones, and must equally incline to both, because by both we are equally supported.\(^9\)

In Canterbury, they hung between the Cathedral and the Catch Club.

Neither Earle nor Brown may have meant to be especially unkind, but (as with the “Land without Music” slur) some jibes stick. The repertoire they sang for their recreation doesn’t help: some catches are, indeed, lewd in the extreme although—as with the men themselves—Christopher Marsh’s salutary warning is that the discordant notes become so deafening that we fail to hear the most harmonious music which is to be found in this diminutive genre. In other words, the music may no more deserve its dreadful reputation than the men do.

Christopher Marsh has pertinent points to make about cathedral singing-men, even though his concerns are with an earlier period. He echoes Blow/Brown, and the key point of this chapter, in noting that “Cathedral singing men, sometimes scorned for their mongrel musicianship, mediated between the church and the ale house in a period that has been credited with driving a wedge between the two institutions.”\(^9\) Unfortunately, there is little evidence in Canterbury to support his suggestion that the two worlds may thus have been brought closer together in some meaningful way; rather, the musicians themselves would appear to be the sole meeting-point, important as they may be in that regard.

Deborah Rohr’s main concern is the instability of the socio-economic environment for musicians and the tensions thus created for musicians who are keen, in the later part of the eighteenth century and the nineteenth, to be recognised at a more professional level than Earle or Brown could possibly have imagined. When Rohr turns her attention to the ecclesiastical world, she finds evidence of tensions very similar to those identified in secular music-making. In particular, her point about the association of musical expertise with a number of features relating to the professions is pertinent for church musicians:

---

88. For which, read Catch Club.
89. Ibid., 301.
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Music could claim a long history of association with the requisite characteristics of a traditional profession: a high-status career track securely linked to church and university; a foundation of theoretical knowledge; recognition as a liberal art by the universities (which had been granting degrees in music since 1463); and essential social value due to its role in the Cathedral services of the Anglican church.91

However, she sees evidence of decline: in the resources allowed by cathedrals, in the salaries of the musicians there, and in the corresponding status of those singers. With respect to the men, Rohr draws on a contemporary article from the Quarterly Musical Magazine and Review:

Although choir singers had once been relatively well paid, early nineteenth-century inflation reduced their salaries to below a subsistence wage.

As professional and social status declined and choir singers resorted to non-musical and non-church related employment, one observer asked in 1824, “what wonder that the singers are frequently taken from the lowest order of society? What wonder that they unite some handicraft business with their profession, in order to eke out a scanty subsistence?”92

On this subject, Canterbury has its own records to contribute—starting with John Marsh once again.

9.5. Sacred and Secular Musicians

Marsh’s social standing, as has been noted, enabled him to consort as readily with the upper echelons of Canterbury society as with the tavern-based company of the Catch Club: Minor Canons and Lay Clerks mix in his company, as here, in 1786:

On Tuesday the 23rd [May] I tried my Morning Service in my hall with Messrs Freeman, Chafy, and Gregory (Minor Canons) Saffery, Jagger, Goodban, Halsey, (singing men) and four choristers, of whom the former afterwards expressed himself as much pleased with it…93

Scenes such as these soften the image presented in the Earle/Brown verbal caricatures. In general, Marsh paints a picture of genial conviviality rather than of bucolic excess, though his own drinking can reach impressive levels: seven people drank 16 bottles of claret and 3 of port at a beefsteak dinner in January 1785.94 True, there are aspects of Canterbury society which do not please him, but he seems to take exception to the level of card-playing rather than anything more transgressive:

Canterbury [was] then a very dirty old-fashioned ill-paved place; and the society not being much to our mind; the style of living being for gentlemen to dine much together and meet at whist or smoking clubs almost every evening at different inns, and only joining the ladies at immense routs where, owing to the

92. Ibid., 96.
94. Ibid., 338.
largeness of the circle at Canterbury, the rooms were generally much crowded and the spirit of card-playing (for which I had no taste and Mrs M. but very little) carried to a great excess.\textsuperscript{95}

In the main, his account of musical life in Canterbury offers a counterpoise to the character assassination perpetrated by Earle and Brown: this is a close-knit community which treasures its music-making, whether in the more institutionalised environment of the Catch Club or in entirely informal domestic settings. It might be thought that Thomas Goodban Senior was conforming to stereotype in running a pub alongside his duties as cathedral singer, but a brief look at him serves as a thought-provoking prelude to this study of Canterbury’s cathedral musicians in the year of the Catch Club print, 1825-6.

9.5.i. The Goodban clan

By 1825, the Cathedral had employed two Thomas Goodbans for a total of 55 years. Goodban Senior had been a Chorister from 1760–1767, then became a Lay Clerk in 1770 and remained so until his death in 1802, when the Chapter recognised his son, Thomas Junior—the central character of the previous chapter—by a most unusual gesture: they ordered “that five guineas be given to Thomas, son of Goodban late Lay Clerk, for a reward to him for his attention to the family.”\textsuperscript{96} The Catch Club, it would appear, was not the only institution to recognise this young man’s qualities. The younger Thomas seems not to have been a chorister—which is unusual, given the frequency with which cathedral singing ran in the family throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—but joined the choir as a Lay Clerk in 1809. He resigned in 1824 for reasons unknown, but which may have had something to do with the busy teaching and publishing career examined above.

One George Goodban was a chorister from 1799 to 1802; he is most likely to be a younger brother of Thomas. A newspaper advertisement shows that Thomas Senior had more than one son: the Kentish Gazette posted an announcement that “Messrs. Goodban and Sons inform their friends that their annual Concert will be held at the Catch-Club room, Prince of Orange, on Friday 19th March inst., 1802.”\textsuperscript{97} Like father and brother, he played the violin, and his son is given a voice trial by Mr Longhurst in 1852,\textsuperscript{98} after which the boy performs for the Club. Music in Canterbury—as in the rest of

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{95} Ibid., 350.
  \item \textsuperscript{96} Dean’s Book 7 (1793-1822), 93.
  \item \textsuperscript{97} Kentish Gazette, 12 March 1802, 1.
  \item \textsuperscript{98} Catch Club Minutes Book 2 (1840-1860), 94.
\end{itemize}
the country—was an activity passed down through the generations.

Thomas Goodban (Jnr.), then, was no longer employed by the Cathedral in 1825-6. The next section considers those who were.

9.5.ii. Thirteen Lay Clerks

The Cathedral’s Treasurer’s Book record the quarterly payments made to all Cathedral Officers. In the year of the Catch Club print the following Lay Clerks (gentlemen singers) are named:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates of service</th>
<th>Years service</th>
<th>Reason for leaving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Shrubsole</td>
<td>1773–1825</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Loop</td>
<td>1778–1830</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Halsey</td>
<td>1784–1830</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Pillow</td>
<td>1789–1836</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Highmore Skeats</td>
<td>1803–1831</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Thomas William Halsey</td>
<td>1815–1850</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Nicholson</td>
<td>1818–1854</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Newington</td>
<td>1818–1834</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dismissal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Thomas Jones</td>
<td>1821–1872</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Elvey</td>
<td>1823–1830</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Move to Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Kempton</td>
<td>1823–1860</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Henry Dobson</td>
<td>1825–1839</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Shoubridge</td>
<td>1826–1840</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Move to London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (Organist 1803-31)  ** (Assistant Organist 1824; Organist 1831-72)

And so the thirteen Lay Clerks (including two Organists) who served in the Cathedral Choir in 1825-6 reach back to 1773 and forward to 1872; their period of service spans just one year short of a century. This encompasses the entire life-span of the Canterbury Catch Club: from Shrubsole’s appointment in 1773, six years before the official formation of the club, to Thomas Jones’ death in 1872, seven years after the Catch Club disbanded itself. It is, however, a coincidence of charming serendipity that the last musician on the list, James Shoubridge, was appointed to replace the first of these thirteen singers: “Mr James Shoubridge was elected & admitted a Lay Clerk in the room [i.e., the place] of Shrubsole,
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deceased." That simply could not have been engineered.

To those unfamiliar with the world of cathedral musicians in the centuries between Henry VIII and Victoria, there are some aspects of this bald account which require immediate explanation. The mortality rate amongst Lay Clerks seems alarmingly high; the deaths in service of one-third of those named gives the impression that cathedral singing is a hazardous occupation. This is explained by the fact that Lay Clerks, like their ordained colleagues, were appointed for life—which also accounts for the strikingly lengthy periods of service of some of the men. Voices, however, fail with age, and in the latter part of the period under discussion, the Dean and Chapter employ strategies to mitigate the worst effects on musical standards of advancing decrepitude. One is the introduction of a pension. This was not formalised until 1850, when the Dean and Chapter finally persuaded the Lay Clerks to accept retirement on a pension of £25 in return for a much-anticipated pay rise based on actual attendance. But before then, resignation was rare, and a pension was entirely in the gift and at the discretion of the Dean and Chapter.

What follows takes each of these thirteen men in order to show something of the lives and work of the cathedral Lay Clerks of this period in general and in Canterbury in particular, in the various spaces they inhabit: in the cathedral, using the Deans’ Books and other records; at the Catch Club, using the Minutes Books to match Lay Clerks’ names to any mention of them as musicians in the Catch Club; and anywhere else they can be found in contemporary records—usually, the local papers, which faithfully reported the concert life of the time, along with any scandal they could spot. The thirteen brief biographies constitute an illuminating snapshot of unsung singers who spent most of their time plying their musical trade in the shadows of a cathedral or club room.

James Shrubsole

The two oldest members of the Choir, James Shrubsole and William Loop, are two of the least well-documented. Both, however, appear at the very start of the Catch Club Committee Minutes Books when, in 1802, they are named as members of the Orchestra Committee.100 This makes it extremely likely that they are members of the orchestra shown in the print. Shrubsole had stepped into a dead man’s shoes in the Cathedral choir at the very end of 1773: on December 8, he was admitted, having

99. Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 37.
100. Catch Club Minutes Book 1 (1802-1840), 22.
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been elected “in the place of George Woolcott deceased.” Two little Shrubsoles had been choristers, one admitted in 1765 and the other in 1768, and, given the frequency with which choristers are later employed as adult singers when their voices have broken, it is highly likely that the man who became a Lay Clerk in 1773 was one of them. Generally speaking, Shrubsoles seem to merit special treatment: in 1810, when the Chapter considers a request for a pay rise from the Lay Clerks—one of several in this period—James Shrubsole is one of only three Lay Clerks found to have a record of good attendance, having been absent only 34 times in the preceding year. This sounds a lot, but it is actually the best attendance record of all: the average was 204 absences. The worst offender was Charles Lepine, with 308, but Thomas Goodban (Jnr.) was not far behind with 249. “Five guineas each was given to Mr Burgess, Shrubsole, and Halsey for their regular attendance” as a result of these calculations, by a slightly surprised but appreciative Chapter. An even more rare and remarkable recognition was granted in 1816, when the Chapter agreed that “seven shillings a week be allowed to Shrubsole our Lay Clerk over and above his stipend; to be paid weekly together with his stipend.” The reason for this outburst of generosity is not given, but that is a significant sum at a time when the Lay Clerks were paid only £40 per annum, adding a further £18.4s. per annum for Shrubsole. It is also extremely unusual for this to be paid weekly; salaries were drawn quarterly for centuries. The absence of any explanation for either phenomenon is but one example of the dusty silence of these cathedral records at precisely those points where the historian would prefer informative eloquence.

Other records for James Shrubsole are hardly more informative: all there is to be gleaned from the local papers is that from 1775 onwards he was a saddler when not in the choir:

JAMES SHRUBSOLE,
Saddler,

Opposite the ROSE, St. George’s Street, Canterbury,

Begs Leave to acquaint the Public, that he has taken that well-known accustomed
Shop and Stock in Trade of his late Master, Mr William Rayner, deceased.

The following year he became a Freeman of the city. Judging by the various advertisements which

101. Dean’s Book 5 (1770-1776), 153.
102. Dean’s Book 7 (1793-1822), 170.
103. Dean’s Book 5 (1770-1776), 248.
104. Kentish Gazette, 28 October 1775, 1.
appear throughout this period, he also played some legal role in disposing of the estates of the deceased on occasion: “All persons who have any claims or demands on the estate and effects of James Smith, coal-merchant, of Whitstable, deceased, are desired forthwith to send their accounts to ... Mr James Shrubsole, ... or to pay their respective debts, ... who [is] duly authorised to receive the same.”

William Loop

William Loop had almost certainly been the boy chorister admitted in 1767, after which he is not mentioned again until his ‘removal’ (presumably when his voice broke) in 1776. The record of his admittance in 1779 “into the office of Lay Clerk in the room [i.e., the place] of Benford deceased” is his last mention in the Deans’ Books, at least with that spelling; in 1830, however, it is almost certainly the same man whose death is noted thus: “Mr John Alexander Longhurst was unanimously elected a Lay Clerk of this Cathedral in the room of the late William Loupe.” Spelling variants are common, and dates match those in the Treasurers’ Books (in which he signs for his quarterly salary as “Wm. Loop” but is entered by the Canon Treasurer as “William Loup”), so this seems certain. John Longhurst, incidentally, was the older brother of William Henry, but disappears from the cathedral records after only a few years’ service, with no reason given.

The paucity of record for William Loop is typical of the evidence (or lack of it) for the vast majority of these men. In all, seventy-five musicians sang in the cathedral choir as Minor Canons, Lay Clerks, or ‘Substitutes’ in the century spanned by the service of the thirteen who happened to have been there in this year 1825-6; of the vast majority of them, information is scant. Despite William Loop’s 61 years’ service to the Cathedral, little is left beyond an informed guess at his level of education (thanks to what we know of choristers’ schooling); a signature, suggestive of adequate literacy; and the knowledge that he sang and played with his fellow-musicians in the taverns of the city and at the Catch Club. As for the rest of his life, he may have been the William Loop whose wife Sophia died at the age of 52 in 1814; he may also have been the man to whom interested parties should have
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applied if they wished to purchase some land near Walmer in 1808. But then again, he may not.

Thomas Halsey

Thomas Halsey, Snr., had also been a chorister: as a nine–year–old, he had been admitted in 1773 and lasted until 1779. The John Halsey who became a Lay Clerk in 1766 (and who died in the same year as Thomas Goodban, Snr., 1802) was almost certainly his father, and the John Halsey who became another chorister in 1774 was probably the younger brother, so Halseys helped populate the choir for eighty-four years. They also contributed to music-making in the city; John Marsh makes slightly dismissive reference to the Halseys as horn players:

We had a choice of 10 men and as many boys belonging to the choir including Gore, Jagger, Goodban, Saffery, Shrubsole, and the two Horn players who all played instruments in the band. Of these the only ones that sung simple songs at this time was Jagger (who had a very good countertenor voice) and one or two of the boys. Of the rest Gore, Goodban, Saffery, Shrubsole, and one of the Halseys (the Horn players) sung in glees and choruses.

Halsey had also been noted for his good attendance, as was mentioned above, which may help explain why he, along with Edward Pillow, is one of those rare examples of singers awarded a pension. The notes in the Deans’ Book give an impression that this may have been typical of the ad hoc arrangements made from time to time: resignation when incapable may have earned the *quid pro quo* of the pension from a Chapter relieved of the burden of a singer no longer fit for office: “Thomas Halsey, Snr., having resigned his position as Lay Clerk [it was] ordered that the sum of £15 per annum be allowed to him during the remainder of his life” in 1830.

Edward Pillow

Edward Pillow was “permitted on account of his advanced age to absent himself from the services of the church, and receive £30 each year” in 1836. For Pillow, this must have been welcome confirmation of an earlier rehabilitation: he had been sanctioned in 1796 when the Dean and Chapter note:

Pillow and Lepine two of our Lay Clerks having lately absented themselves from the Service of the Cathedral for 10 days, without having assigned any sufficient reason to the Chapter for having done so,
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...it is ordered that the last augmentation to the places of the Lay Clerks be withheld from Pillow and Lepine.

This is an early example of the kind of penalty which might be imposed on errant Lay Clerks, and the two men duly fell back into line: shortly afterwards, it was “Ordered that Pillow and Lepine who have been lately very regular in their attendance on the church be reinstated in their salaries.”

Pillow’s pension was noted in the Precentor’s Book for this period: “At this Audit [Nov. 1836], Mr Pillow received a liberal pension from the Dean and Chapter, and retired from his duties as Lay Clerk.” And in a rare addendum relating to a man whose work for the Cathedral was done, the Precentor noted Pillow’s death the following year: “1837. Feb. 7. Mr Pillow died this month having been a Lay Clerk upwards of fifty years.”

The name Edward Pillow appears in contemporary accounts, but there are several, clearly different, men of that name, and linking any of them to the Lay Clerk is fraught with risk. For a taste of the times, though, it’s worth a quick look.

The first one to note is the most obvious: a Mr Pillow appears in the Catch Club print, identified as a “Hoyman [one who steers sailing vessels] for “Cock, Pillow, & Co.”. No Christian name is given there, but the Freemasons’ records mentioned in Chapter 3 show that one Edward Pillow, occupation hoyman, became a member of the Canterbury Lodge on the 8 April 1819, at the age of 59. If this is the Lay Clerk, he would have been 76 when he took his pension—and that makes this association highly likely. This in turn makes it possible to connect the man with the records of the Kent Family History Society—specifically, the index to births, marriages and deaths: this shows that Edward Pillow was baptised on 14 November 1759, son of John and Elizabeth. He married Maria, who died at the age of 72 in 1834. Their daughter, also called Maria, had tragically predeceased her mother at the age of 23 in 1814. Her life had been not only short but difficult: “she had been heavily afflicted from her birth, and for the last six years quite blind,” said the local paper, reporting her passing.

115. Dean’s Book 7 (1793-1822), 40.
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120. Ibid., 8 March 1814, 4.
This Edward Pillow would have been 34 years of age when war with France broke out in 1793, which makes it quite likely that it is he who, according to the local press, regularly sat on the “Committee appointed for the purpose of carrying into execution the several Resolutions adopted at a General Meeting of the citizens and inhabitants of the said city.” These meetings seem to have been concerned with the raising of volunteer companies of infantry; the wars with France scarred twenty-two years of the lives of this generation of men. It was probably the same Edward Pillow who became a steward of the subscription fund set up to indemnify participants against conscription. This response to the extraordinarily unpopular Quota Acts ran for many years: “the government was taken aback at the resentment towards balloting for the militia,” notes Jenny Uglow. Judging by this advertisement, the Canterbury initiative was popular amongst the 18- to 45-year-old age group affected—which would have included Edward Pillow:

Canterbury and East Kent Militia Insurance Society

SUBSTITUTES PROVIDED

The conductors of the above Society, gratified by the approbation of its numerous members ....propose insuring all persons who are, or may be liable to be balloted to serve in the East Kent Militia, under the present act of parliament, on the following terms, should they be drawn between the first day of January and the thirty-first day of December, 1800. … the public are requested to observe, that the mode of insurance adopted, is not merely to pay the fine only, as some societies have done, but (as we have, invariably, in our cases, since the establishment of the society) we positively engage to provide Substitutes, whereby every person insured with us may be freed from every apprehension of being drawn again, during his life, which might, and probably would be the case, should a fine be paid for any man under the age of forty.

Anyone wishing to take advantage of the offer was to pay their fourteen shillings and sixpence to Edward Pillow or one of the other four stewards. Those emphatic italics may partly be in response to a spat about the money at the start of the year, when questions had been raised about the management of the funds in 1798. Pillow and his fellow stewards vigorously rebuffed allegations of impropriety:

The accounts, with vouchers for every farthing expended, are now, and ever have been open to the inspection of every Member, and we have the pleasure to number on our list upwards of 200 of the former Club, and have since had the addition of near 100 others, and several of them from other Clubs and Societies; a proof that, in the opinion of the Public, we have conducted the affairs of the late Society with justice and integrity.
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Saying this much, we shall wave [sic] the subject, having no intention to enter into a newspaper controversy, for the public to laugh at, and printers to profit by.\textsuperscript{124}

And the fund continued to provide insurance against conscription for some years more.

In trailing Edward Pillow through these records, it is probably safe to discount two other men of that name. One appears in the Cathedral Archives’ Index to the Freemen of Canterbury, identified as a tailor.\textsuperscript{125} This E.P. has eight children: Charles (a bookbinder); George (a brewer); Edward (a Royal Navy Lieutenant, who married one Mary-Ann Pillow in 1810\textsuperscript{126}); Thomas (a Lighterman); William Henry (another bookbinder); John (a printer); Frances (who married a wheelwright called Henry Pilcher); and Eliza (who married a grocer by the name of Henry Clackett). The younger Edward is mentioned in the local paper when the frigate on which he is serving captures a Spanish ship in 1807.\textsuperscript{127} As Uglow remarks, “the Napoleonic Wars touched people in every part of Britain … men from one in five families were directly involved, in the army and navy, the militia and volunteers.”\textsuperscript{128}

Another Edward Pillow who can also be safely discounted is a “common-brewer” who goes bankrupt in 1813 and ends up in prison.\textsuperscript{129}

Whichever one of the Edward Pillows lived in St George’s Place suffered a traumatic event in 1811:

“Thomas Back, of St Dunstan’s, was found hanging in the premises of Mr Edward Pillow, of St Georges Place in this city, by whom he was employed as a waggoner. This is said to have been caused by his being told, that he was connected with the late robbery of the Union Bank, and which so affected his mind, as to induce him to commit this rash act, leaving a wife and nine children to lament his untimely end.”\textsuperscript{130}

There is no record of the founding of “Cock, Pillow, & Co.”, but it would come as no surprise to find that the man shown in such relaxed bourgeois surroundings in the print employed waggons in the course of his commercial activities.

Finally, a most enigmatic announcement seems to hint at dastardly deeds involving an Edward Pillow

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{124} Ibid., 8 January 1799, 1.
  \item \textsuperscript{125} Index to Freemen of Canterbury 1984.
  \item \textsuperscript{126} Kentish Gazette, 14 September 1810, 4.
  \item \textsuperscript{127} Ibid., 1 May 1807, 4.
  \item \textsuperscript{128} Jenny Uglow, In These Times, 1.
  \item \textsuperscript{129} Kentish Gazette, 13 July 1813, 4.
  \item \textsuperscript{130} Ibid., 26 April 1811, 4.
\end{itemize}
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in 1814:

Edward Pillow respectfully requests his friends and the public in general to accept his unfeigned thanks for the favours he has received, and for those intended to be conferred on him; but considers it his duty to inform them, that many of the goods which have been ordered to be shipped on board the vessel in which he is concerned, have been artfully diverted to another channel, nor has this conduct been confined to the down freight only. One hundred bags of bark intended for him have lately been shipped on board another vessel at Whitstable, under pretence of the want of room where it might remain under cover until the arrival of the vessel in his employ; he, therefore, provided good and proper stowage near the water for its reception in future, giving particular directions to the person who had engaged to do the land carriage to deposit it there; yet it was so contrived by some persons or other, that the whole of 45 bags more have this present voyage been shipped on board another vessel, instead of being housed for the “Ann” agreeable to the positive orders of the proprietors of the said bark.

E.P. therefore humbly requests that his friends in future will be very particular in those orders they intend for him—that the goods may be shipped on board the Ann, and no other vessel; and in the case of their being clandestinely taken elsewhere, that they will not continue to pay the freightage, as in so doing they encourage the practice of the evil complained of.\textsuperscript{131}

Any suggestion as to what, exactly, was going on here can only be speculation, but: three-quarters of Kent’s border is coastline, to the north, east and south. Smuggling was rife during the wars, and profitable; Jenny Uglow writes of a couple of smuggling millionaires, William Baldock and Zephaniah Job.\textsuperscript{132} As he chooses his words so terribly carefully—and who can seriously believe it is a cargo of bark being discussed here?—this Edward Pillow sounds suspiciously like one of Rudyard Kipling’s “Gentlemen” in whose proximity we are advised to “watch the wall, my darlings.”\textsuperscript{133} It has to be said that Edward Pillow the Freemason, Catch Club member, Hoyman, and—probably—Lay Clerk is a highly likely candidate for this piece of dubious social history, since it involves a sea-going vessel. And it may account for the absence of the younger Edward Pillow and his fellow Lay Clerk, Charles Lepine, from their cathedral duties during those 10 days in 1796.

All this would explain why the dapper gentleman in the print is far more prominent than his fellow-musicians at the back of the room. If this hoyman was indeed the Lay Clerk as well, of course he would have joined in the singing—but he would be 67 years of age by this time, and he has clearly reached a certain social station in life of which he is making the most, whatever the foundations of his wealth.

At this point, full of admiration for social historians, this thesis has to abandon its attempt to stitch

\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., 2 August 1814, 4.
\textsuperscript{132} Jenny Uglow, In These Times, 448–50.
\textsuperscript{133} “A Smuggler’s Song”, accessed 27 Feb 2018,
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together these scraps into the tapestry of a life. The best that can be said of this very brief sociological survey of a few men with the same name is that it offers a snapshot of everyday lives in this period. If it has made somewhat grim reading—and the Cathedral Eleemosynary payments are far, far worse—there is, perhaps, no harm in seeing a little more clearly that there were very good reasons for coveting a job for life in a cathedral choir.

Highmore Skeats

The next two names on the list, Skeats and the younger Halsey (Thomas William), are similarly absent from Catch Club records. One might expect the Cathedral Organist to figure in those records more prominently, as Skeats’ predecessor, Porter, and successor, Jones, do—but we have John Marsh to thank for Porter, since Club records only start a year before Porter died, and for most of Skeats’ time the Club Committee were content to leave the organisation of the Orchestra to Thomas Goodban, so few names are given in the Minutes. Cathedral records of Skeats are also sparse. One provides a tantalising clue as to the Choristers’ education: “Agreed that Mr Skeats do purchase a harpsichord which he said he could procure for four Guineas and a half for the use of the Music School,”134 is all that is tersely noted, conjuring an image of Skeats at the instrument, tucked away in whatever space had been allocated for whatever rehearsal might have been arranged, with the ten boys gathered around. The only other glimpse of Highmore Skeats is caught in a well-known story retold in a biography of William Henry Longhurst:

Dr Longhurst’s first musical criticism—and we must own that it was rather severe—was made in the year 1827, when one afternoon on attending the cathedral service his infantile ears detected something unusual about the organ. The difference was accounted for by the fact that Mr Skeats was presiding at the instrument. On reaching home young William informed his mother that Mr Jones was not at the cathedral that afternoon, but that Mr Skeats played—“he played so funny.”

From the above short anecdote, and from other information we possess, we conclude that old Mr Skeats, however high his other qualifications, could scarcely be termed an adept as an executant. He was very much averse to improvements of any kind, and when, in 1825–6, Mr Longhurst the elder added to the old organ ... a set of pedals—the first seen or heard, Dr Longhurst believes, in Kent—he was much annoyed, and persistently refused to touch them. When any strangers were desirous of hearing their effect, Mr Skeats would call his young pupil, and say, “Here, Jones, you come and show off these things; I never learned to dance!”135

Whatever his qualities as a player Skeats was, in his time, a published composer and editor: according to the Dictionary of Composers for the Church in Great Britain and Ireland, he composed a Morning and

134. Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 7.
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*Evening Service in C*, anthems including *Come Unto Me*, hymn tunes, glee including *All Gracious Freedom*, and songs.\(^{136}\) He edited Dr J. Stephens’ *Cathedral Music* in 1805. Several of these are in the British Library, including his *Collection of Songs* (1784), which has a sizeable subscription list of some 250 people, including the great musical names of the day: Samuel Webbe, Stephen Paxton, Benjamin Cooke, John Goss, and John Marsh, as well as other organists and clerics of cathedral all over the country; it is an impressive geographical and socio-cultural reach.\(^{137}\) Other compositions include a funeral anthem (*The Righteous Souls That Take Their Flight*), the above-mentioned glee, and a few more songs: *Hark, ‘Tis a Voice From the Tomb* for voice, continuo, and two violins; *Cease Thy Carols*, for voice, continuo and flute; and *The Victory of Fishguard*, an eminently forgettable ditty commemorating the disastrous French invasion of Wales in 1797. None of these provide any basis for a fundamental reappraisal of Skeats’ status as a composer, but they are diverting, in a charming galant vein. For the sake of completeness, it should be recorded that his sacred music does not seem to have circulated beyond the two cathedrals he served (he was at Ely from 1778–1803, before coming to Canterbury) but he wrote more than the *Dictionary* records: there are three settings of the Morning Service (i.e., *Te Deum* and *Jubilate*), one in Eb and two in D (one ‘Verse’, one Full) and another setting of the Evening Canticles (*Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimitis*) in A.\(^{138}\)

The only other mention of Highmore Skeats in the Canterbury Cathedral archives before his death in 1831 records a reduction in his salary when one of the other Lay Clerks—Stephen Elvey—takes over the teaching of the Choristers, presumably in response to the 69-year-old Skeats’ failing health. Coincidentally, it was Stephen’s brother George who replaced Highmore Skeats’ son—also called Highmore—as organist at St George’s, Windsor after the latter’s rather early death at the age of 50, in 1835. Cathedral music was a small world in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

**Thomas William Halsey**

The younger Halsey eventually gets a mention in the Catch Club records when he is elected a member

---


on 2 Dec 1850,\textsuperscript{139} after which he is paid to be the Door-Keeper for the Catch Club at 2/6d. per night for several years more.\textsuperscript{140} This must have been some consolation for his precipitate departure from the Cathedral choir: when the Dean and Chapter had sealed the pay and pension deal in 1850, Halsey was the first they put out to pasture, noting that “the services of Halsey be no longer required and that he be allowed to retire on a pension of £25 per annum.”\textsuperscript{141} The only other reference to Thomas William Halsey which has so far come to light occurs in a bizarre account in the \textit{Kentish Express} of 2 June 1835:

in a remarkably detailed report entitled “Canterbury Election Scrutiny” covering “Monday—Ninth Day” and “Tuesday—Tenth and Last Day” two insights may be gained: a glimpse of the exhaustive process of nineteenth-century democratic procedures, and something of what Thomas William Halsey did when not in the Cathedral choir:

Mr Cockburn then objected to the vote of Thomas Halsey, upon the ground of his having been in the band, employed by Mr Lushington’s friends, during the election, and having received money for such service.

Mr Talbot thought he could cut short the matter, as the man whom Mr Cockburn objected to was Thomas William Halsey, a different man altogether from the present.

Mr Cockburn perceiving that he was objecting to the wrong person withdrew it, upon which

Mr Harrison observed that the “pig was soaked and shaved and could not be caught.” (A laugh).

Mr Cockburn thought that an operation at which his learned friends on the other side were expert adepts.\textsuperscript{142}

Stephen Rumbold Lushington was one of those MPs who contributed to the Conservatives’ unbroken reign in Canterbury until 2017; it would seem that T.W. Halsey was at least happy to be paid to strike up in a band on his behalf—in return for some remuneration.

The Index to the Freemen of Canterbury shows Thomas William Halsey was a carpenter, made a Freeman on 5 May 1818.\textsuperscript{143}

In Cruikshank’s \textit{Bee Hive}, none of the occupations so far mentioned would rank particularly highly.

\textbf{Edward Nicholson}

The Dean and Chapter’s judgement on Edward Nicholson seems even more harsh than Halsey’s: in

\begin{itemize}
\item[139.] Catch Club Minutes Book 2 (1840-1860), 85.
\item[140.] Catch Club Minutes Book 3 (1860-1865), 8.
\item[141.] Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 413.
\item[142.] \textit{Kentish Gazette}, 2 June 1835, 4.
\item[143.] Index to Freemen of Canterbury 1984.
\end{itemize}
1854 “It was resolved to permit Mr Nicholson, who was useless in the choir, to resign, with a pension of £25 per annum to which was added a yearly gratuity of £15.”\textsuperscript{144} The extra annual gratuity softens the blow, and prompts a realisation that the word “useless” was less pejorative than is the case in present-day usage; quite literally, Mr Nicholson cannot have been making much noise at that stage in his life. It seems his future had been in some doubt back in 1850 when, along with Halsey, he was given a choice: “...allowed to retire on a stipend of £25 per annum. Or that if he remains in the choir he shall in future receive £25 per annum stipend and 1/- per diem for actual attendance.”\textsuperscript{145} The following year, again, they refrain from actually sacking him, though they seem to have made their lack of regard for his singing clear by then in not allowing him the per diem allowance the others are getting by this stage: “Nicholson, Lay Clerk, having petitioned to be admitted on the same terms as the more efficient lay clerks, [was] refused [the allowance]. But [we] agreed to allow him the same retiring pension (£25 pa) as others would be entitled to.”\textsuperscript{146}

His connection with the Catch Club is rendered opaque by the fact that there seems to have been a sizable Nicholson family: “Edward Nicholson” is only mentioned once, requesting an engagement in the Orchestra for the 1843-84 season.\textsuperscript{147} However, the surname crops up frequently: one young “Master Nicholson” is paid one shilling and sixpence per night for playing something in the orchestra in November 1843, which goes up to two shillings and sixpence per night the following month.\textsuperscript{148} It is increased to 4/- per night in 1845.\textsuperscript{149} It is impossible to say for certain which instrument is being played here; both flute or trombone are played by a young Nicholson for several years throughout the 1840s and 1850s, and in the two years 1844–1846, they still have their father playing bassoon alongside them—if, as seems beyond reasonable doubt, he is the “Mr Nicholson Snr.” recorded in the Minutes Books.\textsuperscript{150} In the 1848–9 Orchestra list, it turns out to be “J. Nicholson” who plays the trombone, whilst “G.F. Nicholson” is the flautist.\textsuperscript{151} Both feature elsewhere: “Geo. Nicholson” was one of the signatories on the 1843 letter of protest from the Orchestra to the Club Committee noted in the previous

\textsuperscript{144} Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 500.
\textsuperscript{145} Ibid., 413.
\textsuperscript{146} Ibid., 456.
\textsuperscript{147} Catch Club Minutes Book 2 (1840-1860), 33.
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., 24.
\textsuperscript{149} Ibid., 51.
\textsuperscript{150} Ibid., 40 & 50.
\textsuperscript{151} Ibid., 72.
while several pieces in the Catch Club collection, existing only in manuscript, are by “Nicholson”, only occasionally further identified with the initial ‘J’. They include a charming glee (I Saw Fair Chlora) and four catches. One of these is the comparatively innocuous Hush, the Catch is Going to Begin, but the other three are amongst the most salacious in the collection: My Lady at Tea Call’d in Haste, Miss Kate Took John’s Oboe in her Hand one Day, and The Three Beggars leave little to the imagination. Nicholson will, therefore, get the attention which is his due in the final section, as befits a talented local composer in this study.

Samuel Newington

Samuel Newington gets no mention in the Catch Club records. His Cathedral service, however, is notable for its ignominious conclusion. The Deans’ Books record that he failed to comply with a summons to attend the Chapter meeting. At this stage, no reason is given for what is a most ominous request, but it becomes clear that he has been absent from his duties as Lay Clerk in the choir.

The explanation is not given in the Deans’ Books, but comes to light in a curious collection of “Inferior Officers’ Papers”. Among them is a Memorial from Samuel Newington—written from his prison cell:

Mr Newington a Lay Clerk absent without leave—being a prisoner in Westgate Gaol

June 28, 1833

To the Very Reverend the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church Canterbury

The humble memorial of Samuel Newington a Lay Clerk of Christ Church Canterbury now a prisoner in Westgate Gaol in the city of Canterbury—

Sheweth that from unfortunate and unforeseen events in trade he has been subject to the incarceration of the Insolvent Debtors Court—that your memorialist further shows that after 15 years in this situation as Lay Clerk from the misfortunes which has now attended him you would in consideration administer the mercy of continuing him in the same having a wife and three children totally dependent on your benign and lenient decision promising for the future ever to be grateful, orderly and regularly attentive to the duties of the choir. Your memorialist further states that he received a note from the Vice Dean admonishing him to return to his duties, to which he replied being incapable from his incarceration to

152. Ibid., 30.
154. Ibid., 42.
155. Ibid., 60.
156. Ibid., 68.
157. Ibid., 68.
appear personally and trusting for your benign consideration the long service that you will retain me after my declaration to perform my duties with assiduity and attention.

Your memorialist will ever be thankful

Samuel Newington. 159

This piteous plea fell on deaf ears; the Dean and Chapter sacked him, 160 though they did re-instate him on probation the following year, 161 only to dismiss him for good in 1835. 162 No further evidence has come to light regarding any continued infractions of his conditions of service. It seems that the hapless Newington is an example of exactly the fate identified by John Rule, quoted in Part I, of the tradesman who, for what might be only a paltry amount of debt, could lose his livelihood. One Samuel Newington, a cordwainer, was made a Freeman of the City on 27 Dec 1825. 163 The same records show his marriage to Esther, daughter of Thomas Clark, another Freeman. It is saddening to chronicle an attempt at making a living which met with such failure, and one wonders how representative the proportion represented by this man—one out of thirteen—is.

Thomas Evance Jones

The next to join the Cathedral choir as a Lay Clerk was Thomas Evance Jones, who has already been mentioned as having been required to dance on the organ pedals by an irascible Highmore Skeats. His career at the Cathedral, first as Chorister 1813–1819, Lay Clerk from 1821, Assistant Organist in 1824, Master of the Choristers in 1830, 164 and then Organist when he succeeded Skeats in 1831, is prescient of the career of William Henry Longhurst who was yet to join the choir in 1826—according to legend, the young William Henry was enthusiastically crawling in and around the cathedral organ pipes as his

160. Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 162.
161. Ibid., 163.
162. Ibid., 165.
164. “Resolved that Mr Jones the Assistant Organist be appointed Master or Teacher of the Choristers during the pleasure of the Dean and Chapter with a salary of £25 per annum and that he be informed that if at any future time he should succeed to the place of Organist he will not be continued as Master or Teacher of the Choristers.” Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 111.
father fixed and tuned it.\textsuperscript{165} Jones serves as a reminder that the Organist was not originally a separate appointment, but was drawn from the ranks of the Lay Clerks; only in 1845, during Jones’ tenure, did the Dean and Chapter resolve “that the Organist be no longer a Lay Clerk also but that no diminution be made of the payments made to him.”\textsuperscript{166} It cannot have helped the standards of cathedral music in this period that the choir had been thus diminished when one of their number went into the organ loft to accompany—and that, in any case, it had no conductor.

By contrast, Catch Club practice more closely reflected secular concert life, in which the appearance of a conductor in front of an ensemble was becoming much more common. The Minutes show quite clearly that having played the violin in the Orchestra for a number of years, Thomas Jones was appointed Conductor in 1847, whilst the Leader was still Mr Palmer.\textsuperscript{167} A few years later, Longhurst took over as conductor but Jones continued to play 1st violin and, not surprisingly, the organ: he is named as organ soloist in the concert records on 13 January 1835,\textsuperscript{168} and dispenses advice to the Committee in 1853, as the Minutes show:

Letter read from Mr Jones stating that he had compiled an organ piece from Mozart’s Don Juan [sic], which he presented to the club.

He also called the attention of the committee to the bad state of the organ and enclosed an estimate of £12.18.0 for its repair.

He also commented on the deficiency of tenor voices in the orchestra and said Mr. Dyson was willing to take an engagement at 6/.

Secretary to thank Mr Jones and to take up his offers and advice.\textsuperscript{169}

They are not quite so quick to follow his advice the following March, 1854, when he “recommends further improvements to the organ for £30-40, necessitating it being taken to London;”\textsuperscript{170} later in the

\textsuperscript{165} The Musical Times obituary has this story to tell, expanded (with an erudite play on the Latin name for an organ pipe) from an anecdote in Herbert Nelson’s biography cited above: “It may not be without interest to mention that when Dr Longhurst’s father added ‘German pedals’ to the Canterbury organ in 1825 or 1826—probably the first of their kind in Kent—Master Longhurst was made to crawl into one of the largest pipes and therein sing a little song. It is not every Cathedral organist who could say that he had so voiced one of his organ pipes, or that he had transformed a ‘pedal open’ into a vox humana.” (“William Henry Longhurst”, in The Musical Times, Vol. 45 (737) (1 July 1904), accessed 11 April 2017, http://www.jstor.org/stable/903770, 447.).

\textsuperscript{166} Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 316.

\textsuperscript{167} Catch Club Minutes Book 2 (1840-1860), 61.

\textsuperscript{168} Catch Club concert records. (1825-1837), 13 January 1835.

\textsuperscript{169} Catch Club Minutes Book 2 (1840-1860), 113.

\textsuperscript{170} Ibid., 151.
year, he is to “report on the probable cost of one suitable to the new room,”¹⁷¹ which is the subject of much debate in the ensuing period of the Catch Club.

Back at the Cathedral, Jones presided over some developments. For the first time in the Deans’ Books, reference is made to the content of the choristers’ musical education: in 1833 “It was resolved that £10 be given to our organist Mr Jones, and that Mr Jones be instructed to give the choristers lessons in instrumental music,”¹⁷² though the prevalence of Lay Clerks in the Catch Club Orchestra would suggest that this had been going on for some time. In 1841, Jones showed that he knew how to manage his ecclesiastical paymasters:

“It was resolved that the sum of £210 be expended upon the reparation and improvement of the Organ according to the estimate of Mr Hill, it being stated by Mr Jones the Organist that the proposed repairs and additions will render the Organ complete, and that it will save to the Dean and Chapter for many years to come any charge for repairs. And the Surveyor was strictly charged not to allow any Candles to be used in executing the work on any pretence whatsoever [my italics].”¹⁷³

Intent on having the last word on the matter, the D&C clearly felt that if they had to lay out that much on the instrument, they were going to save every penny they could on candles.

Thomas Jones bequeathed compositions to the Canterbury music library. The Cathedral Archives have two anthems, Blessed is He That Considereth the Poor (dated 1831) and Unto Him that Loved Us, and two Service settings: an Evening Service in C and some Morning Canticles in Eb (Sanctus, Kyrie—“arranged from Jomelli”—Doxology and Creed). The Dictionary only records the two anthems and notes that his hymn tune, Quinquagesima, was used in the Methodist Church’s School Hymn Book in 1950.¹⁷⁴ This modest achievement means that of the thirteen men who were in the Cathedral choir in 1825–6, Thomas Jones had the greatest impact on twentieth-century British musical life.

Stephen Elvey

Of those thirteen Lay Clerks, Thomas Jones’ service is notable for outlasting the Canterbury Catch Club; his tenure as Organist survives it by some seven years. Among his contemporaries at Canterbury were a few of the most gifted musicians of his generation, including the next to join, Stephen Elvey, who had been a chorister with Jones at Canterbury before becoming a Lay Clerk in

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 119.
¹⁷² Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 162.
¹⁷³ Ibid., 272.
¹⁷⁴ Evans and Humphreys, Dictionary of Composers for the Church in Great Britain and Ireland, 191.
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1824. In 1829—only a year before he left to go to Oxford—Stephen Elvey’s ability had been recognised by the Chapter when they made him “Music Master to the Boys at a salary of £25 per annum” in place of the ageing Highmore Skeats—whose salary is correspondingly reduced, in somewhat penny-pinching fashion, as a result.\(^\text{175}\) According to Grove (2nd edn., 1904) he (Elvey) would have been 25 years of age. His younger brother George would have been 14, and it is probably George’s oratorio which gets the last brief mention of the Elvey name in the Cathedral’s records, in 1839: “Elvey: Subscription to his oratorio six copies” is all that is recorded.\(^\text{176}\) This may have been the short oratorio The Resurrection and Ascension, which had earned him his Bachelor of Music degree at Oxford the preceding year, 1838.\(^\text{177}\) Sir George, as he became, was only nineteen when he was appointed Organist at St George’s Chapel, Windsor, in 1835, a post he held until his retirement in 1882. The Cathedral Archives have four anthems by George Elvey copied into the MS part-books: I Will Always Give Thanks, In That Day, Unto Thee Have I Cried, and Wherewithal Shall a Young Man. Stephen Elvey’s surviving compositions include one anthem (God Shall Lift Up My Head) and various settings of Morning and Evening Canticles: two complete Evening Services in A and F (“Oxon”), a Kyrie in E, and the Sanctus, Kyrie (“from Handel”), Doxology, and Creed in Eb.

There is no mention of a Stephen Elvey in the Catch Club records, but his younger brother George is to be found, at the tender age of 10, singing the traditional Irish ballad, Kate Kearney, on March 29, 1826.\(^\text{178}\) One “Mr Elvey” performed a song called O What Heart Can Teach in the same concert; this was almost certainly Stephen, three years a Lay Clerk by this stage. It is not clear which one of them performed alongside James Shoubridge (the last Lay Clerk in this prosopography) on Dec 2, 1829, in a performance of John Travers’ Haste, My Nanette, but it is almost certainly one of the pair. They would have been a loss to the city’s musical scene, when they moved to Oxford. The last, rather puzzling, mention of an Elvey in the Catch Club Minutes is recorded long after they’d gone: on January 3, 1842, Mr Goodban was requested “to state to Dr Elvey the sentiments of the Committee on the subject of the Catch Club’s anonymous letter requesting Mr Elvey to furnish the club with his latest glee on the birth of the Prince of Wales. Because of the “very peculiar circumstances” under which the music was obtained the committee feels it can not avail themselves of the kind offer by permitting the music to be

175. Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 92.
176. Ibid., 239.
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performed.”179—which explains why no such composition is to be found in the Canterbury collection. Again, that was almost certainly a work by George Elvey; Grove’s second edition notes that “he conducted the Windsor and Eton Choral Society, and the Glee and Madrigal Society.”180 They may have taken the man out of Canterbury, but they clearly could not take Canterbury out of the man.

Stephen Elvey married Ann, daughter of James Rouse, a tailor and Freeman of the city, and was himself made a Freeman in 1830—the year in which he resigned to take up the post of Organist at New College, Oxford. This information comes from the assiduous note-taking of the Revd. Jos. Stratton, the Precentor, during this period, and he adds a rare encomium: “during the time he filled this situation of Lay Clerk, [he] discharged the duties of it with fidelity and zeal.”181

Castle Kempton

Arriving at the same time as Stephen Elvey, Castle Kempton is one of the few men on the list to have come from elsewhere, and it is worth quoting the records in full so as to note the continuities ever at work in the Cathedral’s community: “Mr Castle Kempton of Ely and Stephen Elvey, formerly a chorister in our Cathedral, were elected and admitted Lay Clerks in the room of George Marsh dismissed for immoral conduct and neglect of duty, and Thomas Goodban resigned,”182 is what the Dean’s Book records in 1824. Marsh had only lasted five years as opposed to Thomas Goodban’s sixteen, and the exact nature of his immoral conduct remains primly unrecorded, but Elvey’s succession to Goodban’s place makes a connection with the man who led the Catch Club Orchestra for so long (and with the print and portrait of him, all of which seems even more remarkable in the face of the yawning abysses of ignorance revealed in most of this attempt at prosopography). In 1831, the Choristers found themselves in Kempton’s charge: “Mr Kempton was appointed to teach the Choristers in one of the rooms in the old Registry183 appropriated as a school for them.”184 The boys could not possibly have imagined—having had, in swift succession, an elderly Highmore Skeats, Stephen Elvey, and Thomas Jones—that Kempton was going to stay in that role for over two decades,

181. Precentor’s Book 7 (1830-1837), inside front cover.
182. Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 22.
183. The teaching was later moved: “It was agreed to resume for the use of the Chapter the rooms appropriated by order of Chapter St Catherine 1831 to the teaching of the Choristers, and to send the Choristers to be taught as heretofore at the Residence of the Teacher.” (Ibid., 264.)
184. Ibid., 120.
until he retired in 1854 with two gratuities: one of £10 and another of £35 per annum “in addition to the retiring pension of £25 on his resigning the office of Lay Clerk and Schoolmaster to the Choristers.”¹⁸⁵ This would have been a happy ending to a quiet career but for a puzzling episode some years later: having been “allowed to retain his office as Lay Clerk during the pleasure of the Chapter with the fixed stipend of £60” in 1855—so he didn’t retire after all—something odd happened in February 1860:

On consideration of the defalcation of Mr Kempton in the several [financial] concerns in which he had been entrusted it was agreed not to commence any legal proceedings against him on the facts which have at present come to our knowledge, but that he be informed that his Pension is withdrawn. If however he makes application to the Chapter in Audit that we shall probably be disposed to give him some assistance not exceeding half the amount of his late pension and that even that will be dependent on the reports we may receive of his future conduct.¹⁸⁶

Whatever it was, the matter was resolved in June:

Agreed to allow Mr Kempton £40 a year as from January last by same instalments as paid to other retiring Lay Clerks, it appearing that his defalcations arose rather from incompetency than dishonesty.¹⁸⁷

In the Catch Club, Castle Kempton was a committed functionary: Librarian for several years,¹⁸⁸ he also sang Alto;¹⁸⁹ and one Kempton Jnr. appears in the 1853-4 season as a member of the Orchestra, playing second violin for 2/6d. a night,¹⁹⁰ though a year later he seems to have swapped to cello, which he carries on playing for the next few years.¹⁹¹ Kemptons (R. and William) remain in the Catch Club records as respected members of the orchestra for the rest of the Club’s life, and in the 1860s the Committee decrees that “Mr Mount & Mr Kempton [are] to be allowed to attend concerts as Hon members of the Orchestra.”¹⁹² This implies some recognition.

