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Abstract

Charles Jennens’s collection of Handel’s sacred oratorios from *Saul* to *Jephtha*: sources, contexts, and revisions

Charles Jennens (1700-1773), the librettist of *Saul*, *Messiah*, *Belshazzar*, and probably *Israel in Egypt*, amassed a huge library of music that forms the bulk of what is now known as the Aylesford collection. Jennens’s collection of Handel’s music was unique among those of his contemporaries, not only because it includes part-books, but also because it is unusually comprehensive. The dissertation focuses on his copies of the sacred oratorios beginning with *Saul* (1739) because most of the collection was copied in the 1740s, the sacred oratorios were the works that Jennens was most interested in, and *Saul* was his first collaboration with Handel. As many of these manuscripts have not been the focus of modern scholarly attention, I first establish how, when, and by whom each manuscript was copied, in order to achieve a greater understanding of how and when Jennens assembled his collection, and what his reasons were for doing so. This close study of the manuscripts reveals that Jennens made extensive alterations to the verbal text, the structure, and the music of several oratorios in his collection. His amendments to *Saul* and *Belshazzar* shed light on his collaboration with Handel; and his amendments to *Samson* and *Joseph and his Brethren* provide insights into his attitude to Handel in the mid-1740s, his approach to word-setting, his views on the adaptation of Scripture for oratorio, and his beliefs and commitments. Jennens was a highly educated man whose activities were informed by two deeply held, conflicting allegiances: to the Anglican Church and to the deposed Stuarts. An examination of how he harnessed Handel’s music to deliver his religious and political messages leads to a richer and more profound understanding of the works, of the relationship between Jennens, Handel, and Handel’s music, and of their place in the religious and political context of the mid-eighteenth century.
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Introduction

The collection of Handel’s music owned by Charles Jennens (1700-73), the librettist of Saul, Messiah, Belshazzar, the final part of L’Allegro, il Penseroso ed il Moderato, and probably Israel in Egypt,1 is unlike any other Handel collection that was assembled either during or since the composer’s lifetime. This is partly because it was unusually comprehensive: one of Jennens’s aims was clearly to own every note that Handel had ever composed. His collection – now often referred to as the Aylesford collection, of which it forms a large part – is also unusual in that he had part-books, as well as scores, copied for Handel’s works.2 This dissertation is not the first study of Jennens’s collection. The complicated history of the AYLESFORD collection is known to us through John Roberts’s important work on the collection,3 which included the mammoth task of establishing the location of Jennens’s music books, which are now scattered throughout the world. Roberts’s article was partly based upon Donald Burrows’s unpublished study of the paper characteristics of Jennens’s copies, to which I am very grateful to have been granted access. This dissertation could not have been written without either study.

Jennens’s copies of Handel’s music have also gained the attention of scholars focusing on single works, usually in the course of preparing editions. These studies have revealed not only that Jennens’s collection is even more unusual than it first appears, but also that – in the case of the oratorios – it can be rather puzzling: why, for example, in Jennens’s part-books of Belshazzar, is the soli and chorus ‘Tell it out’ replaced by the Organ Concerto in D minor (HWV 303)?4 why did Jennens alter Handel’s underlay in his score of Messiah?5 and what can be made of Jennens’s Samson part-books, which clearly reflect a version of the oratorio never intended by Handel or Hamilton (the librettist)?6 The best-known study of Jennens’s copies of a single work is Anthony Hicks’s article ‘Handel, Jennens and Saul: Aspects of a