Charles Henry Dobson

Charles Henry Dobson sang for 14 years in the Cathedral Choir and married one Salina Harris in 1826, with Thomas William Halsey as a witness.¹⁹³ His arrival is recorded in the Deans’ Books without

---

¹⁸⁵. Dean’s Book 9 (1854-1884), 10 & 15.
¹⁸⁶. Ibid., 105.
¹⁸⁷. Ibid., 109.
¹⁸⁸. Catch Club Minutes Book 1 (1802-1840), 114 & 162.
¹⁸⁹. Ibid., 61.
¹⁹⁰. Catch Club Minutes Book 2 (1840-1860), 112.
¹⁹¹. Ibid., 129.
¹⁹². Ibid., 168.
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comment, and he makes a favourable initial impression: in 1826 the Dean Chapter agreed “that in consideration of the attention & creditable performance of their duties as Lay Clerks of this Cathedral an increase of £20 per annum to their present stipends be granted to Messrs. Elvey & Dobson to be deducted from the fines [the capital sums paid by tenants of Dean and Chapter lands for the renewal of their leases] and paid half yearly.”194 And two years later, in two separate decisions, it is “resolved that the sum of £10 be given to Dobson.”195 So it is a little odd to find that his departure is not recorded at all.

He is not mentioned in the Catch Club records, which is also odd because his name crops up repeatedly in newspaper reports covering everything else musical in this period. He and James Shoubridge are frequently found performing together, as here at the Catch Club in the nearby coastal town of Deal in 1833: “Messrs Shoubridge and Dobson were as usual quite “at home” in the parts assigned them, and gave great satisfaction”—and it is worth noting that the “humorous song of the Cork Leg” received another outing here.196 The various migrations from Canterbury to nearby towns and villages recorded in the local press say much about both the popularity of these evenings in this period and the willingness of the musicians to make a journey which, by coach, must have been a good hour or so: in 1834, the same singers joined the Ashford Catch and Glee Club in a meeting attended by “250 gentlemen of the town and neighbourhood, being the largest, and at the same time, the most respectable convivial meeting ever held within [the Assembly Rooms’] walls.” The usual rules applied: “in the after evening these gentlemen entertained the company with a great many first-rate songs, glee, and catches, which obtained the most enthusiastic applause, as did several songs given by the amateurs of the neighbourhood.” They were not alone: “The orchestra was composed of the Ashford amateurs, assisted by several professional gentlemen from Canterbury.”197 They returned to Ashford—with more of the Canterbury men—in April to round off their season.198

Back in Canterbury, the Catch Club was not the only purveyor of convivial music at this time, and the musicians showed no favouritism when their talents were sought: familiar names crop up, for example, in a report of an Apollonian Catch Club meeting in April 1834. It is the only reference to

194. Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 37.
195. Ibid., 93 & 97.
197. Ibid., 18 February 1834, 3.
198. Ibid., 1 April 1834, 3.
identify Dobson as a bass, and it is also noteworthy for the piano and harp duet performed by the young Masters Longhurst and Mount: “a surprisingly clever performance for so young hands.” This prompted the unexpected celebrity visitor, “Mr Hart, the celebrated quadrille composer,” to congratulate the company. According to the report he “concluded thus: ‘Proud am I to say, that while juvenile talent is so fostered as it appears to be here, Englishmen will never have cause to fear the invasion of any foreigners.’ He then delighted the company by performing “God Save the King,” with variations, on the pianoforte, and amused a numerous company to a very late hour.”

The conviction that invasion by a foreign foe may be deterred with a piano and harp duet probably owes more to the convivial temper of the evening than any historical evidence, but the alacrity with which a provincial musical club may prompt an evocation of national moral fibre is interesting.

The Apollonian Catch Club showed a notable readiness to vary its musical offering in 1834 by holding meetings “at the Half-way house between this city [Canterbury] and Dover.” In May, at the last of them, “upwards of seventy of the surrounding neighbourhood … met together upon the occasion.” Once again, Shoubridge and Dobson are in evidence. They and their fellow Lay Clerks continually appear throughout this period at the civic occasions marked by sumptuous dinners enlivened by the music of these men: inaugurations of councillors and mayors; a dinner “In Commemoration of His Majesty’s Declaration to preserve inviolate the Constitution in Church and State” in September 1834; an “Inauguration Dinner” celebrating the election of a Jurist of Dover, attended by His Grace the Duke of Wellington in October 1834; a Messiah in November; other concerts; other dinners, including the annual Cattle Show Christmas event (see below): then as now, musicians’ lives moved fluidly between an artisan trade by day and as much music as could be got by night. The need for the manners of a gentleman—however that might be defined in times of socio-political transformation—and the business acumen of a tradesman must have been the ever-present tension of the time.

Some entrepreneurial ability did not go amiss. Although it seems that Shoubridge was the brighter luminary in the Canterbury Harmonic Society, Dobson also performed at its first meeting in May 1834. The brief report gives little detail, but opines enthusiastically about its prospects—as well they

might, given its eventual longevity. Unlike the Catch Club, these meetings occurred during the summer months, perhaps with a shrewd eye on the competition.

One of Dobson’s more curious engagements is next seen as he enlivens the later evening revelries of the Brethren of the Druids Lodge in 1838—a claim to fame in itself—with “several excellent songs, ... accompanied on the piano.” Only a week later, on Christmas Day, he and several fellow lay Clerks entertained the guests at the Kent and Canterbury Cattle Show Dinner, which started at 3.30 in the afternoon. After the National Anthem (“sung by a party of City vocalists, Messrs. Shoubridge, Dobson, Palmer, &c. in good style”), toasts and speeches are interspersed with Rule Britannia and the glee Mynheer Van Dunk (for an appraisal of which see Part III) before the 51 “Premiums” (prizes) are awarded. A number of speeches are then reported, practically verbatim, and at some point, presumably, a hearty dinner was eaten, though this is not recorded. Eventually “the principal part of the company now retired. Several still kept up the hilarity of the evening, and with the aid of the vocalists, Mr Dobson favouring them with three excellent songs, harmony and good humour prevailed to a late hour.”

The combination of music with feasting has been a recurrent theme in this work. Here again, social boundaries are blurred; the position of musicians remains a fluid construction in these varied contexts. Christopher Marsh makes a poignant point in relation to one of the waits of Nottingham, who died in 1667. Solomon Sebastian, he notes, was a man of no great wealth whose social environment, at his deathbed, was represented by his neighbours: “a glover, a cordwainer’s widow and two spinsters.” Yet he had played at civic occasions in fifty years or more for mayors, burgesses, judges, aldermen and kings, and had travelled far, far further afield than most contemporary men of such poor social standing could imagine: Coventry, London, Cambridge colleges, and homes of gentry in Lancashire and Leicestershire. “All in all,” Marsh says, “this friend of glovers and cordwainers had lived quite a life.” If these snapshots of cathedral musicians are anything to go by, Solomon Sebastian’s successors had similarly unusual social experiences.

204. Ibid., 20 May 1834, 3.
205. Ibid., 18 December 1838, 3.
206. Ibid., 25 December 1838, 3.
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James Shoubridge

The last name on the list of men who were Lay Clerks in 1825-6 is that of James Shoubridge, who was appointed in the place of the man who began this propography, James Shrubsole. Shoubridge was clearly a model Lay Clerk: in 1830, it was “Resolved that £10 a year each be given during pleasure to [James] Shoubridge & [John Alexander] Longhurst Lay Clerks.”208 J.A. Longhurst—that older brother of W.H.—was admitted a Lay Clerk earlier that year but, given his relationship with one of the most important musical figures in this study, there is a frustrating silence in the records beyond that. His salary is not recorded in the Treasurers’ Books after 1831, and the Deans’ and Precentors’ Books make no mention of him other than this gratuity. Of Shoubridge, rather more is known. He received another gratuity in 1839: “James Shoubridge received a grant of £10 in addition to his stipend from July 6,”209 again for no specified reason. In the event, he resigned the following year “upon obtaining an appointment at the Foundling [Hospital]”, as was recorded in the Precentor’s Book for the period.210 The Dictionary mentioned above records a long and successful career from there: in 1857 he became a Vicar Choral at St Paul’s Cathedral and conductor of the Cecilian Society, London, in 1852. His compositions include a setting of a few of the Morning Service canticles (Sanctus, Kyrie, and Doxology) in Bb (now in the Canterbury Cathedral archives), an anthem, He Comes dating from his time in Canterbury (1834), though that is not part of the Canterbury collection,211 and Twenty-Four Original Psalm and Hymn Tunes, for Four Voices, published 1840.

On the assumption that the “James Shoulbridge” mentioned a few times in the Catch Club Minutes is the same man, it’s disappointing to have to sound a discordant note in this snapshot of the thirteen singers of 1825-6. In 1839, the Club Committee decides that “Mr James Shoulbridge [be] engaged in the orchestra provided he withdraws the offensive part of his letter charging the committee with injustice.”212 Nothing further is said in the Minutes, and that is the last the Catch Club has to say of him before he leaves for London. The local paper reports, however, make it clear that he contributed significantly to the musical life of the city: his singing is warmly received in reports from 1834,213 but

208. Dean’s Book 8 (1822-1854), 111.
209. Ibid., 238.
210. Precentor’s Book 7 (1830-1837), inside front cover.
211. Evans and Humphreys, Dictionary of Composers for the Church in Great Britain and Ireland, 306.
he seems to have been a leading light in the Sacred Harmonic Society, which first appears in the papers in 1834:

SACRED HARMONIC SOCIETY
Guildhall concert rooms, Canterbury
A grand selection of SACRED MUSIC, from HANDEL’S Oratorio of the MESSIAH; HAYDN’S CREATION, &c., &c., will be given by upwards of SEVENTY VOCAL and INSTRUMENTAL PERFORMERS,
On Monday evening, November 24, 1834.

The list of vocal soloists is practically identical to that of the Lay Clerks in that year: Longhurst, Eastes, Young, James Shoubridge and his brother William, William Palmer and Dobson. But Shoubridge conducts, and seems to be at the helm of the society for the rest of his time—sadly, only six more years—in Canterbury.

This society seems to have outlasted Shoubridge by nearly twenty years, if the paper is accurate in its 1857 report that “The Canterbury Sacred Harmonic Society, newly constituted as the “Glee and Madrigal Society,” gave a performance on Tuesday evening at the Music Hall. To diversify the programme, Mr Macknay, the noted comic singer, was engaged; the band of the 79th Highlanders also assisted, and these varied entertainment attracted a large audience. .... Mr Lyon [Charles Lyon, another Lay Clerk] conducted on the occasion.”214 The extent to which this society was able to move with the changing tastes of the times should have been a lesson to the Catch Club.

In another most serendipitous touch, James Shoubridge was replaced as Lay Clerk in 1841 by William Henry Longhurst, who went on to play such an important role there and in the Catch Club. In fact, this was a technicality, since Longhurst had been “admitted to the Choir as Supernumerary & Assistant to Mr Jones, as Master of the Choristers” in 1836,215 continuing unbroken his service to the cathedral since joining as a chorister in 1828.

9.6. Another Collective Conclusion

Notwithstanding the precipitate departures noted earlier in this chapter, it must be said that much of the above gainsays the gross caricatures perpetrated by Earle and Brown, lending support instead to Deborah Rohr’s impression that cathedral singers were a body of men who were committed to their

214. Ibid., 3 March 1857, 4.
215. Precentor’s Book 7 (1830-1837), inside front cover.
work and keen to be recognised on a more professional basis. Of the thirteen men studied in this chapter—and this perforce ignores two of the most significant figures of the period, Goodban and Longhurst—three were appointed organists (Skeats, Jones and Elvey); five contributed to the cathedral repertoire with their own compositions (those three, with Kempton and Shoubridge); four were involved in music education (Skeats, Jones, Elvey and Kempton); and seven were shown particular appreciation either by the award of gratuitities, a pension, promotion, or an approving mention in the Deans’ Books. Only one left under something of a cloud, and in Newington’s defence it should be noted that his misdemeanours, whatever they were, do not appear to have been transgressive of cathedral statute but of civic intolerance of commercial debt. Their loyalty should also be noted: for comparatively poor reward, eleven of the thirteen remained in Canterbury until death or retirement. This is not a record of wastrel irresponsibility; rather, it is indicative of a group of musicians who, in the main, attempted to combine service to the cathedral choir with whatever other employment they could find. Given that cathedral commitments were deeply unsympathetic to a normal working life, it is not altogether surprising that some of that employment was to be found in the later evening hours of the city’s Catch Club. It must have been one of the most congenial options available.

Wesley had noted in a footnote to his Preface the contrast between the church music of his day and that of the secular concert life of the nation:

Dr. Burney declared that in musical art, the secular, in all ages, had been in advance of the sacred. If this could be said in his time, which was before the great dawn of modern Germany when English art, in its secular departments, was comparatively worthless, and when the same Church writers, whom we deem great now, were all fully known, what must we think now, with the works of Mozart, Beethoven, and Spohr, in our concert rooms and theatres; and those of a host of inferior organists and choir-men, too numerous, and really too contemptible to particularise, in our Cathedrals?  

He hits one nail on the head: in Canterbury, the music to be found in the Catch Club—and the other concert venues—was, regrettably, better at this stage in the nation’s musical history than that of the cathedral. As the musicians left the cathedral after the Wednesday Evensong and headed down Sun Street to the Prince of Orange, they must have been genuinely looking forward to an evening of good food, plentiful drink, good company, and very good music.

PART III:

OUT OF SIGHT

I live in a constant endeavour to fence against the infirmities of ill health, and other evils of life, by mirth; being firmly persuaded that every time a man smiles, but much more so, when he laughs, it adds something to this Fragment of Life.

CHAPTER 10:

“PRESENT ABSENCES”

The citizens in the Canterbury Catch Club print seem justifiably confident about their socio-cultural worth. The most important visible signifier—the orchestra jammed indistinctly into the alcove at the back of the room—testifies to the prosperity of a club which could afford to hire a sizeable ensemble for its weekly entertainment and then, if this image is anything to go by, largely ignore it. Most of the members seem extraordinarily pleased with themselves as they neglect whatever music is being so earnestly played: they chat; they gaze at the fire or into the middle distance; or they drink, puffing at their pipes all the while.

It is very important to this group of people that a great deal of matter is scrupulously ignored, so it comes as no surprise to recall briefly the things this image does not show. Women are as excluded from the image as they were from public discourse. War is ignored: the Napoleonic Wars may have passed, and the music that accompanied them may have fallen largely into irrelevance, but Britain still had an empire to build and defend, in the interests of a national identity which had much to do to become the stable narrative the Victorians might feel able to tell themselves in decades to come. Little of that effortful imperialism adorns the walls, resplendent in their classical allusions; the oh-so-loyal Royal Arms are the only direct reference to the politics of the outside world. Religious schism is ignored—very wisely, given the fact that civic rights for Catholics remained contested while at the other end of the theological spectrum the Church of England seemed to have no answer, in 1826, to the Nonconformist surge which threatened to drive an irreparable wedge between the old rural and the new urban communities; the established church would have to wait another few years before the first tracts of the Oxford Movement appeared in 1833. Far closer to home than all this, the vicinity of the Club is ignored, comprehensively: the room could be anywhere, as long as that anywhere would allow a space in which culture, affluence, and respectability could be performed. The as yet unlit, unpaved, and unpolicing streets of Canterbury—or anywhere else—are of no concern to this scene. Nor are the city’s other inhabitants, or any potential visitors, noted. They may be welcome to look, to admire the poise and assurance of Canterbury’s finest citizens, but that is all the acknowledgment they get. Finally, a defining behaviour of Catch Club members everywhere is completely obscured by the print: in showing sedate immobility, it denies the earthier manifestations of the male libertine
“Present Absences”

culture from which this gathering sprang—the bawdy songs, the unconscionable drinking which went on into the early hours before the Club emptied itself out into the winter night.

All this disregard was entirely understandable, and defensible. The work being done here—the intent performance of social status in the face of tremendous socio-economic pressures—was quite challenging enough without trying to set the rest of the world to rights and, by definition, anything suggesting the less formal, more participatory, aspects of the evening’s sociable activities would be excluded from such an affirmation of respectability as this print aspires to be. But none of this is to the point with respect to a Catch Club evening, whose real purpose is captured by the contemporary music critic, Edward Holmes, as he considers the essential nature of sociable music-making: “It gives a pleasant sensation to look round a large and well-filled room, and see a set of people who for one evening at least have tolerably excluded the cares and vexations of life.”1 So this section takes its cue from that, and considers instead the key component of this picture: the music.

The evidence here is oddly tangible. Oddly, because it relates to the one very important thing in the picture which is not, and can never be, seen. Richard Leppert comments on the ways in which, in the silence of a picture, “the musical signs bequeathed quality to the silent representations of the Quality”.2 Happily, the Canterbury archive is remarkable for its preservation of the pages which gave that music its life.

10.1. The Archive

There are two rich resources inviting an investigation of the repertoire of the Club now in the care of the city library and of the Cathedral Library and Archives. The first are concert records: two sets of them—some sixteen years’ worth in total—spanning the years 1825-1837 and 1857-1861—almost the final years of the club. The first set is almost certainly the work of Thomas Goodban: the records are to be found in a beautifully bound notebook evidently purchased from Henry Ward’s shop (Ward’s label is affixed inside the front cover), and completed in handwritten script.3 Records begin with the first night of the 1825-6 season, 28 September 1825, and end abruptly with the twentieth night of the 1836-7

---

2. Richard Leppert, Music and Image, 177.
season, on 8 February 1837, when the book runs out. So assiduous is the record-keeping for these years that one can only assume companion volumes have been lost. The second set of concert records is a slim volume kept in the city library and museum which was the property of William Henry Longhurst; his name and address (8, St George’s Place, Canterbury) are given in his handwriting, along with the dates of the concert seasons covered, on the front endpaper. Bound into this single volume is a complete collection of the printed leaflets advertising each week’s concert, giving the full programme (occasionally annotated in pencil in cases of alterations) along with details as to how to obtain tickets for ladies.

![Fig: 10-1: Callcott Anthology Subscribers map](image)

The other resource is the music itself: just over 3,000 pieces of vocal music bound into some 70 volumes, and 753 pieces of orchestral music whose parts are written out in approximately 200 instrumental part books for use by the Club orchestra. Of the vocal music, most is printed, and much of that printed material is music originally published as a collection of pieces, funded by subscription. To scholars of this repertoire, many of these collections are familiar: several of Samuel Webbe’s appear, as do those of Warren, Cooke, Horsley, and—most numerously—Bland. Why these publications were eventually bound into the sizable volumes now residing in the Cathedral Library is not clear, but the wealth of information to be found in the many lists of subscribers to these publications gives an intriguing insight into the dispersal of such musical material. As one example,

---

Figure 10-1 is a cartographic representation of the subscription list to be found in one of the most beautiful books in the collection: Volume 1 (of 2) containing a collection of the works of John Wall Callcott, edited by his son-in-law, the composer William Horsley. Although the concentration of subscribers inevitably centres upon London, the distribution of pairs of volumes as far afield as Cork and Newcastle is interesting: of the 404 subscribers listed, 135 were outside the capital.

There is cause and effect at work here: Derek Scott notes that “the commodification of music was at its most visible in the sheet music trade, and the purchase of sheet music was an unambiguous and conspicuous example of the consumption of musical goods.”\(^5\) The Catch Club therefore contributed to the patronage of this trade, and behaved in such a manner as to assert their cultural status in so doing. In this respect, the purchasing patterns of the Canterbury Catch Club reflect those of the nation as a whole in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries; as noted above, Emanuel Rubin’s trajectory of the glee shows how its popularity waned after the last decade of the eighteenth century.\(^6\)

Some of the Canterbury volumes, however, are hand-written manuscript. These tend to be earlier, so would be catering for a smaller, less affluent club, but the more interesting point is that music copying takes time and effort which would not be wasted on unpopular pieces. The contents of those few handwritten volumes, therefore, deserve extra attention.

Both resources offer rich insights for the student of nineteenth century concert life, especially in the context of the somewhat exclusive, subscription-based environment of a semi-formal catch club. By definition, these performance spaces are not normally accessible for such close attention, so both programmes and repertoire will be examined here—and, importantly, will be used to interrogate each other.

It might be thought that this rich archive will help to understand our forefathers’ tastes. Most such attempts drown in very murky waters, especially when trying to explain the popularity of the English glee. Bourdieu is particularly pointed in his assessment of the undertaking: “Sociology is rarely more akin to social psychoanalysis than when it confronts an object like taste, one of the most vital stakes in

---

Chapter Ten

the struggles fought in the field of the dominant class and the field of cultural production.”

There is no getting away from it, though: Oskar Cox Jensen notes that the attempt has to be made, and cites Robert Walser’s explanation of the imperative: “understanding … cultural pleasures is an unavoidable precondition to understanding social relations, identities, structures and forces.” Given that this entire thesis is an attempt to understand one visual representation of the peculiar sociocultural entity which is the Canterbury Catch Club in one year of its history, an examination of the music they sang and listened to would be an essential part of the study, even if that music had not been the main reason for setting quill to parchment in the first place—which it was. As Walser ruefully puts that terribly thorny question: “we might as well confront the issue head-on: we are, despite the proverb, in the business of accounting for taste.”

In fact, the challenge may not be a purely musical one, problematic as that undoubtedly is with this repertoire. Musicologists have, in recent years, given much more attention to music which has languished on the margins of the accepted canon of works deserving of serious study, and in more recent years that study has looked ever further back in time, and ever wider in scope and methodology. Derek B. Scott’s Sounds of the Metropolis argues that any consideration of ‘popular’ music should look back at the latter half of the nineteenth century for a proper understanding of the phenomenon. Scott brings a cultural and philosophical perspective to bear, and in so doing he notes that what might have been considered to be an entirely subjective, highly personal, and largely irrational set of decisions on the part of every individual is probably not quite so opaque: “Taste is not a private matter but rather, as Hans Georg Gadamer puts it, ‘a social phenomenon of the highest order’.” Taste, in other words, is constructed.

This should come as no surprise, given the thrust of the argument in Part I of this thesis. If participation in a social grouping, choice of dress, attitudes between musicians and membership, and decisions about the consumption of tobacco and alcohol all make significant reference—“consciously or not”, to borrow a phrase coming up shortly—to the social, economic, and political influences at work on the individuals in the picture, it is only to be expected that taste in music, however peculiar it

9. Derek B. Scott, Sounds of the Metropolis, 85.
may seem in an individual or group, would be subject to the same influences. The music made and consumed by this distinctive social group will seem largely idiosyncratic, often eccentric, and occasionally transgressively libertine; that music, and the associated behaviours it anticipates and encourages, are as much a part of the membership’s *habitus* as everything else in the picture, seen and unseen. This term of Bourdieu’s has already been introduced (p. xxvii) as the acquired accumulation, through education—whose “effectiveness and duration ... are closely dependent on social origin”\(^\text{10}\)—of social, political and cultural knowledge, understanding and taste. Once acquired, Bourdieu notes, “art and cultural consumption are predisposed, *consciously and deliberately or not* (my italics), to fulfil a social function of legitimating social differences,”\(^\text{11}\) which leads Scott to conclude that “culture can be used as a marker of superiority, a taste for the “refined” over the “vulgar.”\(^\text{12}\)

This is entirely in accord with the interpretation of the Catch Club print launched in Part I with a look at the membership and continued in Part II with the study of the subaltern group of men only dimly visible in the picture. If the orchestra serves as visual affirmation of the Club’s socio-cultural status so, too, might the music it played be expected to offer further testimony to the socio-cultural status of its members, in both their own estimation and that of others.

The workings of this social self-engineering may not always be visible. To be sure, there are texts of songs, duets, choruses, and glees which make the subject position— that of the patriotic Englishman/ Briton (there may be a difference)—quite clear; there are several nationalistic examples in the collection, some the work of local composers and lyricists. Most of the vocal pieces, however, work to affirm social status in much the same way as the purely instrumental pieces do: by taking their cue in choices of repertoire from the ruling class of Britain’s Georgian period. Once again the power of the polite view of things is clearly at work in a process of hegemonic domination. Derek Scott not only explains this neatly but, in so doing, resolves a potential mismatch of ideology and illustration:

> A class manifests its supremacy by exercising hegemony, a key political term employed by Gramsci in his *Prison Notebooks* to describe ‘intellectual and moral leadership’. The dominant culture in society is hegemonic; it aims to win its position of ascendancy through consent rather than impose itself by force. ... The state apparatus is invaluable in establishing hegemony; the dominant culture is mediated through institutions such as schools...

---

\(^\text{10}\) Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 1.


\(^\text{12}\) Derek B. Scott, *Sounds of the Metropolis*, 85.
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It might be thought that the diversity of ideology found in bourgeois songs (drinking versus temperance, belligerence versus compassion) argues strongly against the theory of hegemony. Gramsci, however, argues that bourgeois hegemony necessitates an alliance of fractions: a ‘historical bloc’; it therefore follows that the dominant culture is not homogeneous but subject to (and able to tolerate) conflicting strands within the hegemonic alliance.\(^\text{13}\)

Scott might well have given a provincial catch club as another example of a less formal vehicle—even if self-motivated and only quasi-institutional—by which hegemonic domination is extended.

This perspective is important to this thesis. To be sure, the Canterbury collection has examples which offer fresh musical insights into a relatively neglected repertoire—especially with respect to the English glee—and that work is an important part of this final section; but the music should not drown out the muted testimony to the process of socio-political sedimentation which was taking place. Begun in the later eighteenth century, when the anti-Catholic Gordon Rioters horrified society’s upper echelons at home, and continued into the nineteenth as the French Revolutionaries appalled the entire nation both before and during the Napoleonic Wars, the gradual petrification of Britain’s social layers was a process related as closely to the demarcation of entertainment culture as it was to political power structures. Important as the musicologist’s lens is, the social historian’s must be frequently borrowed.

10.2. The Concert Records

The carefully casual demeanours of the figures in the print—few of whom show any awareness of the viewer—give the impression that what is depicted is a normal Club evening. For an insight into the actual music heard on a weekly basis, the detailed concert records which have survived for the years 1825-1837 are invaluable. It is entirely serendipitous that this record begins with the very period during which Henry Ward conceived the idea for the print and commissioned its execution; it is therefore possible to know exactly what the club members heard in the thirty concerts, every Wednesday evening, from the 28 September 1825 to the 19 April 1826.

The programme for the first of the season’s concerts, transcribed from these records, is given below.

- Orchestra; Handel; *Occasional Overture*
- Glee; Thomas Goodban; *Charter Glee*

\(^{13}\) Derek B. Scott, *The Singing Bourgeois* (Open University Press, 1989), x.
It should be noted immediately that the original records are tantalisingly incomplete, as may be seen
in the image of the page from which the following table is compiled (Fig. 10-2, p. 184). Genre is always given, but additional information may only offer a title, or a performer—if the latter, the former may be omitted entirely, which gives the distinct impression that either the record-keeper didn’t know what was to be sung by a soloist, or that it didn’t matter; the provision of the solo spot for a local celebrity was the important thing. Composers are rarely named. The additional information in the list above has been gleaned from the Catch Club instrumental and vocal catalogues created for this thesis, and the Catalogue of the British Library. It would appear, therefore, that the ‘Order Book’ was a record kept purely for the use of the musical director of the time (Thomas Goodban Junior), and that this volume is one of several, since it breaks off in the middle of the 1836-7 season when the book has been filled up.

The complete list of concert programmes in the 1825-6 season is to be found at Appendix N, p. 475. Apart from the appearance of the National Anthem, which was only sung on the first and last nights of a season and on a few other occasions (such as the annual St Cecilia Dinner), this is a typical evening; the other 360+ records for the next decade or so follow the same pattern. This is further evidence that relatively little had changed since John Marsh’s description forty years previously.

However, this concert seems more substantial, and it seems safe to infer from an 1833 committee directive that by this period the evenings began rather later than in Marsh’s day, at 8.00 pm. Although the reasons for such developments are not clear from the records, both are of a piece with the increasing seriousness with which the Club’s affairs were being conducted by this period.

Whatever the motivation, the Club was by this point in its history offering its members fairly substantial musical fare each Wednesday evening. By the end of the 1825-6 season, the musicians employed by the Club had notched up an impressive number of musical items, as shown in the following table:

| Table 10-1: Count of genres featured in the 1825-26 season |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Genre           | Vocal | Instrumental |
| Glee            | 156   |                |
| Song            | 98    |                |
| Orchestra       |       | 97             |

14. “The secretary to [write to] Mr. Goodban asking him to enforce the rule that concerts shall commence promptly at 8pm.” (Catch Club Minutes Book 1 (1802-1840), 115.)
“Present Absences”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duet</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Anthem</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song &amp; Chorus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>311 97 408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the formal concert, the glee is clearly the most popular genre: glees were performed 158 times out of a total of 408 items. In fact, vocal music significantly predominates, forming just over three-quarters of the season’s music. But there is a nice correspondence in what the print and the concert records choose to show—and to omit: just as the print is coyly mute about the social behaviour of the “after evening”, as Mr Welby called it, so too are the concert records silent with respect to the musical content of the latter stages of a Club night.

The following evidence takes a wider perspective: the first table below ranks the eighteen most popular composers based simply on the number of their compositions played that season; the second lists the rest.

Table 10-2: The most popular composers in the 1825-6 season, by frequency of performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>No. of pieces played</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>(1786-1855)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Callcott</td>
<td>(1766-1821)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Webbe (Snr)</td>
<td>(1740-1816)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Maria von Weber</td>
<td>(1786-1826)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Braham</td>
<td>(1777-1856)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Andrew Stevenson</td>
<td>(1761-1833)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mazzinghi</td>
<td>(1765-1844)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Winter</td>
<td>(1754-1825)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Simpson Cooke</td>
<td>(1782-1848)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.F. Handel</td>
<td>(1685-1759)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gioachino Rossini</td>
<td>(1792-1868)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Mozart</td>
<td>(1756-1791)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdinando Paer</td>
<td>(1771-1839)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard John Samuel Stevens</td>
<td>(1757-1837)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Arne</td>
<td>(1710-1778)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Edward Horn</td>
<td>(1786-1849)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Étienne Nicolas Méhul</td>
<td>(1763-1817)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Shield</td>
<td>(1748-1829)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 10-3: Other composers featuring in the 1825-6 season, by frequency of performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pieces played</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 pieces played</td>
<td>Barnett, John (1802-1890)</td>
<td>Hook, James (1746-1827)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boieldieu, Francois-Adrien (1775-1834)</td>
<td>Smith, John Stafford (1750-1836)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Danby, John (1757-1798)</td>
<td>Wellesley, Garrat Colley, Earl of Mornington (1735-1781)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodban, Thomas (1784-1863)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pieces played</td>
<td>Bochsa, Robert Nicolas Charles (1789-1856)</td>
<td>Paxton, Stephen (1735-1878)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carter, Charles Thomas (1735-1804)</td>
<td>Pleyel, Ignace Joseph (1757-1831)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarke, John (1770-1836)</td>
<td>Romberg, ? (?-?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davoux, Jean-Baptiste (1742-1822)</td>
<td>Schneider, Johann Christian Friedrich (1786-1853)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gyrowetz, Adalbert (1763-1850)</td>
<td>Storace, Stephen (1762-1796)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horsley, William (1774-1858)</td>
<td>Vanhal, Johann Baptist (1739-1813)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palmer, Henry (?) ( -1854)</td>
<td>Whitaker, John (1776-1847)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parry, John (1777-1856)</td>
<td>Willis, Isaac (1785-1869)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pieces played</td>
<td>Attwood, Thomas (1765-1838)</td>
<td>Martini, Jean Paul Egide (1741-1816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haydn, Josef (1732-1809)</td>
<td>Moore, Thomas (1779-1852)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herschel, Frederick William (1738-1822)</td>
<td>Wilson, John (&amp; Savile, Jeremy) (1595-1674)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hummel, Johann Nepomuk (1778-1837)</td>
<td>Wright, James (1763-1829)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knyvett, William (1779-1856)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 piece played</td>
<td>Alford, ? (?-?)</td>
<td>Lee, Louise Leoni (?-?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arnold, Dr. Samuel (1740-1802)</td>
<td>Livius, Barham (?-1865)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bayly, Thomas H. (1797-1839)</td>
<td>Lover, Samuel (1797-1868)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beethoven, Ludvig van (1770-1827)</td>
<td>Nathan, Isaac (1792-1864)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Borgi, Luigi (1745-1806)</td>
<td>Norris, Thomas (1741-1790)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherubini, Luigi (1760-1842)</td>
<td>Perry, George Frederick (after Rossini) (1793-1862)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Davy, John (1763-1824)</td>
<td>Purcell, Henry (1659-1695)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dyne, John (1744-1788)</td>
<td>Reeve, William (1757-1815)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East, Michael (1580-1648)</td>
<td>Rooke, William Michael (1794-1847)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fisin, J. (?-?)</td>
<td>Sacchini, Antonio Maria Gaspare (1730-1786)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gilbert, Alfred (?-?)</td>
<td>Sale, John Bernard (1779-1856)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawes, William (1785-1846)</td>
<td>Sterkel, Johann Franz Xaver (1750-1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jomelli, Niccolo (1714-1774)</td>
<td>Wainwright, Richard (1758-1825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kemp, Joseph (1778-1824)</td>
<td>Waller, Sidney (?-?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King, Robert (?) (c.1676-1728)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most striking aspect of this raw data is the pre-eminence of Henry Bishop. Not counting the 41 pieces by unknown composers (most of them songs now lost even to the British Library archives) it is even more noticeable how far Bishop’s popularity outstrips that of his two nearest rivals—the
foremost glee composers of their day—John Wall Callcott and Samuel Webbe (Senior) in the taste of the Canterbury Catch Club.

To anyone remotely familiar with Bishop’s life and work, this comes as no surprise; he was most highly regarded in his day and his “almost incredible productivity”\(^{15}\) was matched by a sureness of touch when it came to giving his public what they wanted. Although this facility has not endurred him to subsequent generations, it assured him of success in his own lifetime. The 61 pieces played (and/or re-played) that season included twenty-six performances of glees (some of which were taken from his ‘operas’), twenty songs, six duets, the round Yes, ‘Tis the Indian Drum (from Cortez, or the Conquest of Mexico) performed five times, and four orchestral pieces.

In fact, this bald count conceals the popularity of some pieces; as with the round mentioned above, songs and overtures were repeated in the course of a season at respectable intervals of a few weeks or so, probably in response to the perennial demands of popular taste and shortage of rehearsal time. A good example is the glee Mynheer Van Dunk,\(^{16}\) which was performed no fewer than six times in the 1825-6 season, and although a closer look at repertoire is the focus of Chapter 11, a brief glance at this piece, here, says much about the essential character of the Catch Club music.

*Mynheer Van Dunk* is the opening chorus provided by Bishop for George Colman’s play *The Law of Java*. This piece of work did nothing for Colman’s career and reputation: a contemporary critic dismissed it as “a thin mixture of maudlin sentiment and melodrama”,\(^{17}\) and subsequent views have tended to agree. A much more recent critic, commenting on Colman’s attempt to inject some exotic interest into his formulaic dramas by situating them in foreign lands—such as Java—notes that “Colman’s characters remain outstandingly unaffected by their new geography”.\(^{18}\) There is no denying, however, Bishop’s understanding of theatrical imperatives: as the Dutch soldiers, dismally

16. “The fictitious name of a dull Dutch writer”, according to George Lord (George de Forest Lord, *Poems on Affairs of State: 1660-1678* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 341.), in the footnote to a poem of 1671 by Edmund Ashton: *On Mr Edward Howard’s “New Utopia”*, in which this character features: “And who the devil was e’er yet so drunk/To own the volumes of Mynheer Van Dunk?” As the rest of the poem makes clear (it is a contemptuous diatribe against Howard’s play) the suggestion that Howard has taken the work of MVD for his inspiration is intended as a gross insult.
consigned to their faraway outpost of colonial rule, thump out their faux-traditional drinking song, the show gets off to a rollicking start.\footnote{The source of this transcription is the Catch Club archive copy, in Volume 40, 75, but it is easily obtainable at the BL.}

With its simple, two-verse, solo-chorus structure, its infuriatingly infectious iambic tetrameters (te-TUM-te-TUM-tiddle-IDdle-iddle-UM), and its lamentable doggerel—not to mention the pandering to the racial stereotype of the drunken Dutchman—this piece was guaranteed to be a sure-fire hit. More to the point, for a Catch Club audience it offered a tremendous opportunity to join in; demanding much enthusiastic participation with little expressive and/or musical sensitivity, its appeal to the drinking classes is clear. It is another example of the inclusive piece discussed earlier when Mr Welby introduced Goodban’s \textit{Charter Glee}, and it exemplifies the expected aesthetic of this convivial music-making very well. A performance by today’s Canterbury Cathedral Lay Clerks may be viewed at https://vimeo.com/233296710.
10.3. A very contemporary music

There is one further point to make about the Catch Club repertoire in 1825-6. The following table arranges the composers in order of their dates of death:

Table 10-4: Composers represented 1825-6 chronologically by death

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composers still living in 1825</th>
<th>No. of pieces played</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Barnett</td>
<td>1802-1890 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Paxton</td>
<td>1735-1878 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Willis</td>
<td>1785-1869 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gioachino Rossini</td>
<td>1792-1868 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Lover</td>
<td>1797-1868 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barham Livius</td>
<td>±-1865 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Nathan</td>
<td>1792-1864 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Goodban</td>
<td>1784-1863 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Frederick Perry</td>
<td>1793-1862 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Horsley</td>
<td>1774-1858 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Braham</td>
<td>1777-1856 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Nicolas Charles Bochsa</td>
<td>1789-1856 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Parry</td>
<td>1777-1856 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Knyvett</td>
<td>1779-1856 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bernard Sale</td>
<td>1779-1856 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>1786-1855 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Palmer</td>
<td>±-1854 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Christian Friedrich Schneider</td>
<td>1786-1853 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Moore</td>
<td>1779-1852 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adalbert Gyrowetz</td>
<td>1763-1850 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Edward Horn</td>
<td>1786-1849 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Simpson Cooke</td>
<td>1782-1848 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Whitaker</td>
<td>1776-1847 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Michael Roeke</td>
<td>1794-1847 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hawes</td>
<td>1785-1846 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mazzinghi</td>
<td>1765-1844 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luigi Cherubini</td>
<td>1760-1842 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdinando Paer</td>
<td>1771-1839 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas H. Bayly</td>
<td>1797-1839 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Attwood</td>
<td>1765-1838 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard John Samuel Stevens</td>
<td>1757-1837 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Nepomuk Hummel</td>
<td>1778-1837 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stafford Smith</td>
<td>1750-1836 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Clarke</td>
<td>1770-1836 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francois-Adrien Boieldieu</td>
<td>1775-1834 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Andrew Stevenson</td>
<td>1761-1833 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignace Joseph Pleyel</td>
<td>1757-1831 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Composers deceased by 1825

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Davy</td>
<td>1763-1824</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Kemp</td>
<td>1778-1824</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Baptiste Davaux</td>
<td>1742-1822</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick William Herschel</td>
<td>1738-1822</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Callcott</td>
<td>1766-1821</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Étienne Nicolas Méhul</td>
<td>1763-1817</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Franz Xaver Sterkel</td>
<td>1750-1817</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel W. C. (Sr.)</td>
<td>1740-1816</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Paul Egide Martini</td>
<td>1741-1816</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William (arr. Bishop) Reeve</td>
<td>1757-1815</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Reeve</td>
<td>1757-1815</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Baptist Vanhal</td>
<td>1739-1813</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josef Haydn</td>
<td>1732-1809</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luigi Borghi</td>
<td>1745-1806</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Thomas Carter</td>
<td>1735-1804</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Samuel Arnold</td>
<td>1740-1802</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domenico Cimarosa</td>
<td>1749-1801</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Danby</td>
<td>1757-1798</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Storage</td>
<td>1762-1796</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Mozart</td>
<td>1756-1791</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Norris</td>
<td>1741-1790</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dyne</td>
<td>1744-1788</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Maria Gasper Sacchini</td>
<td>1730-1786</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garret Colley Wellesley&lt;br&gt;^20</td>
<td>1735-1781</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Arne</td>
<td>1710-1778</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niccolo Tomelli</td>
<td>1714-1774</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.F. Handel</td>
<td>1685-1759</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert (?)&lt;br&gt;King</td>
<td>c.1676-1728</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Purcell</td>
<td>1659-1695</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wilson</td>
<td>1595-1674</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael East</td>
<td>1580-1648</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(total of 111 pieces)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

“Present Absences”

It is the contemporaneity of the repertoire which is so striking. Of the 75 composers whose dates are certain, 44 were still alive in 1825, and a further 17 had died only within the preceding quarter century. To put it another way, of the 350 pieces played that season, (by identifiable composers; this table omits the remaining pieces), just over two-thirds were by living composers; if 1800 is taken as a date from which composers could be said to be within living memory, 88% of the pieces fall into that category. In other words, it was very much the music of the day which provided the cultural fare upon which Catch Club members feasted every week in the winter months of 1825-6.

21. For the purposes of this calculation the Romberg cousins, Andreas and Bernhardt, are left out; it is not clear which one wrote the pieces bearing their surname. For the record, Andreas died in 1821, Bernhard in 1841.
Chapter 11:

Repertoire

11.1. Instrumental Music

To be more precise, it was a very particular slice of the music of the day—one which became more and more at odds with the developing tastes and performance environments beyond the Catch Club room. By way of striking example, as Table 11-1. p. 194 shows, the symphony is conspicuous by its absence in the programmes of the Catch Club: although there are parts for 173 symphonies in the Canterbury collection,¹ Mozart’s No. 4 and Haydn’s “Surprise” Symphony make only one appearance each—and there is no clue as to how much of each was actually performed. The neglect of the symphony is hardly surprising: the extended argument of even the simplest sonata-form movement does not sit well with an evening in which noisy participation was eagerly anticipated. When this was not appropriate, the evening’s fare was expected to be in some measure good-humoured, sentimental (in our rather vapid modern sense), dramatic, and/or short. No lengthy development section figures in any piece in the club’s concert records in this period. Table 11-1 shows the instrumental music for the 1825-6 season, arranged as another hit parade of composers.

The popularity of the overture, by contrast with that of the symphony, shows how admirably suited it was to the convivial environment of a catch club. By far the most popular orchestral item, 83 overtures (either standalone compositions or filleted from the opera and music theatre of the day) emphatically outnumber the other 12 orchestral pieces played in the 1825-6 season. Its essentially dramatic character gave the Catch Club what it wanted. One of the favourites will briefly serve as a good example: Peter Winter’s Das Labyrinth wheels out all the characters in Mozart’s Magic Flute for a sequel, also penned by Emanuel Schikaneder, in which Pamina and Tamino face trials by the two remaining elements, air and earth. The opera (properly, another Singspiel), written in 1798, had been performed at Vienna, Berlin (1803), Frankfurt (1806) and Nuremberg (1807) by the time the Catch Club acquired the music. The plot was of no importance to the Club; only the overture was ever heard, and it is undeniably charming as it introduces the various characters of the drama, recalling at one point

---

¹ Including: 29 by Haydn; 24 by Abel; 16 by J.C. Bach; 13 each by Borghi and Pleyel; 12 each by Vanhal and Tutton; 7 by Gyrowetz; 6 each by Pitchl, F.X. Richter, Dittersdorf and Dobney; 5 by [John] Marsh; 4 by Johann Stamitz; and 2 each by Mozart, Rosetti, Carl Stamitz, and Mylsiveček.
the pipes of Papageno by way of a deft nod to the Mozartian origins of the piece. It perfectly fulfils the function of the Singspiel overture: declamatory, exhortatory, inclusive, undemanding for an audience, and celebratory; it lifts the curtain on the delights in store, and that makes it perfect material for the Catch Club.

Table 11-1: Orchestral pieces 1825-6, by frequency of performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>No. of pieces played</th>
<th>Details [NB: works from which overtures are taken are given where identified; each work performed x1 unless otherwise stated]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Winter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Zaire x3; Das Labyrinth x4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.F. Handel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Samson &amp; Richard I x2; Esther, Potiphar, Occasional Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gioachino Rossini</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Italian in Algiers x5; Tancred x3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdinando Paer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sargino x4; D’Una in Bero x2; Ginevra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Étienne Nicolas Méhul</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“Overture” x5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Mozart</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Overtures: Figaro x2; Zauberflöte, Don Giovanni, Clemente di Tito; Symphony No. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“Clarinet Concerto” x3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Miller and His Men, Gay Mannering, Comedy of Errors x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francois-Adrien Boieldieu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Caliph de Bagdad x4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mazzinghi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exile x2; Ramah Droog x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domenico Cimarosa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Overture” x2; Overture No. 2 in D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Baptiste Davaux</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sinfonia Concertante x3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adalbert Gyrowetz</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overtures: in D x2; in G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignace Joseph Pleyel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overtures: in D x2; in G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Romberg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Overture” x2; Overture No. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C.F. Schneider</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Overture No. 4” x2; “Overture Op. 50”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Maria von Weber</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Preciosa; Der Freischütz x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josef Haydn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overture in D, Surprise Symphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Nepomuk Hummel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Function x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Paul Egide Martini</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Henry IV x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Franz Xaver Sterkel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organ Concerto x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Baptist Vanhal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42nd Overture [sic], Organ Concerto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludwig van Beethoven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prometheus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luigi Borghi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Overture No. 2”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luigi Cherubini</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anacreon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niccolo Jomelli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Overture No. 2”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Playing With Signs, Kofi Agawu invokes the terms of classical rhetoric.2 On this reading, the overture fulfils the function of the exordium, in which the audience is enticed to engage with the

---

subject under discussion, persuaded to do so by all the rhetorical devices and embellishments at the orator’s disposal, in order to lead to the deeper argument which follows. The overture never really takes its audience beyond this initial stage, since its function is solely to introduce. Hence its perfect suitability for a convivial concert such as the Catch Club’s, which is not interested in a level of profound musical engagement. The appeal of a Catch Club evening lies to a large extent in its state of perpetual exordium, musically speaking.

There is also the undeniable attraction of a good tune. This makes an immediate connection with the vocal repertoire, of which much more shortly; for now, it should be borne in mind in this overview of the instrumental music in the Canterbury collection. The following table shows the genres appearing in the 753 pieces therein, organised into three categories: purely instrumental forms; dance/march movements; and music which serves as accompaniment to vocal music. The dance/march pieces are worth isolating, since they form such a significant body of material within the collection. It should also be noted that they are later in date; this reflects changing tastes. Finally, it is worth noting that the Coronation Anthem is Handel’s *Zadok the Priest* — the only sacred piece in the instrumental collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Dance/March</th>
<th>Accompaniment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>Quadrille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Waltz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinfonia Concertante</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Polka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondo</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Galop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Concerto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera Selection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>March &amp; Polka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerto.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cantata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Symphony</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>National Anthem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March &amp; Overture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Song &amp; Chorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin.Concerto.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cavatina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>Charter Glee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coronation Anthem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to use one set of evidence to interrogate another: as already noted, the high number of symphonies in the collection is not reflected in the programmes actually heard during the 1825-6
Catch Club season. Furthermore, the music collection and the concert programmes lead to different conclusions with respect to the relative popularity of composers. One need only compare Table 11-2, above—in which Peter Winter emerges as the most popular composer of the 1825-6 season—with the names at the top of Table 11-4 to see a mismatch: Winter, appearing some way down the list, is represented in the collection by only 7 pieces.

The main reason for the apparent inconsistency is that the catalogue is the sum of the Catch Club’s 86 years of instrumental music collection whilst the concert records show what was popular in any given year. As brief illustration of this methodology at work, for the purposes of comparison with 1825-6, Table 11-3 shows the most popular composers in the final year of the concert records. William Henry Longhurst, clearly, did not hesitate to promote his own work whilst serving as the Club’s musical director:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of pieces</th>
<th>Composer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Auber, Daniel-Francois-Esprit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Balfe, Michael William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longhurst, William Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>D’Albert, Charles Louis Napoléon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rossini, Gioachino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cooke, Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glover, Charles William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bellini, Vincenzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mendelssohn, Felix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Farmer, Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hatton, John Liptrot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Calicott, John Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donizetti, Gaetano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hérold, Ferdinand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loder, Edward James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macfarren, Walter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stevens, Richard John Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verdi, Guiseppe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11-4: most popular composers in the Instrumental Music collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 pieces or more</th>
<th>7 pieces</th>
<th>4 pieces</th>
<th>2 pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handel (73)</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Emdin</td>
<td>Bellini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (35)</td>
<td>Marsh</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Bosio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydn (29)</td>
<td>Strauss, J.I</td>
<td>Laurent</td>
<td>Boyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel (25)</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Méhul</td>
<td>Callcott, J.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bach, J.C. (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meyerbeer</td>
<td>Cimarosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hook (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Romberg, A.</td>
<td>Clarke-Whitfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auber (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shield</td>
<td>Cooke, T.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleyel (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stamitz, J.</td>
<td>Danby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossini (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gossec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossini (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borghi (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paer (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanhal (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Albert (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musard (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arne (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 pieces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davaux</td>
<td>Cherubini</td>
<td>Balfe</td>
<td>J.C.Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyrowetz</td>
<td>Donizetti</td>
<td>Braham</td>
<td>Jomelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry</td>
<td>Herold</td>
<td>Galuppi</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mazzinghi</td>
<td>Labitzky</td>
<td>Koenig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palmer, H.</td>
<td>Lamotte</td>
<td>Kreutzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lindpaintner</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lyon, Charles</td>
<td>Mysliveček</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marschner</td>
<td>Onslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purcell</td>
<td>Princess Royal of Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>Richter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tinney</td>
<td>Romberg, B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tutton</td>
<td>Rosetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verdi</td>
<td>Smith, T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stamitz, C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Webster, S., Snr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composers with 1 piece in the collection

| Alford                              | Farmer, H.                        | Lobe?                   | Russel                  |
| Arne, T.A.                          | Fessy                             | Loder, E.               | Sacchini                |
| Arnold                             | Fitz                              | Loder, E. J.            | Sanderson               |
| Arnold, S.                         | Fioravanti                        | Longhurst, W.H.         | Schmitt, Joseph         |
| Ashley                             | Franzl,F.                        | Macfarran, G.A.         | Schneider               |
| Attwood                            | Geyr, T.A.                        | Markoerd                | Schobert                |
| Bach, C.P.E.                       | Giardini                          | Martini                 | Schwindl                |
| Barnett                            | Giardini/Marsh                    | Martini [‘ITedesco’]    | Seyfried                |
| Barthelemon                       | Giordini?                        | Maurer                  | Sim         |
| Bates                              | Goodban, H.W.                     | Mendelssohn             | Sirmen, Madalena Laura |
| Beresford                          | Goodban, T.                       | Mono                    | Skeats                  |
| Bilse                              | Gretry                            | Montgomery              | Smart, Sir George      |
| Blewitt, Jonas                     | Gung’l                           | Nicks                   | Smith, J.S.            |
| Boccherini                         | Halévy                           | Nicolo, Isouard         | Smith, S.T.            |
| Bochsa                             | Hargreaves, G.                    | Palmer, William Henry   | Sommerlatt             |
| Carafa                             | Heine                            | Parry, J./J.W.Hobs      | Spangenberg            |
| Carter                             | Hime                             | Parry, John             | Spohr                   |
| Cirri                              | Himmel, Friedrich                | Percy                   | Suck                   |
| Clifton                            | Hodson                           | Perry                   | Trad.                  |
| Cooke, B.                          | Juliano                          | Purday, C.H.            | Vioiti                 |
| Crispi                             | King/Braham                      | Rauzzini                | Walmsley, T.F.         |
| Czerny                             | Kernig                           | Relfe                   | Ware, W.H.             |
| D’Este, John                       | Kuffner, Joseph                  | Rhodes                  | Watson, J.             |
| Danby, J.                          | Labitzky, J.                     | Rodwell, G.H.B.         | Webbe, S., Jnr.        |
| Davy                               | Lanner, Joseph                   | Romberg, A.&B.          | Weigl                  |
| Dibdin                             | Lee, A.                           | Rooke, W.M.             | Welsh, T.              |
| Erdmann, Otto Karl, Count of       | Linley, T. (the elder)           |                        | Wright                 |
| Kospoth                            |                                    |                        |                        |
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The two resources together, however, are invaluable witness to the changing tastes of the Club—and indeed of society at large. As one final example, consider the nature of the instrumental music in the 1860-61 season: of the 134 orchestral pieces (out of 348 items in total), only 65 were overtures. The remainder reflect the vogue—by then well established, as noted above—for dance music: those galops, waltzes, and other dance movements the Committee had particularly requested of Mr Palmer (then conductor) in the early 1850s. when it was “Proposed that Mr Palmer be requested to introduce into each concert during the season one quadrille, waltz or Polka.”

That is a revealing request. The committee seem perfectly well aware that the Club is an agent by which music is made accessible to their audience. Just as “the pleasure garden … gave access to the kind of music performed at subscription concerts, such as the Bach–Abel Concerts (1765-82), which were beyond the pocket of the petit bourgeois,” so did the catch and glee clubs of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries make available a repertoire to which the middle-class urban membership would not have had such sustained and frequent access. It is a nice irony that a Club which set out to be somewhat exclusive thereby acts as an agent for a wider participation in the nation's cultural production and consumption.

Common to almost all these pieces, however, is the characteristically exuberant conviviality found in almost all the vocal music repertoire.

11.2. Vocal Music

There are 70 volumes of vocal music in the Canterbury archive, containing some 3000 pieces. About 1,000 are duplicated, so a filleted tally reveals the scores shown in Table 11-5, p. 199.

The vast majority are ensemble pieces, and by far the most significant genre is the glee. As the Epilogue will endlessly repeat, it is difficult, at this distance of time and cultural space, to empathise very deeply with Catch Club culture. It is particularly difficult to appreciate the extent of and the reasons for the phenomenal popularity of this diminutive genre—to the point where the poor little thing could hardly bear the weight of expectation placed upon it, so extravagant were the claims.
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Table 11-5: Vocal music in the Catch Club Collection, by genre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>No. of pieces</th>
<th>No. of pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>Elegy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>Ballad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Solo &amp; chorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo Song</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Epitaph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Ode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Cantata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Canon 4 in 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrigal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Catch &amp; Glee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzonet</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>National Anthem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rondo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundelay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo Song, Duet or Glee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.2.i. Gles

Of all the genres falling under consideration in this study, the glee is perhaps the least understood—even by comparison with the catch, which has been tragically, if understandably, misrepresented for several centuries. Its oddity is beautifully captured by Emanuel Rubin in his encyclopaedic study of the genre when he muses that the predominance of the glee in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries meant that “England turned left while the rest of the parade turned right.”\(^5\) Culturally, it is difficult to account for it: even if it were not tainted by its association with the catch, and with convivial music-making in informal settings—which it most certainly was—it would be difficult to imagine Matthew Arnold, to take one example, including it in his definition of culture. As Anthony Appiah explained in the 2016 Reith Lecture, “For Arnold, the poet and literary critic, culture was the “pursuit of our total perfection by means of getting to know, on all the matters which most concern us, the best which has been thought and said in the world.”\(^6\) It is doubtful Arnold would have regarded the glee as qualifying by that criterion. Even those who liked it seem perplexed: in 1932 Edward Dannreuther sounds surprised to find himself saying “This would seem to be the right place to call attention to a species of concerted music for solo male voices unaccompanied, which is worthy of note

---

as peculiarly English, intrinsically genuine, and in its peculiar way good.”

Earlier, in 1831, William Crotch had drawn his distinction between “the sublime, the beautiful, and the ornamental”, consciously following Joshua Reynolds’ aesthetic categorisation. Crotch holds that the sublime in music “never descends to anything small, delicate, light, pretty, playful, or comic,” but rather that it is “the grandest style in music” destined to convey “the most awful [sic] and striking images.” Arguably, the glee starts with an inherent disadvantage by these criteria, since it is usually a piece for three, four, or five unaccompanied male voices. Although it does attempt grandiosity from time to time, it does so only seldom, and not necessarily successfully. That said, for Crotch, quite a lot of music is sublime, and some of it is smaller in scale: sacred music; “simplicity, and its opposite, intricacy, when on a large scale” may qualify, as may a large orchestra, a “succession of major chords”, a madrigal, or an organ fugue. The glee, however, remains conspicuous by its omission from any of Crotch’s lists. There are certainly examples of gles aspiring to a conveyance of “the most awful and striking images”, but one suspects they may disqualified by Crotch’s disdain for anything “light, playful, or comic”.

Crotch’s second category may be more promising territory for the glee. Beauty in music, according to Crotch, “is the result of softness, smoothness, delicacy, smallness, gentle undulations, symmetry, and the like.” This is more apt, given the glee’s favoured homophonic texture: melody over a relatively simple harmonic vocabulary: “when, therefore, in music the melody is vocal and flowing, the measure symmetrical, the harmony simple and intelligible, and the style of the whole soft, delicate, and sweet, it may with as much propriety be called beautiful, as a small, perfect, Grecian temple, or a landscape of Claude Lorraine.” This could describe many gles rather well, though the recollection of Thackeray’s Claude Carmine is unfortunate; Crotch is entirely lacking in satirical intent here. Categorisation of the glee, however, remains problematic: Crotch’s “ornamental style” is the next rung down in his aesthetic hierarchy, and “is the result of roughness, playful intricacy, and abrupt variations.” These features are familiar in a glee, albeit within the limitations of the human voice. Some resolution may be found in the fact that “beauty and ornament are … frequently blended.”
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Perhaps the glee has found its spot on Crotch’s cultural ladder, dangling between the two lower rungs.

The bad news for the glee is the hierarchy Crotch creates for these styles, for in the course of his “consideration of the mental labour employed in their formation, and the mental capacities required for the comprehension and enjoyment of them”, it becomes clear that a music which aims for “a milder gratification from that which soothes and tranquillises the mind” is of a lower order, and—worse—that in which “a still greater number seek for amusement and delight from the wit and humour of the lowest style” offers only a “meager enjoyment” ranks lower still.\(^{11}\) In this respect, the glee may not fare so well. Meanwhile, it is clear that Crotch is concerned only with the environment of the concert hall and the cathedral; the tavern is not considered a serious locus of genuinely aesthetic experience. This may be why Crotch does not actually mention the glee, at all. It is not surprising that a migration of some sort was necessary if the glee was to become respectable.

The glee does not speak loudly on its own behalf: the conservatism of its musical features, its occasionally infelicitous choice of text, its over-reliance on word-painting—all this has earned it “the immense condescension of posterity”,\(^ {12}\) in the splendid phrase Gatrell probably adapted from E.P. Thompson\(^ {13}\) and, like Thomas Rowlandson, the glee needs to be rescued from such patronising disregard. Several scholars—besides Rubin—have made attempts to do so: David Johnson’s work in the late 1970s and early 80s resulted in a slim volume of eight gles in 1983,\(^ {14}\) the same year in which Paul Hillier included half a dozen in his 300 Years of English Part songs, published by Faber. OUP followed this up in 1990 with a larger collection of twenty-six pieces in The English Glee, edited by Percy M. Young and prefaced by his informative introduction; and Rubin’s work appeared in 2003. Before any of the music appeared in twentieth-century publication, Johnson was editing and performing pieces from the repertoire, and an academic offshoot of this work appeared in The Musical Times in 1979; his pithy summary of the quality of much of the repertoire deserves a reprise: “A dip into any glee collection will quickly provide examples of trite lyrics and part writing whose textbook

---

11. Ibid., 37–41.
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correctness is matched only by its fear of modulation,” he says, before going on to do what all these scholars attempt: argue for a re-appraisal of this repertoire in the context of a better understanding of its aesthetic. One more essay on the glee—to be accurate, on *Glees, Madrigals and Partsongs*—appeared in 1988 as part of *The Blackwell History of Music in Britain: The Romantic Age, 1800-1914*, written by Michael Hurd.

This was by no means the earliest scholarship to take an interest in the glee and its antecedents. Some of the glee composers were themselves antiquarians and academics: R.J.S. Stevens, appointed Gresham Professor of Music in 1801, records in his diaries delivering his lecture on the English Glee twice, in 1808 and 1816; and John Stafford Smith published his *Musica Antiqua* in 1812, a historical anthology which traced the development of music “from the commencement of the twelfth to the beginning of the eighteenth century, comprizing [sic] some of the earliest and most curious Motetts, Madrigals, Hymns, Anthems, Songs, Lessons & Dance Tunes …from manuscripts and printed works of great variety and value, the whole calculated to shew the melody & harmony of this country; & to exhibit the different styles & degrees of improvement of the several periods.” The period covered by his volume does not get as far as the glee, but there is one clue as to the musical conservatism which characterises the genre: concluding his “Remarks on the various compositions”, Stafford Smith takes an overview of the development of the harmonic resources he perceives across the centuries:

So late even as the year 1680, Fux, the famous chapelmaster to the Emperor of Germany declared mi contra fa to be diabolus. The disallowances at that time have since been worked up with exquisite taste; but now harmonical modulation is so loaded with semitonic passages, that their use, in determining the key and mode of composition, is in some degree lost; for the superior knowledge of instrumental effect, possessed by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and others, by no means compensates for the want of that manly, open, clear, vocal melody, which characterised the works of Mr Handel, and of those great masters who wrote in his dignified manner.18

It was not only Handel’s melodic gifts which so enchanted this generation of composers. Examples abound, in the glee literature, of more or less successful attempts to emulate his mastery of contrapuntal technique and his absolute command of contrasting choral textures for dramatic effect, while setting texts which echo the nobility and archaic solidity of the biblical poetry found in Handel’s
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oratorios: Webbe’s *Threnodia* (Appendix P, p. 496) is perhaps the most obvious example of such work. The sentiment at the start is akin to Shelley’s later *Ozymandias*: in monolithic homophony punctuated by sob-laden pauses, antique monuments are recalled, as a faint reminder of the sense of awe and majesty they evoked in all those who looked upon them.

For Webbe, however, their “transcendent fame can never die”, and the piece attempts to match this noble sentiment in a fugal final section. Despite the wealth of thematic ideas, this never really takes flight in the Handelian manner Webbe and the other glee composers were trying to achieve at times like this—as if the music is weighed down by the expectation placed upon it. That said, there is no doubting the model on which such work was based, and it may be one of the few examples in the repertoire which could, in all conscience, aspire to Crotch’s “sublime”.

The earlier scholarship is reflected in the fact that some pieces in the Canterbury collection belong to the genre which is the ancestor to the glee: the madrigal. Examples by Thomas Weelkes (*Like Two Proud Armies*) and John Bennet (*When as I Look’d*) are reproduced as Appendix Q (p. 502) and Appendix R (p. 508) respectively, not for particularly remarkable musicological reasons but because they are two very fine examples of the madrigal which have not been published in recent years. They and others pop up amidst the eighteenth-century compositions without warning; two madrigals by Michael East (1580-1648) also feature: *How Merrily We Live* and *O Come Again My Love*. Clearly, this earlier repertoire was in circulation even as the glee attracted the attention of—and the prizes awarded by—the London Noblemen and Gentlemen’s (or ‘Nobs and Gents’) Catch Club.

Contemporary writers were acutely aware of the prominence of this tiny genre in the musicology of their nation, as witness one grudgingly approving review of a new publication of glees by Bishop in 1833. This review is notable for more than its appraisal of Bishop’s music: its disappointed tone relating to Bishop’s Italian schooling and to his chosen outlet make clear that on both counts he has mildly betrayed his heritage:

*The glee is our national music, is indigenous to these isles, and a beautiful species of composition however viewed. ….Mr. Bishop, though he pursued his professional duties under an Italian master, and has devoted his life chiefly to the theatre, has cultivated what in an English musician may almost be called a natural talent for glee-writing, to which, it is fair to a laudable institution to state, he has probably been partly induced by his connection with the Concentores Society, a small club, whose sole*
object is the conservation of this kind of composition, and for the service of which three out of the present collection were produced.\textsuperscript{19}

Much later in the century, in the 1880s, when it was generally agreed that the glee’s sun had set—or at least, that dusk could not last much longer—one David Baptie published a history and catalogue of the glee which listed some 23,000 compositions—“and reckoned that as many again had been composed that had not reached print.”\textsuperscript{20} At about the same time, in 1886, a Lay Vicar of St Paul’s, William Alex Barrett, wrote an extensive appreciation of the glee entitled \textit{English Gles and Part-Songs: an Inquiry into their Historical Development}. And it is indeed a scholarly work putting the glee firmly in its historical context. Most intriguingly, perhaps, the glee was paid the most remarkable compliment by one of England’s most eminent composers. Writing in 1914, in \textit{The Music Student; The Magazine of the Home Music Study Union and of the Music Teachers’ Association}, Ralph Vaughan Williams said:

The 18th century, undistinguished as it undoubtedly was in the annals of music—oppressed as it was by the foreign fashionable domination of Italian operas and singers—was yet responsible for two exclusively English art forms—forces small in scope, and not of heroic build, but it was just in such forms as these that the English character found its true utterance; directly it went further it began to lose itself. These two forms are the Anglican chant and the glee. …

The glee is another purely English invention. It differs from the Madrigal in that it moves in blocks of harmony rather than contrapuntally, and, rather like the “verse” anthem, consists of several short movements. A glee is written for solo voices, usually those of men, the top voice being almost invariably an alto. It is this alto voice which largely helps to give a special character to the glee, and to distinguish it honourably from the flood of music for tenor and bass chorus, which swept over Germany a little later.” The hey-day of the English Glee is comprised in the career of its greatest exponent, Samuel Webbe, who was born in 1740 and died in 1816. Such glees as his Thy Voice, O Harmony, Spofforth’s Health to my dear, or Stevens’ Cloud Capt’ Towers, give a good view of this very characteristic form of art, and one which could have flourished nowhere but in England.\textsuperscript{21}

Finally—as far as this brief literature review is concerned—it should be recalled that Brian Robins and Emanuel Rubin have made the most significant contributions to the scholarship on the glee in the last few decades, as noted in the Introduction. What follows is a dreadfully brief summary, of key points.

The glee was a publishing phenomenon in its day. Herein may have lain the genesis of its subsequent disregard, as glees were published more cheaply, but with far less discrimination, than had been the case for its ancestor, the madrigal. This partly explains why the next paragraph is true of far more

\textsuperscript{19} “Review of New Music: Six Original English Gles Composed by H. R. Bishop”, in \textit{The Harmonicon}, Vol. 11 (1833), 148.

\textsuperscript{20} Johnson, “The 18th-Century Glee”, \textit{The Musical Times}, Vol. 120 (1633), 200.

glees than might be wished by anyone writing a thesis about them.

The glee’s musical features always were deeply conservative. As Michael Hurd put it, “What Samuel Webbe was writing in the 1770s is not markedly different from what William Horsley was publishing in 1840.” Its key features are: careful attention to the musical expression of the text in an attempt to capture the true ‘sentiment’—a word rather richer in intellectual weight than its vapid modern meaning now implies—therein; a sectional structure, much in the manner of a Baroque suite—or the English verse anthem invoked by Vaughan Williams, above—which matched the differing moods of the text but which usually felt the need to end with a lively, triple-time section (even when not entirely appropriate, on occasion); an emphasis on essentially lyrical melody in the service of textual expression; the employment of limited harmonic resources beyond occasional use of a secondary dominant, an entirely functional diminished seventh, or modulation to a closely-related key from one section to another; even more limited use of dissonances apart from those associated with galant grace notes; textural variety reminiscent of the madrigal but making less use of contrapuntal interplay between the voices except, on occasion, for learned display; and brevity. Few glee's exceed 100 bars.

However much such conservatism may have owed to the deficiencies in creative talent of some of the less gifted contributors to the repertoire, there is no doubt that it was, in part, a response to contemporary taste—which could, on occasion, be articulated in the most repressive terms. The review of Bishop’s glee's introduced above makes its disapproval of harmonic experimentation clear: finding “some clashing notes, though we allow that many of them are passing notes,” in the following passage from Bishop’s No More the Morn with Tepid Rays, the reviewer asserts that “nothing in music can justify what is disagreeable to a cultivated ear”:
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Example 11-1: Bishop: No More the Morn with Tepid Rays; extract

The review concludes with a truly frightful piece of aesthetic determinism clearly intended to freeze the marrow of any upstart young composer daring to consider the use of a subversive unprepared suspension or some insidious linear chromatic movement:

We may pronounce this [collection] to be a successful work: the glees are all of the orthodox kind, deficient in nothing that good taste requires, or that the nature of the composition, by a prescriptive right, demands. No very hazardous attempts are made at novelty, but we meet with nothing common, and no pedantic show of mistaken learning. Mr Bishop has written to please, not without a sufficient regard for his own reputation, and has not failed in his endeavour.23

By 1833, it would seem, the glee had become the musical instantiation of ossified bourgeois values: unthreatening, unchallenging, deeply suspicious of “learning”, institutionalised. Given the lively origins of the genre, this is to be regretted.

The writers noted above—especially Rubin—offer an exhaustive appreciation of the aesthetic environment in which the glee flourished. At the end of it all, however, it may still be that the reservations Derek Scott articulated about the scholarship of the late twentieth century are valid: writing his introduction to Music, Culture and Society: a Reader, Scott remarks: “There has been a lack of weight accorded to the historical, social, economic, psychological, or other circumstances which bear upon a composer’s music.”24 Of particular interest to this thesis has been the socio-political influences at work in British society in the period around the 1826 print—specifically, about the peculiarity of the catch club culture which nurtured this music and its attendant behaviours. Scott’s remark has much to say with respect to a study of the glee, especially with respect to the composer’s mentality: bearing in mind the convivial, near-anarchic characteristics of the after-dinner and catch club environments described by Marsh, Stevens, Dickens, Thackeray, and numerous newspaper accounts, some consideration should be given to the difference this might have made to the composer, as he picked up his quill and set about penning his opus.

The glee was a child of the Hanoverian dynasty. The cultural grand narrative of this period traces society’s evolution from politeness to sentiment and sensibility: “a new sort of refinement”, in John

---
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Brewer’s phrase.\textsuperscript{25} But the discussion of a blatantly transgressive print culture showed that that is not the whole story. Gatrel has already introduced the issue here, and it is time to explain that, as satirical prints are the visual incarnations of those “earthier behaviours and attitudes”\textsuperscript{26} which generated the “‘bawdy carnivalesque of the old laughter’”,\textsuperscript{27} so may the catch and glee be their musical counterparts—especially the catch. As Gatrel already notes, though, it is not quite as simple as that; this repertoire is cleverer than such a straightforward description might suggest.

A contemporary literary counterpart is to hand. Nietschze is an unexpected guide here, though he didn’t know it when he said this: “[he] who demands to know ….whether [the glee] is making a serious or laughing face, must be given up for lost: for [it] knows how to encompass both in a single … expression.”\textsuperscript{28} He was not actually talking about the glee, as may be guessed from the square brackets, but the comment is pertinent; he was responding to the characteristic—and occasionally baffling—intermingling of the serious and the comic in the writings of Lawrence Sterne.

Sterne’s own argument for his anarchic, experimental, reflexively knowing style and technique is best captured in the passage from The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman in which he asks the reader to consider the inseparable qualities of wit and judgement:

—Here stands wit—and there stands judgement, close beside it, just like the two knobs I’m speaking of, upon the back of this self-same chair on which I am sitting.

—You see, they are the highest and most ornamental parts of its frame—as wit and judgement are of ours—and like them too, indubitably both made and fitted to go together, in order, as we say in all such cases of duplicated embellishments—to answer one another.

Now for the sake of an experiment, and for the clearer illustrating this matter—let us for a moment take off one of these two curious ornaments (I care not which) from the point or pinnacle of the chair it now stands on—nay, don’t laugh at it,—but did you ever see, in the whole course of your lives, such a ridiculous business as this has made of it? … Now these two knobs—or top ornaments of the mind of man, … are the most needful—the most priz’d—the most calamitous to be without, and consequently the hardest to come at.\textsuperscript{29}

This is but a small extract from a passage in which Sterne develops his conceit with all the art and artifice of a metaphysical poet. Such appeal to the intelligence of his reader, implying as it does a

\begin{itemize}
\item[26.] Vic Gatrel, City of Laughter, 17.
\item[27.] Ibid., 417.
\item[28.] Tim Parnell, “Introduction,” in Laurence Sterne, A Sentimental Journey and Other Writings, ed. Tim Parnell (Oxford University Press, 2003), xxiii.
\item[29.] Laurence Sterne, The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman (Penguin Classics, 1997), 163–64.
\end{itemize}
mutual enjoyment of the processes of reasoned argument in witty vein, lies at the heart of his writing. There is flattery here, too, as he draws the reader along with the recognition that such characteristics are the most noble features of humanity; we thereby collude in his rational discourse. This is not the stuff of the lecture hall; it is conversational diversion—by the fire, after dinner, with a drink, perhaps at a Catch Club. There is warm conviviality to be found in time spent with Sterne, and it is essentially informal.

The delicate serio-comic balancing act so brilliantly achieved in *Tristram Shandy* owes much to a well-established intellectual lineage: “The tradition of ‘learned wit’ came down to Sterne from Rabelais and from Burton’s *Anatomy of Melancholy* ... with its mockery of mustiness, its half-loving ridicule of learning run mad, its profane zest for theological speculation. [...] All this, with a battery of learning (real and fake) [...] and with contemptuous gusto.”30 To this list of attributes, Ian Campbell Ross adds “Sterne’s gallery of vital eccentrics,”31 which is something that could most definitely be said of the catch and glee repertoire. Once again, writers describing creative genius in another contemporary medium describe the glee rather well, and in so doing offer an illumination of the aesthetic of the age. Here are some of those “social, economic, psychological, or other circumstances” Scott mentions. There is, too, a union of form with function: the shifting moods of a text can be matched by contrasting, sectional, musical treatment; musical “learning” can be displayed where appropriate, to serve the expressive demands of a text.

A few examples will show how readily this playful, witty, occasionally anarchic aesthetic is to be found in the music of the Canterbury Catch Club. Perhaps the best example of ‘learned wit’ is—once again—to be found in a glee by Samuel Webbe (Snr.) (1740-1816). He was the acknowledged master of the genre in his own lifetime, with over 200 glees, nine published volumes of his music, and nine Catch Club Prize Medals to his credit. Politics are the subject of *My Pocket's Law,*32 and it was topical: in 1810 the cost of war with France had become burdensome. The note of despondency is evident from the start: a bass bewails his poverty in a most plangent lament for a good 15 bars—and it is worth noting that a single-line texture like this is not uncommon in the glee repertoire; these moments recall

30. Ricks, “Introduction,” x.
32. The complete piece appears as Appendix I.1, p. 332.
the start of a catch which, by definition, begins in this monophonic fashion:

![Example 11-2: Webbe: My Pocket’s Low, bb. 1-16](image)

The other singers then enter, following the second tenor entry shown at the end of Example 11-3, trying to cheer him up in lively counterpoint by assuring him that “our loyalty” will mean “the times may mend”, whilst the bass carries on grumbling. Almost unnoticed above this attention-grabbing polyphonic ingenuity, the counter-tenor begins to sing the national anthem. The result is the gloomiest re-harmonisation ever penned, in a depressed minor mode, of our patriotic song:

![Example 11-3: Webbe: My Pocket’s Low, bb. 25-30](image)

It is deeply ironic—and very funny. But Webbe is not done; by the time the counter-tenor has finished singing the entire national anthem, the bass has been persuaded that things may indeed get better. This is the cue for a change of mood, thanks to a swift modulation to the relative major and the introduction of a more vigorous passage heralded by the second tenor, anticipating the smile of “propitious fortune”, taken up by alternating pairs of voices typical of the textural variety found in glees—which owes much to their madrigalian ancestry:
Most importantly, it is upon “Fair Britannia’s sea-girt isle” that Fortune will smile. The consequence of her favour is prosperity, promised in an all-too-brief passage of the most assured counterpoint:

Example 11-5: Webbe: *My Pocket’s Low*, bb. 57-66

Only a few bars later, all four voices cadence onto the dominant, heralding a triumphant re-statement of the national anthem, now restored, with added embellishments, to its major key harmonisation.
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Rubin is certain that this text was written by Webbe, along with a dozen others, and the subject position clearly has the Catch Club audience in mind: it perfectly exemplifies a number of features which illustrate the points made above. Cloaked in patriotic fervour and evoking an idealised image of Albion—the “sea-girt isle”—which traces its literary lineage back through Purcell and Dryden to Shakespeare, and further back to the Arthurian legends which had been reworked by Malory in the mid-18th century, its final, affirmative message of reassurance would sit very well with an audience still living through the darkest days of the Napoleonic Wars. The sly wit, however, of that subversive treatment of the national anthem would subtly appeal to a bourgeois audience engaged in an aspirational struggle for political recognition. There is intriguing evidence that, in Webbe’s case, it was more keenly felt. Webbe—a Catholic—was employed as organist at the Sardinian Embassy Chapel from 1775 and “was closely associated with the other Catholic embassy chapels in London.” This was a period in which Catholics were subjected to numerous constraints in law, and although these were relaxed in the later eighteenth century, it is not entirely surprising to find that Webbe and his son, Samuel Junior (c. 1770-1843) appear to have been active in radical politics, despite their associations with a “range of professional and patronage connections,” as Deborah Rohr puts it. Noting that Samuel Senior was secretary to the London Noblemen and Gentlemen’s Catch Club of London from 1794, that Samuel Junior was a founder member of the Philharmonic Society, and that both were members of the Royal Society of Musicians (founded 1738), she says that, nevertheless, “both, according to the radical tailor Francis Place, were associated with the democratic ideals and activities of the London Corresponding Society.” Webbe, apparently, lent Place French books. Rohr continues: “Their political activities were also noted by Samuel Wesley in a letter to Vincent Novello in 1813: ‘tomorrow evening ... we are likely to have the point argued in true parliamentary manner by our friend Sam Webbe’, who you know has been a celebrated man in matters of political discussion.”

Webbe goes on to suggest, in Rohr’s extract, that Webbe narrowly escaped prison for his views. There is a faint echo here of the way in which the Canterbury musicians were moved to action in their own struggle against the ruling elite of the Club later in the nineteenth century, but Rohr’s verdict on such

36. Probably the younger, given dates, ages, and Paul Weaver’s comment that young Samuel Webbe became friends with Samuel Wesley.
movements could apply equally well to both:

Such political associations confirm the view of musicians as urban artisans who might be more in sympathy with democratic ideals, at least during the radical 1790s. It would however, be misleading to suggest that many musicians were candidates for revolutionary action in this period. As was true for other literate artisans, the pursuit of upwardly mobile solutions to the social and economic pressures of the times diluted the democratic impulses of the 1790s.37

And so the wit in Webbe’s My Pocket’s Low is judiciously dispensed: just enough subversion smuggled into a piece of gentle entertainment to sharpen the political point for an audience which would appreciate intelligent satire but reject a call to arms.

Regrettably, there is no record in the 1825-6 season (when the concert records begin) of a performance of My Pocket’s Low at a Catch Club evening, but perhaps its very topicality meant that it had fallen out of fashion; the Napoleonic Wars were a decade in the past by then, and this was a club which kept its repertoire up to date. This is one feature which contributes to the very strong sense that the Club was perpetuating a living tradition—in itself a celebration, in a convivial context, of cultural acuity; an intelligent welcoming of the heights of cultural fashion.

Appendix J, p. 443 shows the complete list of glees performed in the 1825-6 season, and it means that the hit parade of composers remains unchanged as far as the top three are concerned:

Table 11-6: Most popular glee composers in the 1825-6 season, by frequency of performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Callcott</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Webbe</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mazzinghi</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Danby</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Goodban</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such lively engagement with whatever contemporary culture had to offer also characterises the

37. Ibid.
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treatment afforded the music when it fell into the hands of the Club. One example of that might be the audience participation in performances of Bishop’s *Mynheer Van Dunk* described above: lively, alcohol-fuelled involvement seems highly likely. A glance at the table in Appendix J shows that, in fact, *Mynheer Van Dunk* was only the second most popular glee that season. The piece which tops the list is not, strictly speaking, a glee at all: it is the *Huntsmen’s Chorus* from Act III of Weber’s *Der Freischütz*. Once again, though, it is highly likely that it got the *Mynheer Van Dunk* treatment: the repetitive “fal-la-la-la” accompaniment, starting at the end of bar 41, is begging for the Catch Club membership’s enthusiastic engagement. Example 11-6, p. 215 shows the complete chorus in short score: the parts for “4 or 8 solo voices” specified in the score from bar 44 onwards would be taken by the professional musicians, while everybody else sang along. We can only speculate as to the alcoholic penalty which may have been imposed on anyone who sang one “la” too many; easily done, in all the excitement.

A very musically literate example of the living tradition being brought to bear on the Club’s repertoire is to be found in the rather lavish orchestration inflicted upon one of Webbe’s finest pieces, *When Winds Breathe Soft*, by an unknown arranger—though one suspects it was Thomas Goodban. The very fact that the taking of such liberties would strike the present-day glee purist with horror is an indication of how far removed our culture is from that of the Catch Club, at least in this regard: a composer’s oeuvre is today held in such awful reverence that any tampering can only be done by permission of copyright holders, usually upon payment of large fees. No such constraints dampened the enthusiasm of whoever thought it would be a good idea to accompany this fine glee with a large orchestra. This treatment emphatically contradicts William Horsley’s dicta on glee performance practice, to be found in the pair of splendid volumes in the Canterbury Collection which were his labour of love in honour of his father-in-law, John Wall Callcott. In the Preface, Horsley makes it clear that the glee should be unaccompanied:

> According to the models which have been left us, by the finest writers, the real English glee is a vocal composition perfect in itself, and requiring no instrumental additions whatever. In accompanying the following pieces, therefore, great care should he taken to subdue the piano-forte - so that it may never predominate over the voices. Above all, in those passages which are marked “Solo”, the instrument, except in cases of necessity, should scarcely be touched.38

Jägerchor  
from  
Der Freischütz  

Carl Maria von Weber  
(1786-1826)
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Example 11-6: Weber: Der Freischütz: Huntsmen’s Chorus (complete)
This seems to have bothered the arranger not one whit. The result is a remarkable experience requiring full strings and woodwind, two horns, two trumpets, and timpani. Bearing in mind that a glee would only normally be performed with one voice per part, the inherent balance problems may well be anticipated by the modern musicologist. It is a brave essay on the part of the unknown arranger, which treats a fine piece with exuberant affection in positively Handelian style—though with a degree of circumspection: the instrumental part-books to be found in the Cathedral Archives have a few pieces of paper glued over the opening bars in several parts, concealing some music about which the arranger clearly had second thoughts. This may have been wise; they suggest a somewhat over-inventive instrumental decoration of the start of the glee which may have been some way from the restrained serenity Webbe intended.

Both Rubin and Hurd give appropriate attention to this piece, so there is no need to expatiate further upon its fine word-setting, its deft shifts of mood from Mozartian delicacy to sea-shanty rumbustiousness, or its fine writing for voices—although the ascending scale for unison tenors and basses at bar 65 on the word “wrath” is worthy of particular attention, if only because it’s a thrill to sing:

Example 11-7: Webbe: *When Winds Breathe Soft*, bb. 60-71
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For this thesis, the end result of the Canterbury orchestrated version stands as a fine example of the culture of creative engagement with the music which came into the Club’s possession.

The most obvious instantiations of the vitality of the tradition are the new compositions brought to the Club by the city’s musicians. Two of the pieces appearing in the 1825-6 season were original compositions by Club musicians: Goodban’s Charter Glee has already been mentioned, and the other—Henry Palmer’s The Gypsies (Appendix I.3, p. 355)—was briefly referenced in Chapter 9 (see p. 134). It is a curious piece. In the handwritten original, there is no piano part until it assumes an independent role in the middle section beginning at bar 103, when a ‘Solo Treble’ introduces the wistful spinster hoping for good news from the gypsy fortune tellers. The sly gypsies tell her what she wants to hear, to a wayward melodic line which starts off sounding like a plainsong cantus firmus, so firmly is it glued to one note, before becoming gradually more expansive, underpinned by surprising shifts of harmony more reminiscent of later nineteenth-century Viennese operetta; although not wholly coherent, it is probably one of the more adventurous passages in the entire Canterbury collection. There is similar schizophrenia to be found in Longhurst’s The Fairies (Appendix I.4, p. 361): again, there is no evidence of the piano in the hand-written score until a markedly contrasting middle section at bar 54 depicts the fairies stepping sprightly till the break of day before disappearing off to their sylvan cells, which is accompanied by a passage of virtuoso arpeggiation clearly intended to veil the voices in a gossamer stream of harmony. It says much for Longhurst’s technical accomplishment as it does so.

Those later examples merited some consideration for their curiosity value; not all the home-grown works do. In the previous century, one of Marsh’s companions, Osmond Saffery, had contributed a rather ill-adviced patriotic effort: it must be doubted that the song The English Volunteers, with words by Mr Burnby—all nine verses of them—travelled far beyond the city. Much later, the published version of Longhurst’s All Hail to Thee, Britain (Appendix I.5, p. 377) found its way into the collection

40. bb. 103-117 move ambiguously between F major and minor; b. 118 slips chromatically via a German 6th into V of A major before a chromatic bass line and a couple of diminished seventh chords bb. 120-123 cadence (Ic-V-I) in B flat major at bb. 123-5; then an abrupt modulation to G major bb. 125-6; bb. 126-9: tonic-dominant harmony in G before a surprise chord of E flat (the flat submediant) and a hint of G minor (b. 131) before “the creature” is harmonised with a diminished seventh chord on C sharp leading to D7 (V of G); thereafter remains in G major to the end of the section.
Repetoire

thanks to the fact that he donated copies to the Club, but it is not clear how widely taken up this piece was. It has to be conceded that its appeal probably remained somewhat localised, worthy though Longhurst’s attempt is to elevate Mr W.C. Wells’ lyrics above something approaching banality. The serene opening is pleasant enough—perhaps reminiscent of Webbe’s When Winds Breathe Soft:

Example 11-8: Longhurst: All Hail to Thee, Britain, bb. 1-8

The next section explains—in a lively 6/8—that this happy isle tempted the Muses to come and sing their song here: this heralds the grandiose moment which gives the song its title:

Example 11-9: Longhurst: All Hail to Thee, Britain, bb. 64-69

Mr Wells’ lyrics offer Longhurst an opportunity for some pleasant word-painting as he repeats the words “weave round thee her chain” to a progression of fifths; otherwise, this passage is largely unremarkable.

41. Catch Club Minutes Book 1 (1802-1840), 165.
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Example 11-10: Longhurst: *All Hail to Thee, Britain*, bb. 74-94

In keeping with the glee’s usual aesthetic imperatives, the long penultimate section is another rollicking 6/8 in which the “song of the nine [Muses]” — “love, beauty and wine” — is repeated with a few textural variations before the majestic final chords round the whole thing off.

Example 11-11: Longhurst: *All Hail to Thee, Britain*, bb. 128-end

It is one of the better patriotic efforts to be found in the Canterbury repertoire but, at the risk of damning with faint praise, it can really only be said of these locally-composed pieces that at least they had the courage, energy and commitment to offer their cultural contributions to the music of their time and place.

All this talk of learned wit and creative engagement with a living tradition is not to deny the sheer exuberance of the repertoire, perhaps most obviously exemplified in the hunting songs. Those huntsmen noted earlier are the German version of a figure well known in the glee repertoire: further
evidence of the mimetic tendency of the Club to celebrate Britain’s elite vicariously in its song. “Fox-hunting,” says Linda Colley, “emerged as the ideal pursuit of the upper classes.”42 The sport is immortalised in what is usually fairly dreadful poetry and banal music several times in the Canterbury collection, reflected in the 1825-6 season by the appearance of Bishop’s Foresters, Sound the Cheerful Horn, Horn’s The Horn of the Chace [sic.], and R.J.S. Stevens’ Hark, the Hollow Woods Resounding. Arguably, these settings give fox-hunting the treatment it deserves, especially if one agrees with Colley on the subject:

The inedibility of the quarry was, of course, the great giveaway. Here was one of those rare sports where taking part really was far more important than winning. Fox-hunting attracted a broad spectrum of rural society, but the main expense of breeding and feeding hounds and hunters fell to the great landowners, who thereby reaffirmed their prominence in the local community. They reaffirmed much more as well. Fox-hunting, in contrast with stag-hunting or hare-coursing, was a particularly British sport. It was fast, physically dangerous, splendid to watch, carried out in a dashing, close-to-the-body costume that quite obviously mimicked military uniform, and at this stage was confined almost exclusively to men. In short, the invention of foxhunting can be seen ... as another expression of the new patriotic, patrician machismo.43

That reference to the “taking part” recalls both Colley’s and Matthew Hilton’s point about the leisure pursuits of the English gentleman: an attitude of intellectual detachment was to be adopted at all times; such coarseness as competitive ambition was to be spurned. But this aloof position had its risks, which hunting happily dispelled: “Hunting enabled a gentleman to flaunt his leisure without seeming in the process to be idle or effete.”44 Colley’s reference to the military uniform, moreover, invites further quotation from her consideration of that career path for the young men of Britain’s elite: “All aristocracies have a strong military tradition, and for many British patricians the protracted warfare of this period was a godsend. It gave them a job and, more important, a purpose, an opportunity to carry out what they have been trained to do since childhood: ride horses, fire guns, exercise their undoubted physical courage and tell other people what to do.”45 For the Catch Club membership, eager to affirm their participation in this elite behaviour by proxy, there was the added attraction of an engagement from the sidelines, via the medium of cultural artefact, to the accompaniment of alcohol.

There are many more examples of glee’s revelling in the mock seriousness encountered above; pieces

42. Linda Colley, Britons, 173.
43. Ibid., 174.
44. Ibid.
45. Ibid., 181.
glorying in the whimsical intellectual playfulness which was such an important streak in the cultural character of Britain in the eighteenth century, however hard some would try to deny it. That the composers knew very well what they were doing—as well as did Lawrence Sterne—is most evident in the glee which offers the most direct companion to Sterne’s ‘wit and judgement’ discourse. In *If the Prize You Mean to Get*, Benjamin Cooke (1734-1793) created a glee—to words by Edward Mulso—which offers advice to any composer hoping to win one of the London Catch Club prizes: “Season music well with wit,” advises Cooke, and the perky repetitions of the words, hopping around the voices, bring a smile:

“Sense and harmony”—intelligence and craftsmanship—Cooke urges, “make a banquet for the mind”, in a passage of fine textural assurance:

And he clinches his argument—and offers an example of deft wordplay to the aspiring artist—with the final couplet: “The prize obtained, with me you’ll hold / Sterling wit is sterling gold” in assertive homophony. It is a confident exhortation to adopt a winning combination; Lawrence Sterne would have approved.

As one last example of ‘learned wit’, Arne’s *The Medium of Life* explores the possibility that a bowl of punch might stand as a metaphor for life itself:

*You ask me, dear Jack, for an emblem that’s rife*
And clearly explains the true medium of life.
I think I have hit it, as sure as a gun,
For a bowl of good punch and the medium are one.
When lemon and sugar so happily meet,
The acid’s corrected by mixing the sweet,
The water and spirit so luckily blend
That each from th’extreme does the other defend.

Then fill up the bowl, rot sorrow and strife.
A bumper, my boys, to the medium of life,
Which keeps our frail state in a temper that’s meet,
Contented in blending the sour with the sweet.

This jolly romp begins in a triple time dance metre:

Example 11-14: Arne: The Medium of Life; bb. 1-7

The convivial final chorus is captured in a duple time passage employing characteristically dramatic repetitions:

Example 11-15: Arne: The Medium of Life; bb. 57-65

The mention of punch draws attention to the fact that drink figures significantly in the subject matter of the glee. There was plenty of exhortation to sociable consort in the 1825-6 concert programmes: T.S. Cooke’s Fill me, Boy, as deep a Draught and his Beef Steak Glee (though that is rather more about eating a great deal); Samuel Arnold’s In Summer’s Cool Shade; Norris’ Bacchus, Jove’s Delightful Boy; the Earl of Mornington’s Hail, Social Pleasure; Wainwright’s Life’s a Bumper; and Sacchini’s How Should We Mortals Spend Our Hours? are a few examples.

The answer to that last question, incidentally, is threefold: in love, in war, and in drinking. This glee
became the subject of a print by Thomas Rowlandson (fig. 11-1), for no reason which has yet come to light. Rowlandson chooses to depict the three figures in the piece sat around a board groaning beneath the weight of a punch bowl: the lovesick youth in an attitude of yearning, the recumbent general bedecked with medals, and the sozzled tippler on the point of collapse. It’s a nice example of a picture of a piece of music—a tiny sub-genre of the late eighteenth-century print which has received scant attention hitherto. For the sake of reuniting these two delightful works of light art, here are print and glee:

Fig: 11-1: Rowlandson (after Sacchini): *How Shall we Mortals Spend our Hours?*  
(Lewis Walpole Library 10959)
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"How Should We Mortals Spend Our Hours?"
[Vol. 38; p. 87; transposed down a tone]

Antonio Maria Gasparo Sacchini
(1730-1786)

How should we mortals spend our hours? How should we mortals spend our hours? In_

None but the fool, none but the fool, none but the fool consumes his pow'rs in

How should we mortals spend our hours? In war, in war, in war. How should we mortals spend our hours?

How should we mortals spend our hours? In drink- ing, in drink- ing, in

None but the fool consumes his pow'rs in peace, in care, and think- ing.

None but the fool consumes his pow'rs in peace, in care, and think- ing.

None but the fool, none but the fool, none but the fool consumes his pow'rs in

peace, in care, and think- ing, in peace, in care, and think- ing, in
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Example 11-16: Sacchini: How Shall we Mortals Spend our Hours?

There is, of course, outright humour, verging on lunacy, in the Canterbury collection. Horsley didn’t think much of his father-in-law’s attempts at ribaldry—“convivial subjects were rarely treated by Dr.
Callcott, and never with any remarkable success,” he says—but the examples in the Canterbury collection suggest his judgement may have been somewhat clouded, probably by understandable embarrassment. If John Wall Callcott’s *When Arthur First in Court Began to wear Long Hanging Sleeves* (reproduced in the Appendices in full at Appendix I.7, p. 387) is viewed through the lens of a very English jingoistic silliness, it may be possible to appreciate its antique appeal. In the far less politically correct environment of two hundred years ago, with a tankard in hand and the contents of several more in the bloodstream, such pieces affirm an Englishness—albeit negatively, as abuse is hurled at our near neighbours (Example 11-17):

![Example 11-17: Callcott: When Arthur First in Court Began to Wear Long Hanging Sleeves, bb. 1-15](image)

Elsewhere in the collection, *Aldiborontiphascophornio* seems even more bizarre until one realises, first, that it is a setting of some nonsensical words from Henry Carey’s 1734 slapstick satire, *Chrononhotonthologos* (“the most tragical tragedy ever tragediz’d by any company of tragedians”) and, second, that it gave Callcott a golden opportunity to write the ideal musical tongue-twister for the end of a century: the date (31st December 1799) is given at the top, and the only performance direction is “Repeat several times, each time faster and faster”. This is a clear invitation to musical mayhem, given the usual alcoholic penalty for failure to perform properly (Example 11-18).
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Example 11-18: Callcott: *Aldiborontiphoscophornio*, complete

In more theatrical vein, Harington’s *Goody Groaner* (included in complete form at Appendix I.8, p. 390) is the tormented tale of a young man, desperate to find the midwife (Example 11-19), who gives up when he realises that he has encountered the two people with the worst speech defects in the village (Example 11-20).

Example 11-19: Harington: *Goody Groaner*; bb. 1-9
Webbe’s *On his Deathbed Poor Lubin Lies* seems sombre at first: a poignant scene, with the sighs of the tearful lovers reinforced by Purcellian pauses (Example 11-21), until Parson Sly points out the different perspectives of the protagonists: “Poor Lubin fears that he may die; his wife that he may live.” (Example 11-22).
Finally, Henry Harington (again), in a particularly iconoclastic example of learned wit, perpetrated a grievous insult on the canon Non Nobis Domine (long thought to be by Byrd but possibly by Philip van Wilder) in his excellent depiction of contrapuntal incompetence, *What Shall We Sing Now Here are Three?*, in which the singers attempt the canon but fall apart in acrimonious discord (Appendix I.10, p. 394).

This is the kind of music that recall’s Vic Gatrell’s musings: both print and glee can be described as “one of the nation’s happier self-representations”. “In our own censoring age,” Gatrell thinks, “deferential to corporate, managerial, religious and other forms of fashionably correct values, we should both celebrate and learn from their candour.”

Similarly, the kind of transgressive, knowing, mocking absurdity found in this musical repertoire is very much of its time.

The streak of madcap humour did not preclude genuinely serious work. Many of those pieces performed in 1825-6 are evidence of the gravity composers brought to this small form: Mornington’s *Here in Cool Grot*, with words by Shenstone—who was popular with glee composers, as witness the fact that Arne wrote an elegy on his death—combines a yearning for Arcadian serenity with whimsical reference to fairy folk; Arne’s own *Blow, Thou Wintry Wind* is a perfectly serious setting of the Shakespeare; Webbe’s *Glorious Apollo* and *When Winds Breathe Soft* (which, incidentally, is the only glee in the collection to make any reference to the Christian god Jehovah by name) have already been mentioned; and his *When Shall We Three Meet Again?* (transcribed in full at Appendix I.11, p. 396) is not, as might be thought, an invitation to further convivial consort, but a suitably dramatic setting of various lines uttered by the witches in Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*, beginning with the opening scene:
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Example 11-23: Webbe: When Shall We Three Meet Again?; bb. 1-7

After a brief reference to Hecate’s “artificial sprites / As by the strength of their illusion / Shall draw him on to his confusion” from Act III, Scene 5, the witches’ evil chattering from Act IV, Scene 1 is set with particular relish, as Webbe makes the most of the onomatopoeic “Double, double toil and trouble / Fire burn and caldron bubble” by doubling the rapidity of the word-setting (Example 11-24):

Elsewhere in the Canterbury collection, Arne’s The Emperor Adrian, Dying, to his Soul (Appendix I.12, p. 399), is a poignant soliloquy on the frailty of life, set with a moment of beautifully restrained word-painting as the soul takes flight. Horsley’s gothic monstrosity, the monumental Lo! On Yon-Resounding Shore (Appendix I.13, p. 401), presents a scene of the utmost horror which deftly includes a(nother) reference to the witches from Macbeth (the “yelling harpies”); this is a ghastly fantasy from the pen of
Ogilvie which Horsley sets with relish, even if the final section—a merry 12/8 jig in a cheerful E-flat major—might not be an entirely appropriate setting of words which depict fiends dancing at the mouth of hell. John Stafford Smith found an opportunity to plumb the depths of intensely private emotion in Henry D’Urfey’s 1694 adaptation of Cervantes’ classic, *The Comical History of Don Quixote*: the song *Sleep Poor Youth* (Appendix I.14, p. 409) appears in Act 2, scene 2, at a moment which is far from comical: the young Chrysostom is being laid to rest, and young maidens sing this ‘Dirge’ to accompany the burial. Death, says the song, has at least spared this young man any more of the cares of this mortal life. Smith sets the text with great expressive power. Callcott’s *The May Fly* (Appendix I.15, p. 414) muses upon the fleeting frailty of life in a delicate three-part setting which genuinely takes flight at the words “the torrent of thy overflow”—and Callcott might be forgiven his indulgence in an arioso flourish for the sake of purely musical effect, in that context.

Space only permits one more detailed example of the serious glee, but the sixty-three bars of *Discord, Dire Sister* (transcribed in full at Appendix I.16, p. 418) distil the essence of the genre: a slow, homophonic introduction in F minor grimly evokes the gathering tensions heralding War (“dire sister” to Discord):

![Example 11-25: Webbe: Discord, Dire Sister; bb. 1-5](image)

This eventually erupts into a contrapuntal passage depicting the monster herself stalking the earth:
Eighteenth-century aesthetics are satisfied when peace breaks out in a lilting, triple-time tonic major to “quell the rising storm”, and only the merest breath of discord is recalled at the end in a subtly-etched secondary dominant at bar 60.

By 1825, Romanticism was more than a breath on the cultural wind; Goethe had, after all, written *The Sorrows of Young Werther* in 1774, and Stephen Paxton’s *Sonnet Spoken in the Character of Werter* [sic] (Appendix I.17, p. 422) is one response to it. There are others amongst the pieces performed during the 1825-6 season for the Catch Club: two works of Callcott, who chose to set texts which lent themselves to his strain of plangent lament, appear. *Thou Art Beautiful, Queen of the Valley* (Appendix I.18, p. 426, words by Southey from his epic poem *Madoc*) is one such, and *The Red Cross Knight* (Appendix I.19, p. 433, the poetry from Thomas Evans’ *Old Ballads*) is another. This latter taps in to the mythology of chivalry and the Crusades, taking its place in those antique evocations of a glorious Albion of bygone
This leads us directly to patriotism—though in truth it has been lurking in the background for some time. It has to be conceded that if fox-hunting elicited only poor music and poetry, patriotism outdid it in its depressing inanity of chauvinistic sentiment (here in its very modern sense) much of the time. One of the most popular glee’s in the 1825-6 season, Webbe’s *Ode to Liberty* (Appendix I.20, p. 438) is actually one of the better examples, as one would expect: an expansive five-part (ATTBB) setting, it achieves a degree of structural coherence with the repeat of the “O Liberty” motif and the recall of the opening at bar 78. When all the sound and fury of the imitative entries and Handelian homophonic close are done, though, one is still left with the very strong feeling that it was embraced more for its sentiment than its musical quality.

Perhaps this musical articulation of some sort of idealistic aspiration is no bad thing: it could certainly be said of Thomas Goodban’s *Charter Glee* (Appendix D, p. 292), performed as often as the Webbe—and Goodban’s piece had the added advantage of accessibility for the amateur singer. Most of the repertoire discussed above was simply too musically and technically demanding for general participation, as the most cursory examination of the examples given will show. But that is consistent with the aesthetic of the socio-cultural environment visible in the 1826 print: the gentlemen there are quite disinterested in the music, simply expecting to hear it—without necessarily listening—in the background. They are adopting, as is appropriate for men of this social standing, that detached air of indifference to the cultural artefact on offer. The glee repertoire perfectly embodies the attitudes and values of the aspirational bourgeoisie in this respect.

Catches were another matter.

11.2.ii. Catches

The appearances of the glee in the 1825-6 concert season are well documented in the concert records; some glee or other was performed 156 times that year. By contrast, only three catches appear in the thirty concerts recorded, and two of those are the same piece: William Herschel’s *Echo Catch*. The other is Horsley’s *Ah, How Sophia*. Not for the first time in this thesis, the musicologist draws a blank where some evidence would be helpful.

There is the other evidence: Marsh and Mr Welby have given quite vivid descriptions of what went
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on. The concert records account for an evening which started at 8.00 pm and would probably have lasted until about 10.30 pm, for the thirty nights of the season. Thereafter the informal ‘after-evening’ carried on for some hours. But of what was sung in the course of that late-night revelry, or how seriously or successfully, we know practically nothing. Clues must be sought elsewhere.

The catch has a long history. Rounds have been popular in Britain for centuries: *Sumer is Icumen In* dates from the thirteenth century. The Canterbury Catch Club archive collection, in this respect, can boast little that is not known very well elsewhere: although a raw count shows just over 600 catches, so many are duplicated (in both printed and hand-written volumes, which says something about how widely circulated they were) that the final tally is some 360, of which only about half a dozen may be peculiar to the city. The first *Aldrich Book of Catches*, published by Novello in 1989, contained 224,49 and Book 2 brought the total to 440.50 Book 351 has added Ray Hall’s transcription of five more early collections. The catch has been well served in this respect.

Regrettably, however, its poor reputation has not, in the main, been revised. Most of the blame for the bad press may be laid firmly at the feet of Henry Purcell, but other composers contributed even more salacious specimens of the genre, often with far less musical ingenuity, and so the catch embarked upon the 1700s in very bad odour. For many, nothing changed in that century: in 1795 one William Jackson described them as pieces which ‘when quartered, have three parts obscenity and one part music’,52 and A.F.C. Kollmann dispatched it with seven words in 1812: “Of catches,” he said, ”we have nothing to say.”53 There is a dismissal here which is strongly reminiscent of the opprobrium heaped upon singers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—and of course their relationship with this repertoire is part of the problem. In the face of this widespread preconception, the Canterbury collection may have a distinctive contribution to make to scholarship, in two ways. First—despite the absence of formal records of catch singing—the catalogue allows a guess at the repertoire most often aired and, second, it may be possible to mount a defence of the genre.
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The only clue to the repertoire of catches which might actually have been sung at the Canterbury Club lies in the hand-written volumes of the collection. As noted above, copying music takes time and effort, and this would not be wasted on unpopular pieces. Of the 70 volumes, most are bound copies of disparate printed material, clearly bought separately and bound together at a later date for some reason. In some cases, this must have happened after the copies had been used for performance, judging by the well-thumbed corners and performers’ markings; to be sure, many of the finished books are too heavy to hold whilst actually singing. But volumes 1-7, and volume 9, are hand-written, and give every impression of having been used in their present form. They are hefty: almost 200 pages of closely-written words and music. The first few share a great deal of repertoire, while the contents of 5, 6 and 7 are identical. Volume 9 is even larger: with well over 200 pages, it has some unique entries. It should also be noted that these books are the oldest in the collection: Volume 1 has ‘1785 Aug 28’ hand-written on the inside back cover.

A quick tally shows that Volumes 1-7 (number 8 is missing) and 9 contain almost half the catches in the entire collection, which says a great deal for the relative popularity of the genre in the early days of the club; there are almost as many catches (79 of them) as glee (82) in these first eight volumes; the shift in taste from the participatory nature of the catch to music which is intended to be consumed as disinterested spectator—i.e., glee—is an insight in itself. Although there is no indication as to which of the 79 catches were the most popular, an attempt at a taxonomy may offer some idea, at least, of what the subject matter of the most popular catches concerned. For anyone hoping to emancipate the catch from its disreputable thrall, Table 11-7, p. 236 makes somewhat depressing reading.

Convivial song in its various forms emerges as a topical favourite, with human relationships and mild obscenity not far behind. In this sense, this collection holds no real surprises, or fresh insight. One notable feature of the Canterbury collection is that a local composer contributed to this repertoire, although his oeuvre has to be recorded with mixed feelings. A Lay Clerk of this name was introduced in Chapter 9 (p. 161), and the problems of identification there noted continue here: identified only as ‘Nicholson’ in the manuscript books, this composer is represented by several pieces in Volume 9. There is no date on this volume, but it may be a little later than the first few, and it is tempting to relate this Nicholson to the Lay Clerk. If it is him, these pieces would suggest that some, at least, of his younger days were spent penning scurrilous catches; three may be found in the Appendices: My Lady at Tea (Appendix K.1, p. 446); Miss Kate took John’s Oboe (Appendix K.2, p. 447); and The Three Beggars
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(Appendix K.3, p. 449). They are not necessarily musically edifying, but they are fun to perform and, from a linguistic perspective, they do show that the vocabulary of innuendo and obscenity has a long history. Miss Kate is especially effective if a counter-tenor takes Kate’s words, for entirely obvious reasons which are further discussed on page 275.

Table 11-7: A Taxonomy of Catch Subject Matter in Volumes 1-7 & 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject matter:</th>
<th>1 = Mostly concerns</th>
<th>2 = Partially concerns</th>
<th>3 = Slightly concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacred</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewdness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misogyny</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epitaph</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jollity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jovial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdsong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchanalian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchus vs. Cupid</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love &amp; Friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviviality</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtship</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroic Love</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Love</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports &amp; Pastimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Commentary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this point it should be recalled that singing a catch is a participatory experience. It is also repetitive: in essence, a catch is a single melody, broken up into phrases of equal length (usually three or four), which may be sung not only consecutively, but concurrently. The composer’s skill is then evident, as the underlying harmony becomes audible. In performance, the singers begin the melody in turn, each beginning when the preceding singer reaches the end of the first phrase, and all will simply repeat the
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melody until, by common consent or musical mishap, all stop. But the real delight of the catch is as much textual as musical: in the more salacious catches, a double entendre may only emerge when the voices combine. This is the kind of repertoire which has tainted the reputation of the catch, and it does make an appearance in the collection, from these earliest volumes. One example will suffice: Luffman Atterbury’s *As t’Other Day Susan and Tom Trudg’d Along* (Example 11-28, p. 238), begins as a light-hearted tale of Susan and Tom attempting to sing a song. Tom is less competent than Susan, and keeps losing his place. His entreaties to Sue to help him regain it (“let me in”) are met with smiling rebuffs, since she doubts his ability, at which point Sam comes along and offers to fill Tom’s role. In case the double-entendre had not become sufficiently clear, Atterbury’s setting reinforces it in bars 7 and 8 by means of the carefully placed pauses in the different voice parts.

By way of prelude to a defence of the catch, it could be noted here that there is work of more substance than all this salacious frivolity, and this raises a further point about the genre which is not sufficiently well recognised. To exemplify: Samuel Webbe’s splendid piece of nonsense, *As Thomas Was Cudgell’d One Day by his Wife* (Appendix K.4, p. 450), is on the face of it a slapstick tale about a chap suffering domestic abuse at the hands of his Xantippe.54 His friends rush to his aid and drag him away from the scene of his humiliation, which has gathered an interested crowd of onlookers, but, astonishingly, he fights them off and—improbably—returns to his wife to be “thresh’d” once again. This is one of the longer catches in the repertoire, consisting of four 16-bar phrases, underpinned by a chord sequence which is simple enough. The issue raised—which reinforces the very important point about the catch—is one of performance practice, for there is here a narrative which unfolds in conventional linear fashion over the four lines. In performance, the first line will be audible to any audience, since it starts on its own; but the second, third and fourth will become gradually more and more incomprehensible in the hubbub as the preceding voices continue the story. Anyone trying to listen would be challenged to make sense of it, despite Webbe’s skilful interplay of voices popping in and out of each other’s rests. The narrative would be lost in the din, incomprehensible to any listener.

As t’other Day Susan...

[Vol. 9, p. 44]

Luffman Atterbury
(1735-1796)

Example 11-28: Atterbury: As t’other Day Susan

The problem as posed here, however, is erroneous in its assumption. It assumes an audience; this is a false premise. The catch never expected one. This particular example simply makes that more obvious than most. All were expected to participate, subsuming the roles of both performer and audience; our very modern tripartite relationship between composer and the other two partners in the transaction does not apply to this repertoire. This is music which, in a very literal sense, was never intended to be
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That said, the attempt was often made. William Gardiner’s lively description of a concert performance of Baildon’s *Mister Speaker* at a Catch Club meeting has already been quoted (p. xx), and Brian Robins finds a great deal of evidence for the performance of catches (as well as glee) in the concert programmes of both Marybone and Ranelagh Gardens in the 1760s, notably promoted by Thomas Arne: his first, on 12 May 1767, “was announced as a programme of catches and glee ‘selected from the collection of the catch club’.” Robins goes on to note that “The Marybone Gardens 1767 season was almost certainly the first concert series to programme catches and glees systematically”, though he goes on to note the difficulties of establishing the detail: there was some fluidity of terminology, and a dependence on what would appear to be a relatively small number of favourite pieces: “of the eight hundred or so catch and glee concert performances McVeigh records, fully a third are distributed between fewer than twenty titles.” 6 While the programmes of the London Gardens concerts show a decline in the popularity of the catch and glee in performance, the practice spread to the theatres, where the genres (often in a favoured pairing) appear in programmes up to the end of the century.

In the absence of any detail about the ways in which those performances solved the problems identified above, one can only speculate that contemporary concert performances of catches dealt with them much as modern performers do. This is discussed in more detail in the last chapter but, in brief, if the entries of the voices are carefully managed, the audience may have a sporting chance of making sense of the story before the full cacophony sets in.

This, however, is a compromise solution which robs the performance of the essential catch experience. It must have been intensely enervating, as the different lines were bellowed across the crowded room in a kind of competitive polyphony. Our forefathers knew how to enjoy themselves.

Thomas hints at another question, to which the answer can probably never be known: how good was the average catch singer? The lines in *Thomas* are angular at times, the tempo lively, and the rhythmic interplay between the voices, with many phrases starting off the beat, is quite demanding. And yet the piece is written out in the hand-copied volumes of the Catch Club, as if in anticipation of regular use.

---

In the absence of empirical evidence at this distance of some two-and-a-half centuries, a fair conclusion may simply be that the average Catch Club member was a good amateur singer. He certainly had regular practice. There is also a related—and similarly unanswerable—question: how big a repertoire of catches might the average Club member have committed to memory? Beyond the hand-written books which have survived in the Club collection, there is no other evidence in the Canterbury archive to give any clues. There is elsewhere, however: the British Library holds two sets of ingeniously-produced collections of catches and glees, printed on small cards (12mm x 8mm in size), each presented in a box containing some 52 cards. They were produced by George Smart in 1785 and 1789; the appearance of the second set strongly suggests a response to a very positive demand. They are the ideal **vademecum** for a catch club member. Their existence suggests that if they were not available in Canterbury, something similar must have been in circulation amongst Club members, probably in hand-written form.

Whatever the response of the average Catch Club member to the challenges posed by the repertoire, there was most certainly a didactic purpose in the minds of many composers. Here begins in earnest the case for the defence of the catch. One of the joys of the Canterbury collection is the array of Prefaces, Dedications, Introductions, Fond Memoirs, and Sycophantic Grovellings on display, and there is more here to explore for future scholars. The one written by the first witness for this defence, however, has already been mentioned (p. 5); in his **Preface to Catches, Glees and Canons** (1757) William Hayes issued an implicit plea for a re-evaluation of the catch on grounds of sociability. It is also, he argues, commendable for educational reasons, as much at home in the rooms of an Oxford don (i.e., his own) as anywhere else:

> Many of the [compositions] were born under the happy auspices of the most agreeable and well-regulated society that met weekly, and subsisted several years, in very high perfection, in this place [i.e., Oxford University], and which ... contributed to the improvement of the younger practitioners, enabling them to sing readily at sight, by being accustomed to a variety of Cliffs [clefs] and Movements, and this, not by Compulsion or Drudgery, but by Allurement, and the Gratification of a Pleasure they found in it themselves.\(^{58}\)

A serious educational intent, in other words, has been dressed up in attractive garb, and there is no doubt that the “allurement” of Hayes’ catches owed much to their subject-matter. His offerings

---
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display something of the remarkable literary invention with which composers treated this dram-sized genre. Clearly, William Jackson cannot have known this collection when he so furiously inveighed against the catch. Not only is it unthinkable that a man of Hayes' undoubted gentility and learning would venture into the realms of obscenity in his music, but a casual turning of the pages assures the reader that the catch has freed itself from its tavern-based origins to become the plaything of the cultured, literate elite—whilst at the same time posing musical and vocal challenges for those brave enough to attempt their performance. No wonder the Catch Club collected these publications voraciously; that appeal to learned entertainment is exactly what they were about. Below is a complete catch which perfectly exemplifies this aesthetic. *Democritus, Dear Droll* is one of several which invoke classical learning; this piece begs the philosopher to revisit Earth and restore mirth, while at the same time (in a different metre) asking Heraclitus to teach us seriousness, beginning with the descending semitones which had long been the signifier of grief—reinforced by the Neapolitan A flat in the antepenultimate bar; between the two, the petitioner knows not how to position himself – in short, whether to laugh or cry. Its lament is as pertinent now as it has ever been, and its subtle massage of the spectator/performer's sense of self-worth—affirming the subject position of the Canterbury Catch Club repertoire—does no harm either:
Repertoire

Democritus, Dear Droll
[Vol. 18, p. 141; transposed down a major 3rd]

William Hayes
(1708-1777)

Example 11-29: Hayes: Democritus, Dear Droll

In a collection which sets texts on matters as diverse as onions and ink-selling, drunken Quakers and inebriated knights—As Sir Toby Reel’d Home (Appendix K.6, p. 456) rivals Thomas in telling a good tale—there are a host of pieces which elevate the catch from the mire of poor repute. For example: the collection as a whole is rich in clever epitaphs but, recalling the spirit of Sterne, On the Death of Wells is a particular gem of learned wit. The subtitle explains why the demonstrative butchers would be so upset at Wells’ passing: he had been Master of the Bear-Garden, so an important supply of meat was endangered. The idea of their taking up “marrow-bones and cleavers”—almost certainly the only occasion on which those words have been set to music—to accompany their lament is not as bizarre as it now seems: the noise of marrow-bones clashing against cleavers really was the soundtrack to both celebration and riot, according to Vic Gattrell:

Music of this kind was played at the shaming rituals that mocked adulterous couples or henpecked husbands or it was played celebratorily at weddings … and it was increasingly heard at elections and
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mock elections to show approval or otherwise. A ‘reasonable good ear’ [Gatrell had just quoted Bottom’s line from *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*] it didn’t invite.  

*On the Death of Wells who was Master of the Bear Garden*  

**On the Death of Wells**  

[Vol. 18, p. 156; transposed down a minor 3rd]  

William Hayes  
(1708-1777)  

Before closing this discussion of the catch, one final point needs to be made about its demands, which begs another unanswerable question about the kind of performance they may have been given at the time: some catches are difficult to sing. Consider the vocal range in the catch above: from a top F natural—thanks to that Neapolitan moment in line 1, bar 3—to a low A, in this transposition. A span of almost two octaves is something of a stretch for the average singer. There are musical challenges here too: the wide-ranging melodic lines are sometimes rather angular in the leaps they make, such as  

---  

60. The editorial decisions taken here have usually set the catches in a mid-range accessible to most people.
the minor 9th in line 2, bar 4 from “cleavers” to “with...”. This sort of vocal challenge had always been the case, as is evident from a glance through the Canterbury collection. John Blow’s setting of *Ring the Bells* (Appendix K.8, p. 461) has this virtuoso passage in the middle:

Example 11-31: Blow: *Ring the Bells*; bb. 6-9

...which must have sounded interesting in the context of some late-night revelry. Whether Blow did that deliberately can never be known, but Henry Harington certainly intended this to be challenging: in *I Cannot Sing This Catch* the singers themselves point out the problems:

---

*I Cannot Sing This Catch*

[Vol. 12; p.45; transposed down a tone]

Henry Harington (1727-1816)

---

Once again, the extent to which composers were deliberately challenging their friends to raise the standards of their vocal performance can never be known, but there are times when a present-day
singer can feel the shades of these men watching with interest as we try.

The few examples here must stand for many more in making Canterbury’s argument for an increased respect for the catch. Although we cannot tell how many of these cleverer pieces made their way into the regular repertoire of Club evenings, the music collection was greatly expanded as collections like that of Hayes’ came on to the market. The explosion of printed music, in turn, meant that the catch declined in importance as glees and canons elbowed it out of prominence, whilst at the same time ensuring that the catches which did make their way into the collection became more respectable.

The catch had always had the capacity to treat serious subjects with dry wit: its discussions of the relative merits of Cupid and Bacchus are an obvious example, and its treatment of politicians stands firmly in a tradition of British satire which has yet more in common with the prints of which Gatrell writes so eloquently. As mentioned in the Prologue, Atterbury’s Canvassing Squire, for example, falls down dead drunk whilst out on the stump, in full view of his electors, and the three pompous politicians in Baildon’s Mister Speaker, Tho; ’tis Late are very familiar figures.

Hayes applies this little poem of Thomas Yalden (1670-1736) to the catch:

How does the little epigram delight
And charm us with its Miniature of Wit!
While tedious Authors give the Reader pain,
Weary his Thoughts, and make him toil in vain;
When in less Volumes we may Pleasure find;
And what diverts, still best informs the Mind.61

The brevity of its form dictated the pithy quality Hayes celebrates here. The catch simply did not have the space for the more expansive aesthetic of the glee; it cannot allow itself any very extended flights of ostentatious display. In our frantic, sceptical age, there is much in the catch we might like to revisit.

11.2.iii. Theatre Music

Several pieces already discussed were drawn from the opera and theatre music of the day, and it is clear that this repertoire was an important part of the musical menu on offer to a Catch Club audience. The instrumental collection shows how keenly felt were the influences of the public concert culture of the period; extracts from the stage also to be found in the Catch Club programmes in 1825-6 reinforce

the impression that this was a membership eager to consume edited highlights, at least, of the music of their day. The concert records show (Table 11-8, p. 247) that exactly one quarter of the pieces performed at the Catch Club in the 1825-6 season were extracts from opera or music theatre works: 102 out of 408. Almost exactly half (50) of those were overtures; the rest comprised 27 glee, 14 songs, 6 duets and the round *Yes! 'Tis the Indian Drum* performed 5 times.

The table also shows the dates of the works from which the extracts came. The contemporaneity of the repertoire strikes afresh; the ink had barely dried on T. S. Cooke’s *Malvina*, and *Der Freischütz* had only appeared in England a year or two previously. Once that is acknowledged, other general remarks strike the same note as has been heard throughout this chapter: this repertoire is lively and eclectic, offering opportunities for convivial participation whilst remaining firmly on the side of enjoyable entertainment.

A closer examination of the 1825-6 season’s theatre music selection, then, may have something to contribute to the discussion of the reception of these works at the time, since the enthusiastic audience they gained in the Catch Club is not as well known as the one in the much more public spaces of the theatre and Gardens. Once again, the healthy appetite for selections from the stage repertoire speaks to this discussion of the subject position so self-consciously adopted by the Club membership. There is also a point to be made about what might be called the liminal space occupied by the Club environment, given that some of this repertoire was making its way into the early nineteenth-century drawing room, with the help of the increasing numbers of pianos to be found in the domestic setting: neither openly public nor entirely private, the Catch Club is something of a half-way house between the theatre and the home, on this reading. Finally, this section of the thesis will argue that the musical traffic was not all one-way: as the music of the stage was invading the Catch Club, the glee (along with the odd catch or two) was migrating in the opposite direction. One indication of that is the number of items in this list which call themselves ‘glees’:
### Table 11-8: Extracts from opera and music theatre in the Canterbury Catch Club programmes 1825-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Extract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Der Freischütz</em> (1821; 1824 in England)</td>
<td>Carl Maria von Weber</td>
<td>Glee: <em>Huntsman’s Chorus</em> 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duet: <em>With Thou Tempt the Waves</em> 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overture 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Song &amp; Chos.: <em>Laughing Chorus</em> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Song: <em>Life is Darken’d</em> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Round: <em>Ye! ‘Tis the Indian Drum</em> 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cortez, or the Conquest of Mexico</em> (1823)</td>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Duet: <em>Stay Amazitli, Stay</em> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Italian in Algiers</em> (1813)</td>
<td>Gioachino Rossini</td>
<td>Round: <em>Yes! ’Tis the Indian Drum</em> 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overture 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Comedy of Errors</em> (1819)</td>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Glee: <em>Come Thou Monarch</em> 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overture 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Guy Mannering</em> (1816)</td>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Glee: <em>The Chough and Crow</em> 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overture 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glee: <em>The Winds Whistle Cold</em> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Caliph de Bagdad</em> (1800)</td>
<td>Francois-Adrien Boieldieu</td>
<td>Overture 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Malvina</em> (1826)</td>
<td>Thomas Simpson Cooke</td>
<td>Glee: <em>See the Sun is Brightly Glowing</em> 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Narmino</em> (1803)</td>
<td>Ferdinando Paer</td>
<td>Overture 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tancred</em> (1813)</td>
<td>Giacomo Rossini</td>
<td>Overture 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Song: <em>Cease thus to Palpatate</em> [sic] 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Das Labyrinth</em> (1798)</td>
<td>Peter Winter</td>
<td>Overture 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Noble Outlaw</em> (1815)</td>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Song: <em>Pilgrame [sic.] of Love</em> 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Brother and Sister</em> (1815)</td>
<td>William Reeve</td>
<td>Song: <em>Echo Song</em> 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zaire</em> (1805)</td>
<td>Peter Winter</td>
<td>Overture 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Fall of Algiers</em> (1825)</td>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Glee: <em>Let the Moorish Tambour Sound</em> 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Richard I</em> (1727)</td>
<td>G.F. Handel</td>
<td>Overture 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fanchon</em> (1804)</td>
<td>Friedrich Heinrich Himmel</td>
<td>Overture 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Henry IV</em> (1774)</td>
<td>Jean Paul Gilles Martini</td>
<td>Overture 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eziole</em> (1808)</td>
<td>Joseph Mazzinghi</td>
<td>Overture 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ramah Droog</em> (1798)</td>
<td>Joseph Mazzinghi</td>
<td>Overture 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Le Nezze di Figaro</em> (1786)</td>
<td>W. A. Mozart</td>
<td>Overture 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>D’Una in Ben</em> (1794)</td>
<td>Ferdinando Paer</td>
<td>Overture 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Siege of Belgrado</em> (1791)</td>
<td>Stephen Storace</td>
<td>Song: <em>The Sapling Oak</em> 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Prisoner</em> (1792)</td>
<td>Thomas Attwood</td>
<td>Song: <em>Where the Banners</em> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prometheus</em> (1800)</td>
<td>Ludvig van Beethoven</td>
<td>Overture 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Farmer’s Wife</em> (1814)</td>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Duet: <em>O Give me the Man</em> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Miller &amp; His Men</em> (1813)</td>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Overture 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anacron</em> (1803)</td>
<td>Luigi Cherubini</td>
<td>Overture 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Fire Lovers</em> (1806)</td>
<td>Thomas Simpson Cooke</td>
<td>Song: <em>Paddy O Snap</em> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Free Knights</em> (1810)</td>
<td>Joseph Mazzinghi</td>
<td>Glee: <em>A Little Farm</em> 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Clemenza di Tito</em> (1791)</td>
<td>W. A. Mozart</td>
<td>Overture 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Don Juan</em> [sic] (1787)</td>
<td>W. A. Mozart</td>
<td>Overture 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Repertoire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opera/Music</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>No. of performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zauberflote (1791)</td>
<td>W. A. Mozart</td>
<td>Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginevra (1800)</td>
<td>Ferdinando Paer</td>
<td>Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pirates (1822)</td>
<td>William Michael Rooke</td>
<td>Glee: Farewell Merry Maids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Castle of Andalusia (1798)</td>
<td>William Shield</td>
<td>Song: The Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Thirty Thousand</td>
<td>Sir John Andrew Stevenson</td>
<td>Glee: Come Unto These Yellow Sands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preciosa (1820)</td>
<td>Carl Maria von Weber</td>
<td>Overture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11-8 shows the frequency with which individual items were performed; for the sake of completeness, here is the by-now-familiar score sheet of composers.

Table 11-9: Popularity of opera and music theatre composers, by frequency of performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>No. of performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossini</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paer</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazzinghi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boieldieu</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reeve</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storace</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martini</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooke</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherubini</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Henry Rowley Bishop’s performance is impressively consistent, but Weber’s success with Der Freischütz means that he runs Bishop a closer second in this little league than others have managed thus far. That in itself is a clue to the shift in taste represented by this repertoire: the whiff of Romanticism noted at the end of the discussion on the English glee is, in 1825, much more than a mere tang in the air. Der Freischütz had its counterparts in the fledgling English opera of which Bishop was at the forefront: the exotic settings of Cortez and The Law of Java fed an emerging appetite for the fantastic, the Gothic, for naturalistic settings, and for a psychologically more intense narrative drive.
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James Robinson Planché’s *Cortez* provided Bishop with “a graphically violent libretto, representing the Spanish forces’ invasion of Mexico”, and it was immensely popular immediately upon its appearance in 1823. As the season’s record shows, however, the Catch Club had an attitude to this sort of thing: the round *Yes! ‘Tis the Indian Drum* and the duet *Stay Amazilli, Stay* were the only extracts played from the opera—and the craze did not last; a few years later, there is no trace of the work in the Club’s concert programming.

For the year 1825-6, however, it was popular, and a closer inspection of the music explains why. Bishop labels it a “Round” in his score, and indeed it is: four 12-bar phrases make up the entire piece, apart from a homophonic coda lasting ten bars. The essence of it is shown below, and this presentation makes its relation to a catch entirely clear, notwithstanding that snatch of gleeful homophony tacked on at the end (in fact, such a hybrid form is not unknown in the repertoire, as may be seen in Hayes’ *On a Puritan, Drunk* (Appendix K.9, p. 462)). In performance it is given an energetic orchestral accompaniment, working itself up by means of a long crescendo and ever-denser orchestral texture as the voices join in to reach the climactic final bars, tension having been racked up to a suitably unbearable pitch. The round keeps going for 56 bars, allowing the first voice time for a complete run-through and a repetition of the first line. This would have made fine fare for a Catch Club evening. The mystery remains as to how many Club members might join in (in the opera, it is sung by only four soloists, not a chorus)—but the deft little imitations within the piece, between voices 1 and 2, in bars 7-9, make it even more likely that most would try.

Why “round”, it might be asked, rather than “catch”? The answer is depressingly predictable: no London-based musician could have remained ignorant of the musical culture endemic to the capital’s taverns, clubs and upper-class dinners, so the word “catch” probably held associations for Bishop he preferred to dodge. Whatever the reason, a catch is what it is, with a bit of glee to round things off. But it is a catch intended for an audience, and a theatre audience at that, cleverly taking into account all the audience issues identified above: the words don’t change from one line to the next, so there is no narrative sense to be made; and the visceral excitement of actual participation is replaced by the vicarious thunderings of an orchestra. This is a catch which has crossed the footlights, dragged a scrap

of glee along with it, and expects to be listened to. Here it is, in essence:

Yes! ‘Tis the Indian Drum

Henry Rowley Bishop
(1786–1855)

Example 11-33: Bishop: Yes! ‘Tis the Indian Drum; opening round
Not that the glee needed any help in its own migration toward the stage. Although Michael Hurd pursues the distinctions between ‘glee’, madrigal’, and ‘partsong’ assiduously, he admits at the outset that all three terms were used “very loosely indeed”, particularly with respect to the ‘glee’. It is quite clear from Table 11-8 above (p. 247) that composers were quite happy to appropriate the term—perhaps a sign of its essential respectability—to describe a piece for mixed voices, even when it crops up in the middle of an opera, with all the paraphernalia of set, scenery, costume and (above all) accompaniment provided by a large orchestra: a far cry from the unaccompanied purity of Horsley’s conception of the genre. But in the fevered exuberance of early nineteenth century English opera, that didn’t matter.

---

Nor, it would appear, did plot, much. Reference has already been made to the paucity of inspiration in Colman’s *The Law of Java*. Whilst it has to be conceded that Daniel Terry’s adaptation of Walter Scott’s novel *Guy Mannering* (a process Scott called “Terry-fying”⁶⁴) was rather better, the ‘glee’ *The Chough and Crow to Roost Have Gone* is simply a vehicle for a rollicking gypsy song, in which the words of the chorus have very little to do with the narrative. Once again, this has all the hallmarks of a piece with which a Catch Club audience might feel able and willing to join in: various contributions from soloists (the gypsies are about their dastardly work threatening our hero’s life) lead into the chorus which is not even reproduced in the libretto, so immaterial is it to the narrative trajectory. Once again, the Catch Club audience had no need to worry about whatever it was they were “opening” in this chorus:

![Sheet music](example_music.png)

**Example 11-35**: Bishop: *The Chough and Crow to Roost are Gone*; bb. 28-35

A Catch Club evening was not all sound and fury, however much, for the members, it signified. Every

---

good piece of theatre has the moments of tender reflection against which stormy episodes may be measured, and these are to be found, on occasion, in the songs scattered about the concert programmes. Two will suffice as examples.

_The Pilgrim of Love_, from Bishop’s opera _The Noble Outlaw_ of 1815, was sung frequently by the tenor Sims Reeves as one of “his standard encores for thirty years”. It is transcribed in full at Appendix L.1, p. 464. Sims was one of the period’s most successful concert performers, so that remark puts the song very firmly on the stage, but Derek B. Scott’s focus is on the privacy of the drawing-room, and this piece is eminently well suited to that environment, too. Albeit coincidentally, now, its foreboding opening, with offbeat repeated Cs against the C minor arpeggio in the bass, is strangely reminiscent of Schubert’s _Erlkönig_ (published the same year, 1815) at one point, when the triplet quavers appear, fleeting as they are.

![Musical notation](image)

**Example 11-36: Bishop: The Pilgrim of Love, bb. 1-8**


This eight-bar introduction heralds a pathetic recitative in which our hapless pilgrim is found wandering in what is obviously a barren landscape, hearing only a pitiless echo—provided by the accompaniment—as he calls the name of his beloved.

---

66. Derek B. Scott, _The Singing Bourgeois_, 128.
That done, the song falls into the regrettable error of aesthetic judgement so often found in this repertoire: while continental taste had no qualms about wallowing in nihilistic desolation for far lengthier periods—Winterreise springs to mind—something about the early nineteenth-century English aesthetic insists on a wretchedly cheerful resolution, whatever the text may say. In this case, the “pilgrim of love” churlishly spurns the kind offer of an ancient hermit’s shelter, and trudges on his
Chapter Eleven

way in a jolly C major, the only possible point simply being to show off the singer’s languid top G—or A, if he wishes—before a cheery little postlude wraps the whole thing up.

Example 11-38: Bishop: The Pilgrim of Love, bb. 49-end

Either our 21st century sensibilities are so far out of kilter with this repertoire that judgement is best reserved, or this sort of merry coda really is a regrettable lapse of artistic refinement. For reasons which will be explored in the Epilogue, this period seems to have longed for reassurance—always a futile yearning, and certainly not to be satisfied, as here, simply by a modulation to the tonic major. Other repertoire already discussed has demonstrated the same tendency: Horsley’s finale to Lo! On Yon Long-Resounding Shore has already been mentioned, and even Webbe’s mighty When Winds Breathe Soft has a final section—in the inevitable 6/8—which, even allowing for the nautical context, sounds rather too much like the chorus of villagers.

255
Ennui and weltschmerz can be staved off, however, on a temporary basis, by entertainment, especially of a melodramatic cast, and this was what was on offer in another of the songs heard in the 1825–6 season, The Wolf, by William Shield. It appears in the opera The Castle of Andalusia, which made its first appearance on the London stage in 1782. Derek B. Scott considers this song at some length: it “became a war horse of the Victorian drawing room”, he says, going on to note that it “held its place throughout the nineteenth century as one of the half-dozen best-known bass songs.” But he finds this appeal something of a puzzle:

It is specifically aimed at the wealthy … the main emphasis is on the fear of losing possessions rather than one’s life. The precious possessions whose possible loss chills the hearts of the drawing-room audience are the vanities of luxury—jewels, cash, and plate.

The reason needs to be explored why, at this stage of evolution of the English opera, a drawing-room classic should emerge. As noted above the words relate to the fears of the wealthy bourgeois, but why did the song survive musically? … The principal explanation for its continued musical fascination would seem to be the possibilities it offered for a melodramatic rendition.” 67

![Musical notation](image)

**Example 11-39: Shield: The Wolf; bb. 1-10**

The pages of the song (transcribed in full at Appendix L.2, p. 467) are indeed soaked in melodrama.

---

67. Ibid., 7.
Chapter Eleven

The opening 6/4 Siciliana creates an illusory sense of calm undercut by the point made in the text that we are most vulnerable whilst at rest: “At the peaceful mid-night hour, / Ev’ry sense and ev’ry powr, / Fetter’d lies in downy sleep.”

Thus lulled, says the song, we may fall prey to the prowling wolf, in a hint of the tonic minor with the rumbling of sinister octaves in the piano. The baying to the moon is captured in rising melodic sequences before a long melisma culminates in deep, emphatic octaves to round off this Andante.

Example 11-40: Shield: *The Wolf* bb. 21-30

The tension mounts in the next section: a more rapid Allegro characterised by a more fragmented, angular melodic line with a repeated, chordal quaver accompaniment in the piano—though this is a rather pale reflection of the scrubbing semiquavers in the original orchestral version, as is clear from the Walker publication. Sudden hushed octaves for “Silence or you meet your fate” emphasise the danger, the exact nature of which is then spelt out. Scott remarks on the fact that it is a household’s very bourgeois possessions which are imperilled rather than the lives of its inhabitants; this oddity probably arises as much from the need to find a rhyme for “fate” than for any reason of narrative or


69. Ibid.
plot. In its original context this song would never have been taken seriously anyway: *The Castle of Andalusia* is a comic opera with the usual cast of doddering elders, winsome heroines, and hopeful suitors, along with a bunch of bungling bandits led by the faintly ludicrous Don Caesar, who sings this song in Act 3, Scene 3 whilst plotting with his wily henchman, Spado, to be let in to the castle in order to set about his dastardly business. The audience’s appreciation of Don Caesar’s comparison between that natural predator and his own imagined persona works on two levels: it is comically inappropriate in itself, since the incompetent bandit chief’s self-image is woefully overblown; and we know he can’t see that. All this adds another frisson of enjoyment, as the Don snarls the long-held low B flat on “plunder”:

```
Locks, bolts, and bars soon fly a sun-der,-
Then to ri-fle,- rob, and
plun-der,- Then to ri-fle,- rob, and
plun-der,- Then to ri-fle,- rob, and
plun-der,- Then to ri-fle,- rob, and
```

![Example 11-41: Shield: The Wolf; bb. 71-82](image)

The singer’s final utterance—in a song which offers any baritone great opportunity for bravura display—is a positively Handelian melisma with which to mark his exit as the piano/orchestra thumps out more of those repeated chords over a bass line marked *ben marcato*, as if that were necessary. It’s a fine final flourish rejoicing in both its vocal athleticism and its wicked characterisation of the villain of the melodrama.
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Example 11-42: Shield: The Wolf; bb. 87-98

There is no reason to doubt that the Catch Club audience loved the thrill of a preternatural threat just as much as the listeners in the drawing-room, the music hall, or the theatre, even if the threat was aimed directly at the trappings of bourgeois security; reflexively, there is something affirming about a piece of entertainment which seems to speak to your perceived social status. But it is Scott’s emphasis on the drama of a good performance which is the cue to close this chapter.

11.3. Conclusion

At the risk of melodramatic overstatement, it is time to point out that drama has been a leitmotif of this chapter. The repertoire has offered a kaleidoscopic parade of characters, scenery, and plot: Thomas’ skittering about between friends and his shrewish wife, butchers clashing cleavers at a funeral, Sir Toby tottering home backwards, beggars pleading for alms with lascivious innuendo, pontificating politicians, love won and lost—and all to the accompaniment of “prodigious amounts of fermented liquor,” to borrow Thackeray’s phrase. All of human life is here, amidst the pages of the Catch Club’s music, in all its chaotic frailty, strutting its tiny stage. Thus has the music of the Catch Club flirted and occasionally eloped with the music of the theatre—and this was an age when the theatre was stuffed full of it: “hardly a theatrical production of any kind was put on in London
Repertoire

without including some music.” Gles such as Harington’s Goody Groaner (Appendix I.8, p. 390) look ridiculous on the page and are hardly more sensible in concert performance; some stagey ‘business’ involving—at the very least—the frantic entrance and even more distressed exit of the hapless tenor in search of the midwife gives the live performance the treatment the song demands. There is more than a whiff of the emerging music hall in this repertoire, even as it claims, with a straight face, to be serious music descended from elite ancestry, to be performed in a private gentleman’s club.

The view from the Canterbury Catch Club may give the impression that the traffic was all one-way. As has already been noted at the start of this thesis, this was by no means the case: both Brian Robins and Emanuel Rubin note the tremendous success of the catch and glee repertoire in the theatre in the last quarter of the eighteenth century:

Attention has already been drawn to the linking of theatrical entertainments with the performance of catches and glees instigated in the 1770s by Arne and others, with Dibdin going so far as to introduce an independent catch club scene into one of his operas [in The Cobler, or A Wife of Ten Thousand]. In the following decade composers progressed a step further and started to introduce glees into operas, plays, and music drama. These were either borrowed from the popular established repertoire or newly composed for the work in question. The earliest example established so far dates from 1775, with the inclusion of both a glee and catch in The Duenna, a pastiche first given at Covent Garden on November 21 and a piece set to become one of the most popular English operas of the eighteenth century.

Robins goes on to note that “the practice peaked in the 1780s”, notably in the works of William Shield and Henry Rowley Bishop.

The relationship between this repertoire and the stage might have been anticipated from its earliest days. One of the earliest pieces in the Canterbury Collection is quite clearly an essay in operatic scena form. The City Feast, by John Marsh (Appendix O, p. 491), begins with a sombre reflection on the poverty of lives deprived of joys, before brightening up a little as it points to the foodstuffs which “tempt our mortal paunch”. There follows a lively fugato on the words “O, ‘tis merry in the hall / When beards wag all,” culminating in a most emphatic “what a noise and what a din.” The repetitions of “more fat” are delivered with special relish. The tempo speeds up in a depiction of the bellowing

72. Ibid., 130.
73. Ibid., 134.
for food and drink around the hall, but comes to a horrified stop—briefly—at the realisation that someone has cut off the Alderman’s thumb in their excited hacking at the meat. The Alderman himself is given a mournful accompanied recitative—there are strings in attendance—to lament the loss of his digit, but only for six bars, before all is forgotten and the clamour strikes up once again. By way of a coda, the fugato returns before the whole piece closes with Handelian block chords. It is an exuberant celebration of excess, perfectly captured in music which sets a text of slapstick character in mock serious vein. Connoisseurs of the glee set aside Marsh’s string quartets and symphonies for this, his finest hour.

All this is to argue that while the music says much about the Club membership—even when it leaves much unsaid, as with the catch—it problematises both itself and the environment in which, for a long time, it flourished. The glee is a puzzle, not just because of its relationship with its disreputable tavern-dwelling cousin, the catch, but because its very nature makes it difficult to pin down: there are times when it is transgressive and, therefore, morally suspect in its frequent celebration of excessive drinking; it is strangely distant in its treatment of myth and fable; and it can seem weighed down at times by ponderous subject matter. And all the time, it seems to carry a keen awareness of its own evanescence and our mortality, in very Shandean manner.

Its environment similarly defies neat categorisation. The Georgian theatre audience was, at best, a rowdy mob, and this was a matter of concern for the theatre management. Consider this description of the theatre into which Samuel Foote stepped in the 1740s:

Performers and playwrights literally begged the indulgence of their audiences in prologues and epilogues written for the purpose, and if they were not met with such indulgence, as Foote came to recognise as prologue speaker, they could be pelted with orange peel or worse. Both Drury Lane and Covent Garden had ‘strong iron spikes’ running across the stage front. They were there to guard the actors against personal attack. It was a shared space, but a dangerous one. Riots were common. One of Foote’s key roles was as a mollifying ringmaster, soothing with a joke, for his theatre straddled the opposing forces of the Augustan age: it was violent yet formal, exuberant and restrained, and on the faultline was the prologue speaker, at the iron-spiked cusp of the stage.  

Things did improve: “Theatre historians generally agree that audiences grew larger and less sophisticated over the course of the long eighteenth century, and that they also grew quieter or more ‘polite’ during that same period,” according to Betsy Bolton, though she proceeds to problematize

---

both ‘quieter’ and ‘less sophisticated’. Whilst the performance space in the Catch Club was hardly so aggressively contested, it certainly is a liminal space with respect to the norms of concert/social behaviour; neither a formal concert room nor an entirely sociable setting, there were distinctive codes of behaviour which needed to be learned. Even today, as an audience gathers on the top floor of a pub in Canterbury for an evening of this convivial song, they regard the tables laid out for food and drink with suspicion, not knowing quite what to do.

The Club had, however, one thing in common with the domestic setting: “The drawing-room was never to acquire any status as a site of high-quality performance,” observes Derek Scott,76 and so it was with the Catch Club, whose days, by the mid-nineteenth-century, were numbered anyway. It gave way to the commercial centres of commodified entertainment as the century wore on. The Catch Club, distinctively, had one colossal disadvantage which doomed it in a world of leisure activity dominated by capitalist private enterprise: it expected people to join in with their own entertainment in ways unregulated and unpredictable, far beyond the bounds of polite—or even rowdy—applause. Such participatory subversion had no place in the entertainment palaces of the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

76. Derek B. Scott, Sounds of the Metropolis, 15.
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Epilogue: Several Conclusions

12.1. A Historical Conclusion

The Canterbury Catch Club now is dead and gone. Its demise—considering the decades of successful music-making which had gone before—came quite quickly.

In 1854, the club was served with notice of eviction from the Guildhall Tavern. With typically Victorian, entrepreneurial invention, the then Chairman, Mr Thomas Norman Wightwick (known to Canterbury’s historians as Mayor of the city three times between 1857 and 1862), proposed a bold initiative: a purpose-built, privately funded room of the club’s own; and so the Music Hall Company was formed. Even by Victorian standards, progress was rapid: within months, the subscriptions (£5000) had been raised, the job put out to tender, contractors appointed and, by the start of the new season in September 1854, the imposing new Music Hall was open for business. It seemed that Canterbury had acquired a venue fittingly expansive for a city whose cultural life had become an important part of its public identity.

For the Catch Club, however, the honeymoon was short-lived. There must have been a grievous conflict of interest for those many members of the club who had subscribed to the Music Hall in what followed: one correspondent writing to the Kentish Gazette on 15 Sept 1856 noted that “the committee of the Music Hall Company and the committee of the Catch Club of last season were almost identical.”¹ The sordid details are beyond the scope of this study, but they involved all the usual elements of acrimonious disagreement and conflicting commercial interests. For the Club, this was just one part of a story of gradual decline which, as Mr Welby pointed out years later, was characterised by an aging membership and financial mismanagement. Club records show a refusal to countenance even modest adjustments in the terms of membership, but in any case its day was done; a somewhat exclusive club was out of kilter with an age in which far more accessible entertainments were freely on offer with no insistence on the longer-term commitment of a subscription.

It outlasted two other such clubs in the city: on 1 September 1861, the Kentish Express ruefully reported

---

¹ Kentish Gazette, 16 September 1856, 3.
that there was “very little probability of the pleasant meetings of either the Madrigal or the Apollonian Glee Clubs being resumed during the coming winter. Many of our fellow citizens, we feel confident, will peruse this announcement with regret.” In fact, the Catch Club had only two more seasons to run; in 1863, they could not find a room they could afford, and had to conclude that “the Club should remain in abeyance until another season, having reason to believe that a room will by that time been provided adequate to the requirements of the club.” But the same sorry saga was played out the following year, with the same result, and twelve months later the Club was forced to fall on its sword.

In remarking on its demise a decade later, The Whitstable Times and Herne Bay Herald seems to agree with Mr Welby (see Appendix C, p. 289): “The introduction of “stars” and sensational singers, and the opening of the meetings of the Club to all comers, like a London Concert Hall, at once destroyed that institution, . . . The only local gathering now for the practice of music is that of the St Lawrence Amateur Musical Society, which meets weekly, and which last night had one of its “social smokers” at the club room in Palace Street.” The tone is already one of regretful nostalgia, and by 1882 the Club had become a mascot of Canterbury’s past, a living museum exhibit to be trotted out for visitors—on this occasion, the Australian Cricket Team, on tour and arriving for Canterbury’s annual (third week in August) Cricket Week. The following anticipatory report in the local paper does two things: it makes clear the perception of the Club as a piece of by-then-antique cultural heritage, and in its reference to smoking and drinking it gives clear sight of how things had changed:

The St Lawrence Amateur Musical Society will give a Catch Club concert at the Oddfellows’ Hall on the Wednesday evening in the Cricket Week. The affair promises to be one of great interest. The entertainment will partake, as near as possible, of the character of the old Canterbury Catch Club in its palmiest days, arrangements having been made to carry it out on almost exactly the same scale as the concerts of that now defunct institution. The Australian cricketers have been invited, and the guests will also comprise the leading citizens and residents. In order that the hospitality of the Society may be accepted by as many of the citizens as possible, the members will forego their privileges as to tickets of invitation. It is a pity the Town Council could not see their way to granting the Society the use of the Corn Exchange for the concert, as then there would have been room for a very much larger company; but as they declined to accede to the request (for what earthly reason we cannot imagine, except indeed because the Town Clerk said it would not be proper to allow smoking and drinking there), the society

2. Ibid., 1 September 1860.
4. The Whitstable Times and Herne Bay Herald, 1 November 1873.
5. I.e., the premises formerly known as the Prince of Orange—the tavern in which the Club had originally met; the Oddfellows bought the building in 1876.
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will be obliged to make the best use of the Oddfellows’ Hall; and we are glad to learn that the arrangements, so far as they have progressed, are exceedingly satisfactory."

By 1900—only a generation or so after the club’s demise—the Kentish Gazette was moved to remark, as it contemplated the print: “What manner of men they were in those early days we can only surmise, but … it is impossible to help smiling at the rows of sedate-looking citizens, all wearing the dress coat and white “neckcloth” of the period, and each one puffing at a church-warden clay pipe full half a yard long.” As a new century dawned, the Canterbury Catch Club print was but a dusty remnant of an institution whose time had passed.

Against that sorry tale of decline, it should be noted that the music outlasted the Club, both in the city and in the country at large. The City Library and Museum holds a small collection of banquet cards from the 1890s, which show that the repertoire was still part of festive fare. Figure 12-1 shows the musical programme organised to accompany the Installation Banquet of the Royal Military Lodge on 14 October 1889. Apart from the recognition of old favourites (Webbe, Callcott) and some of the later repertoire (Hatton, Sullivan), it’s worth noting that all the singers were Lay Clerks, and four of them were Freemasons; the process of embourgeoisement is alive and well, in this banquet card.

6. Ibid., 5 August 1882.
Meanwhile, in the nation beyond Canterbury’s city walls, the glee remained in the musical lexicon throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century. The Canterbury archive offers some clues to this: occasionally a date is written onto a copy of some music, as is the case with C.W. Martin’s *Prize Glees, Part Songs, &c.* in Volume 71 (no. 7) of the Club collection: “Feb 5, 1860” is pencilled in the top right-hand corner. But one does not have to look for long in turn-of-the-century publications to find frequent reference to the glee as a genre, usually alongside “madrigal” and “part-song”: one such collection, advertised in the *Musical Times* of 1 April 1900, runs to seventeen volumes, though it has to be noted that the only glee composer represented from the first half of the nineteenth century is Henry Bishop. This rather lends weight to Michael Hurd’s assertion (op. cit.) that the term was used increasingly loosely. That year, however, the *Musical Times* advertises the activities of “Glee Clubs” in
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Sheffield, Windsor, and Manchester, and in 1915 it carried a lengthy article on the Abbey Glee Club. It begins with an appreciation of the genre, which sounds the familiar note of national pride to set the scene for the argument for preservation:

The glees composed by our forefathers towards the end of the 18th century and up to about the middle of the 19th century are national musical assets that one may hope will not be 'scrapped' by the evolution of the later 'part-songs' and 'choral songs'....

Do we ever in any other form of concerted music experience the perfect chording that fills the ear with gorgeous resonance and fascinates the attention simply as sound, as when a fine glee party warbles one of the old masters' finest creations? It has been well said that modern music looks so much better than it sounds, but this glee music may be said truly to sound much better than it looks, for the simple reason that the best composers, either by instinct or craft, knew just where to 'throw' each voice in order to produce the maximum effect with the minimum of effort.

This suggests that by this stage, Musical Times readers needed reminding what the glee actually was, but it is heartening to see the clarity of nomenclature at the start, and the recognition of the craftsmanship—even if couched in a clumsy, back-handed compliment—of the genre.

Finally, it is worth noting that although it may not be surprising to find the glee still flourishing during the First World War at home, it is more remarkable to discover it behind the lines in France. In September 1917, The Music Student carried an article recording the establishment of a successful “Glee Club” based at a YMCA Hut. “Its singing,” notes the Editor, “was well up to the standard of home and of peacetime—a remarkable fact, considering the difficulties of choral work in a Remount Camp, where at any moment a batch of your men may have to be despatched up the line.” Regrettably, little clue as to repertoire is given, though in other articles in the same issue—entitled Music and the Soldier—the pieces cited coincide with the contents of the Novello volumes mentioned above. But the name lives on, though it seems to have fallen out of use thereafter.

At this distance of time, then, the repertoire and the club culture which treasured it are simply a piece

Epilogue: Several Conclusions

of history—the most striking aspect of which is the remarkable length of time it took to become one. The glib conclusion is that its time had come and gone, but as this thesis has shown, the more accurate reading of its rise and eventual demise is that the club culture successfully outlasted its Georgian socio-cultural origins, lasting well into the nineteenth century despite “the transformative force in the middle ranks of life that was called respectability’.” As the middle classes discovered “the rewards of good manners and the purchasing power to express them”, however, the more libertine manners of the Catch Club were eventually superseded.

12.2. A Cultural Conclusion

Nineteenth-century manners and mores were themselves problematic. Ian Bradley, musician and cleric, makes a persuasive case for a re-assessment of Victorian sentimentality when he posits it as “an alternative and understandable response to … a recognition of the loss of community, innocence and simple values in the face of rapid industrialisation.” He makes this point in a chapter which considers more generally the challenge to established religious doctrines in the nineteenth century, but the relevance here is the methodology: a thing is considered not as an isolated, self-referential entity, but as a response to something. This is a particularly worthwhile exercise when confronted with a picture of a group of people apparently trapped in an affluent bunker, with no clear means of entry or egress. They seem to have been walled in—or are they trying, very deliberately, to keep the outside world at bay? Against what are these worthy citizens shoring up their collective sense of cultural, economic, and/or political identity?

As Bradley suggests, it was a difficult age, made even more testing by the socio-economic imperative to keep up the appearances so carefully cultivated in the print. So far, the image has led to a scrutiny of the manners and norms of behaviour of the age. It has taken a view of the economic relationships at work in this place, this time, and this society—especially between those who laboured and those who had the money to pay for that labour, and between those indentured to one of Britain’s most ancient institutions—the cathedral—for their foreseeable and uncertain future, and their social and political superiors. It has deconstructed culture and matters of taste, seeing both simply as another function of

13. Vic Gatrell, City of Laughter, 575.
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a dialectical process in which the dominant hegemony finds a multitude of ways to ensure the primacy of its elite view of things. These politics have featured in the discussion insofar as the politics of the day were contested: in the fact that only a few of the men in this picture were enfranchised, and that most of the rest, given the temper of the time, would argue that they, too, should be so recognised by the dominant elite—though they would have to wait, perhaps for decades, before they were.

Some of the conclusions have been surprising. The way in which this Club offered a socio-cultural space which in one sense defied the view of an elite in allowing a relatively inclusive—albeit controlled and controlling—membership is in one sense subversive of the then-dominant elite view of things. Its accommodation—if not encouragement—of women as performers and audience was a contribution to a discourse which was only to grow in volume throughout the century. Political power was contested, flexed, and re-defined in the face of incremental adjustments offered by the elite in the governance of the nation, and this discussion has shown something of that interminably slow process in microcosm, within a musical social club, in a city in the south-east corner of England.

In the face of all this, this uniquely English institution sang. As Evelyn Waugh says of Uncle Peregrine, the Catch Club “could have occurred nowhere else but in England and in no period but [its] own”\textsuperscript{16}: once a week, for thirty weeks of the year, for almost a century, they created a space in which the terrible tensions of the time were dissipated in intense conviviality. Charles Taylor—following Victor Turner—calls this experience the “festive”, and characterises it thus:

The notion of the “festive” I’m invoking here has to be understood in a broad sense. It includes feasts and pilgrimages. It involves, first, large numbers of people coming together outside of quotidian routine, whether the “outside” is geographic, as in the case of pilgrimage, or resides in the ritual of the feast which breaks with the everyday order of things.\textsuperscript{17}

Taylor’s invocation of Turner’s “communitas” emphasises the transgressive, anarchic quality of such occasions, where, in a world “turned upside down,” we find ourselves “beyond the hierarchical divisions of the established order, ….together as equal human beings.”\textsuperscript{18} Victor Turner himself enlarges upon the “antistructural” character of these gatherings:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16} Evelyn Waugh, \textit{Unconditional Surrender} (Penguin Books, 1964), 125.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Charles Taylor, \textit{A Secular Age} (Harvard University Press, 2007), 469.
\item \textsuperscript{18} \textit{Ibid.}
\end{itemize}
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Here we have what I would call “communitas” or social antistructure (since it is a “bond uniting ... people over and above any formal social bonds,” that is, “positive” structure).  

More interestingly still, Turner’s later work has an insight to offer in relation to that juxtaposition between the serious and the playful which has been articulated in various ways throughout this discussion—in Sterne’s wit and judgement, for example; in the formal concert and the “after-evening”; and in various examples from the repertoire itself. Whilst arguing that western culture has largely lost this aspect of its ritual, he argues that:

The great Oriental religions ... still recognise in many public performances that human ritual can be both earnest and playful. Eros may sport with Thanatos, not as a grisly Danse Macabre, but to symbolise a complete human reality and a Nature full of oddities.

Turner blames “industrialisation, urbanisation, spreading literacy, labour migration, specialisation, professionalism, bureaucracy, [and] and the division of the leisure sphere from the work sphere by the firm’s clock” for this fracture, but goes on to note the various performative genres—including “rock music, carnivals, processions, folk drama, [and] major sports events” which have arisen to fill the void left by those—formerly religious—rituals which allowed participants to set aside the norms of their behaviour. Had the focus of his attention been the leisure activities available in nineteenth-century culture, his work suggests that he would readily accept a Catch Club evening as such a ritualised event and include it in that list of antistructural genres which have come to offer an alternative to the liminal space once offered by religious celebration. For Turner, this is a powerful experience: “a time and place lodged between all times and places defined and governed ... by the rules of law, politics and religion, and economic necessity. Here, the cognitive schemata that give sense and order to everyday life no longer apply, but are, as it were, suspended.”

Recalling the visceral excitement which must have been coursing through the assembled company as they bellowed their choruses and catches to the rafters into the early hours of the morning, this seems a justifiable conceptualisation of the processes at work on a Club night, and a good reason for the membership to keep it all going when fashion, custom, and competing forms of entertainment would have deemed it antique. And it seems that there was more to it than mere excitement.

21. Ibid., 85–86.
22. Ibid., 84.
Robin Dunbar has made it clear that there are sound neurological reasons why such convivial songmaking should feel like a good thing to do. Although it may seem worryingly anachronistic to turn the spotlight of cutting-edge 21st-century research in neurophysiology on to a nineteenth-century catch club, Dunbar’s work on the evolutionary function of song and dance sits very comfortably alongside Turner’s anthropological perspective:

Music seems to [have] a capacity to produce endorphins which have a positive effect on our attitudes towards others. … The suggestion is that the surge of endorphins triggered by engaging in communal musical activities makes us feel positively disposed towards those with whom we engage in this activity.  

Dunbar’s point, developed in later writings and seminar papers, is neatly summed up in an interview with the Australian Broadcasting Company in 2016:

Music really in many ways is just fundamental to our ability to hold together large communities of individuals. The problem we had, or at least our ancestors had, in the course of later human evolution was trying to bond ever larger communities, communities beyond the size that you could bond by the classic mechanisms that monkeys and apes use, which is grooming each other. And what music does is kick in the same physiological mechanisms that underpin grooming and make grooming the ideal primate way of creating relationships, bonding social groups.

The ‘communitas’ of a Catch Club evening, it would appear, had a sound physiological basis.

Such perspectives help to explain the phenomenon of the catch club culture, even if the participants would not have recognised it in quite these terms at the time. For a richly textured multiplicity of reasons, then, the Club was very good for its members whilst on the one hand it allowed them to assert their place in society, on the other it gave them some time off from that effortful process.

---


12.3. A Musical Conclusion

Music is as silent on the page as it is in a picture, and an obvious line of enquiry for the present-day musicologist is the investigation of this repertoire through performance itself. This can pose interesting questions. As noted above, both Simon McVeigh and Brian Robins chronicled the migration of the catch and glee from sociable club to concert platform and theatre, so the challenges of presenting an essentially participatory genre of music—the catch—to a mute audience are not new, nor do the solutions seem to have changed much. Recent recordings of catches such as The Art of The Bawdy Song\(^\text{25}\) experiment with the introduction of the different parts at different times so that individual lines may be heard before they come together in contrapuntal combination, as has been done in the example below (Example 12-1), with Hilton’s Here Lies a Woman, shown first in its original short score.

**Here Lies a Woman**

[Vol. 9; No. 25]

John Hilton (1599-1657)

---
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The arrangement shown below (Example 12-2, p. 274) allows the third voice to offer the sly revelation that the dead woman would wake and talk again while the second repeats the second line to provide the beginnings of the harmony. A couple more repetitions of the 8-bar phrases allow the harmony to speak for just long enough before the piece outstays its welcome, at least for a passive audience.

Some such arrangement must have been made in the performance of the “Parliamentary Catch” Gardiner witnessed, quoted in Nettles’ article on page xx. That piece—Baldon’s Mister Speaker (Example 1-3, p. 13)—still works in performance today; the sight of three grown men standing up and sitting down repeatedly has a slapstick quality to it whose appeal has not dimmed in two and a half centuries.

The narrative catches mentioned above in Chapter 11.2 present a greater challenge, for there is, as pointed out earlier (p. 237), a story involved. There survives no record of any public performance of As Thomas Was Cudgell’d One Day by His Wife (reproduced in its original form at Appendix K.4, p. 450), so no clue is to be found in older literature as to how it might be done. The musical challenges of this piece have already been noted, so one option should be discarded: a modern performer would be ill-advised to attempt to teach it to an audience in a performance context. The solution is a more elaborate arrangement, to be found at Appendix K.5 (p. 451). Here, the four voices sing continuously, but each in turn takes a line of the original catch while the other three provide a suitably inane accompaniment designed to provide an unobtrusive harmonic undercarriage. Only when all four voices have completed the story does the final page let rip with the catch in all its competitive glory. Audiences seem appropriately traumatised by the time the performance is finished.

26. One such attempt, with an audience of musicologists at a conference in Salzburg in 2014, was not entirely successful.
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Here Lies a Woman

[Vol. 9; MS]

John Hilton (1599-1657)

Example 12-2: Hilton, Here Lies a Woman, arranged
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Much the same treatment has been meted out to a favourite of Cantuar’s: William Hayes’ As Sir Toby Reeled Home (in its original form at Appendix K.6, p. 456, and “arranged” at Appendix K.7, p. 457). Originally only three parts, the presence of a counter-tenor in Cantuar invited an upper-voice obbligato part, so the arrangement offered here includes one. Once again, the three lower voices take it in turn to sing a line of the story whilst the others accompany and contribute sound effects; the jovial competition at the end finishes things off nicely. This catch deserves revival if only because it is the only piece of music to set the words “mathematics” and retrograde” convincingly to music.

Mention of William Hayes recalls his advice of 1757. Anxious that his publication be as useful as possible, he offers guidance on performance: “I shall beg leave to add, that these little pieces produce an agreeable effect, when justly performed upon such [treble] instruments; especially, if a convenient number of them are selected, and properly arranged together. The canons do well on three violoncellos [sic].”27 Interestingly, having explained how to start the catch off, he feels the need to enter a plea for some musicality in performance:

I must beg leave to suggest, that, so often as it is repeated, an alternacy of forte and piano, or loud and soft, in imitation of the Chiaro Oscuro, or light and shade in painting, has an agreeable effect; except in such, when the humour of the subject requires a certain jollity to be kept up throughout the whole, which the performer will very easily distinguish. And if, amongst the following [of his compositions], any should be found worthy of being deemed pathetic, or to have anything delicate in their taste or construction, I would recommend mezzo piano (at least something under the full tone of voice) as being more expressive of tenderness.28

For anyone who has used rounds, catches and canons in an educational context, that advice has an authentic ring. “Novices in the Art” (Hayes’ phrase), confronted with the challenge of sustaining their own line independently against others, will indeed be inclined to make the singing of a catch rather too much of a competitive enterprise. Hayes’ counsel may be over 250 years old, but it still holds.

One of Canterbury’s home-grown offerings, Nicholson’s Miss Kate took John’s Oboe in her Hand One Day (Appendix K.2, p. 447), needs only a little manipulation to achieve precisely the effect Nicholson may have been aiming for. The first line (shown as Part 1 in the transcription) obviously needs the interpolations from the other voices to work convincingly, so at its first announcement the soloist may ignore most of the rests, retaining only enough to whet the appetite of the audience and convey

28. Ibid., iii.
something of the gathering urgency of the part before the second voice enters. Any group which can call upon a high counter-tenor may enhance the performance by allocating Kate’s reported speech to him; the high-pitched giggling in line 3 is far more effective as a result. The performance is not subtle, but that quality is not a key requirement of this opus.

Thus has the tradition of catch singing been introduced to modern audiences—and it should be noted that on various occasions audiences have been successfully taught several simpler examples of the genre.

As was noted above, the glee expects an audience, and so, to begin with, the modern performer need do no more than heed the advice offered almost two centuries ago by William Horsley, in his Preface to the two-volume edition of Callcott’s works he produced in 1824, quoted above (p. 213): one voice to a part, unaccompanied, is all that is required. In that form, the glee fulfils exactly the function identified by one nineteenth-century writer, Edward Holmes, when he argues that its efficacy in musical training is unsurpassed: the glee is, he maintains, “a simple and obvious test of the proficiency of the ear and voice, at a time when singing is carried on in crowds, and everywhere with too much help.”

Modern performances occasionally have to consider some puzzles posed by the archival source, as may be guessed by the number of pieces in the Appendices which note the fact they have been transposed. The allocation of voices to a part is frequently neglected, and although the first assumption is that the ensemble would have been entirely male, this does not always result in the best

disposition of voices. One example is Callcott’s *The May Fly* (already mentioned in Chapter 11, p. 231 and reproduced at Appendix I.15, p. 414): voice parts are not given at the start, though it is perfectly obvious from the original copy (in Volume 21 of the Canterbury Catch Club music archive, Figure 12-2) that the bottom part is intended to be a bass, given the clef. The fact that the two upper parts are not shown as tenor clefs (with the octave *bassa* notated) is typical of the ambiguity often encountered in the archive. In this case, however, it may be accurate: two soprano voices result in more felicitous voicing. For example, in bars 10–13, tenor and bass parts would cross, resulting in odd inversions, especially at the Ic–V–I cadence in bb. 12–13. This piece may be another snippet of evidence to support our understanding that a treble or two would often be imported to supply upper parts; or it may be another example of the glee’s migration to domestic music-making. Evidence for this is necessarily scant, but Brian Robins draws heavily on the the Marsh diaries and the Harris papers to build a case suggesting that the performance of catches and glees in domestic circles was common in the latter part of the eighteenth century, and that it included women: “by the 1770s amateur ladies were not only listening to catches and keys, but also singing them themselves. ... Such interest and participation also accounts for the fair number of women subscribers to catch and glee collections during this period”—an assertion borne out by the many subscription lists in the Canterbury collection.

---
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Pitch range more generally is an occasional issue. Catches often seem to be written out with little concern for the tessitura demanded of the voices: Webbe’s As Thomas Was Cudgell’d, for example, is hand-written in the Canterbury collection’s Volume 9 in the key of B flat. This requires all the singers to spend quite a lot of time singing a top F (see Fig. 12-3). Transposition is the obvious solution to what is probably a piece of manuscript which was only intended as a rough guide to performance.

A more interesting conundrum is that posed by some pieces in which the issue is not one of tessitura, but the extraordinarily wide range demanded. John Stafford Smith’s Flora Now Calleth Forth Each Flow’r (Appendix T, p. 514) offers a striking example. Scored for two sopranos, alto, tenor, and bass, this piece has gone down in glee history as the one which should have won a prize: R.J.S Stevens records how a very grumpy John Stafford Smith remonstrated with Stevens at a (London) Catch Club meeting after Flora had been beaten to a medal by Stevens’ See What Horrid Tempests Rise. One can only hope that Smith was mollified by Steven’s conciliatory “I have no doubt that your composition is the best”, although Stevens also made it quite clear that he intended to hang on to the prize. It has to be doubted that Smith ever read Stevens’ diaries, but for posterity the record is set graciously and unequivocally straight:

It is but common justice, here to declare, that John Stafford Smith’s composition should most undoubtedly have had the gold medal for the best cheerful glee in preference to mine. His glee of Flora Now Calleth Forth Each Flow’r, the poetry from Spenser, is an ingenious, and an admirable composition: it must have suffered in effect in performance, for want of two soprano voices.34

Mark Argent takes the opportunity to remind us in his notes that “the Catch Club engaged boys rather than women to sing the top part in vocal compositions,” and points out that this would have placed John Stafford Smith’s offerings at a disadvantage, since his glee’s “made effective use of women’s voices.”35 In Flora, this is very noticeably the case, especially in the tremendously effective final section in which all the voices combine in close imitation to “leaden [lead] our dance” from around bar 80 onwards. In fact, there is much to appreciate in this piece—not least the delightful conceit of combining two time signatures so that the line “that now sleepeth in Lethe’s lake” can toll as a pedal note in slow duple time against some lively counterpoint in 6/8 throughout the piece—but the point of introducing Flora here was to provide an example of a note which would never nowadays be

34. Argent, Recollections of R. J. S. Stevens, 42.
35. Ibid.
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written: the low D (a seventh below middle C) in bars 41–2 (Example 12-3) and 68–9 cannot be sung by a modern counter-tenor without fluking into the baritone register. In the context of this piece, it is an interesting effect, but in the context of the wider repertoire, it begs the question as to how readily tenors and counter-tenors may have expected to shift without demur between registers: if the written pitch of much of the printed repertoire is to be accepted as intended for tenors (rather than altos who are happy to change gear), this suggests a more relaxed attitude to ‘chest’ and ‘head’ voice production.

By way of a coda to this consideration of the performance practice issues surrounding this repertoire, it is worth noting that Cantuar has made its own contribution to the repertoire—or, to be more accurate, one of its members has. Finding that no-one responded to a call for compositions at a recent conference, Paul Young contributed two of his own to fill the void. One—I’m Sorry!, a catch very much for our time, to be sung whilst pinching the nose in order to achieve a suitably tinny tonal quality whilst demonstrating conclusively that sophisticated electronic processing requiring expensive equipment is not necessary—appears below (Example 12-4). The other, New Year Rhymes, appears as Appendix U, p. 521.

I'm Sorry!

Suggested performance:
each part once through by separate singers,
then top 2 parts, then 3 parts and lastly all 4

The composer is modest about his contributions, but he has deftly parodied the glee characteristics in New Year Rhymes: pairs of voices played off against each other, moments of imitation, the sectional structure matching the different moods of the text, etc.. And the use of a contemporary poet is a nice touch.

All the above is intended to show that we can, in fact, recapture something of the convivial aesthetic of this music. Audiences have shown themselves willing and able to join in (including senior university staff who assured us that they had not sung a note for forty years), and the engaging humour of the repertoire has proved its enduring appeal in performances over the last few years in a variety of contexts including stately homes, Archives Reading Rooms, after-dinner entertainments, Arts Festival evenings, and—of course—pubs. Musicologists have, at various points in the last few decades, urged a re-appraisal of this repertoire on musicological grounds. The point of this thesis has been to urge a re-appraisal—at least in part—on musical grounds.
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12.4 A Synoptic Conclusion

One long, last look is appropriate. The print is 515mm x 620mm in size, so standing a few feet away affords a perfectly clear view. The gentlemen remain, “pictorially privileged”, as Leppert puts it,37 in the front of the image, some of them looking disinterested to the point of absence. One figure, standing toward the back on the right, looks slightly lost—but this is Mr Small, landlord of the Prince of Orange, presumably anxious to ensure that his patrons are well supplied with refreshment. This would make his the most realistic depiction in the picture. For the rest, this is a scene of relaxed enjoyment, in which friendship is evident and socio-economic status is affirmed, in a most amiable and safe environment.

Now, though, knowing how it all gave permission for an enactment not only of bourgeois respectability but of transgressive, libertine exuberance, we may see something rather more knowing in the assured poses. As if, the moment we have walked away from the print—as soon as our backs are turned—the assembled company might burst into riotous convivial song. They would only be doing what the songs told them to: “Now round the board,” invites Luffman Atterbury’s glee of that name, “let friends in concert join, / And drown despair in copious draughts of wine.”38

And so they did.

APPENDICES
Appendix A: The Catch Club Print
## Appendix B: The Catch Club Print – key & corroborative information

Key: * = information in Electoral Roll [ER]; ** = information in Kings School Register; KSC = Kings School Canterbury Scholar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key no.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Directory address:</th>
<th>ER 1826</th>
<th>King's School Register</th>
<th>Freemason (age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P = Pigot (1824);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S = Stapleton (1838);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mr. [William]**</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
<td>High St (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?Son WG 1821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Barnett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Baskerville, Sen.</td>
<td>Billet master</td>
<td>Monastery Hse (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mr. T. M.</td>
<td>Baynes</td>
<td>Artist; [44, Burton St., London]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mr. William**</td>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>Old Palace Brewery</td>
<td>Lady Wooton's Green (S)</td>
<td>Son AJ, 1836</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 April 1821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mr. **Francis</td>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>St George's St (S)</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>Son George 1807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>?Joseph</td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Yeoman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 May 1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Boorman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alderman **</td>
<td>Sladden</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Coach Builder</td>
<td>All Saints (S)*</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>?Son CH 1820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Browne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alderman Henry**</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>Stour St (S)</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>KSC 1803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mr. Charles</td>
<td>Cottrell</td>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>29 St Margaret's St (S)</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>8.04.1819 (29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Cullen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mr. Thos Thorpe**</td>
<td>Delaix</td>
<td>Coroner</td>
<td>12 Castle St (S)</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>?1763; ?Son TP 1828</td>
<td>24.08.1820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr. Charles</td>
<td>Delmar</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>St Margaret's St (S)</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>?Son Charles, 1800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Delmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Denne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Dewell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mr. William**</td>
<td>Dombrain</td>
<td>Wine Merchant</td>
<td>St Margaret's St (S)</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>Son JQ 1836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key no.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Directory address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S = Stapleton (1838);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P = Pigot (1824)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas[**]</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>Burgate (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Downe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>Sun Inn</td>
<td>Sun St (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fletcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>?Richard</td>
<td>Frielend</td>
<td>?Mayor of the City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Furley</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>St George (S)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Goodban'</td>
<td>Leader of the Orchestra</td>
<td>Bridge St (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Goodhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Halsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>Wine Merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hollingbury</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Holtum</td>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>1, Parade (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manager, Halford's Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keeler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lansbery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Lepine</td>
<td>Silversmith</td>
<td>St Peter's St (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>Lepine, Sen.</td>
<td>Victualler*</td>
<td>St Margaret (S)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linford</td>
<td>Chemist, “Weeks &amp; Linford”; 47, Burgate (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>[Thomas]**</td>
<td>Marseille</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miette</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Broad St (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **married Frances Marseille, daughter of No. 7, Thomas Marseille**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key no.</th>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Directory address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Mourylan</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>George**</td>
<td>Neame</td>
<td>Grocer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Neame</td>
<td>St Margaret's St (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Pillow</td>
<td>Hoyman,&quot;Cock, Pillow, and Co.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Pout</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Ridout</td>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>12 Palace St (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Wool Stapler</td>
<td>16 Best Lane (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Ruglys</td>
<td>Malster</td>
<td>Wincheap (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>Sankey</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Shindler</td>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>St Paul (S)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Landlord, “Prince of Orange”; Orange St (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Solly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>[James Hollingbery]**</td>
<td>Stringer</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Publisher of the Print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 Sun St (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Welby</td>
<td>(? St Peter's St (S)</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Wilkinson</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Terrace (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Wills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = Pigot (1824); S = Stapleton (1838); ER 1826; King's School Register; Freemason (age)
## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key no.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Directory address: P = Pigot (1824); S = Stapleton (1838);</th>
<th>ER 1826</th>
<th>King's School Register</th>
<th>Freemason (age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>T. H.</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Boot Maker</td>
<td>Sturry (S);</td>
<td>ER 1826</td>
<td>King's School Register</td>
<td>Freemason (age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Wootton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: A description copied from a manuscript, by Mr Welby, 1875

Scholes (Ed.), *The Music Student*, Vol XII, No. 8, May 1920, p. 468

The Canterbury Catch and Glee Club of its rise, and, alas! that tongue or pen should tell, of the fall of this grand old club, we will endeavour to bring a few recollections to mind.

The club occupied a large share in the century 1770 to 1870, as the last season ended in 1865.\(^1\) Commencing in a very humble public tavern by some half a dozen musical citizens meeting to sing glee and catch, it rose to be the chief estate of Canterbury. Within the memory of many now living the orchestra comprised some 50 performers,\(^2\) and the club consisted of about 200 members, numbering among them the resident gentry, clergy, and leading tradesmen. The new members were proposed by a member, and balloted for. No citizen could be admitted unless a member. No apprentice or minor could ever be admitted. Visitors were admitted by payment, on the last night of the season only. Admission, half a guinea, one year’s subscription, one guinea.

The club was renowned throughout England for its famous music, and for its gentlemanly atmosphere; and visitors were numerous, consisting of officers of the Army, country gentry, and commercial travellers. When the mayor paid an official visit his name was inserted in the Charter Glee [the piece written for the club by Thomas Goodban, Jnr.; see p. XXXI]. The MPs of the city and candidates for that office always attended, and great was the speech-making.

The famous motto of the club was “Harmony and Unanimity” and politics were rigidly excluded.

This important club lasting nearly 90 years—1779 to 1865—had a beneficial effect on the city, as, in the first place it was a school for vocal and instrumental practice, and during this long period an army of ‘young un’s’ were brought up and wended their way to the metropolis.

Sir George Elvey, son\(^3\) of Dr Stephen Elvey, Hobbs, Hawes, Goulden, Shoubridge, Dyson, Tom Young, *et hoc genus*, vocalists and instrumentalists were constantly in practice. A full rehearsal always took place on Saturday evening for the Wednesday concerts, of which 30 were given from the first Wednesday in October to the last in March.

The first, and almost perpetual, chairman was Charles Delmar, Esq.\(^4\) The most rigid order was kept, rarely did any disorderly visitor interrupt; the cry of “Turn him out” was swiftly raised. When the program was concluded the early birds retired, and for some forty years the after evening was celebrated by amateur free and easy singing, the mirth growing fast and furious till the small hours. No Bruce [police] being then in existence, our grandparents made a night, and often, too, a morning of it.

Gin Punch in half-pint mugs was the beverage, and the mutton-pie man, Hagell, supplied the solids.

The room in Orange Street, now called the Apollonian Hall, was built for the club about 1800, and there the meetings were held for some 40 years.

---

1. In fact, the club had not met for two seasons before finally expiring in 1865.
2. Club Minutes tend to suggest the number was more like 25-30, as shown in the print
3. Actually brother.
4. A slight exaggeration, though Delmar’s uninterrupted tenure as President from 1802-28 must have cast a long shadow.
The club then removed to the Guildhall Concert Room where it remained until the new Music Hall in St Margaret’s Street was built for it about 1850, where, after a lingering decline, it expired in 1865.

The Hall was uncomfortably large, the old members died off, and innovations were made on the ancient rules, citizen visitors were admitted at one shilling. Music Hall comic singers and stars from London came down and swept away the larger part of the funds. Party spirits began to divide the city, and the end came. Ichabod! When will the citizens be wise enough to revive this happy institution?

We subjoin a list of the musical worthies—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Violins</th>
<th>Second Violins</th>
<th>Violinecellos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thos. Goodban, senr. (leader for 30 years)</td>
<td>John Irons</td>
<td>M. Wellard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Evans Jones (then Organist of Cathedral)</td>
<td>[Castle] Kempton, senr.</td>
<td>H. Goodban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Palmer (afterwards Leader)</td>
<td>J. Shoubridge (afterwards of St Paul's)</td>
<td>J. Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmond Saffery</td>
<td>S. Elvey (afterwards Dr Stephen Elvey)</td>
<td>G. Mount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Double Bass</th>
<th>Flutes</th>
<th>Oboe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Lepine, senr.</td>
<td>Wm. Palmer</td>
<td>W. Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stacey</td>
<td>H.T. Clark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarionettes</th>
<th>Bassoons</th>
<th>Trumpets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.M. Welby</td>
<td>J. Mount</td>
<td>M. Furner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saml. White</td>
<td>James Welby</td>
<td>- Manclark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trombones, Drums, etc.</th>
<th>Horns</th>
<th>Vocalists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Elvey, W. Longhurst, Merrett, Coveney and Eastes</td>
<td>- Foster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We ⚫ subjoin the list of the musical worthies—

5. This removal took place in 1831, as recorded in Minute Books of the Club.
6. It is not clear from Scholes’ account whether this is his editorial contribution or part of Welby’s writing.
7. Actually the younger Thomas Goodban, but in Mr Welby’s recollection, father to Charles, Henry and another Thomas.
Often the military bands contributed to the harmony.

The programme usually consisted of four overtures, or parts of symphonies by Haydn, Bach, or Abel; sometimes part of Mozart’s. Handel’s Overtures were frequently done in first-class style. Three or four glees for 3, 4, or 5 voices, one duet, four songs, and one Catch or Round.

The noble Charter Glee, the Music and the words of which are the sole composition of the late Thomas Goodban, was always performed by the whole orchestra on the opening and closing nights of each season, introducing the health of the Chairman. On the visit of the Mayor his name was substituted.

We subjoin the words, and let all clubs which desire a model take this, the words happy, the music perfectly good.

Charter Glee

Goodban. *Circa* 1820

To Apollo and Bacchus our offerings let’s bring,
And join hearts and voices their praises to sing,
Relaxing from labour and all cares beguiling,
How happy we’re met at our Club so inviting,
Here’s a pipe and good liquor our spirits to cheer,
And music’s sweet sounds, so delightful to hear,
Here’s social good fellowship all hearts inspiring,
And mirth and good humour on each face sits smiling.
Then, with pleasure abounding,
Its fame far resounding,
Let’s be merry and happy at our meeting so rare;
From contention refraining
And order maintaining,
Here’s success to our Club, and a health to the chair.
Appendices

Appendix D: Thomas Goodban, Charter Glee

The Charter Glee

[Vol. 35]

Thomas Goodban
Appendices
Appendices
Appendices
Appendices

sounding, let’s be merry and happy at our meeting so rare; be merry and happy at our meeting so
Appendices

| S   | From content refraining, and order maintaining, here's suc |
| A   | order maintaining, From content refraining, and order maintaining, here's suc |
| T   | - ing, From content refraining, and order maintaining, here's suc |
| B   | order maintaining, From content refraining, and order maintaining, here's suc |
| F   | 
| Ob  | 
| Hn  | 
| Vln | 
| Vln II | 
| Vl  | 
| Vc  | 
| Hpsd | 
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Appendix E: Herschel: The Echo Catch

Echo Catch

[Vol. 9, p. 193]  
William Herschel  
(1738-1822)

They say there is an Echo here, they say there is an Echo here, I'll try, I'll try I'll try.

Ha, no 'tis not here. Ha, nor is it there.

Pray try again, try again, try again, try again, You'll find it by and by.

Pray try again, try again, try again, try again, You'll find it by and by.
Appendices

try. Ha, no 'tis not here. Ha, nor is it there. Perhaps this place.
by. A-gain, try a-gain, a-gain, try a-gain, you'll find it by and by.
by. You'll find it by and by, you'll find it by and by, you'll

by, you'll find it by and by. That's it, that's it, that's it, by Jove, you've
find it by and by. That's it, that's it, that's it, by Jove, you've

it, by Jove, to a T, T. It calls for tea, 'tis
hit it to a T, T. The echo calls for tea, 'tis very
hit it to a T, T. The echo calls for tea, 'tis very

Tea
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Appendix F: The Goodban Subscription

F.1: Extracts from the Catch Club Minutes recording the Subscription

The committee, anxious to preserve that credit and respectability which has attached to the club ever since its foundation (now 40 years), think it their duty to introduce Mr Thomas Goodban, the present Leader of the Orchestra, to the notice of the members generally.

As a gentleman who early in life under the superintendence of his much respected relatives and other friends to the institution, was a constant assistant therein; and who has ever since, as his musical abilities increased, devoted them with the utmost energy in the same cause, namely, to promote the Harmony and Unanimity of the club.

They further and more particularly do it, in consequence of his disinterestedness, in declining to accept the usual annual compliment for his attention and trouble, at a time (some years since) when the finances of the club were in an involved state; also from a full conviction that but for his most strenuous exertions since he became the head of the Musical Department this Club could not have maintained its pre-eminence if even it could have continued to exist.

On these considerations the committee beg leave to suggest a compliment to be paid to Mr Thomas Goodban, and to recommend a subscription for purchasing a Piece of Plate (such as he shall approve) to be presented him, as a testimony of the personal esteem of the President and members of the club for him, and of the grateful sense they entertain of his endeavour to promote their amusement.

Furthermore the committee cannot refrain from embracing the present opportunity (in behalf of the members as well as themselves) of paying every tribute of respect to Messrs. Marrable, Mr Lepine, Charles Lepine, Watson and Girst who have gratuitously rendered their assistance in the orchestra in conjunction with Mr Goodban, and thanking them for their continued exertions for the credit of the club and the gratifications of its members as well as the numerous non-resident visitors.

They appoint a subcommittee to consist of the President, the deputies, the secretary, and the five following gentlemen, (viz) Messrs Roberts, Allan, Stringer, Appleyard, and XXXX, to carry the above into effect, three of whom shall be competent to act.

They request the subscriptions to be paid on or before the 31st of this instant (March) to either of the members of the subcommittee, or to the secretary (Mr Baskerville) and they directed that proceedings to be printed, and a copy sent to each member.

(Signed) William Baskerville, Secretary & Treasurer

In pursuance of the foregoing resolutions the committee therein named open a subscription which produced 50 guineas collected from upwards of 170 members and a few non-resident visitors to the club, with which they purchased (it being Mr Goodban’s choice) a large embossed silver gilt bowl and salver, with a ladle to correspond, and on which the following inscription was engraved, viz.

Canterbury Catch Club
Established 1779

In testimony of the eminent services rendered gratuitously to the club, for several years of the above period by the constant attention and exertion of his musical talent; this bowl and Salver, were the 1st
day of June 1819 presented to Mr Thomas Goodban by the members as a mark of their esteem and gratitude.

Charles Delmar, President.

Which was presented to Mr Goodban on the day thereon and in testimony of his grateful acceptance of them a letter (of which the following is a copy) was sent to the President by that gentleman.

F.2: Goodban’s response

Gentlemen, the distinguished honour conferred on me by the very handsome presents delivered to me today from you demands my most sincere thanks, and while I continue to fill the situation I have now the honour to hold in the Orchestra, I trust my conduct will evince my gratitude as well as the high sense I entertain of the compliment paid to me. To the gentlemen of the committee I consider myself particularly indebted, for the trouble they have taken on this occasion, as also to the members at large for their unanimity and I beg to assure them that so long as my services may be continued to the Orchestra, no endeavour on my part shall be wanting to promote the prosperity of the Catch Club; and while I live I hope to see it flourish and long continue an ornament to this my native City.

I am,

Gentlemen,

Your much obliged and very humble servant

T. Goodban

Canterbury June 1819.
## Appendix G: Catalogue of Canticle Settings held in 24 Cathedral Libraries (source: QMMR 1824)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Bngr</th>
<th>Bris</th>
<th>C’by</th>
<th>Carl</th>
<th>Ches</th>
<th>Chick</th>
<th>Dur</th>
<th>Ely</th>
<th>Extr</th>
<th>Glou</th>
<th>H’f’d</th>
<th>L’fld</th>
<th>Lincn</th>
<th>Lia</th>
<th>N’ch</th>
<th>Oxf’d</th>
<th>P’bro</th>
<th>Roch</th>
<th>S’by</th>
<th>St D’s</th>
<th>Wells</th>
<th>Wmch</th>
<th>Wcstr</th>
<th>York</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Dm</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcock</td>
<td>Am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcock</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcock</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcock</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcock</td>
<td>Em</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldrich</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldrich</td>
<td>Em</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amner</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attwood</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylward</td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td>Am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batten</td>
<td>Dm</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow</td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyce</td>
<td>A (F)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyce</td>
<td>A (V)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyce</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brailsford</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broderip</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broderip</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broderip</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullis</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calah</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camidge</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camidge, Dr.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camidge, M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camidge</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camidge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chard</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chard</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chard</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child A (V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Bb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child F [1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child F [2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark, Jer.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke Am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke E [1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke E [2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke Eb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke F (Short)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combes</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connault</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connault</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendices

| Name     | Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 | Column 4 | Column 5 | Column 6 | Column 7 | Column 8 | Column 9 | Column 10 | Column 11 | Column 12 | Column 13 | Column 14 | Column 15 | Column 16 | Column 17 | Column 18 | Column 19 | Column 20 | Column 21 | Column 22 | Column 23 | Column 24 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Cooke    | C        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 5         |
| Cooke (Dr.) | G       | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Cooke (R.)  | C       | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 1         |
| Coombs    | D        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 1         |
| Cooper    | Bb       | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Cooper    | E        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Cooper    | F        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Cooper    | G        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Corfe     | A        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Corfe     | Bb       | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Corfe     | E        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Cotton    | A        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 1         |
| Creighton | Bb       | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Creighton | Bb (V)  | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Creighton | C        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Creighton | C (V)   | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Creighton | D        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Creighton | D (V)   | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Creighton | E        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 12        |
| Creighton | Eb       | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 15        |
| Creighton | F        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
| Croft     | A        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 10        |
| Croft     | D        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 1         |
| Croft     | E        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 4         |
| Dare      | G        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 1         |
| Davis     | C        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 1         |
| Davis     | G        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /        | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | /         | 2         |
|    | Day | A   | Bb  | C   | D   | Eb  | Fm  | Gm  |    | Farrant | A | Am  | Bb  | E   | Elway | D | Fussell | A | Bm  | Garland | A | Gates | F | Gibbons | C | D | Gibson | A | Giles | C | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|--------|---|-----|-----|-----|------|---|---------|---|-----|--------|---|-------|---|---------|---|-----|--------|---|-------|---|---------|---|-----|--------|---|-------|---|---------|---|-----|--------|---|
|    | D   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 1  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Dean| A   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 2  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Dean| Bb  | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 4  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Dean| C   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 6  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Dupuis| Bb | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 2  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Dupuis| C  | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 2  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Dupuis| D  | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 5  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Dupuis| Eb | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 9  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Dupuis| F  | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 4  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Dupuis| Gm | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 2  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Elway| D   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 2  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Farrant| A  | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 2  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Ferabosco| A  | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 4  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Ferabosco| Am | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 2  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Ferabosco| Bb | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 8  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Ferabosco| E  | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 2  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Foster| Dm  | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 1  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Fussell| A  | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 11 | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Fussell| Bm  | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 2  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Garland| A  | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 2  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Gates| F   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 1  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Gibbons| C  | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 1  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Gibbons| D  | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 2  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Gibson| A   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 1  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
| Giles| C   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | /   | 1  | /      |   | /   | /   | /   |       |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   | /     |   | /       |   | /   | /      |   |
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## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodson</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldwin</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greville</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guise</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Jnr.</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall &amp; Broderip</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall &amp; Hine</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall &amp; Hine</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handel</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handel</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayter</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins</td>
<td>Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins</td>
<td>Bm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathcote</td>
<td>Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathcote (Rev. G)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hempell</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hempell</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henstridge</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herschell</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holder</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphries</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphryes G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrys Em</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglo@</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglo@ F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Bb [1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Bb [2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Eb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelway A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelway Am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelway Bm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempton Bb (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempton Bb (V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Em</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Gm</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Bb</th>
<th>Bm</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Gm</th>
<th>A</th>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linley</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
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<td>/</td>
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<td>/</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
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<td>/</td>
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<td>/</td>
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<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudd</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
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<td>/</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudd</td>
<td></td>
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<td>/</td>
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<tr>
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<td>/</td>
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<td></td>
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<tr>
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</tbody>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nalson</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nares</td>
<td>C [1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nares</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>D</td>
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<td>2</td>
</tr>
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<td>F</td>
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<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Gm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitt</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitt</td>
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<td>G</td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td>Priest</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>F (F)</td>
<td></td>
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<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>E</td>
<td></td>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Key 1</th>
<th>Key 2</th>
<th>Key 3</th>
<th>Key 4</th>
<th>Key 5</th>
<th>Key 6</th>
<th>Key 7</th>
<th>Key 8</th>
<th>Key 9</th>
<th>Key 10</th>
<th>Key 11</th>
<th>Key 12</th>
<th>Key 13</th>
<th>Key 14</th>
<th>Key 15</th>
<th>Key 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randall A</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall C</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raylton A</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raylton E</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raylton Eb</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raylton G</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson C</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodgers A</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodgers Eb</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers A</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers Am</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers Em</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers F</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell A</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargerson Bb</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serton D</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenton A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenton C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenton D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenton Eb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenton G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeats A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeats C</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeats D (F)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeats D (V)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skeats</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slatter</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyth</td>
<td>Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strodgers</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swarbrick</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallis</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomkins</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tozer</td>
<td>Am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travers</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travers</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripp</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudway</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkley</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkley</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallond</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>Dm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wise E</th>
<th>Wise Eb</th>
<th>Wood C</th>
<th>Woodward Bb</th>
<th>Worzan Eb</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcock’s printed volume</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold’s Collection</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyce Collection</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix H: Samuel Sebastian Wesley: Preface to the Service in E


On February 5, 1845, Samuel Sebastian Wesley sold the copyright of his masterly ‘Service in E’ for the sum of fifty guineas, to Martin Cawood, an ironmaster of Leeds, who had requested Wesley to compose the Service. The work was published, in instalments, in 1844 and (possibly) early in 1845. For the original edition of his Service Wesley wrote an exhaustive Preface which does not find a place in modern editions. This remarkable contribution to the subject of English Church Music is too important to remain in oblivion. We therefore reprint Wesley’s trenchant Preface - his church-music creed, in fact - in the hope that it may interest our readers.

Preface

The present is an attempt to give musical expression to the Te Deum, Jubilate, Sanctus, Kyrie Eleison, Credo, Magnificat, and Nunc Dimittis of the Church Service. In submitting it to public notice, more especially to that of the higher order of musical critics, the composer is not sorry to avow himself of the opportunity which it affords to offer a few remarks relative to the present state of Church music and to invite attention to a species of composition so peculiar as that of the Cathedral Service - which, undoubtedly, may be said to place great difficulties in the way of any composer whose object it is to invest such a work with a character of practical utility, as well as with that degree of merit in respect to composition, which may satisfy the higher claims of art. To these, then, he would suggest, how essentially unlike every other species of musical composition such a work must be; designed as it is for performance during the very brief space of lime allotted to our daily Cathedral worship; a period so brief - while the subjects to be treated are so various, of such grand and universal application - as necessarily to divest composition of its ordinary features; rendering almost every species of amplification of a particular subject either difficult or impossible; and this, too, in connection with words which seem, in the musician’s judgment, to demand of him the most exalted efforts of which his art is capable.

It is not, at the present day, too much to assert that however meritorious were the efforts of those who first gave the Canticles their contrapuntal form, they have fallen short of what ought to be, and may be, accomplished. Whatever may have been their merit in their day - and in some instances it was, and still continues to be, rated, deservedly, very highly - the advanced, and still rapidly advancing, state of the art affords resources, both in harmony and melody, unknown to, and consequently, unemployed by, the composers in question. This, if it was, in one sense, a disadvantage to the artist, had at least a corresponding compensation; in that, where all that was known was exhausted, and known to be so, the critic and composer would at least be on a level: the one could not exact more than the other could supply. This alone, as contrasted with the present state of things, would seem to sustain the position thus laid down. To it, however, are to be added the claims and requirements of a now more refined and cultivated taste. Taken together, they render it impossible to recognize, in the unvarying syllabic accentuation, the monotonous undesccriptive expression, of those artists who flourished at a period immediately subsequent to the Reformation, any satisfactory fulfilment of the demands of this exalted subject; in saying which, the writer protests against being met on the one hand by the imputation of mere emulous detraction, or on the other, by the opposition of mere antiquated prejudice.
In support of what is here advanced, the following extracts may be adduced from the Services of Tallis, Aldrich, and Rogers: they are characteristic of that style of Service which is regarded as among the best of those in general use. Such works may very well be presumed to have escaped the attention of connoisseurs; but as their demerits, however great, will not be found without advocates, or even professed admirers, the writer does not venture to say all that might be said concerning a musical taste so defective as that which can sanction the almost general use of such music in the daily performance of the Cathedral Service. If constrained to declare his own opinion of their comparative inferiority, it is not without support from the highest authority of the time. He claims in aid the evidence of Spohr, and of Mendelssohn, when he ventures to assert that such works as those from which the present quotations are made are as unworthy of the words to which they are set as they are ill-calculated to excite interest in any congregation acquainted with music at the present day.

Example 1: An extract from Rogers' Creed

Example 2: An extract from Dr. Wilson’s Glee ‘From The Fair Lavinian Shore’

In the two specimens marked No. 1 and No. 2, it will be considered that the passage which Dr Wilson considered sufficiently expressive of a ridiculous allusion to avarice, Dr Rogers applies to the most

1. [The extracts which Wesley gives are as follows:
   1. Tallis Gloria in Excelsis (Boyce’s ‘Cathedral Music,’ vol. i, p. 36). From ‘Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father’ to the end of the movement.
   2. Aldrich Te Deum in A. From ‘When Thou hadst overcome’ to ‘We believe that Thou shalt come to be our Judge.’
   3. Aldrich Creed in G. From ‘Is worshipped and glorified’ to ‘And the life of the world to come.’]
solemn and aweful declaration of belief which it can enter into the heart of man to conceive! Nor is the quotation, ‘We believe that Thou shalt come to be our judge’ any better.

It is impossible to hear these compositions performed and not feel that their composers have been fettered in the development of their ideas, no less by the necessary attention to what they believed to be prescribed limits in point of time for performance than by the deficiencies of imperfect art. The impression left on the mind by such music naturally suggests the enquiry of, to what are we to ascribe the evidently conventional form in which such specimens appear to have been framed. If it be not altogether to the felt necessity of their being ‘got through’ in a given time, the true reason may probably be found in the prescription or suggestion given by Archbishop Cranmer; who, when adapting an English Version of the Litany to a Chant, which he was the first to do, in a letter to King Henry VIII, in the year 1545, according to Collyer, is found to write thus: ‘according to your Highness’s commandment I have translated into the English tongue certain portions of the Public Service - The judgment whereof I refer wholly to your Majesty, and after your Highness has corrected it, if your Grace commands some devout and solemn note to be made thereunto (as is to the procession which your Majesty has already set forth in English) I trust it will much excite and stir the hearts of all men to devotion and godliness. But in my opinion, the song that shall be made thereunto would not be full of notes, but as near as may be, for every syllable a note, so that it may be sung distinctly and devoutly, as be in the Matins and Evensong, Venite, the Hymns Te Deum, &c. Wherefore I have travail’d to make the verses in English, and have put the Latin note unto the same. Nevertheless, those that be cunning in singing, can make a much more solemn note thereto; I made them only for a proof to see how English would do in a song.’

The style of these expressions is sufficient evidence of the primitive condition of our art in its connection with public worship at the date mentioned: that it was, in respect to the union of counterpoint, or four-part harmony, with the English language, for church purposes, in its infancy. But, if we assume that the suggestion of Cranmer ‘for every syllable a note’ was binding on the composers of the time, this did not limit them to the use of a single species of note, a practice they so extensively adopted. Although notation was but imperfect, Marbeck, who published the Prayer Book

---

2. The object of saving time could have been more readily attained, and a far better effect produced, by reserving certain portions of the work to be sung in harmony; and chanting, either in unison or harmony, the rest. Such a course would have been an agreeable relief to the monotonous clockwork accentuation adopted by these masters; more in accordance with the primitive model; and would also afford great opportunity to the development of modern genius. For short services, this idea may not be without value to future composers for the church, should any such arise. It had often occurred to the writer, before he was made aware that some such idea had been acted upon by the late Precentor Creighton, of Wells; the admired author of the well known and ingenious piece of counterpoint ‘I will arise and go to my Father’, who had composed a Te Deum of this nature, but which, it will be regretted, from its mutilated condition is not likely to become of any future use.

‘Several eminent musicians of old time, and of the unreformed Churches,’ observes the Rev. Mr. Jebb, in his work on the Choral Service, p. 349, ‘have adapted the Canticles to the descant, as it is called upon the plainsong, or Gregorian chant’ (meaning a unisonous, unmetrical chant, it is presumed) ‘making variations somewhat after the manner of our Services, though less free in their departures from the original structures of the melody.’

3. Burney’s History of Music vol ii p. 577. [Wesley has not given the quotation strictly literatim et verbatim.]

4. In allusion to certain other translations which had been made the preceding year, and sent by the King to the Archbishop of Canterbury for the use of his Province, with an order for their being said or sung in all churches.
Appendices

Note 5. Burney declared that in musical art, the secular, in all ages, had been in advance of the sacred. If this could be said in his time, which was before the great dawn of modern Germany when English art, in its secular departments, was comparatively worthless, and when the same Church writers, whom we deem great now, were all fully known, what must we think now, with the works of Mozart, Beethoven, and Spohr, in our concert rooms and theatres; and those of a host of inferior organists and choir-men, too numerous, and really too contemptible to particularise, in our Cathedrals? To what may we ascribe the improvement, the perfection, in the one; the stagnation, the deterioration in the other? Is it to the fact of its having been nurtured in the great light of public notice, with its genial warmth to cherish and improve what was good, its searching, blighting influence to check and wither that which was not good, that the former has ever been subject to a comparatively just system of reward and punishment, while the music of cathedrals has been as little criticised, as little known by the great bulk of the musical profession, and the musical public, as that of the Kolpeks or the Druses? People, it is true, do not go to Church especially to criticise music: what they find there, the generality are content to ‘take as they find it;’ the few who feel, forbear to analyse; but from the absence of all healthy criticism and from the fact of such music being subject to the irresponsible control of those who are not only quite ignorant of the subject, but who openly, and with consistency it may be added, profess to regard it as a matter of secondary importance, the Church musician is made to feel, if the writer may judge from what he witnessed during several years’ service at the Cathedral of Exeter, that in the connection of his art with Church worship, principle, and the results of a lengthy, a laborious and expensive course of education, go, absolutely, for nothing; that knowledge is not power; and that from the extreme inferiority of the musical arrangements in which he will have to take part, entailing as they must, on the well-educated musician, an almost daily violation of conscience, he is reduced to the level of a mere machine, and made to know that the real position of his art is scarcely in advance of that of astronomy in the time of Galileo.

Painful as the tone of such remarks must be the writer feels that they are loudly called for by circumstances; and he believes it to be a matter of duty, in those who have experience, to endeavour to impress, on the public mind, the abject state of our Cathedral music, in too many instances; and the necessity which exists for public interference on its behalf; and on that also of the more conscientious and able members of the musical profession therein engaged, who ought to be protected and encouraged in their work, and enabled, conscientiously, to ‘do their duty in that state of life in which it has pleased God to call them.’
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can the modern artist, who considers the claims which these exalted subjects bring upon his art, approve? The real, but limited, merit of such compositions may be apparent to the initiated; but their effect on the mass of hearers is invariably that of a vast fatiguing monotony. It cannot be right to adapt the same musical phrases to sentiments the most opposite: the same sounds should not accompany ‘We praise thee, O God’ - ‘Heaven and earth are full of the majesty of thy glory’ - and, ‘Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep us this day without sin’ - ‘Have mercy upon us,’ &c. Yet, into such an error have the early masters fallen in their adaptations of music to the Canticles for the uses of the Church: the same jog-trot emphasis appears from the first word to the last, let the sentiment be what it may.

The writers subsequent to Gibbons have each taken their own course; so that the modern composer will not want precedent for every considerable latitude; but it would appear to be the duty of a church musician to be guided in great measure by the forms of our early writers, in cases where, by such a course, he was not compelled to sacrifice the still higher claims of an improved taste. To imitate their faulty accentuation, their monotonous expression, would be unreasonable; but the forms of melody and harmony should ever be church-like, and the general effect not unsuited to modern ears. In suggesting that the services of Tallis, Farrant, Bevin, Aldrich, and others, must fall if judged by the taste of our present highly advanced standard, the writer would not be thought insensitive to, or incapable of appreciating, the general merits of those authors. Far be it from him to impugn the truly devotional spirit, the diatonic purity, which is occasionally found in their works. The present remarks apply more particularly to their Services: and the question, for the church musician of the present time, is: are these compositions the best which the art can afford? Will they be viewed with interest by the thousands, the tens of thousands, now learning the rudiments of singing, and whose love for all things appertaining to the church, it is a duty to encourage by every fair means? Will such persons acquire the antiquarian spirit necessary to lead them to make use of, by choice, such works at the service hour? Is it desirable that they should? It would seem to be a taste of but inferior grade that could educe such a result. Those who either possess a great deal of true taste, or who have none, decidedly will not approve of these services.

The church musician who really understands his Art must perceive, and perceiving should have the courage to maintain, that our present knowledge of the early school is far in advance of that of the early masters themselves: he must see, that our appreciation of diatonic dissonance (exemplified to such perfection in the modern works of Germany) and our acquaintance with the true features of Gregorian melody, is such as might be expected of us; and that it is quite possible to entertain, and avow, a dislike for the species of composition in remark, without incurring the suspicion of inability to perceive the real merits of the early Church school. No one can be insensible to the sublime qualities of certain portions of Tallis’ Service (omitting the Canticles), which we find in Boyce’s First Vol. of Cathedral Music. No one can fail to esteem the little diatonic pieces of Tye, in his ‘Acts of the Apostles’; or of Farrant’s ‘Call to Remembrance,’ ‘Lord, for thy Tender Mercies’ Sake,’ or, of the madrigal of Gibbons, ‘The Silver Swan,’ and several other specimens, for instance. These are absolutely perfect, and perhaps were never exceeded by any foreign authors whatever: but how ‘few and far between’ are such examples! A few sheets of paper, less than twelve, perhaps, might contain all the really unexceptionable specimens in this school available for common use, which have descended to present times in connection with the musical worship of the Church of England.
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Those critics who award such warm and, it must be added, such indiscriminate praise to cathedral music, and who, in some instances, give a substantial proof that they write conscientiously, by printing and publishing for sale no inconsiderable a portion of the same, can scarcely be aware how small is the amount of really excellent music in existence that can be considered strictly to belong to the school in remark. Their panegyrics of the school may be sufficiently accurate. All may agree that its best specimens are admirable, and display the most charming features of a devotional style. But have they done all which might be expected of them when expressing themselves in a strain thus happily accordant both with their inclination and their interest? A strain of unmitigated eulogy? It is, after all, but a poor compliment which is so often advanced in our honour, and diffused so generally by the more serious portion of the press, that, namely, which results from a comparison of the best specimens of the English, with the worst of the Italian, schools of modern Church music; for, it is with the worst of the latter, that comparisons are on such occasions invariably made. However unsuited to our English Cathedral service the light, flimsy Masses of Mozart and Haydn may be, they are at least the productions of great men, if their worst. Mozart, it is well-known, thought as little well of them as any others could do; but ‘little’ as there may be ‘in a name,’ the Kings, the Scroggineses, Joneses, Porters, and Smiths, of Cathedrals! - what have they been known to do well? Truly, the present position of cathedral music in public estimation is not such as to warrant our regarding that species of charity which ‘thinketh no evil,’ as a friend. What said my lord Henley? And it may be enquired, are there not choral establishments belonging to the royal palaces, the performances of which are believed to be objects of positive indifference to the sovereign? Inferior as the performance of the cathedral service too commonly is, the inexpressive, unartistical composition performed is by no means less palpable or deserving of censure. Surely then, critics do but half their work when they expatiate on the qualities of the school, and omit to inform themselves of the real quantity of unexceptionable specimens in existence. As regards ‘services,’ the sensation resulting from well-directed enquiries might be painful indeed; that is, if the writer may presume to anticipate what he conceives to be a just judgment at their hands. But some little fear may, perhaps, be entertained that the judgment would not be always of the most healthy kind. Many of those who write with enthusiastic praise on the merits of the early vocal school, are known to be incapable of appreciating the beauties of more modern growth; can they truly appreciate the one, and be insensible to the other? If their love for the ‘light of other days’ were honest, could admiration fail them when its best reflections occur, as they frequently do, in even the most capricious developments of modern symphony? The true merits of all good composition will be apparent to the well-informed professor in the solitude of his study: nor can the feeble, meretricious creations of early times derive any importance in his mind either from appearing in square notes, or from being sung with their ‘linked sweetness long drawn out ’ amongst the reverberating aisles of a cathedral.

But to return: of the authors in remark, it may perhaps, be allowed that the epigrammatic was within

6. ‘One of the most desirable of these reforms would be in the present system of Church Music: in taking away such reliques of Popery as chanting, and all anthems, solos, duets, voluntaries, etc., and endeavouring to make our psalmody simple, easy, and above all universal and congregational, a practice to be adopted and encouraged wherever, in the beautiful language of Mr Montgomery, “there is a church on earth training up candidates for the church in heaven”.’ A Plan of Church Reform p. 35.
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their reach. They could fill a page, without disobeying the claims of contrast, keeping, analogy, or losing sight of the general effect; but not so the Epic: their Te Deums were failures - a volume was beyond their powers.

The adoption, the continued use, of these; the few attempts that have been made to improve upon them; the comparative want of success when the experiment has been tried, may all be urged (and, it is presumed, with much plausibility) to invalidate the writer’s impeachment of their unqualified excellence.

That there is no lack of ‘appliances’ at the present day, he has already shewn. Why these have not been put under requisition, to the extent to which they may, opens a wide field for enquiry: the nature of the present publication forbids any lengthened discussion on the present state of church music. It is, however, no easy task for the musician wholly to abstain where the subject is so interesting to him, and while it calls loudly for investigation. The importance of placing before the eye of the public just views upon this subject, cannot be unperceived by the Church musician. Not only is the welfare and advancement of a portion of his very numerous profession concerned, but certain it is that the decencies and interests of religion itself suffer from the general dearth of good musical principles, and their corresponding development in practice; for, there are numberless instances in which a few, slight but judicious, efforts in the cause of improvement would relieve the choral service from a condition which is absolutely unbearable to well-cultivated ears.

Among other well-acknowledged authorities there is one who, in such a cause, might take the lead with the happiest effect: the talents, and position, of the truly estimable Professor of Music in the University of Oxford alike befit him for so honourable a post. Few are there to whose opinion equal deference should be paid; but he, alas! has ‘an invincible objection to saying anything on the subject’ - these are his words. A key to which those who have been ‘behind the scenes’ in matters of church music, and who know how irregular and unsystematic - how unbusiness-like - are its workings, how unpalatable is the tale which the musical profession are unanimous in telling about it, will not require. Dr. Crotch was once the organist of Christ Church, Oxford and as his secession from that office, some few years since, seemed scarcely regarded as a matter of any moment, he may naturally have concluded that public opinion was not sufficiently advanced on the subject of his art to appreciate anything he might say respecting it.

That reform can come without an appeal to some high standard, that it can proceed from any choral establishment which is deficient in competent musical authority, is impossible. Though fully aware of the use which may be made of the following observation, the writer unhappily avers, that until some other qualification than merely to have behaved respectably in an inferior office, to have been a choir-boy, deputy organist, or organist’s apprentice, shall be required of the person who seeks the situation of cathedral organist, until something more is known by, and required of him in the higher departments of musical science than of late days has been the case, the result will be what it is. The comparative immunity from the calls of a more active life, which the seclusion of the cloister is

7. But it is not on this ground that he presumes to plead the cause of improvement in Church Music. In this point of view it can only be interesting to his own profession; if one is excepted to whom the prosperity of all classes is known to be an object of kind, benevolent solicitude: the sovereign
8. Dr Crotch [MT Ed.]
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supposed to confer on those favoured members of our church establishment who compose cathedral bodies - enabling them to devote themselves to that more recondite and valuable learning which ‘cometh by opportunity of leisure’ - would, in all probability, if it were extended, as perhaps it well might be, to the organist, not only induce the services of a higher rank of the profession than is commonly found at our cathedrals, but might enable such professors themselves to give their attention more immediately to the higher departments of the art, and to that pure and elevated branch of it, in particular, known as the ‘Church School’ - new specimens of which are as loudly called for by the circumstances of the times as by the smallness of the amount of any unexceptionable ones in general use.

But another mischief is, that, from the absence of good information in those quarters where it should exist; from the deficiency of all accurate knowledge of the habits and feelings of the musical profession on the part of those in whom the right of election to musical offices in the church is vested; and from the absence of every species of information concerning the just requirements of the art in its connection with public worship, in the same quarter, it is more than probable that when a professor of better standing does join a cathedral in this capacity, after the efforts of a few years, he will feel himself compelled to choose between his interest and his duty; and, either to relinquish such connections as he may have there formed, and leave it again, or, incur the disrespect of his profession by remaining in a position from whence nothing is seen to proceed for the advancement of his art, nothing deserving public approbation; without reference to higher motives.

It is a fact beyond dispute, that, while in its secular departments the art has been making the most rapid progress towards perfection, as regards the church it has remained almost stationary, or worse, for centuries. An idea obtains, in some quarters, that things should ever remain thus; that improvement is unnecessary. But if public opinion advances, the result of this is too clear.

The discipline of choirs, or rather the want of it, is another obstacle to improvement. Although as respects composition, the time may be gone by in which the musical composer could be expected to indulge a predilection for his art at the expense of his domestic comforts, by giving his time to the subject; still, something might be done in this respect wherever clever men were engaged in cathedral duties, were choirs in a state of efficiency and order: had choirs their fixed times for study and rehearsal, a great difficulty would be removed. But it is a fact, that, from the description of tenure on which, in many instances, lay choristers hold their appointments, there are no means of compelling such persons to give the necessary attention to self-culture; and that, absolutely, a new Act of Parliament must be passed before they can be compelled to practise! At the late discussion on church affairs, in Parliament, a few strokes of the pen would have remedied this evil; but, alas! who there represents the interests of music and musicians? Church music has many sworn, but no true guardians; or this favourable opportunity for infusing new life into our choral service would not have been neglected.

Surely the musical affairs of the church should be rendered more conformable to the highly intellectual standard of present times. Could not the musical professorships of our Universities be

---

9. There are many persons of this description employed at country cathedrals who have never had what the metropolitan professor would call a single lesson in music. [The ‘metropolitan professor’ here referred to is evidently Edward Taylor, Gresham Professor of Music from 1837 to 1863]
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made to aid in this object? The operations of these offices be greatly enlarged? Frequent lectures, with good practical examples, in the University towns, would inoculate the minds of those studying for the clerical office with the principles of good taste, and a just view of the true position of the art and its professors, as connected with the church. Might not the University professors be allowed a voice in the election of cathedral organists? And the organists in those of the singers? Beyond all doubt, a very considerable improvement in the performance of Cathedral Service would soon, by this means, be effected; presuming, of course, that to these said professorships, appointments were made, both unexceptionable, and worthy of the approval of the musical profession at large. It may be conceded that much zeal has appeared during the last year or two, in behalf of the art, amongst capitular bodies; and that some of that zeal has, perhaps, been ‘according to knowledge.’ No disrespect is meant, however, when it is suggested that not every member of a chapter who is pronounced, in a cathedral town, to be ‘very musical’ is competent to act with absolute wisdom in the affairs of music: and surely, no one can be impressed with a keen appreciation of truth in matters of art, keeping in mind the object of church music, who will ever rest satisfied where, in what is done, any but the highest standard is appealed to.

For thus digressing from the immediate object of a Preface, and for the discursive nature of the foregoing observations, the writer would urge, in apology, how difficult it is to touch on any portion of the musical discipline of the Church without discovering that great principles are involved even in minute details, and that on points of much importance, little or no real information exists at the present moment: and he feels that an apology might well be added for that which remains unsaid. Glad would he be if the hints thus thrown out were deemed worthy of the notice of those who possess both the literary talent and the power, in connection with the public press, to do justice to this great subject. To suggest remedies for the errors alluded to may not be difficult, but the task of so doing might better become a higher power than belongs to any individual member of the musical profession. But he would add, that as far as his own experience goes, it must be a very high and a very strong power that can succeed in effecting a general and systematic remedy. In particular instances, it may charitably be hoped that individuals exist who would do any reasonable thing for the improvement of the music of their church. But truly, at the present day, it is not too much to hope and expect that some general and systematic arrangement might be effected, which would render the position of musical art and its professors, in connection with cathedrals, more consistent with the present state of things - a position which might be a guarantee to the public that our choral worship was endowed with every propriety within the present reach of art. But so far from this being the case, the musical profession, as a body, can scarcely be said to have any voice in the matter, and its management is as completely in the hands of others as it was at the period when the clergy knew and practised all the little which was known, and a musical profession was not in existence.

For the appearance in print of certain portions of the following composition he would also offer a few words of apology. The Creed and Kyrie Eleison (No. 2) were written for treble voices only, to meet an emergency which occasionally arose at one of the cathedrals with which he was connected, and were never intended for public inspection. Their performance, however, was the origin of the present composition, as a gentleman, Mr. Martin Cawood, of Leeds, on hearing the Creed performed, proposed to the author the completion of the entire Service, undertaking to remunerate him for his work, and incur the sole risk and responsibility of its publication. The following is the result of this kind offer and, however unworthy it may be, the good intentions of Mr. Cawood surely deserve
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notice, in times when an act of so much liberality is entirely without parallel, and when it is remembered that cathedral bodies rarely encourage (even by the purchasing of a few copies for the use of their choirs) such undertakings. Indeed, such parties seldom even condescend to notice any applications made to them of the kind - a fact which may astonish those who remember the nature of our choral service, and how largely the musician’s art is, twice a day, called into requisition, throughout the entire year, in every cathedral and college chapel in the kingdom.  

So inconsiderate, so ungenerous has been the policy in which a church aristocracy, of late years, has conducted itself towards the professional musician! Who cannot in any instance or point of view whatever, perceive the degree of encouragement and patronage bestowed on those high branches of his art of which the church, from its constitution and its daily usages, appears so much in need; and in behalf of which, one might naturally suppose, the best efforts of a civilized people would be perseveringly directed. The sculptor, the painter, the architect, have no complaints to urge against society on such a score; nor, in all probability, will the musician again; for the attention of the better class of professors is now, of necessity, directed to the secular departments of music; the successful cultivation of which not only reveals to the mind the highest beauties, the finest examples for study and practice, but also affords a degree of pecuniary recompense which, to the dependent, it must in common prudence, be an object of much importance to attain.

The *Creed*, thus alluded to, would not have been published by the author’s desire. It was a youthful effort, is without merit, and was intended for private use. This will, it is hoped, be a sufficient defence against criticism in respect to this piece, as well as that of *Kyrie Eleison*, No. 2, both of which belong to one date, and contain a well-known modulation, which is, it is believed, strictly the property of Sebastian Bach, (it occurs in a *Credo*) but is also met with in a chorus of that noble production of the

---

10. In London a lady annually awards a gold medal, value five pounds, for the encouragement of the *true Church School*. This donation, which is called ‘The Gresham Prize,’ has existed some years; and, even now, it is believed, competition has *not* fallen into such perfect disrepute, but that some few among the earliest beginners in musical composition are observed to make their first essay, with a view towards publication in this direction. [The lady donor of the Gresham Prize was Miss Maria Hackett, the choristers’ friend - Ed. M.T.]

What painters, architects, and sculptors, might think were such an award held out for the encouragement of the higher departments of their respective arts, it is not difficult to imagine. But a Lawrence, a Barry, or a Chantrey, will allow that in the course of history, periods may be instanced when the public mind has been as little advanced in respect to their high, and now thoroughly appreciated callings, as it appears to be at present on the subject of the great school of church music: when a heap of unhewn stone was a church, when the painter’s work was valued at the cost of the material employed in its composition, and when sculpture did not exist; and then possibly, a donation of five pounds, might be viewed otherwise than as a mockery of the arts and their professors. True merit in their arts is now, happily, the straight path to honour, fame, and fortune; and our Prime Minister is so well satisfied that such should be the case, that he points to the fact, with pride, as an instance of the greatness and prosperity of the nation. But musical art - notwithstanding its various claims on the gratitude of society, especially as regards its connection with the worship of the church - this art, with reference to the higher branches of composition, has not a single instance of liberal encouragement to point to, not one of any kind whatever! A consideration of this circumstance should, perhaps, deter the veriest tyro from again entering into competition for the ‘Gresham Prize.’ The few who have already done so, especially those who have gained the ‘Prize,’ are sufficiently punished by the fact of one of the two umpires employed to select the best candidate having declared that the awards hitherto made have ever been in opposition to his judgment; for that his colleague would always have *his own* way, and so, he would have nothing more to do with the matter.
pure and beautiful Spohr, ‘Die Letzten Dinge,’ where it is made the feature of a sequence.

And, in conclusion, he would express his fear that, from the nature of the precedent remarks, it may be supposed he considers he is presenting to public notice a work possessing all the merits, and none of the defects, to which allusion has been made. But this is by no means the case, or the reference also made to the difficulties which beset such an undertaking would be needless. He would, however, guard against the degree of success which may attend its performance by provincial quires being considered a fair criterion of its merits: as on the publication of, perhaps, the most perfect work of a similar nature (a ‘Service,’ by the late Samuel Wesley,) it was so ill-performed that a gentleman who holds a canonry in the cathedrals of both Oxford and Exeter, unable to distinguish between the defects of performance and those of composition, desired that it might never be used again - a judgment, however, which has since been superseded, and the work’s great merits allowed; but if such was the temporary fate of a work of unquestionable genius, from its happening to be somewhat dissimilar to the ‘Services’ which had been sung by the choir of the cathedral in remark, (that of Exeter,) ‘from their youth upwards,’ a still less favourable one may be anticipated for the present, which, in fact, is a still further departure from common usages.

There is a simplicity, which, when allied with other great qualities in composition, it should ever be the student’s utmost effort to attain; their union is perfection: but this, under the present disastrous circumstances of cathedral music, should hardly be expected of any one. Assuredly, in the present work, the writer aspires to nothing of the kind: still, he would hope that no difficulties occur in the following pages which a body of singers possessing average ability may not easily surmount.

The present Service occupies two or three minutes more in performance (calculating the entire Service) than the longest now in general use - a defect, which with others of which the composer is already sufficiently sensible, he hopes, on again adapting music to these subjects, to rectify.

Leeds, February, 1845.
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Appendix I: Selected Glees from the Catch Club repertoire

I.1: Samuel Webbe (1740-1816): My Pocket’s Low

My Pocket’s Low and Taxes High

[Vol. 35, p.70]

Samuel Webbe
(1740-1816)
Appendices

A. pair? The times may mend; our loy-al-ty shall us be-friend.

T.1 pair? The times may mend; our loy-al-ty, our loy-al-ty shall us be-friend.

T.2 pair? The times may mend; our loy-al-ty, our loy-al-ty shall us be-friend.

B. pair? The times may mend our loy-al-ty shall us be-friend. My Pock-er's

A. God save great George our King, Long live our no-ble King, God save the King.

T.1 Our loy-al-ty shall us be-friend, shall us be-friend.


B. low and tax-es high my pock-er's low and tax-es high my pock-er's ve-ry low, ve-ry

A. Send him vic-to-ri-ous, hap-py and glo-ri-ous, long to reign

T.1 But why des-pair? The times may mend, why, why des-pair? The times may mend, our
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A. 3

over us God save the King. Send him victorious, 

T.1

loyalty shall us befriend. But why despair? The times may 

T.2

Our loyalty shall us befriend. But why despair? 

B. 

loyalty shall us befriend. But why despair? But why despair? 

41

A. 

happy and glorious, long to reign over us God save the 

T.1

mend. Why? Why despair? The times may mend. Our loyalty shall us be - 

T.2

Why despair? Why despair? Our loyalty shall us be 

B. 

Why despair? Why despair? The times may mend. Our loyalty shall us be - 

46

Un poco allegro 4

A. 

King. yet may smile pro - tious For - tune yet may smile, 

T.1

friend. yet may smile pro - tious For - tune yet may smile, 

T.2

friend. Pro -tious For - tune yet may smile pro - tious 

B. 

friend. yet may smile pro - tious pro - tious
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A. 52

_yet may smile on fair_ Brit - tan - nia's sea - girt isle.

T.1

_yet may smile on fair_ Brit - tan - nia's sea - girt isle.

T.2

Fort - tune yet may smile on fair Brit - tan - nia's sea - girt isle.

B.

Fort - tune yet may smile on fair Brit - tan - nia's sea - girt isle.

59

A. 52

Then

T.1

po - ver - ty shall take her, flight, shall take her, flight, shall take her

T.2

Then po - ver - ty shall take her, flight, shall take her

B.

Then

62

A. 52

po - ver - ty shall take her, flight, shall take her, flight, and we will

T.1

flight, shall take her, flight, and we will

T.2

flight, shall take her, flight, shall take her, flight,

B.

po - ver - ty shall take her, flight, shall take her, flight,
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65

A. 

sing, we will sing, we will sing by day and night: God save great George our King,

T.1

sing, we will sing, we will sing by day and night: God save great George our King,

T.2

we will sing, we will sing by day and night: God save great George our King,

B.

we will sing, we will sing by day and night: God save great George our King,

71

A.

Long live our noble King, God save the King. Send him victorious,

T.1

Long live our noble King, God save the King. Send him victorious,

T.2

Long live our noble King, God save the King. Send him victorious,

B.

Long live our noble King, God save the King. Send him victorious,

77

A.

happy and glorious, long to reign over us, God save the King.

T.1

happy and glorious, long to reign over us, God save the King.

T.2

happy and glorious, long to reign over us, God save the King.

B.

happy and glorious, long to reign over us, God save the King.
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I.2: Samuel Webbe (1740-1816): When Winds Breathe Soft

When Winds Breathe Soft

[Vol 19, p. 108]
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\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \]

\[ \text{For } i = 1 \text{ to } n \]

\[ \text{Let } a_i = \text{some expression} \]

\[ \text{Then } \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i = \text{some result} \]
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I.3: Henry Palmer (d. 1854): *The Gypsies*

*The Gypsies*

[Vol. 38; pp. 146-159]

Written by Mrs. C. B. Wilson

Henry Palmer  
(d. 1854)
Appendices

2

S. A.

31

T. B.

36

S. A.

T. B.

42

S. A.

T. B.

49

S. A.

T. B.

53

S. A.

Chorus

T. B.

"Bars" pencilled in to original at this point
Appendices

S. A.
ev'ry chang-ing plea-sure rile, As'neath the hedge-row or the tree we pitch our tent of Li-ber-ty.

T. B.

101 Solo Treble

S. A.
When oft, an old maid stanch'd and staid, who has of

Pno.

109

S. A.
wed-lock been a-fraid (But now, tho' late, be-

Pno.

114 cresc.

S. A.
gins to find she'd some-how like to change her mind) steals

Pno. cresc.

119

S. A.
thro' the dark to cross our palm For all her

Pno.

* A flat missing from original
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124

fears we find a balm. While blushing she behind her

129

fun, Cries "May I trust the creature, Man?" Our art fore

134

tells some handsome youth ere long shall plight his love and truth. Our art fore-

138

tells some handsome youth ere long shall plight his love, and truth.
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Then hey for the taw-ny gyp-sies' life, with all the joys of free-dom rife. As

'nearth the hedge or shel-tring tree we pitch our tent of Li-ber-ty.

Chorus

Then hey for the taw-ny gyp-sies' life, with all the joys of free-dom rife, As

'nearth the hedge or shel-tring tree we pitch our tent of Li-ber-

y, of Li-ber-ty, of Li-ber-ty. [Piano]
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I.4: William Henry Longhurst (1819-1904): The Fairies

The Fairies: In the Stilly Night

[Vol. 58; No. 21]
Appendices

Tr. 1 7

[Music notation]

Tr. 2 7

[Music notation]

T.

[Music notation]

B.

[Music notation]

Pno.

[Music notation]
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Tr. 1

Light - ly we trip, o'er the sweet_ cow - slip, o'er the sweet_

Tr. 2

Light - ly we trip, o'er the sweet, the sweet_ cow - slip, o'er the

T.

Light - ly we trip, o'er the sweet_ cow - slip, o'er the

B.

Light - ly we trip, o'er the sweet_ o'er the sweet_

Pno.

cow - slip, And_ the dai - sy, the dai - sy, the dai - sy on_ the green; light - ly we

Tr. 1

cow - slip, And_ the dai - sy, the dai - sy, the dai - sy on_ the green; light - ly we

Tr. 2

sweet, sweet cow - slip, And_ the dai - sy, and the dai - sy on_ the green;

T.

sweet, sweet cow - slip, And_ the dai - sy, the dai - sy on_ the green; light - ly we

B.

cow - slip, And_ the dai - sy, the dai - sy, the dai - sy on_ the green;

Pno.
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Tr.1  A tempo

shown Where we o'er night have been, where we o'er night have been. In the

Tr.2  A tempo

shown Where we o'er night have been, have been. In the

T.  A tempo

shown Where we o'er night have been, have been. In the

B.  A tempo

shown Where we o'er night have been, where we o'er night have been.

Tr.1  cresc.

morn when we've flown, it can not be shown Where we o'er night have been.

Tr.2  cresc.

morn when we've flown, it can not be shown Where we o'er night have been.

T.  cresc.

morn when we've flown, it can not be shown Where we o'er night have been.

B.  cresc.

In the morn when we've flown, it can not be shown Where we o'er night have been.
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Larghetto

Tr.1

p leggero

We—step so light—ly, gay and

Tr.2

p leggero

We—step so light—ly, gay and

T.

p leggero

We—step so light—ly, gay and

B.

p leggero

We—step so light—ly, gay and

Pno.

p leggero

58

sprightly From eve till the break of

Tr.1

sprightly From eve till the break,
till the

Tr.2

sprightly From eve till the break,
till the

T.

sprightly From eve till the break,
till the

B.

sprightly From eve till the break of

Pno.
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Tr.1

day, we step so lightly,

Tr.2

break of day, we step, step so lightly,

T.

break of day, we step, we step so lightly,

B.

day, we step so lightly,

Pno.

Tr.1

gay and sprightly from eve till the break of

Tr.2

gay and sprightly from eve till the break of

T.

gay and sprightly from eve till the break of

B.

gay and sprightly from eve till the break of

Pno.
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A tempo primo

Tr.1
In the stillly night, by the moon's pale light, We fairies dance and sing;

Tr.2
In the stillly night, We fairies dance and sing;

T.
In the stillly night, by the moon's pale light, We fairies dance and sing; Neath the

B.
In the stillly night, We fairies dance and sing; Neath the

Pno.

A tempo primo

Tr.1

Neath the green-wood tree, right merrily We

Tr.2

Neath the green-wood, the green-wood tree, right merrily We

T.
Neath the green-wood tree, Neath the green wood tree, right merrily We

B.
Neath the green-wood tree, Neath the green wood tree, right merrily We

Pno.
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Tr. 1

trace our magic ring, Lightly we trip,

Tr. 2

trace our magic ring, our magic ring. Lightly we trip,

T.

trace our magic ring, our magic ring.

B.

trace our magic ring. Lightly we

Pno.

Tr. 1

sweet cow-slip, o'er the sweet cow-slip, And the daisy, the

Tr. 2

o'er the sweet, the sweet cow-slip, o'er the sweet, sweet cow-slip, And the

T.

trip, o'er the sweet, cow-slip, o'er the sweet, sweet cow-slip, And the

B.

trip, o'er the sweet, o'er the sweet cow-slip, And the daisy, the

Pno.
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12

118

Tr.1

dai-sy, the dai-sy on the green; light-ly we trip, light-ly we trip,

Tr.2

dai-sy, and the dai-sy on the green; light-ly we trip,

T.

dai-sy, the dai-sy on the green; light-ly we trip,

B.

dai-sy, the dai-sy on the green; light-ly we trip,

Pno.

123

mf

trip, o'er the sweet cow-slip, And the dai-sy, the dai-sy on the green. In the

Tr.2

cresc.

o'er the sweet cow-slip, And the dai-sy on the green. In the morn when we've

T.

cresc.

trip, o'er the sweet cow-slip, And the dai-sy, the dai-sy on the green. In the morn when we've

B.

cresc.

o'er the sweet cow-slip, And the dai-sy, the dai-sy on the green. In the

Pno.
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Tr.1
fa-ries dance, and sing, dance dance, 

Tr.2
dance dance and sing, dance and sing, dance and 

T.
dance, dance dance, and sing, dance and sing, dance and 

B.
sing, dance, dance and sing, dance and sing, dance and 

Pno.

Tr.1
-- dance dance and sing. 

Tr.2
sing, dance and sing, we dance and sing, dance and sing. 

T.
sing, dance, we dance and sing, dance and sing. 

B.
sing, dance, we dance and sing, dance and sing. 

Pno.

W.H.L. 2/3[18]42
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I.5: William Henry Longhurst (1819-1904): *All Hail to Thee, Britain*

*All Hail To Thee Britain*

Glee for 4 Voices

Poetry by W. C. Wells Esq.

Music by W. H. Longhurst

Transcribed by Sam King

377
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A. 

the Muses tempted by the Smile, Which nature

B. 

When lo! the Muses tempted by the Smile Which nature

A. 

spread o'er Britain's happy Isle For sook their haunts to visit

B. 

spread o'er Britain's happy Isle For sook their haunts to visit

A. 

England's thron While hill and vale resound with their

B. 

visit England's thron While hill and vale resound with their
Appendices

4

A. for sook their haunts to visit England's throng While

T. for sook their haunts to visit England's throng While

T. for sook their haunts to visit England's throng While

B. for sook their haunts to visit England's throng While

A. hill and vale resounded with their song While hill and vale resounded with their song

T. hill and vale resounded with their song While hill and vale resounded with their song

T. hill and vale resounded with their song While hill and vale resounded with their song

B. hill and vale resounded with their song While hill and vale resounded with their song

62 Allegro maestoso \#112

A. sound ed with their song All Hail to thee Britain! All Hail to

T. sound ed with their song All Hail to thee Britain! All Hail to

T. sound ed with their song All Hail to thee Britain! All Hail to

B. sound ed with their song All Hail to thee Britain! All Hail to
Appendices

A.  

thee! Thy joys let us share, Thy joys let us share, Whose Sons are so gen’rous and

T.  

thee! Thy joys let us share, Thy joys let us share, Whose Sons are so gen’rous and

T.  

thee! Thy joys let us share, Thy joys let us share, Whose Sons are so gen’rous and

B.  

thee! Thy joys let us share, Thy joys let us share, Whose Sons are so gen’rous and

A.  

Daughters so fair and Daughters so fair Whose fame is em- blazon’d O’er

T.  

Daughters so fair and Daughters so fair Whose fame is em- blazon’d O’er

T.  

Daughters so fair and Daughters so fair Whose fame is em- blazon’d O’er

B.  

Daughters so fair and Daughters so fair Whose fame is em- blazon’d O’er

A.  

earth and o’er main While peace and good will Weave round thee her

T.  

earth and o’er main While peace and good will Weave round thee her

T.  

earth and o’er main While peace and good will Weave round thee her

B.  

earth and o’er main While peace While peace and good will Weave

381
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A.

chain

While peace and good will
Weave round, thee her chain
While peace and good

T.

chain

While peace and good will
Weave round, thee her chain
While peace and good

T.

chain

While peace and good will
Weave round, thee her chain, while peace and good

B.

round, thee her chain
While peace and good will
Weave round, while peace and good

---

Allegro \( \frac{\text{f}}{\text{f}} \)

91

will weave round, thee her chain.
O welcome welcome the

T.

will weave round, thee her chain.
O welcome welcome the

T.

will weave round, thee her chain.
O welcome welcome the

B.

will weave round, thee her chain.
O welcome welcome the

---

Sisters the song of the nine shall ever echo.
Love, Beauty,

A.

Sisters the song of the nine shall ever echo.
Love, Beauty,

T.

Sisters the song of the nine shall ever echo.
Love, Beauty,

T.

Sisters the song of the nine shall ever echo.
Love, Beauty,

B.

Sisters the song of the nine shall ever echo.
Love, Beauty,
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I.6: Benjamin Cooke (1734-1793): If the Prize You Mean to Get

*If the Prize you Mean to Get*

[Vol. 11, p.121]

Benjamin Cooke (1736-1794)

Vivace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alto</th>
<th>Tenor</th>
<th>Bass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the prize you mean to get, sea-son mu-sic well with wit with wit sea-son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the prize you mean to get, sea-son mu-sic well with wit, with wit, sea-son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the prize you mean to get, sea-son mu-sic well with wit, with wit, sea-son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the prize you mean to get, sea-son mu-sic well with wit, with wit, sea-son
Appendices

25
A.  
har. mo. ny com bin'd, sense and har. mo. ny com bin'd make a ban-quet for the mind, make a ban-quet for the

T.  
har-mo-ny com bin'd, make a ban-quet for the mind, make a ban-quet for the

T.  
* sense and har-mo-ny, and har-mo-ny com bin'd make a ban-quet for the mind, make a ban-quet for the

B.  
sense and har-mo-ny com bin'd, sense and har-mo-ny com bin'd make a ban-quet for the mind, for the

33
A.  
mind, The prize ob-tain'd, with me you'll hold: ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold, ster-ling wit is

T.  
* mind, ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold, ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold, is

T.  
* mind, The prize ob-tain'd, with me you'll hold: ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold, ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold,

B.  
* mind. ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold, is ster-ling gold,

40
A.  
ster-ling gold, is ster-ling gold, ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold, ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold.

T.  
* ster-ling gold ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold, ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold.

T.  
* ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold, ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold, ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold.

B.  
ster-ling gold, ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold, ster-ling wit is ster-ling gold.
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I.7: John Wall Callcott (1766-1821): When Arthur First in Court Began

When Arthur First in Court
[Vol. 15, p. 120, transposed down a tone]
Appendices

2

T

wor__ The first he was an I_rish-man, The se__ond was a Scot__ The third, he was a

Bar

wor__ The first he was an I_rish-man, The se__cond was a Scot__ The third, he was a

B

wor__ The first he was an I_rish-man, The se__cond was a Scot__ The third, he was a

22

T

Welch__ man, and all were knives, I wor__ The I_rish-man loved Us__que_baugh*, the

Bar

Welch__ man, and all were knives, I wor__ The I_rish-man loved Us__que_baugh, the

B

Welch__ man, and all were knives, I wor__ The I_rish-man loved Us__que_baugh, the

27

T

Scot lov__d ale__ call'd Blue Cap, the Welsh__man, he lov__d toast__ed cheese, and made his mouth like a

Bar

Scot lov__d ale__ call'd Blue Cap, the Welsh__man, he lov__d toast__ed cheese, and made his mouth like a

B

Scot lov__d ale__ call'd Blue Cap, the Welsh__man, he lov__d toast__ed cheese, and made his mouth like a

32

T

mouse__trap. Us__que_baugh burn__d the I__rish-man,

Bar

mouse__trap. the Scot__was drown__d in ale__

B

mouse__trap. the

* The Gaelic "uísquebaugh", meaning "Water of Life", phonetically became "usky" and then "whisky" in English (www.whisky.com).
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Welch-man had like to be chok'd with the mouse, but he pull'd her out by the tail.

Us-que-baugh burnt the Irish-man, the Scot was drown'd in ale, the Welch-man had like to be

chok'd with the mouse, but he pull'd her out by the tail, pull'd her, pull'd her,
Appendices

I.8: Henry Harington (1727-1816): Goody Groaner

Goody Groaner

[Vol. 9; p. 18]

Henry Harington
(1727-1816)

Tenor 1

O sir, can ye tell, O sir, can ye tell, Where Old Goody Groan-er, the mid-wife do dwell?

Tenor 2

Who, who, who, who, who, Sir, who, who, who, who, Sir, who?

Bass

1, 1, 1, 1, I will

T.1

where, pray sir, where? Pray do sir, do sir, do sir. Be quick, sir, Be quick, sir,

T.2

She, she, she, do

B.

tel tel tel tel you, you, you, you, you, you, Sir, you, Sir:

T.1

my wife, sir, is sick, sir, Be quick, sir, my wife, sir, my wife, sir, is sick, sir,

T.2

li li li li live, do li li live, she do, do, she do, do, do, do, live, She do

B.

No, no, no, no, no, no, Sir, Old Goody Groan-er is
Appendices

T.1
Let quick, be quick, be quick, I pray, sir, pray, sir, be quick, I pray. Quick,

T.2
live, she do, do, do, do, do, live, Sir, o-o-o-o-o-ver the way, o-o-o-o-o-ver the

B.

go - go - gone, gone, go - go - gone, they say, Sir. No, no, no, no,

T.1
quick, zounds, zounds, you'll be all day, Sir, zounds, zounds, you'll be all day, all day, Sir.

T.2
way, sir. Stay, stay, stay, Sir.

B.

no, Sir, no, no, no, no, she's gone, they say, Sir. No, no, no, no, no, no, no, she's gone, they say, Sir.

T.1
Poor J en - ny is bad, Sir. Poor J en - ny is bad, Sir. Such stutter-ing and sputter-ing,

T.2
I, I, I, Sir, will tell by and by, Sir, will tell by and by, Sir, I will

B.

No, no, he he he do

T.1
such stum-mer-ing and hum-mer-ing 'twill make a man mad, Sir, make a man make a man mad, Sir.

T.2
te - te - te - te - te - tell I will tell by, by, by, by and by, Sir, I will

B.

lie, Sir, do lie, lie, lie, do lie, Sir, he do, do, do,

T.1
'twill make a man mad, Sir. Zounds, zounds!

T.2
tel - tel - by and by, Sir, by, by, by, by, by and by, Sir, by, by, by and by, Sir.

B.

he, he, he, he do lie, Sir. He, he do lie, Sir, he, he, he do lie, Sir.
I.9: Samuel Webbe (1740-1816): On His Deathbed Poor Lubin Lies

On His Deathbed Poor Lubin Lies

[Vol. 12, p. 74]

Samuel Webbe
(1740-1816)
Appendices

PARSON SLY, THE SAME EFFECT THE SAME EFFECT MAY GIVE: POOR LUBIN

FEARS THAT HE SHALL DIE, THAT HE SHALL DIE, HIS WIFE, THAT HE MAY LIVE. POOR LUBIN, POOR LUBIN FEARS,

LUBIN FEARS THAT HE SHALL DIE, HIS WIFE, HIS WIFE THAT HE MAY LIVE.

LUBIN FEARS THAT HE SHALL DIE, FEARS, FEARS, THAT HE MAY LIVE.
I.10: Henry Harington (1727-1816): *What Shall We Sing Now Here Are Three?*

*What Shall We Sing Now Here are Three?*

[Vol. 5, p. 96]

Harington

Tenor 4

Tenor 4

Bass 4

5

T. Non no - bis Do - mi - ne, Non...

T. Non no - bis Hold, hold, sir, that's wrong, that's wrong, in - deed, 'tis Non

B. Be-gin a - gain, be-gin a - gain, it is not so sir, you are quite wrong, sir.

14

T. I'm sure 'tis right, I'm sure 'tis right, so pray, go on, sir, pray go on 'tis you that are no - bis Do - mi - ne I'll swear 'tis wrong, I'll swear 'tis

B. No no Non no - bis
Appendices

I.11: Samuel Webbe (1740-1816): When Shall We Three Meet Again?

When Shall We Three Meet Again

[Vol 12, p. 70]

Samuel Webbe (1740-1816)
Appendices

Larghetto

T. 12

hur-ley bur-ley's done,

that will be er set of sun.

Bar. 4

When the bat-tie's lost and, won,

that will be er set of sun, where the

B. 16

Allegro

Andante

T. 16

U-pon the heath. There we go to meet Mac-beth. There we'll per-form our ma-gic rites, and

Bar. 16

place? There, there we go to meet Mac-beth. There we'll per-form our ma-gic rites,

B. 16

place? There, there we go to meet Mac-beth. There we'll per-form our ma-gic rites, and

T. 21

raise such ar-ti-fi-cial sprites as by the strength of their il-lu-sion shall draw him on to

Bar. 21

and raise such ar-ti-fi-cial sprites as by the strength of their il-lu-sion shall draw him on to

B. 21

raise such ar-ti-fi-cial sprites as by the strength of their il-lu-sion shall draw him on to

Larghetto

T. 26

his con-fu-sion, to his con-fu-sion, shall draw him on to his con-fu-sion. We'll

Bar. 26

his con-fu-sion, to his con-fu-sion, shall draw him on to his con-fu-sion. We'll

B. 26

his con-fu-sion, to his con-fu-sion, shall draw him on to his con-fu-sion. We'll
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I.12: Thomas Arne (1710-1778): *The Emperor Adrian, Dying, to his Soul*

*The Emperor Adrian, Dying, To his Soul*

[Vol. 15, p. 91]  

Thomas Arne  
(1710-1778)

---

399
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LO, ON YON LONG RESOUNDING SHORE

[Vol. 20, p. 149]

_a Glee for five voices_
(the poetry from Ogilvie’s Odes)

_Composed and inscribed to his friend Mr Webbe_

_BY WM. HORSLEY, Mus. Bac. Oxon_

---
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Piu Presto

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes

mut'ring, stand mut'ring o'er the diz-zy steep. Their mur-mur shakes
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Andante e forte

A

\[\text{low's a-long the ruf-fled sky, the ruf-fled sky. To the deep vault}\]

T.1

\[\text{low's, low's a-long the sky, the ruf-fled sky. To the deep vault}\]

T.2

\[\text{low's a-long the ruf-fled sky, the ruf-fled sky. To the deep vault}\]

Bar

\[\text{low's a-long the ruf-fled sky, the ruf-fled sky. To the deep vault}\]

B

\[\text{low's, low's a-long the ruf-fled sky To the deep vault}\]

A

\[\text{the yel-ling har-pies run, its yawn-ing mouth re-ceives the in-fer-nal crew. Dim thro' the}\]

T.1

\[\text{the yel-ling har-pies run, its yawn-ing mouth re-ceives the in-fer-nal crew. Dim thro' the}\]

T.2

\[\text{the yel-ling har-pies run, its yawn-ing mouth re-ceives the in-fer-nal crew.}\]

Bar

\[\text{vault the yel-ling har-pies run, its yawn-ing mouth re-ceives the in-fer-nal crew. Dim thro' the}\]

B

\[\text{vault the yel-ling har-pies run, its yawn-ing mouth re-ceives the in-fer-nal crew.}\]

A

\[\text{black gloom winks the glimm- ing sun, and the pale fur-nace}\]

T.1

\[\text{black gloom winks the glimm- ing sun, and the pale fur-nace}\]

T.2

\[\text{black gloom winks the glimm- ing sun, and the pale fur-nace gleams,}\]

Bar

\[\text{black gloom winks the glimm- ing sun, and the pale fur-nace}\]

B

\[\text{and the pale fur-nace gleams,}\]
Appendices

gleams, and the pale fur - nace gleams, the pale fur - nace gleams with brim-stone

gleams, and the pale fur - nace gleams

and the pale fur - nace gleams, the fur - nace gleams

gleams, and the pale fur - nace gleams, the pale fur - nace gleams with brim-stone

and the pale fur - nace gleams, and the pale fur - nace gleams with brim-stone

blue. Hell howls, and fiends that join, that join the dire ac-

the pale fur-nace gleams with brim-stone blue. Hell howls, and fiends that join the dire ac-

the pale fur-nace gleams with brim-stone blue. Hell howls, and fiends that join, that join the dire ac-

blue. Hell howls, and fiends that join, that join the dire ac-

claim dance on the bub-bl ing tide, dance on the bub-bl ing tide, dance on the bub - bl ing tide, and point the li-

claim dance on the bub-bl ing tide, dance on the bub-bl ing tide, and point the li-

claim

claim dance on the bub-bl ing tide, and point the li-

claim
Appendices

54

A

flame, fiends dance on the bub-bling tide and point the li-vid flame

T.1

flame, fiends dance on the bub-bling tide

T.2

Hell howls, and fiends dance on the bub-bling tide,

Bar

flame.

57

A

Hell howls, Hell tide, the bub-bling tide

T.1

tide, the bubbling tide Hell howls, and

T.2

dance on the bub-bling tide and point the li-vid flame,

Bar

tide, dance on the bubbling tide, dance,

59

A

howls, Hell howls and fiends that join the dire ac-

T.1

fiends dance on the bub-bling tide. Hell howls and fiends that join the dire ac-

T.2

Hell howls, Hell howls and fiends that join the dire ac-

Bar

on the bub-bling tide, Hell howls, and fiends that join the dire ac-

B

tide, Hell howls, and fiends that join the dire ac-
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I.14: John Stafford Smith ((1750-1836): Sleep Poor Youth

Sleep, Poor Youth

[Vol. 12; pp. 32/6]

Words by Henry D’Urfey,
from A Comical History of Don Quixote

John Stafford Smith
(1750-1836)

Sleep, sleep, poor youth. Sleep, sleep in peace, relieved from

love and mortal care, whilst we that pine in life's dis -

V. case, uncertain blest, less happy are. Couch'd in the

409
dark and dismal grave no ills of fate thou now canst fear.

In vain would tyrant pow'r enslave or scornful beauty be seen.

Wars that do fatal storms disperse Far from thy happy mansions keep.
Appendices

Far from thy happy mansions keep, earth-quakes that shake the universe can't rock thee

Far from thy happy mansions keep, earth-quakes that shake the universe can't rock thee

Far from thy happy mansions keep, earth-quakes that shake the universe can't rock thee

Far from thy happy mansions keep, earth-quakes that shake the universe can't rock thee

Can't rock thee into sounder sleep, can't rock thee into sounder sleep.

Can't rock thee into sounder sleep, can't rock thee into sounder sleep.

Can't rock thee into sounder sleep, can't rock thee into sounder sleep.

Can't rock thee into sounder sleep, can't rock thee into sounder sleep.

Can't rock thee into sounder sleep, can't rock thee into sounder sleep.

Earth-quakes that rock the universe can't rock thee into sounder sleep.

*—C in the original
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[mezzo voce]

A  Past is the fear of future doubt, the sun is

T  Past is the fear of future doubt, the sun is

Bar  Past is the fear of future doubt, the sun is

B  Past is the fear of future doubt, the sun is

A  from the dial gone. The sands are sunk, the

T  from the dial gone. The sands are sunk, the

Bar  from the dial gone. The sands are sunk, the

B  from the dial gone. The sands are sunk, the

A  glass is out, the folly of the farce is done. done.

T  glass is out, the folly of the farce is done. done.

Bar  glass is out, the folly of the farce is done. done.

B  glass is out, the folly of the farce is done. done.
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I.15: John Wall Callcott (1766-1821): *The May Fly*

*The May Fly*

[Vol. 21; p.19]

John Wall Callcott
(1766-1821)

*Appendices*

15: John Wall Callcott (1766-1821): *The May Fly*

*The May Fly*

[Vol. 21; p.19]

John Wall Callcott
(1766-1821)
Appendices

bid'st them spread-ing, spread-ing shine. Thou humm'st thy short and bus-y tune

bid'st them spread-ing, spread-ing shine. Thou humm'st thy tune, thou

un-mind-ful of the blast, un-mind-ful of the blast, un-mind-ful

humm'st thy short and bus-y tune un-mind-ful of the blast, un-mind-ful

humm'st thy tune, un-mind-ful of the blast, un-mind-ful

of the blast, And care-less, while 'tis burn-ing noon, and care-less while 'tis burn-ing noon, How

of the blast, And care-less, while 'tis burn-ing noon, and care-less while 'tis burn-ing noon, How

of the blast. And care-less while 'tis burn-ing noon, How

short that noon has past. and care-less while 'tis

short that noon has past. And care-less, while 'tis burn-ing noon, and care-less while 'tis

short that noon has past: And care-less, while 'tis burn-
Appendices

burning noon, How short that noon, that noon has past. A show'r would lay, would lay thy beauty

burning noon, How short that noon, that noon has past. A show'r would lay, would lay thy beauty

- ing noon, How short that noon, that noon has past. A show'r would lay thy beauty

low. A show'r would lay, would lay thy beauty low. The dew of twilight be_

low. A show'r would lay, would lay thy beauty low.

low. A show'r would lay thy beauty low. The

thy storm of des - ti-ny, the tor - rent of thy_

thy storm of des - ti-ny. tor - rent of thy o - ver - throw, the tor - rent of thy_

o - ver - throw, thy storm of des - ti-ny. Then, then, in - sect, then, then in - sect.
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I.16: Samuel Webbe (1740-1816): *Discord, Dire Sister*

Discord, Dire Sister

(This Gain’d a Prize Medal 1772)

[Vol. 12; p.18]

Samuel Webbe
(1740-1816)
Appendices

Allegro

A.

While scarce the skies her hor-rid head can bound She stalks on earth

T.1

While scarce the skies her hor-rid head can bound She stalks on earth

T.2

While scarce the skies her hor-rid head can bound She stalks on earth

B.

While scarce the skies her hor-rid head can bound She stalks on earth

While scarce the skies her hor-rid head can bound

B.

earth

While scarce the skies her hor-rid head can bound

B.

earth She stalks on earth and shakes the

A.

earth and shakes the world a-round. Dire sis-ter of the

T.1

stalls on earth and shakes the world a-round. Dis-cord,

T.2

stalls on earth and shakes the world a-round. Dis-cord,

B.

world a-round, and shakes the world a-round. Dis-cord, dire
Appendices

A. 31

slaugh'tring pow'r, small at her birth but rising ev'ry

T.1

of the slaugh'tring pow'r, small at her birth but rising ev'ry

T.2

of the slaugh'tring pow'r, small at her birth but rising ev'ry

B.

sister of the slaugh'tring pow'r, small at her birth but rising ev'ry

38

hour, while scarce the skies her horrid head can bound she

T.1

hour, while scarce the skies her horrid head can bound she

T.2

hour, her horrid head can bound she

B.

hour, while scarce the skies her horrid head can bound she

43

rit.

stalks on earth and shakes the world a round. round.

T.1

stalks on earth and shakes the world a round. round.

T.2

stalks on earth and shakes the world a round. round.

B.

stalks on earth and shakes the world a round. round.

420
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Grazioso

1st time mf; 2nd time p

A.

But love - ly peace in an - gels' form, des - cen - ding

T.1

But love - ly peace in an - gels' form, des - cen - ding, des-cen-ding

T.2

But love - ly peace in an - gels' form, des - cen - ding

B.

But love - ly peace in an - gels' form, des - cen - ding

53

A.

quells the ri - sing storm. Soft ease and sweet con -

T.1

quells the ri - sing storm. Soft ease and sweet con -

T.2

quells the ri - sing storm. Soft ease and sweet con -

B.

quells the ri - sing storm. Soft ease and sweet con -

58

A.  NRB: top 3 parts redistributed

tent shall reign, and dis - cord ne - ver rise a - gain.

T.1

tent shall reign, and dis - cord ne - ver rise a - gain.

T.2

tent shall reign, and dis - cord ne - ver rise a - gain.

B.

tent shall reign, and dis - cord ne - ver rise a - gain.
I.17: Stephen Paxton (1735-1787) Sonnet Spoken in the Character of Werter

Sonnet Spoken in the Character of Werter

[Vol. 15, p. 150]

Stephen Paxton

where grass and flowers in wild luxu-riance

where grass and flowers in wild luxu-riance

Make there my tomb, be-nath the lime tree's shade

in wild luxu-riance

in wild luxu-riance; let no me-morial

in wild luxu-riance; let no me-morial

in wild luxu-riance wave; let no, no me-morial mark,

in wild luxu-riance wave; let no, no me-morial mark,

mark where I am laid, or point to com-moneys the lo-ver's grave; but oft at twi-light morn, or

mark where I am laid, or point to com-moneys the lo-ver's grave; but oft at twi-light morn, or

mark where I am laid, or point to com-moneys the lo-ver's grave; but oft at twi-light morn

mark where I am laid, or point to com-moneys the lo-ver's grave; but oft at twi-light morn,
Appendices
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Closing day, the faith-ful friend with fal-ling step shall glide, tributes of fond re-gret,
dolce

T.

Closing day, the faith-ful friend with fal-ling step shall glide, tributes of fond re-gret,
dolce

T.

the faith-fal friend with fal-ling step shall glide, tri- butes of
dolce

B.

Closing day, the faith-fal friend with fal-ling step shall glide, tri- butes of

32

Tributes of fond re-gret by stealth to pay, and sigh and sigh, for the un-hap-py

sfz

Tributes of fond re-gret by stealth to pay, and sigh and sigh, for the un-hap-py

sfz

Tributes of fond re-gret, tri-butes by stealth to pay, and sigh and sigh, for the un-hap-py

sfz

Tributes of fond re-gret, tri-butes by stealth to pay, and sigh and sigh, for the un-hap-py

sfz

B.

Tributes of fond re-gret, tri-butes by stealth to pay, and sigh and sigh, for the un-hap-py

sfz

39

A little faster

A.

Su-i-cide, and sigh and sigh, for the un-hap-py su-i-cide. And some-times when the

p

Su-i-cide, and sigh and sigh, for the un-hap-py su-i-cide.

p

Su-i-cide, and sigh and sigh, for the un-hap-py su-i-cide. And some-times when the

p

Su-i-cide, and sigh and sigh, for the un-hap-py su-i-cide.

p

Su-i-cide, and sigh and sigh, for the un-hap-py su-i-cide. And some-times when the

p

* D in the original
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sun with part-ing rays gilds the long grass that hides my si-lent bed, the tears shall

sun with part-ing rays gilds the long grass that hides my si-lent bed, the tears shall

gilds the long grass that hides my si-lent bed, the tears shall

trem ble, shall trem ble in my Char-lotte's eyes; dear pre-cious drops! Dear pre-cious drops! They

trem ble, shall trem ble in my Char-lotte's eyes; dear pre-cious drops! Dear pre-cious drops! They

trem ble, shall trem ble in my Char-lotte's eyes; They

trem ble, shall trem ble in my Char-lotte's eyes; They

shall em-balm the dead. Yes! Char-lotte. Yes! Char-lotte, yes, Char-lotte o'er themourn-fal

shall em-balm the dead. Yes! Char-lotte. Yes! Char-lotte, yes, Char-lotte o'er themourn-fal

shall em-balm the dead. Yes! Char-lotte. Yes! Char-lotte, yes, Char-lotte o'er themourn-fal

shall em-balm the dead. Yes! Char-lotte. Yes! Char-lotte, yes, Char-lotte o'er themourn-fal
Appendices

[Sheet music not provided, but the text appears to be a vocal piece with musical notation.]
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I.18: John Wall Callcott (1766-1821): Thou Art Beautiful, Queen of the Valley

Queen of the Valley

[Vol. 19, p. 48]

Words by Robert Southey (1774-1843)
from the epic poem Madoc, pub. 1805.

John Wall Callcott (1766-1821)
Appendices
Appendices

A

to the sun. Me-lo-dious wave thy groves, Me-lo-dious wave thy groves, Me-

T.1

to the sun. Me-lo-dious wave thy groves, Me-lo-dious wave thy groves, Me-

T.2

to the sun. Me-lo-dious wave thy groves, Me-lo-dious wave thy groves, Me-

Bar

to the sun. Me-lo-dious wave thy groves, Me-lo-dious wave thy groves, Me-

B

to the sun. me-lo-dious

A

lo-dious wave thy groves, thy gar-den sweets en-rich the plea-sant air, the plea-

T.1

lo-dious wave thy groves, thy gar-den sweets en-rich the plea-sant air, the plea-

T.2

wave thy groves,

Bar

wave thy groves, en-rich, thy gar-den sweets en-rich the plea-sant

B

wave thy groves,

A

air, thy gar-den sweets en-rich the plea-sant air, the plea-

T.1

air, thy gar-den sweets en-rich the plea-sant air, the plea-

T.2

thy gar-den sweets

Bar

air

B

en-rich, thy gar-den sweets en-rich the plea-sant air, thy

428
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53

A

thy gar-den sweets en-rich the plea-sant air,

T.1

thy gar-den sweets en-rich the plea-sant air, lie the long

T.2

sweets en-rich the plea-sant air, lie the long

Bar

thy gar-den sweets en-rich the plea-sant air, up on the lake

B

sweets en-rich the plea-sant air, up on the

60

A

lie the long sha-dows of thy tow'rs.

T.1

sha-dows of thy tow'rs, lie the long sha-dows of thy tow'rs.

T.2

sha-dows of thy tow'rs, lie the long sha-dows of thy tow'rs.

Bar

the sha-dows of thy tow'rs, the sha-dows of thy tow'rs, the sha-dows of thy tow'rs. And

B

lake lie the long sha-dows of thy tow'rs, of thy tow'rs.

67

A

thy tem-ple py-ra-mids a-rise

T.1

thy tem-ple py-ra-mids a-rise And high in

T.2

high in heav'n

Bar

high in heav'n thy tem-ple py-ra-mids a-rise, and high in heav'n

B

and high in
Appendices

A

B

T.1

T.2

Bar

B

431
I.19: John Wall Callcott (1766-1821): The Red Cross Knight

May 12th 1797

The Red Cross Knight

[Vol. 20, No. 10; this edition revised, with grateful acknowledgement, from CPDL]

Words by
Thomas Evans: Old Ballads (1777)

John Wall Callcott
(1766-1821)

Appendices
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Let the mass be sung And the bells be rung, And the feast, the feast eat merrily.

Let the mass be sung And the bells be rung, And the feast, the feast eat merrily. Let the mass be sung, And the bells be rung, And the feast, the feast eat merrily. The war der looked from his tower on high. As far as he could see I see a bold knight, and by his red cross he...
Appendices

T1
comes from the East coun-try. Then loud the war-der blew his horn, And called 'til he was

T2
comes from the East coun-try.

B.
comes from the East coun-try.

T1
boarse, I see a bold knight, and on his shield bright, he bear-ed a flam-ing cross.

T2
I see a bold knight, and on his shield bright, he bear-ed a flam-ing cross. Then

B.
I see a bold knight, and on his shield bright, he bear-ed a flam-ing cross.

down the Lord of the cas-tle came, the RedCross Knight to me, And when the Red Cross

T1
Thou'rt wel-come here, dear Red Cross

T2
Thou'rt wel-come here, dear Red Cross

B.
Thou'rt wel-come here, dear Red Cross

T1
Knight, dear Knight, For thy fame's well known to me; And the mass shall be sung And the

T2
And the mass shall be sung And the

B.
And the mass shall be sung And the

T1
bells shall be rung, and we'll feast right mer-i-ly, mer-i-ly; And we'll feast right

T2
bells shall be rung, and we'll feast right mer-i-ly, mer-i-ly; And we'll feast right

B.
bells shall be rung, and we'll feast right mer-i-ly, mer-i-ly; And we'll feast right
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T.1
ly, For all in my cas - tle shall re - joice, That we've won the

T.2
ly, For all in my cas - tle shall re - joice, That we've won the

B.
ly, For all in my cas - tle shall re - joice, That we've won the

T.1
vic - to - ry that we've won the vic - to - ry.

T.2
vic - to - ry that we've won the vic - to - ry.

B.
vic - to - ry that we've won the vic - to - ry. And the mass shall be sung, and the bells shall be rung, and the

T.1
And the mass shall be sung, and the bells shall be rung, and the

B.

And the

T.1
feast, the feast eat mer - ri - ly And the mass shall be sung and the bells shall be rung, and the

T.2
the feast eat mer - ri - ly And the mass shall be sung and the bells shall be rung, and the

B.
feast, the feast eat mer - ri - ly And the mass shall be sung and the bells shall be rung, and the

T.1

T.2

B.
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I.20: Samuel Webbe (1740-1816): *Ode to Liberty*

*Ode to Liberty*  
[Vol. 30, No. 4]

Words: extract from  
The Letter from Italy: The Blessings of Liberty  
by Joseph Addison  
(1672-1719)

Samuel Webbe  
(1740-1816)  
Transcribed by Taney Agnew
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36
A.

B.

reign in thy presence reign and smiling plenty
pleasures in thy presence in thy presence reign and smiling plenty
and smiling smiling plenty smiling plenty smiling plenty

41
A.

T.

leads thy jocund train O liberty, eas'd of her load sub-jec-tion
leads thy jocund train O liberty, eas'd of her load, sub jec tion grows more
leads thy jocund train O liberty, eas'd of her load sub jec tion

47
A.

T.

grows more light and po-ver-ty__ looks cheer ful po-ver-ty__ looks cheer ful cheer ful
load, sub jec tion grows more light and po ver ty__ looks cheer ful, po ver ty__ looks cheer ful looks
light, more light.

B.

Po ver ty looks cheer ful looks

grows more light.
Po ver ty looks cheer ful looks
Appendices
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Adagio

O Liberty! O Liberty! Thee god-dess thee, Brit-tann-ia's Isle a-

Allegro

dores

For
do-re-s. For thee her free-born sons ex-haust their stores,
Appendix J: Glees performed in the 1825-6 season, by frequency of performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carl Maria von Weber</td>
<td>Huntsman’s Chorus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Mynheer Van Dunk</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Calcott</td>
<td>Thou Art Beautiful, Queen of the Valley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Hark from Yonder Holy Pile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Goodban</td>
<td>Charter Glee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel (Snr.) Webbe</td>
<td>O Liberty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Calcott</td>
<td>Drink to Night</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mazzinghi</td>
<td>Roderigh vich Alpine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Palmer</td>
<td>Gypsies’ Glee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J.S. Stevens</td>
<td>What Shall He Have</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Andrew Stevenson</td>
<td>Come Unto These Yellow Sands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garret Colley Wellesley</td>
<td>Here in Cool Grot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Willis</td>
<td>Merrily Goes the Bark</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Arne</td>
<td>Blows Thou Wintry Wind</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Come, Thou Monarch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Foresters Sound the Cheerful Horn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Loud Let the Moorish Tambour Sound</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>O Bold Robin Hood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Sleep, Gentle Lady</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>The Cough and Crow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>The Winds Whistle Cold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Calcott</td>
<td>Go Idle Boy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Calcott</td>
<td>The Red Cross Knight</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Calcott</td>
<td>When Time was Entwining</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Calcott</td>
<td>With Sighs Sweet Rose</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Thomas Carter</td>
<td>O Nanny</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Clarke</td>
<td>Sprightly Spirit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.S. Cooke</td>
<td>Fill me, Boy, as deep a Draught</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.S. Cooke</td>
<td>See the Sun is Brightly Glowing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.S. Cooke</td>
<td>Take Thou This Cup</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Danby</td>
<td>Awake Aeolian Lyre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hook</td>
<td>With Horns &amp; Hounds</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mazzinghi</td>
<td>O Sing Sweet Bird</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Paxton</td>
<td>How Sweet How Fresh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stafford Smith</td>
<td>Return Blest Days</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stafford Smith</td>
<td>While Fools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J.S. Stevens</td>
<td>Bragela</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Andrew Stevenson</td>
<td>Away with Philosophy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Andrew Stevenson</td>
<td>Come Live with Me</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Andrew Stevenson</td>
<td>Fishermans Glee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Webbe (Snr.)</td>
<td>Come Live with Me</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Webbe (Snr.)</td>
<td>Glorious Apollo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Webbe (Snr.)</td>
<td>When Winds Breathe Soft</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wilson</td>
<td>O By Rivers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wright</td>
<td>Diogenes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Samuel Arnold</td>
<td>In Summer's Cool Shade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Attwood</td>
<td>Hark, the Curfew</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Rowley Bishop</td>
<td>Hark, Apollo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Calcott</td>
<td>Lovely Seems the Moon's Fair Lustre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Calcott</td>
<td>Peace to the Souls of the Heroes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Calcott</td>
<td>The Derby Ram</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Calcott</td>
<td>When Arthur First in Court Began</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Calcott</td>
<td>Who Comes so Dark?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.S. Cooke</td>
<td>Beef Steak Glee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Danby</td>
<td>Fair Flora</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Danby</td>
<td>When Sappho Tuned</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Davy</td>
<td>The Bonny Owl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dyne</td>
<td>Fill the Bowl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Este</td>
<td>How Merrily We Live that Soldiers Be</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Finin</td>
<td>Rest, Stranger, Rest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hawes</td>
<td>Bring Me Flowers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hook</td>
<td>Dame Durden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Edward Horn</td>
<td>The Horn of the Chase</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Horsley</td>
<td>By Celia's Arbour</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Horsley</td>
<td>Mine be a Cat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Horsley</td>
<td>See the Chariot at Hand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Kemp</td>
<td>Ye Mariners of England</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Knyvett</td>
<td>And Are Ye Sure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Knyvett</td>
<td>The Bells of St. Michael's Tower</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mazzinghi</td>
<td>A Little Farm</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Norris</td>
<td>Bacchus, Jove's Delightful Boy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Paxton</td>
<td>Go, Damon, Go</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Purcell</td>
<td>Come Unto These Yellow Sands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Michael Rooke</td>
<td>Farewell Merry Maids</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Sacchini</td>
<td>How Should We Mortals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J.S. Stevens</td>
<td>Hark the Hollow Woods Resounding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Andrew Stevenson</td>
<td>Borne in Yon Blaze</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Andrew Stevenson</td>
<td>Buds of Roses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Wainwright</td>
<td>Life's a Bumper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Webbe (Snr.)</td>
<td>Discord, Dire Sister</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Webbe (Snr.)</td>
<td>If Love and All the World</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Webbe (Snr.)</td>
<td>Swiftly From the Mountain's Brow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Webbe (Snr.)</td>
<td>The Mighty Conqueror</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Webbe (Snr.)</td>
<td>Thy Voice, O Harmony</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Webbe (Snr.)</td>
<td>When Shall We Three Meet Again</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garret Colley Wellesley</td>
<td>Hail, Social Pleasure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Winter</td>
<td>Lord of the Castle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K: Selected Catches from the Catch Club repertoire

K.1: Nicholson: *My Lady at Tea*

*My Lady at Tea*

[Vol. 9, p. 58; transposed down a minor third]  
Nicholson

Appendices
**Appendices**

**K.2: Nicholson: Miss Kate took John’s Oboe**

*Miss Kate Took John’s Oboe*

[Vol. 9, p. 60; transposed down a perfect 4th]

Nicholson

---

1. Miss Kate took John’s ho-boy in her hand one day, she took it in her hand,

2. "See, this thing, the reed, Miss, so slender and long, so slender and long,

3. "O, 'tis a might-y, pret-ty thing, I de-clare, 'tis a might-y, pret-ty thing,

4. took it in her hand, in her hand one day, Says, Miss, 'I would vast ly like to try,

5. so slender and long, so slender and long. Introduce it

6. 'tis a might-y, pret-ty thing, 'tis a might-y, pret-ty thing,

7. should like to try, should like to try,

8. just be-tween the lips, and pinch be-tween the lips, intro-duce it just be-tween the

9. It tick-les me, it makes me laugh, it tick-les, ha, ha, ha,

10. should like to try, to try to play. Says John, 'Hold it there, no, put it in fur-ther,

11. lips, pinch strong be-tween the lips, pinch strong, then you'll get a tone, well done, now 'tis coming, now 'tis

12. ha! It makes me laugh, it tick-les me so. O Lord, O Lord, O
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Lord, O Lord, I'm quite spent, out of breath, I'm quite spent, out of breath, out of breath, I'm quite spent, out of breath, quite out of breath, and so sore, so fatigued, in deed I

I'd rather try once more, once more, once
Zounds, you've spoilt my reed, zounds, you've spoilt my reed, you've spoilt my

I can't, I can't, I can't, I can't, I can't, I can't

I'd rather try once more, I'd rather try once more, I'd rather
reed, you've spoilt my reed, you've spoilt my reed, you've spoilt my reed, I know by its humming.

I can't stand, I can't, I can't in deed stand any more.
Appendices

K.3: Nicholson: *The Three Beggars*

_The Three Beggars_

[Vol. 9, p. 88; transposed down a perfect 4th]

Nicholson

1. Pray, good sir, take pi-ty on me, take pi-ty on me, I'm quite

2. O good la-dy, pi-ty me.

3. A poor old man whose age's his plea: pour forth the bal-sam,

4. blind, I'm quite blind I can-not see, I can-not see, I can-not

5. O - pen the bow-els, O - pen the bow-els, O - pen the bow-els,

6. pour forth the bal-sam, pour forth, pour forth the bal-sam, pour forth the

7. see, I can-not see, I can-not see, I can-not see. And this poor, babe, hear how it cries, it

8. O - pen the bow-els of cha - ri-ty. See this pre-cious limb it lies,

9. bal-sam, the bal-sam of life to me. From real dis-tress turn not your eyes. Put

10. is so weak it can-not rise, it can-not rise, it can-not rise,

11. re-duced to a stump, re-duced to a stump, re-duced to a stump,

12. in your mite, put in your mite, put in your mite, put

13. it can-not rise, it is so weak it can - not rise.

14. re-duced to a stump, re - duced to a stump be - fore your eyes.

15. in your mite, put in your mite, put in your mite, re - lieve our cries.
K.4: Samuel Webbe (1740-1816): *As Thomas Was Cudgell’d One Day by his Wife* (original)

*As Thomas Was Cudgelled One Day By His Wife*

[Vol 9; p. 157; transposed down a minor 3rd]

Samuel Webbe

(1740-1816)

Appendices
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K.5: Samuel Webbe (1740-1816): *As Thomas Was Cudgell'd One Day by his Wife* (arranged)

*As Thomas Was Cudgell'd One Day By His Wife*

[Vol 9; p. 157]

Samuel Webbe (1740-1816)

arr. Chris Price
Appendices

three dear-est friends came by in the squab-ble
And skreen'd him and skreen'd him at

once from the Shrew and the rab-ble.
Skreen'd him at once
And skreen'd him at

Then ven-tured to give him some-what some ad-
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36

B. ah good ad-vice ah oo oh no oo ...

T. ah good ad-vice ah oo oh no oo ...

B. vice But Tom is a fel-low of Hu-mour so nice Too proud to coun-sel too wise to take

dm dm ...

44

B. He sent oo ah a Chal-lenge next morn-ing. na na na na na na na na

T. He sent oo ah a Chal-lenge next morn-ing. He fought with all three He

warn-ing. He sent to all three a Chal-lenge next morn-ing. na na na na na na na na

B. He sent oo ah a Chal-lenge next morn-ing. na na na na na na na na

53

B. na na na ... and was thresh’d by his wife by his

T. fought, thrice ven-tured his life, Then went home a - gain and was thresh’d By his wife

B. na na na ... and was thresh’d by his wife by his

B. doo doo doo doo dm dm ...
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T.

T. wife and was thresh’d and was thresh’d, na na na na ... how he fought home a-

and was thresh’d He fought with all three, thrice ventured his life, He fought, then went home a-

B.

B. wife and was thresh’d and was thresh’d, na na na na ... how he fought home a-

and was thresh’d, thresh’d, thresh’d, thresh’d thresh’d by his wife. Tom’s

T.

T. gain and was thresh’d and was thresh’d and was thresh’d And was thresh’d by his wife. As

gain and was thresh’d thresh’d And was thresh’d thresh’d by his wife. He

B.

B. gain and was thresh’d and was thresh’d and was thresh’d and was thresh’d And was thresh’d by his wife. Then

and was thresh’d, thresh’d, thresh’d, thresh’d thresh’d by his wife. Tom’s

T.

T. Thomas was cud-gell’d one day by his wife By his wife was cud-gell’d As

fought with all three He fought, thrice ventured his life, Then went home a -

B.

B. ventured to give him some wholesome advice But

three dearest friends came by in the squabble And screened him
Appendices

Tho-mas was cud-gelf'd by his wife As Tho-mas was

gain and was thresh'd By his wife and was thresh'd He fought with all three, thrice ven-tured his

Tom is a fel-low of Hu-mour so nice Too proud to take

and skreen'd him at once from the Shrew and the rab-ble.

One day by his wife He

life, He fought, then went home a-gain and was coun-sel too wise to take warn-ing He

Skreen'd him at once And

took to his heels and ran and ran for his life.

thresh'd thresh'd And was thresh'd thresh'd by his wife.

sent to all three a Chal-lenge next morn-ing.

skreen'd him at once from the Shrew and the rab-ble.
As Sir Toby Reel'd Home

[Vol. 18, p. 156; transposed down a tone]

As Sir Toby Reel'd Home

K.6: William Hayes (1708-1777): As Sir Toby Reel'd Home (original)

Appendices

William Hayes (1708-1777)

As Sir Toby Reel'd Home with his skin full of wine, to his house in the square from his friends at the Vine, he smuff’d the fresh air, and his one step gain’d forward I back-ward reel two. I’ll re-turn to the Vine, so, as gaining ground back-ward found out the right place; the sor’s ma-them-a-tics at nod-dle turn’d round, he stag-ger’d but gain’d not an inch of the ground.

one may sup-pose, Sir To-by in-tend’d to fol-low his nose.

length did pre-vail, and Sir To-by steer’d home by the help of his tail.
Appendices

K.7: William Hayes (1708-1777): As Sir Toby Reel'd Home (arranged)

As Sir Toby Reel'd Home

[Vol. 18, p. 156; transposed down a tone]

William Hayes (1708-1777)
arr. Chris Price
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A

bim-ble, bim-ble, bim-ble, bim, from his friends at the Vine_(Sniff) Ah!

T

house in the square from his friends at the Vine, he snuff'd the fresh air, and his

Bar

bim-ble, bim-ble, bim-ble, bim, from his friends at the Vine_(Sniff) Ah!

B

bim-ble bim-ble bim, bim, bim-ble bim, he snuff'd the fresh air, bim,

A

bm bm bm bm bm bm he stag-ger'd not an inch of the ground.

T
	nod-de tur'd round, he stag-ger'd but gain'd not an inch of the ground.

Bar

bm bm bm bm bm bm he stag-ger'd not an inch of the ground. "Get

B

bim, bim, bim, bim bim but gain'd not an inch of the ground.

A

Hm hm hm hm hm if for one step gain'd for-ward I back-ward reel two.

T

Hm hm hm hm if for one step gain'd for-ward I back-ward reel two.

Bar

home!'quoth the knight, "Why, this can-not do, if for one step gain'd for-ward I back-ward reel two. I'll re

B

Bim, whoops bim bim bim,- if for one step gain'd for-ward I back-ward reel two. Bim,
Appendices
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help of his tail. dm dm dm etc. doo_ dm dm dm doo_

help of his tail. As Sir To - by reel'd home with his skin full of wine, to his

help of his tail. "Get home!" quoth the knight, "Why, this can-not do, if for

help of his tail. But this re - tro - grade knight ne'er al - tered his pace, and

house in the square from his friends at the Vine, he snuff'd the fresh air, and his

one step gain'd for - ward I back - ward reel two. I'll re-turn to the Vine," so, as

gain - ing ground back-ward found out the right place; the sort's ma-the-matics at

nod - de_ turn'd round, he stag-ger'd but gain'd not an inch of the ground. Hic!

one, may sup - pose, Sir To - by in - ten - ded to fol - low his nose. Hic!

length did pre - vail, and Sir To - by steer'd home by the help of his tail. Hic!
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K.8: John Blow (1648/9-1708): Ring the Bells

Ring the Bells
[Vol. 24, p. 104; transposed down a major 3rd]

John Blow
(1648/9-1708)

1. Ring, ring the bells, and the glasses pull away,
   Tis a grand pitcher, pull away, pull away, 'tis a grand,
   Our King we have again, ring the bells, our
   ring, ring the bells, and the glasses pull away, pull a-
   grand pitcher, day. Drink, drink, let us drink, drink, let us drink to our
   King we have again, now all your pitchers clatter, clatter, clatter, clatter, clatter,
   way, he that leads we will set all, all the vessels in the
   power, we'll have full sixty rounds,
   clatter, and may he, and may he, like Gideon all,
   house, all, all, all the vessels in the house on their heads.
   — and do, out do the Tower.
   all, all, all, all his enemies scatter.
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K.9: William Hayes (1708-1777): On a Puritan, Drunk

On a Puritan, Drunk

[Vol. 18, p. 150; transposed down a semitone]

William Hayes
(1708-1777)

Chorus; Vivace
Appendices

him, but woe to him, whom they're dis-pos'd to abuse. Thus for each

but woe to him, woe to him, whom they're dis-pos'd to abuse. Thus for each

him, but woe to him, whom they're dis-pos'd to abuse. Thus for each

crime the Friends will find excuse, but woe to

crime the Friends will find excuse, But woe to him,

crime the Friends will find excuse, but woe to him, woe to him,

him, woe to him, whom they're dis-pos'd to abuse. But woe to

woe to him, whom they're dis-pos'd to abuse. Woe to

but woe to him, whom they're dis-pos'd to abuse. But woe to

him, whom they're dis-pos'd to abuse.
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Appendix L: Music Theatre Pieces

L.1: Henry Bishop: The Pilgrim of Love

The Pilgrim of Love

Words by
Dimond [Hatton Anthology]
Or Amelia Alderson Opie (1769-1853) [Opera in English; M.R. Griffl]

Sir Henry Rowley Bishop
(1786-1855)
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21 Allegro.
E-cho hears and calls again.

25 Pno.
mi-mic voice re-peats the name a-round. And with O-ryn-thia all the rocks re-sound!

30 AIR Andante

36 Pno.

40 Pno.
A her-mit who dwells in these so-li-tudes, cross'd me, As way-worn and faint up the
"Yet, tar-ry, my son, till the burn-ing noon, pass-es, Let boughs of the le-mon tree._
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mountain prest'd, The aged man paus'd on his shelter thy head. The juice of ripe muscadel

staff to acost me, And prof'er'd his cell, As my mansion of rest.
flows in my glasses, And rush'es, fresh pull'd, For siesta are spread!

Ahl' nay, courteous father, right on ward I rove; No rest but the grave for the

Pilgrim of Love for the Pilgrim of Love, for the Pilgrim of Love, No

rest but the grave for the Pilgrim of Love.
L.2: William Shield: The Wolf

The Wolf

Words by
John O'Keefe (1747-1833)

William Shield
(1748-1829)

Appendices
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While the wolf in nightly prowls, Bays the moon with hideous howl, While the wolf in

nightly prowls, Bays the moon with hideous howl.

Gates are barr’d, a vain re sis-tance, Fe males shriek but no as-

sis-tance; Si-ence, si-ence, or you meet your fate, si-ence, or you meet your

fate—— Your keys, your jew els,
Appendices

cash, and plate, your keys, your jew-els, your jewel-es, cash, and plate, your

jew-els, cash, and plate, your jewel-es, cash, and plate.

Locks, bolts, and bars soon fly a-sun-der,

Locks, bolts, and bars soon fly a-sun-der, Then to ri-fle, rob, and

plun-der, Then to ri-fle, rob, and plun-der,
Locks, bolts, and bars soon fly a - sun - der, Then to

ri - fle, rob, and plun - der, to ri - fle, rob, and plun - der.
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Appendix M: Officers’ Papers No 5: Memorial on the state of cathedral music in England, c. 1841.

The Memorial of the underwritten respectfully addressed to The Very Reverend The Deans and The Reverend The Chapters of the Cathedral and Collegiate Churches of England and Wales

Sheweth

That your Memorialists review with regret the imperfect manner in which the Service is at present performed in our Cathedral Churches.

That the choirs are inadequate to the due and sole performance of Cathedral Music and that such improvement as the Chapters may be pleased to make in their respective choirs will be hailed by your Memorialists with gratitude.

That they would respectfully offer the following suggestions to the consideration of the Chapters.

1. That for the proper performance of cathedral music four voices, At least are required to a Part(a), viz: 4 Altos, 4 Tenors, and four Basses, with an appropriate number of boys(b).

2. That it would be desirable to have a practising room(c) established in which the choir might meet, once a week, to rehearse the music for the following Sunday, and thus the sacredness of the church be more religiously regarded.

3. That the organist, as Master of the Boys, should more completely direct their musical education, (as indeed according to the spirit of the several statutes he is bound to do) by which means they will be kept in an efficient state, and be taught not merely to sing at Church, but also to play upon instruments and be well grounded in the theory of music(d).

It is, however, self-evident that the discharge of the duties which would fall upon us, were this Memorial fully carried out, would involve the abandonment of that large portion of our professional employment, which is utterly unconnected with our proper duties as Cathedral Organists. These engagements are, at present, absolutely necessary for the decent support of ourselves and families. We would gladly devote a larger portion of our time to our Cathedral duties and can only hope that if more is required of us than when we were first appointed to our situations, we shall not be suffered to lose thereby.

Your Memorialists trust that this statement of their views and wishes will be received in the same spirit in which it is submitted to your consideration. They hope that they shall not seem to be stepping out of their proper sphere, if, in conclusion, they advert to the great benefit which would result to the cause of religion throughout the land, from the more decent and solemn performance of the daily Service in every Cathedral, which would not fail, among other effects, to produce a deeper feeling of the beauty of church music and increased congregations on the week-days.

a/ Cathedral music being antiphonal, four voices to a part would give but two in the alternate singing.

b/ A small fund to which every member of the choir might contribute would be highly useful for pensioning off those members whose voices fail them. This would, at the same time, secure, in an unobjectionable way, the efficiency of our choirs, and also act as an inducement for young men to join our bodies by holding out a small yet comfortable provision for their declining years. Such a plan as this was evidently contemplated by the Founders of our Cathedrals, and the Almshouses to many of
them might be well restored to this use.

c/ Anthems and Services would then never be performed for the first time in the church, as is often the case.

d/ The Organist should be bound personally to attend every Service, unless prevented by illness or other urgent cause. He should also devote a portion of his time to arranging music for the Choir, who ought to look up to him (under the Dean or Precentor) as their Musical Director.

And your Memorialists &c.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Church or Position</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amott</td>
<td>Gloucester Cathedral</td>
<td>1832-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkins</td>
<td>St Asaph's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>St David's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td>1829-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>1819-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfe</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>1804-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfe</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>1825-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elvey</td>
<td>St George's Chapel, Windsor</td>
<td>1835-1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunton</td>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Manchester [Sudlow &amp; Harris shared Manchester 1831-48]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haylett</td>
<td>Chester, formerly Cambridge</td>
<td>1824-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>1835-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janes</td>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>1830-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Eton College</td>
<td>1832-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>1820-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pring</td>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale</td>
<td>Choirs of the Chapels Royal and Westminster Abbey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skelton</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>1794-1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart</td>
<td>Chapels Royal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speechley</td>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>1836-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudlow</td>
<td>Manchester [Sudlow &amp; Harris shared Manchester 1831-48]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turle</td>
<td>Westminster Abbey</td>
<td>1831-82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation by the musical profession

We the undersigned members of the Musical Profession would view with great satisfaction the adoption of any measure similar to that recommended in the annexed Memorial. We feel confident that any steps which the Deans and Chapters may be pleased to take for the restoration of our noble Cathedral Service to its proper dignity and magnificence would raise the musical taste of the people at large and enable each Organist to devote himself wholly and solely as it is desirable that he should be able to do to the duties of his Church, to the general superintendence of the Choir, and to the composition and arrangement of Cathedral Music.

Anderson, Director of Her Majesty's Private Band
### Appendices

| Barnett, Royal Academy of music |
| Bellamy, Thomas Ludford |
| Bennett, William Sterndale, Prof of Music Royal Academy |
| Benson, Armagh Cathedral |
| Bishop, H.R. |
| Blackbourn, Organist of Clapham Church |
| Calkin, Conductor of Her Majesty's State Band |
| Cherry, Organist of St Marks, Armagh |
| Cramer, Francois |
| Cramer, William |
| Cooke, J. |
| Elliott, organist of Curzon Chapel, Mayfair |
| Hackett, organist of the parish church Rotherham |
| Harris, organist of St Lawrence, Guildhall and St Mary Magdalen, Milk Street, London |
| Hawes, Wm., St Pauls Cathedral & the Chapels Royal |
| Horsley, Wm. |
| Knyvett, Charles |
| Locter, John D., Director and Leader of the Philharmonic Society |
| Lucas, Charles, Prof of Music Royal Academy |
| Morgan, organist of Cheltenham |
| Oliphant, Thomas |
| Potter, Principal of the Royal Academy of Music, London |
| Severin, organist of the German Lutheran Church, Trinity Lane, City of London |
| Smith, organist of St Margaret's, Lynn, Norfolk |
| Spencer, Charles Child, London |
| Sturgess, organist of the Foundling Hospital |
| Taylor, Gresham Prof of Music |
| Walmisley, Thomas Attwood, Prof of Music in the University of Cambridge |
| Westrop, Henry, London |

### Recommendation by the clergy

We, the undersigned Clergymen of the Church of England, would view with heartfelt satisfaction the adoption of any measure similar to that recommended in the annexed Memorial. We feel confident that any steps which the Deans and Chapters may be pleased to take for the restoration of our noble Cathedral Service to its proper dignity and magnificence would gain for them the affections of the people at large, would advance in no small degree the cause of Religion throughout the land, and would promote the glory of Almighty God, by fully carrying out the intentions of the founders of our Cathedrals, whose main object it is evident was to secure the due and solemn performance of Divine Service in every Cathedral, daily, for ever.

115 names, including

| Hoskins, Wm. Ed., Rector of St Alphege, Canterbury |
## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rouch, Frederick</td>
<td>Minor Canon of Canterbury Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratton, Joshua</td>
<td>Minor Canon of Canterbury Cathedral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix N: Complete list of concert programmes 1825-6 season

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Solo Inst.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Handel, G.F.</td>
<td>Occasional Overture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Goodban, Thomas</td>
<td>Charter Glee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Wellesley, Garret Colley, Earl of Mornington</td>
<td>Here in Cool Grot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Alford</td>
<td>Merry Little Soldier</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Henry Goodban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
<td>O Liberty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Round</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Yes! 'Tis the Indian Drum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cortez, or the Conquest of Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Winter, Peter</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td>Life is Darken'd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Der Freischütz</td>
<td>Mr Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Hark from Yonder Holy Pile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Air and Variations</td>
<td></td>
<td>? Hawkshaw</td>
<td>Flute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Whitaker, John</td>
<td>Fly Away Dove</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Parry, John</td>
<td>We Are Two Roving Minstrels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
<td>Glorious Apollo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Mozart, W. A.</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Figaro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>National Anthem</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>God Save the King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Romberg</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Hark from Yonder Holy Pile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Barnett, John</td>
<td>O Take This Wreath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>The Selson(?) of the Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Callcott, John Wall</td>
<td>With Sighs Sweet Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Bid Me Discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Mynheer Van Dunk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Law of Java, The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>First Line</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Second Line</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Méhul, Étienne Nicolas</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Shield, William</td>
<td>The Wolf</td>
<td>Castle of Andalusia</td>
<td>Mr Tilly [sic.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>King, Robert (?)</td>
<td>Tis Love, 'tis Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Catch</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Ab, How Sophia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Horsley, William</td>
<td>See the Chariot at Hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Waller, Sidney</td>
<td>The Marriage Act</td>
<td>Master Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Danby, John</td>
<td>Awake Aeolian Lyre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Mozart, W. A.</td>
<td>Symphony No. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Méhul, Étienne Nicolas</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Go Idle Boy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Tell me, My Heart</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Winter, Peter</td>
<td>Lord of the Castle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>My Pretty Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td>Huntsman’s Chorus: What Equals on Earth</td>
<td>Der Freischütz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Gyrowetz, Adalbert</td>
<td>Overture in D(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Tis When to Sleep</td>
<td>Mr Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Round</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Ye! 'Tis the Indian Drum</td>
<td>Cortez, or the Conquest of Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Thou Art Beautiful, Queen of the Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Reeve, William (arr. Bishop)</td>
<td>Echa Song</td>
<td>Brother and Sister</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>The Cough and Crow</td>
<td>Gay Mannerneing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Boieldieu, Francois-Adrien</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Calipsh de Bagdad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Cimarosa, Domenico</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Stevens, Richard John Samuel</td>
<td>What Shall He Have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Drink to Night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Duct</td>
<td>Barnett, John</td>
<td>O Take this Wreath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Glee</th>
<th>Mazzinghi, Joseph</th>
<th>Roderigh vich Alpine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Rossini, Gioachino</td>
<td>Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Storage, Stephen</td>
<td>The Sapling Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Palmer, Henry (?)</td>
<td>The Gypsies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Arne, Thomas</td>
<td>Blow Thou Wintry Wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Mocking bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Wright, James</td>
<td>Diogenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Paer, Ferdinando</td>
<td>Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
<td>Thy voice O Harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Horn, Charles Edward</td>
<td>Cherry Ripe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
<td>Come Live with Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Stay Amazéeth, Stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Stevenson, Sir John Andrew</td>
<td>Away with Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Davaux, Jean-Baptiste</td>
<td>Sinfonia Concertante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Shield, William</td>
<td>A Fire Burns [the Charger]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Stevens, Richard John Samuel</td>
<td>Bragella [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>When Time was Entwining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Braham, John</td>
<td>Sons of Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>The Winds Whistle Cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Rossini, Gioachino</td>
<td>Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Gyrowetz, Adalbert</td>
<td>Overture in D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Drink to Night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Stevenson, Sir John Andrew</td>
<td>Fishermans Glee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Stevenson, Sir John Andrew</td>
<td>No, Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Mazzinghi, Joseph (?)</td>
<td>Tell Me, Have you Seen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Class.</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>&quot;As Down the (?) Vale&quot;</td>
<td>Exile</td>
<td>Braham, John</td>
<td>&quot;When Thy Bosom&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Willis, Isaac</td>
<td>&quot;Merrily Goes the Bark&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Braham, John</td>
<td>&quot;When Thy Bosom&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>&quot;Sleep, Gentle Lady&quot;</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>&quot;When Day was Scarcely Dawning&quot;</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wainwright, Richard</td>
<td>&quot;Life's a Bumper&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boieldieu, Francois-Adrien</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Caliphs de Bagdad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Handel, G.F.</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
<td>&quot;The Mighty Conqueror&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mozart, W. A.</td>
<td>&quot;Time Around his Dial&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Callcott, John Wall</td>
<td>&quot;Thou Art Beautiful, Queen of the Valley&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Horn, Charles Edward</td>
<td>&quot;Cherry Ripe&quot;</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>&quot;Foresters Sound&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sterkel, Johann Franz Xaver</td>
<td>Organ Concerto</td>
<td>Mr Palmer</td>
<td>Organ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Storace, Stephen</td>
<td>&quot;The Sapling Oak&quot;</td>
<td>The Siege of Belgrade</td>
<td>Mr Tilley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carter, Charles Thomas</td>
<td>O Nanny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Braham, John</td>
<td>O Alban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bochsa, Robert Nicolas Charles</td>
<td>&quot;Though from Thee&quot;</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>&quot;Hark, Apollo&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pleyel, Ignace Joseph</td>
<td>Overture in G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Miller &amp; His Men, The</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
<td>O Liberty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Horsley, William</td>
<td>&quot;Mine be a Cat&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>&quot;Hark from Yonder Holy Pile&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>O Bold Robin Hood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Arranger/Performer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Clarinet Concerto</td>
<td>Mr Norton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Shield, William</td>
<td>On by the Spur</td>
<td>Mr Tilley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Paxton, Stephen</td>
<td>How Sweet How Fresh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Mr J Harrison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Catch</td>
<td>Herschel, Frederick William</td>
<td>Echo Catch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Braham, John</td>
<td>Gallop on Gaily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td>Huntsman's Chorus: What Equals on Earth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Winter, Peter</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Das Labrynth [sic]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Paer, Ferdinando</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Sargino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Smith, John Stafford</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Return Blest Days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Stevenson, Sir John Andrew</td>
<td>Tell Me Where is Fancy Bred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Attwood, Thomas</td>
<td>Hark, the Carfew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Mr Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Mynheer van Dunk</td>
<td>Law of Java, The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Martini, Jean Paul Egide</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Henry 4th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>When Arthur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Braham, John</td>
<td>O'er Nelson's Tomb</td>
<td>Mr Goodban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>With Sigh Sweet Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
<td>Glorious Apollo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Pleyel, Ignace Joseph</td>
<td>Overture in D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Méhul, Etienne Nicolas</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Stevens, Richard John Samuel (?)</td>
<td>What Shall He Have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Red Cross Knight; Blow Warden, Blow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Concert of Music</td>
<td>Mr Sloman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>The Winds Whistle Cold</td>
<td>Gay Mannering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Der Freischütz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Livius, Barham</td>
<td>O 'Tis Love</td>
<td>Mr Sloman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Glee</th>
<th>Cooke, Thomas Simpson</th>
<th>Beef Steak Glee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Braham, John</td>
<td>Gallop on Gaily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Medley [sic.] Hawkshaw Flute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td>Huntsman's Chorus: What Equals on Earth Der Freischütz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Rossini, Gioachino</td>
<td>Overture Italian in Algiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Himmel, Fredrich Heinrich*</td>
<td>Overture Fanchon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Clarke, John</td>
<td>Sprightly Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>When Day was Scarcely Dawning Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Arne, Thomas</td>
<td>Blow Thou Wintry Wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Song &amp; Chos.</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td>Laughing Chorus Der Freischütz Mr Sloman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>The Derby Ram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Romberg</td>
<td>Overture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Braham, John</td>
<td>O Albion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Palmer, Henry (?)</td>
<td>Gypsies' Glee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>? Mr Sloman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Clarinet Concerto Mr Norton Clarinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Mazzinghi, Joseph</td>
<td>Roderigh vich Alpine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Horn, Charles Edward</td>
<td>When a Man Weds Mr Sloman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Winter, Peter</td>
<td>Overture Das Labrynth [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>National Anthem</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>God Save the King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Mazzinghi, Joseph</td>
<td>Overture Ramah Droog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Stevenson, Sir John Andrew</td>
<td>Born in Yan Blazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bayly, Thomas H.</td>
<td>The Old Bachelor Mr Sloman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Danby, John</td>
<td>Fair Flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Home and Native Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Stevens, Richard John Samuel</td>
<td>Hark the Hollow Woods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>No. in 12th Ed.</th>
<th>Clef and Key</th>
<th>Composers</th>
<th>Works and Authors</th>
<th>Performers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Gay Mannering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Don My Soul,'tis True</td>
<td>Mr Sloman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Horsley, William</td>
<td>By Celia's Arbour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>O Give me the Man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>Visit to Brighton</td>
<td>Mr Sloman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Dyne, John</td>
<td>Fill the Bowl [with Racy Wine]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Rossini, Gioachino</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Tancredi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Paer, Ferdinando</td>
<td>Overture No 11</td>
<td>Ginevra [degli Almieri]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
<td>O Liberty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Lover, Samuel</td>
<td>Where is the Light of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Trad., arr Bishop, Henry Rowley (?)</td>
<td>Jack o Flaxg'dene</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Who Comes so Dark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Este, Michael</td>
<td>How Merrify We Live that Soldiers Be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Overture No 16</td>
<td>Comedy of Errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Round Ye Hills</td>
<td>Mr Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Peace to the Souls of the Heroes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Round</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Yes! 'Tis the Indian Drum</td>
<td>Cortez, or the Conquest of Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>As it Fell Upon a Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Hawkshaw, Flute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Norris, Thomas</td>
<td>Bacchus, Jove's Delightful Boy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Paer, Ferdinando</td>
<td>Overture No 12</td>
<td>D'Una in Bene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Winter, Peter</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Zaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Stevenson, Sir John Andrew</td>
<td>Away with Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Round</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Yes! 'Tis the Indian Drum</td>
<td>Cortez, or the Conquest of Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Sale, John Bernard</td>
<td>Butterfly Duet (Gay being)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Thou Art Beautifull Queen of the Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Shield, William (?)</td>
<td>The Rose Bud</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Composer, Artist</th>
<th>Work/Selection</th>
<th>Orchestra/Conductor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td><em>O Bold Robin Hood</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Clarinet Concerto</td>
<td>Mr Norton Clarinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Parry, John</td>
<td><em>As Down the Vale</em></td>
<td>Mr Tilley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Willis, Isaac</td>
<td><em>Merrily Goes the Bark</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td><em>With Thou Tempt the Waves</em> Der Freischütz</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td><em>Bid Me Discourse</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td><em>Huntsman's Chorus: What Equals on Earth</em> Der Freischütz</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Mozart, W. A.</td>
<td><em>Overture</em> Zauberflöte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Wellesley, Garret Colley, Earl of Mornington</td>
<td><em>Hail Social Pleasure</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td><em>When Day was Scarcely Dawning</em></td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Hawes, William</td>
<td><em>Bring Me Flowers</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Stevenson, Sir John Andrew</td>
<td><em>Borne in Yon Baysy</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Paxton, Stephen</td>
<td><em>Go, Damon, Go</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
<td><em>When Winds Breathe Soft</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Méhul, Etienne Nicolas</td>
<td><em>Overture</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Attwood, Thomas (after Mozart)</td>
<td><em>Where the Banners</em> Prisoner, The</td>
<td>Mr Dobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Stevenson, Sir John Andrew</td>
<td><em>Buds of Roses</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td><em>?</em> Hawkshaw Flute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td><em>Tell me, My Heart</em></td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Goodban, Thomas</td>
<td><em>Charter Glee: To Apollo and Bacchus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Paer, Ferdinando</td>
<td><em>Overture</em> Sargina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Mozart, W. A.</td>
<td><em>Overture</em> Don Juan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Davy, John</td>
<td><em>The Bonny Owl</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Horn, Charles Edward</td>
<td><em>Cherry Ripe</em></td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Danby, John</td>
<td><em>When Sappho Tuned</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?Bishop/Braham/Bingley...</td>
<td><em>Isabel</em></td>
<td>Mr Beckwith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Rossini, Gioachino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Shield, William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Horn, Charles Edward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Purcell, Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Martini, Jean Paul Egide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>National Anthem</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Handel, G.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Danby? Arne?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Mazzinghi, Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Winter, Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Davaux, Jean-Baptiste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Carter, Charles Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Wellesley, Garret Collie, Earl of Mornington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Perry, George Frederick (after Rossini)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Danby, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Vanhal, Johann Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Handel, G.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Sacchini, Antonio Maria Gaspera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Callcott, John Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Braham, John</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Composer/Artist</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Hark from Yonder Holy Pile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Haydn, Josef</td>
<td>Surprise Symphony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Pilgrim (sic.) of Love</td>
<td>Noble Outlaw, The</td>
<td>Mr Beckwith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Sleep, Gentle Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bochsa, Robert Nicolas Charles</td>
<td>Tho' From Yee I Now Depart</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Cooke, Thomas Simpson</td>
<td>Paddy O Snap</td>
<td>Five Lovers, The</td>
<td>Mr Beckwith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Goodban, Thomas</td>
<td>Charter Glee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Boieldieu, Francois-Adrien</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Caliphs de Bagdad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Cimarosa, Domenico</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Come, Thou Monarch</td>
<td>Comedy of Errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Tell me, My Heart</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Callcott, John Wall</td>
<td>When Time was Entwining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Der Freischutz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td>With Thou Tempt the Waves</td>
<td>Der Freischutz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Reeve, William</td>
<td>The Right End of Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Kemp, Joseph</td>
<td>Ye Mariners of England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Cherubini, Luigi</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Anacreon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Braham, John</td>
<td>Death of Abacromba (sic.)</td>
<td>Mr Welford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Stevenson, Sir John Andrew</td>
<td>Come Unto These Yellow Sands</td>
<td>Thirty Thousand, The</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley (after Rossini)</td>
<td>There is a Grief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Stevens, Richard John Samuel (?)</td>
<td>What Shall He Have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Rossini, Gioachino</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Tancredi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>God Save the King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Handel, G.F.</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Wilson, John (Savile, Jeremy)</td>
<td>O By Rivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>When Day was Scarceley Dawning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
<td>Discord, Dire Sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Orchestra</th>
<th>Mazzinghi, Joseph</th>
<th>Overture</th>
<th>Exile</th>
<th>Mr Beckwith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Arne, Thomas</td>
<td>Under the Greenwood Tree</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Fisin, J.</td>
<td>Rest, Stranger, Rest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Reeve, William (arr. Bishop)</td>
<td>Echo Song</td>
<td>Brother and Sister</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Mozart, W. A.</td>
<td>Overture No 39</td>
<td>Clemenza di Tito</td>
<td>Mr Beckwith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Smith, John Stafford</td>
<td>While Fools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Braham, John</td>
<td>O've Nelson's Tomb</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Mr Beckwith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Hook, James</td>
<td>With Horns &amp; Hounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Mozart, W. A.</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Le Nozze di Figaro</td>
<td>Mr Beckwith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Handel, G.F.</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Cooke, Thomas Simpson</td>
<td>Fill me, Boy</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>I am Certain</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Hook, James</td>
<td>Dame Durden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Nathan, Isaac</td>
<td>In This Lovely Raw</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Mr Beckwith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Winter, Peter</td>
<td>Overture No 26</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Zaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Braham, John</td>
<td>Bird Duet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Smith, John Stafford</td>
<td>Whole Fools</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Mr Beckwith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Arne, Thomas</td>
<td>The Soldier Tierd [sic]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Fantasia</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Stevens, Richard John Samuel</td>
<td>Braggia [sic]</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Hawkshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Pilgrim [sic] of Love</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Mazzinghi, Joseph</td>
<td>Roderigh rich Alpine</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Rossini, Gioachino</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Italian in Algiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Beethoven, Ludvig van</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Promethaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
<td>O Liberty</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Goodbye</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
<td>Swiftly From the Mountain's Brow</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendixes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 22 5 Glee Mazzinghi, Joseph</td>
<td>A Little Farm</td>
<td>Free Knights, or The Edict of Charlemagne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 22 6 Orchestra Romberg</td>
<td>Overture No. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 22 7 Song ?</td>
<td>On the Battle</td>
<td>Mr Beckwith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 22 8 Duet Clarke, John</td>
<td>Fair Solima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 22 9 Catch Herschel, Frederick William</td>
<td>Echo Catch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 22 10 Song Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Mocking Bird</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 22 11 Orchestra Paer, Ferdinando</td>
<td>Overture No. 7</td>
<td>Sargino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 22 12 Glee Knyvett, William</td>
<td>And Are Ye Sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 22 13 Song ?</td>
<td>No Flower Can Be Compared</td>
<td>Mr Beckwith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 22 14 Glee Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td>Huntsman's Chorus: What Equals on Earth</td>
<td>Der Freischütz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 22 15 Orchestra Boieldieu, François-Adrien</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Calipsh de Baghd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 1 Orchestra Borghi, Luigi</td>
<td>Overture No. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 2 Glee Webbe, Samuel (Str.)</td>
<td>When Winds Breathe Soft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 3 Song Lee, Louise Leoni</td>
<td>A Nosegay Once With</td>
<td>Mr Beckwith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 4 Glee Calcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Lovely Seems the Moon's Fair Lustre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 5 Duet Stevenson, Sir John Andrew</td>
<td>Tell Me Where is Fancy Bred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 6 Song Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Bid Me Discourse</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 7 Orchestra Méhul, Étienne Nicolas</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 8 Round Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Ye! 'Tis the Indian Drum</td>
<td>Cortez, or the Conquest of Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 9 Song ?</td>
<td>Mists Silent Shade</td>
<td>Mr Beckwith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 10 Solo ?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Hawkshaw</td>
<td>Flute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 11 Song ?</td>
<td>With Helmet on His Brow</td>
<td>Mr Beckwith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 12 Glee Arnold, Dr. Samuel</td>
<td>In Summer's Cool Shade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 13 Orchestra ?</td>
<td>Clarinet Concerto</td>
<td>Mr Norton</td>
<td>Clarinet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 8 1 Orchestra Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Comedy of Errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 8 2 Glee Cooke, Thomas Simpson</td>
<td>Fill me, Boy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 8 3 Song Bishop, Henry Rowley (?)</td>
<td>And Ye Shall Walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendices

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Wellesley, Garret Colley, Earl of Mornington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bochsa, Robert Nicolas Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Willis, Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Brahms, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Rossini, Gioachino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Pleyel, Ignace Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Stevenson, Sir John Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Carter, Charles Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Davaux, Jean-Baptiste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Palmer, Henry (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Arne, Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Webbe, Samuel (Snr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Moore, Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Vanhal, Johann Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Jomelli, Niccolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Clarke, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Mazzinghi, Joseph (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Stevenson, Sir John Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Callcott, John Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Winter, Peter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Glee and Song Titles
- Here in Cool Grot
- Slowly Wears the
- Merrily Goes the Bark
- Gallip on Gaily
- Clarinet Concerto
- Thou from Thee
- Law of Java, The
- Noble Outlaw, The
- Italian in Algers
- Come Live with Me
- Goodbye
- O Nanny
- Sinfonia Concertante
- Gypsy's Glee
- Under the Greenwood Tree
- If Love and All the World
- Love and the Sun Dial
- Overture No. 42
- Overture No. 2
- Sprightly Spirit
- Tell me Have Ye Seen
- Thou Art Beautiful, Queen of the Valeey
- Das Labrynth [sic]

---
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### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>Arranger</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Weep Not, Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Callcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Drink to Night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Trad. Scottish, arr. Craven/Chipp</td>
<td>My Heart is Sair For Somebody</td>
<td>Master Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Wilson, John (&amp; Savile, Jeremy)</td>
<td>O By Rivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Moore, Thomas</td>
<td>Fanny Was in the Grove</td>
<td>Master Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Hark Apollo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Cimarosa, Domenico</td>
<td>Overture No. 2 in D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td>Overture No. 3</td>
<td>Preciosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Come Thou Monarch</td>
<td>Comedy of Errors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Trad. Irish</td>
<td>Kate Kearney</td>
<td>George Elvey [aged 10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Smith, John Stafford</td>
<td>Return, Blest Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Schneider, Johann Christian Friedrich</td>
<td>Overture No. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Knivett, William</td>
<td>The Bells of St. Michael's Tower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Parry, John</td>
<td>As Down the Vale</td>
<td>Mr Tilley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Rooke, William Michael</td>
<td>Yarmare! Merry Maids</td>
<td>Pirate, The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Vanhal, Johann Baptist</td>
<td>Organ Concerto</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>O What Heart Can Teach</td>
<td>Mr Elvey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>O Give Me the Man</td>
<td>Farmer's Wife, The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Wright, James</td>
<td>Digenes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Winter, Peter</td>
<td>Overture No. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Hummel, Johann Nepomuk</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Paxton, Stephen</td>
<td>How Sweet How Fresh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Whitaker, John</td>
<td>Fly Away Dove</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Yorsters Sound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Paer, Ferdinando</td>
<td>Overture No 12</td>
<td>D'Una in Bene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td>With Thou Tempt the Waves</td>
<td>Der Freischütz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Song</th>
<th>Barnett, John</th>
<th>Liberty and Wine</th>
<th>Mr Tilley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Loud Let the Moorish Tambour Sound</td>
<td>Fall of Algiers, The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Schneider, Johann Christian Friedrich</td>
<td>Overture No. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Mazzinghi, Joseph</td>
<td>O Sing Sweet Bird</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Bid Me Discourse</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td>Huntsman's Chorus: What Equals on Earth</td>
<td>Der Freischütz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sots Wis</td>
<td>Mr Rippon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Winter, Peter</td>
<td>Overture No. 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Handel, G.F.</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Richard 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Callcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Go Idle Boy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Hook, James (?)</td>
<td>When Should Ladies Listen ['The Squeeze of the Hand']</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Hook, James</td>
<td>With Horns &amp; Hounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>(?Gilbert, Alfred</td>
<td>Oh Liberty ['Dear Liberty']</td>
<td>Mr Pett (of Wingham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Haydn, Josef</td>
<td>Overture in D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Cooke, Thomas Simpson</td>
<td>Take Thou This Cup ['The Sun is Brightly Glowing']</td>
<td>Malvina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Storace, Stephen</td>
<td>The Sapling Oak</td>
<td>The Siege of Belgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Cooke, Thomas Simpson</td>
<td>See the Sun is Brightly Glowing</td>
<td>Malvina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Plough Boy</td>
<td>Mr Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Mocking Bird</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Mythenhe Van Dunk</td>
<td>Law of Java, The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Mazzinghi, Joseph</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>Ramah Droog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Schneider, Johann Christian Friedrich</td>
<td>Overture Op. 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Bishop, Henry Rowley</td>
<td>Loud Let the Moorish Tambour Sound</td>
<td>Fall of Algiers, The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Duet</td>
<td>Braham, John</td>
<td>Gulp up on Gaily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Whitaker, John</td>
<td>Fly Away Dove</td>
<td>Miss Longhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Callcott, John Wall</td>
<td>Thou Art Beautiful, Queen of the Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Sterkel [NB: written as &quot;de Sterthel&quot;]</td>
<td>Concerto for Organ</td>
<td>Mr Palmer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Performer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer/Arranger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Cooke, Thomas Simpson</td>
<td><em>Take Thou This Cup (The Sun is Brightly Glowing)</em></td>
<td>Cooke, Thomas Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Barnett, John</td>
<td><em>Liberty and Wine</em></td>
<td>Mr Tilley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Cooke, Thomas Simpson</td>
<td><em>See the Sun is Brightly Glowing</em></td>
<td>Cooke, Thomas Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td><em>?</em></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Goodban, Thomas</td>
<td><em>Charter Glee: To Apollo and Bacchus</em></td>
<td>Goodban, Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Reeve, William (arr. Bishop)</td>
<td><em>Echo Song</em></td>
<td>Mr Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Glee</td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
<td><em>Huntsman’s Chorus: What Equals on Earth</em></td>
<td>Weber, Carl Maria von</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>Winter, Peter</td>
<td><em>Overture No. 9</em></td>
<td>Winter, Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>National Anthem</td>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td><em>God Save the King</em></td>
<td>Anon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix O: John Marsh (1752-1828): The City Feast

The City Feast
or
Man of True Taste
[Vol. 27, no. 24]

John Marsh
(1752-1828)
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Appendix P: Samuel Webbe (1740-1816): *Threnodia*

*Threnodia*

[Vol. 14, p. 68b]

Samuel Webbe
(1740-1816)

"Where, where, where, where, hapless I- lion are thy heav'n-built walls, thy high em-batt-led towers, thy spu-cious halls? Where are thy tem-ples where, where, is thy pal- las,"

"Where, where, where, where, hapless I- lion are thy heav'n-built walls, thy high em-batt-led towers, thy spu-cious halls? Where are thy tem-ples fill'd with forms di- vine, where, where,"

* Eb in the original
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2
10
S.  con piú moto 2
where, the migh-ty Hector, where thy fa\'v\'rite boast and all thy va-liant sons, a

A.
where where the migh-ty Hector, thy fa\'v\'rite boast and all thy va-liant sons, a

T.
-- her aw-ful shrine, where the migh-ty Hector, where thy fa\'v\'rite boast and all thy va-liant sons, a

B.
where her aw-ful shrine, the migh-ty Hector, where thy fa\'v\'rite boast and all thy va-liant sons, a

15
S.  tempo primo
splen did host, a splen did host, a splen - did host? Thy arts, thy arms, thy rich-es,

A.
splen did host, a splen did host, a splen - did host? Thy arts, thy arms, thy rich-es,

T.
splen did host, a splen did host, a splen - did host? Thy arts, thy arms, thy rich-es,

B.
splen did host, a splen did host, a splen - did host? Thy arts, thy arms, thy rich-es,

20
S.  and thy state, thy pride, thy pomp, thy all that made thee great?

A.  and thy state, thy pride, thy pomp, thy all that made thee great?

T.  and thy state, thy pride, thy pomp, thy all that made thee great?

B.  and thy state, thy pride, thy pomp, thy all that made thee great?

* Bb in the original; ** A in the original
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3 Lento

These prostrate, prostrate now in dust, these prostrate

These prostrate now, these prostrate now in

These prostrate now in dust and ruin, in dust and

39

now in dust and ruin lie, but thy transcendent

A. dust and ruin lie, but thy transcendent

T. dust and ruin lie, but thy transcendent fame

B. ruin in lie, but thy transcendent fame, thy transcendent

4 Andante

fame can never, never, never, never, never die. Fame

fame can never, never, never die. 

_ can never die, _ can never die, _ can never die. 

fame can never die, can never die, can never die, can never die.
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boasts no pow'r to sink they glo-ries past, they fill the world and with the

they fill the world.

they fill the world, they fill the world and

they fill the world, they fill the world and

world, with the world shall last, with the world shall last, with the

Fate boasts no pow'r to sink they glo-ries past, they fill the world and with the

with the world shall last, they fill the world, they fill the world and with the

with the world shall last, with the world shall last.

world shall last. Fate boasts no pow'r to sink thy glo-ries past, no,

world shall last. Fate boasts no pow'r to sink thy glo ries past,

world shall last. Fate boasts no pow'r to sink thy glo ries past, no,

Fate boasts no pow'r to sink thy glo ries past, they fill the world and with the
Appendices

thy fame can never die, no never, thy transcendent

thy fame, thy fame can never die, no,

glories, thy fame can never die, thy fame can never die, no, no, thy transcendent

world shall last. Thy fame can never die, thy
Appendices

boasts no pow'r to sink thy glories past, they fill the world

no pow'r to sink thy glories, they fill the world and with the world shall last,

to sink thy glories past, they fill the world and with the world shall last, they

and with the world shall last, they fill the world, they fill the

last, and with the world, and with the world shall last, they fill the world and

shall last, they fill the world and

world and the world shall last, with the world shall last.

with the world shall last, with the world shall last.

with the world shall last, with the world shall last.

with the world shall last, with the world shall last.
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Appendix Q: Thomas Weelkes (1576-1623): *Like Two Proud Armies*

*Like Two Proud Armies*

[Vol. 55, No. 3, p. 14]
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2

S1

field, marching in the field, join ing a thun d'ring

S2

field, marching in the field, join ing a thun d'ring

A.

field, marching in the field, in the field, join ing a thun d'ring

T.

field, marching in the field, in the field, join ing a thun d'ring

B.

marching in the field, join ing a thun d'ring

B.

marching in the field, join ing a thun d'ring

S1

fight, join ing a thun d'ring fight, each scorns to yield.

S2

fight, join ing a thun d'ring fight, each

A.

fight, join ing a thun d'ring fight, a thun d'ring fight, each scorns to yield, each

T.

fight, join ing a thun d'ring fight, each scorns to yield, each

B.

fight, join ing a thun d'ring fight, each

B.

fight, join ing a thun d'ring fight, each scorns to yield,
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4
S1
scorns to yield, to yield; So in my heart, my heart your

S2

A.
scorns to yield; So in my heart, your

T.
__ each scorns to yield; So in my heart,

B.
scorns to yield; So in my heart,

B.
scorns to yield; So in my heart, my heart

21
S1
beau - ty and my rea - son the o - ther says 'tis trea - son, the

S2
beau - ty and my rea - son the one claims the crown, the one claims the

A.
beau - ty and my rea - son the one claims the crown, the o - ther says 'tis

T.
beau - ty and my rea - son the one claims the crown, the o - ther says

B.
the o-ther says 'tis trea - son, the

B.
the one claims the crown, the one claims the
Appendices

S

S

A

T

B

B

56

o - ther says 'tis trea - son, trea - son. 

But O your beau - ty shin-eth as the sun, 

and daz-zled rea - son yields as quite un-done, 

as the sun, and daz-zled rea - son yields as quite un-done, and daz-zled 

sun, as the sun, and daz-zled rea - son yields as quite un-done, 

shin-eth as the sun, the sun, and daz-zled rea - son yields as quite un - 

sun, as the sun, 

and daz-zled rea - son yields as quite un-done, and 
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and dazzled reason yields as quite un-done, as quite un-done,

reason yields as quite un-done, he yields as

and dazzled reason yields as quite un-done, as quite un-done, and dazzled reason yields as quite un-done, as quite un-done,

yields as quite un-done, he yields as quite un-done,

- dazzled reason -

as quite un-done, and reason yields as quite un-done.

quite un-done, as quite un-done, as quite un-done.

done, as quite un-done, as quite un-done, as quite un-done, as quite un-done.

- done, as quite un-done, as quite un-done, as quite un-done.

as quite un-done, as quite un-done, as quite un-done, as quite un-done, un-done.

son yields as quite un-done.
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Appendix R: John Bennet (1575-1614): *When As I Look'd*

*A.D. 1599*

*When As I Look'd*

[Vol. 11, p. 194]

John Bennet
(1575-1614)
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2

S.1 plain’d, that me she ne’er re-gard - ed, and that my love with

S.2 con-plain’d, that me, that me she ne’er re-gard - ed, and that my love with slight-ing

S.3 plain - ed that me she ne’er re-gard - ed, and that my love with slight - ing was re-

A. plain’d, that me she ne’er re-gard - ed, and that my love with slight - ing was re-

28

S.1 slight-ing was re - ward - ed, then wan-ton-ly she siml - eth, then

S.2 was re - ward - ed, then wan-ton-ly she siml - eth, then

S.3 ward - ed, re - ward - ed, then wan-ton-ly she siml -

A. ward - ed, re - ward - ed, then wan-ton-ly she siml -

33

S.1 wan-ton-ly she siml - eth, she siml - eth, and grief from me ex - il - eth. Then eth.

S.2 wan-ton-ly she siml - eth, she siml - eth, and grief from me ex - il - eth. Then eth.

S.3 eth, then wan-ton-ly she siml - eth, and grief from me ex - il - eth. eth.

A. eth, then wan-ton-ly she siml - eth, and grief from me ex - il - eth. eth.

509
Appendices

Appendix S: Thomas Goodban (1784–1863): *The Motto — Harmony and Unanimity*

Harmony and Unanimity

Words: H. Beckwith

Music: T. Goodban (1784-1863)
Transcribed & edited by J. Greenacre
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Appendix T: John Stafford Smith (1750–1836): Flora Now Calleth Forth Each Flow'r

Flora Now Calleth Forth Each Flow'r
[Vol. 15, p. 143]

John Stafford Smith (1750-1836)

Soprano 1

Soprano 2

Alto

Tenor

Bass
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and bids make rea-dy Mai-a's bow'r,
Flora now

rea-dy Mai-a's bow'r, and bids make rea-dy Mai-a's bow'r,
who

rea-dy Maia-a's bow'r,
who still doth lie in a trance,

Flo-ra now call-eth forth each flow'r,
now

call-eth forth each flow'r,
who still doth

Flo-ra now call-eth forth each flow'r,
now

still doth lie in a trance,
now call-eth forth each flow'r,
now

call-eth forth each flow'r,
and bids make

lie in a trance;
and bids make rea-dy Mai-a's bow'r, and bids make

call-eth forth each flow'r, and bids make rea-dy Mai-a's bow'r,
make

call-eth forth each flow'r, and bids make rea-dy Mai-a's bow'r, make rea-dy Mai-a's bow'r, make

flow'r,
Appendices

\[31\]

S.1
\[\text{Allegro}\]

ready Mai-a's bow'r.

A.

Then

T.

Then will we lit-tle Love a-wake, that now sleep-eth in

B.

Le-the's lake, and pray him lead-en our dance.

40

S.1

dance

A.

Flora now call-eth forth each

T.

that now sleep-eth in Le-the's lake,
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then will we little Love a-wake, and

Then will we little Love a-wake, then will we little Love a-wake, and

Love a-wake, then will we little Love a-wake, that now sleep - eth in

lie in a trance.

trance.

pray him lead-en our dance

pray him lead-en our dance

Le - the's lake, then

then

that now sleep - eth in

that now sleep - eth in Le - the's

that now sleep - eth, and

will we little Love a-wake, and pray him lead-en our dance

will we little Love a-wake, and pray him lead-en our dance

Le - the's lake.
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6

76

S.1

lake, and pray him lead- en our dance.

S.2

pray him lead- en our dance.

A.

T.

B.

that now sleep - eth in Le - the's lake, and

80

S.1

our dance.

S.2

our dance.

A.

our dance.

T.

our dance.

B.

pray him lead - en our dance, lead - en our dance.

84

S.1

our dance,

S.2

our dance, our dance,

A.

our dance, our dance,

T.

our dance and pray him

B.

our dance and pray him lead - en our dance,
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Appendix U: Paulus Iuvenes (b. 1961): New Year Rhymes

What Can Be Said in New Year Rhymes?

Words: Ella Wheeler Wilcox The Year (1910)
Music: Paul Young

[Music notation page]
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2

A. poco rit mp Adagio

We rise up laughing with the light! We

T.1

We rise up laughing with the light, We rise up laughing with the light!

T.2

rise up laughing with the light, We rise up laughing with the light, We rise up laughing with the light!

Bar

rise up laughing with the light, We rise up laughing with the light, We rise up laughing with the light!

Andante (with fervour)

A.

lie down weeping with the night. We lie down weeping with the light We hug the

T.1

We lie down weeping with the night. We lie down weeping with the light We hug the

T.2

We lie down with the night. We lie down weeping with the light We hug the

Bar

we lie with the night We hug the

29

A. dim poco a poco Meno mosso (piteously)

world until it stings We curse it then and sigh and sigh sigh for wings

T.1

world until it stings we curse and sigh and sigh sigh for wings

T.2

world until it stings and sigh sigh, sigh for wings

Bar

world until it stings and sigh sigh, sigh for wings
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**Allegretto**

We live, we love, we woo, we wed, We wreathe our brides, we sheet our dead, We

**T.1**

We live, we love, we woo, we wed, We wreathe our brides, we sheet our dead, We

**T.2**

We live, we love, we woo, we wed, We wreathe our brides, we sheet our dead, We

**Bar**

We live, we love, we woo, we wed, We wreathe our brides, we sheet our dead, We

---

39

laugh, weep, we hope, we fear, And that's the burden of the year.

**T.1**

laugh, weep, we hope, we fear, And that's the burden of the year.

**T.2**

laugh, weep, we hope, we fear, And that's the burden of the year.

**Bar**

laugh, weep, we hope, we fear, And that's the burden of the year.

---

44

we hope, we fear, And that's the burden of the year.

**T.1**

we hope, we fear, And that's the burden of the year.

**T.2**

we hope, we fear, And that's the burden of the year.

**Bar**

we hope, we fear, And that's the burden of the year.
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Cruikshank, George, *A Comic Alphabet* (Cruikshank, G., No. 23, Middleton Terrace, Pentonville, 1836), letter X.
ARCHIVE SOURCES

British Library Rare Books & Music Room
*Goodban’s Music Cards* (Simkin, Marshall and Co., Stationer’s Court, 1845); GB–Lbl Music Collections a.60.
Smart, George: *The Vocal Pocket Companion*, 1785, GB–Lbl A.1066
Smart, George: *The Vocal Pocket Companion*, 1789, GB–Lbl A.1066.a

Canterbury Cathedral Archives and Library
Canterbury Catch Club concert records (Ca Ca Cl “Order Book”)
Canterbury Catch Club Minutes Books, 1802-1865: CCA-CC-W/7/1-4
Canterbury Catch Club Music Volumes 1-72
Dean’s Books, 1695-1895: CCA-DCc-DB
Index to Freemen of Canterbury
Kent Family History Society microfiche publication:
   – Baptisms Cat. No. 1824
   – Marriages Cat. No. 1839
   – Burials Cat. No. 1772
Lay Clerks and Inferior Officers’ Papers: CCA-DCc/OP/6
Precentor’s Books 1695-1895: CCA-DCc-PB
Treasurers Books 1660-1905: CCA-DCc-TB

Canterbury City Library (Beaney House of Arts & Knowledge)
Banquet Cards

Church of England Records Office:
Folder ECE/7/1/1188: records of Enquiries from and appeals to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners relating to governance of the cathedral and Lay Clerks’ stipends.

Lambeth Palace Library
Archbishop’s Visitation Articles of Enquiry 1832 (LPL/VG5/)
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OTHER SOURCES

Oddfellows

Journals

Canterbury Cathedral Chronicle
Canterbury Journal, Kentish Times and Farmers’ Gazette
Kentish Gazette
The Music Student
The Harmonicon
The London Magazine
The Monthly Magazine from 1833-35, then The Chronicle
The Musical Times and Singing Class Circular
The New Monthly Magazine and Literary Journal
The Precentor
Whitstable Times and Herne Bay Herald

Websites:

Ancestry: www.ancestry.co.uk/
British Newspaper Archive: http://www.britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk/
Brewery History: http://www.breweryhistory.com
Measuring Worth: https://www.measuringworth.com/
The National Archives: www.nationalarchives.gov.uk
Wirksworth Parish Records 1600-1900: http://www.wirksworth.org.uk
Art UK: http://artuk.org

Audio

Books

“A Cavalry Officer”. *The Whole Art of Dress! or, The Road to Elegance and Fashion, at the Enormous Saving of thirty per cent!!!* Royal Exchange, London: Effingham Wilson, 1830.


*The Canterbury Cathedral Chronicle* No. 39 (September 1943).


Chappell, Paul. *Dr. S.S. Wesley: Portrait of a Victorian Musician.* Great Wakering: Mayhew-McCrimmon,


Gatrell, Vic. Thomas Rowlandson: Pleasures and Pursuits in Georgian England, edited by Patricia Phagan,
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Poughkeepsie: The Frances Lehman Loeb Art Center, Vassar College, 2011.
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Scott, Derek B. *Sounds of the Metropolis*. OUP, 2011.


Skeates, Highmore. *A Collection of Songs Composed By Highmore Skeats, Organist of the Cathedral At Ely*. 530
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Weaver, Paul, Nicholas Temperley, and Leanne Langley. Webbe Family.
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*The Canterbury Cathedral Chronicle* No. 39 (September 1943).

Answers to Archbishop’s Visitation Articles of Enquiry, 1720. GB-Lip: VG 5/2

Answers to Archbishop’s Visitation Articles of Enquiry, 1724. GB-Lip: VG 5/3

Answers to Archbishop’s Visitation Articles of Enquiry, 1728. GB-Lip: VG 5/4

Answers to Archbishop’s Visitation Articles of Enquiry, 1832. GB–Lip: VG 5/25
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Canterbury Catch Club Concert Records, (1825-1837); GB-C/A: Ca Ca Cl ‘Order Book’.


“Catalogue of Music Manuscripts in Canterbury Cathedral Archives.” (Unpublished). GB–C/A:


The Baltimore Consort, “The Art of the Bawdy Song”; (2000),
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Dean's Book, Vol. 6, (1777-1792); *GB-C*: CCA-DCc-DB/6.

Dean's Book, Vol. 12, (1854–1895); *GB–CA*: CCA-DCc/DB/12.
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KC. “Kentish Chronicle Template.” *Kentish Chronicle*.
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Musical Quarterly XXIV (January 1948).
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Scott, Derek B. Sounds of the Metropolis. OUP, 2011.


Quarterly Musical Magazine and Review 11 (1821).