---

1 On 10 July 1741, Jennens wrote to his friend Edward Holdsworth, and referred to his libretto of Messiah as “another Scripture Collection”. The significance of this comment was first drawn attention to by Anthony Hicks, ‘An Auction of Handeliana’, MT, 114 (1973), pp. 892-3, at p. 893. Jennens’s authorship of this libretto has since been further confirmed by John H. Roberts (‘Handel, Charles Jennens and the Advent of Scriptural Oratorio’, in Colin Timms and Bruce Wood (eds.), Music in the London Theatre from Purcell to Handel (Cambridge, 2017), pp. 222-243, at pp. 228-9).
2 It is usually assumed that one of the reasons why Jennens had part-books copied was that he wanted to be able to perform Handel’s works at Gopsall Hall: he figured many of the basso continuo parts in his scores; he did not have trombone part-books copied for Israel in Egypt or a harp part-book copied for Alexander Balus, presumably because he could not have expected to have either instrument at Gopsall; his part-books for the operas – which he is less likely to have performed – lack vocal part-books and semplice recitatives; and he had a music desk from which fourteen musicians could play (see Brenda Sumner, ‘Charles Jennens’s Piano and Music Room’ HIN, 22/2 (2011), pp. 1-3).
4 This is described by Donald Burrows in his Novello edition of Belshazzar as an “inexplicable feature of this source” (Donald Burrows (ed.), Belshazzar (London, 1993), p. viii).
5 A discussion of these amendments can be found in Donald Burrows, Handel: Messiah (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 79-80.
6 The contents of Jennens’s part-books to Samson were first noticed and commented on by Donald Burrows, “Something Necessary to the Connection”: Charles Jennens, James Hunter and Handel’s Samson’, HIN, 15/1 (2004), pp. 1-3.
Collaboration’. In addition to using Jennens’s copies of Saul to shed light on the pre-performance history of the oratorio, Hicks showed that these copies adopt many of Jennens’s alterations to the autograph score. As a result, these manuscripts – like the part-books to Samson – contain a version of the oratorio that was never intended or performed by the composer. Jennens’s copies of Saul are even more interesting than they first appear: as they contain music that was discarded by Handel at a very early stage in the work’s history, one would expect them to have been copied very early; but their paper characteristics – as identified by Burrows – suggest that they were copied in the mid-1740s. Although the comprehensiveness of Jennens’s collection means that his copies are tempting sources for editions of Handel’s music, his manuscripts are clearly not always straightforward copies of primary sources: they can be more deceptive than helpful for unsuspecting editors. They do, however, present intriguing challenges for a PhD dissertation. Jennens’s collection was not unusual through an accident of history: it was unlike any other collection because Jennens was unlike any other collector. It would therefore be impossible to understand these copies of the oratorios without understanding their first owner.

Fortunately, our knowledge of Jennens has been greatly enlarged in recent years by the work of Ruth Smith, who has done much to expand our understanding not only of Handel’s oratorio librettists, but also of the historical, social, political, and religious contexts in which the oratorios were written. She is the third scholar whose research was indispensable in writing this dissertation. Several of the many aspects of Jennens’s life and personality on which Smith has shed light are of direct relevance to this dissertation. Almost all of his many activities were informed by two deeply held, conflicting allegiances: to the deposed Stuarts, and to the Anglican Church. It was probably during his time at Balliol College, Oxford, that the former allegiance was fostered. As he refused to abjure loyalty to the Stuarts, he could not follow in the footsteps of his family in becoming a magistrate; fortunately, he put his education to good use elsewhere. Smith has described how Jennens was “the driving force” behind a work of Virgil scholarship written by his friend Edward Holdsworth, noting that the correspondence between the two men reveals in Jennens a “breadth and depth of reading, a competence – not to be assumed to result from an Oxford education at this date – in Greek and Latin, and an entirely characteristic determination to establish critical truth through

8 In particular ‘The Achievements of Charles Jennens (1700-1773)’, ML, 70/2 (1989), pp. 161-90. Although most of the references that follow are limited to this article, Smith has since continued to explore the subject; further examples of her work are given in the bibliography.
9 Most notably in Handel’s Oratorios and Eighteenth-Century Thought (Cambridge, 1995).
11 Ibid., pp. 175-81.
12 Ibid., p. 172.
scholarly exactness". All of these qualities are evident in his libretti, as well as in the pioneering edition of Shakespeare’s works that he began towards the end of his life; as will become clear throughout this dissertation, these qualities are also evident in his copies of Handel’s oratorios. When Jennens inherited his home, Gopsall Hall, in 1747 (along with 34 other properties), he set about rebuilding it. It eventually housed a noted art collection, a music room, and a library containing around 10,000 volumes, which reflected his chief interests by including about 700 volumes relating to theology.

Jennens was also a devoted admirer of Handel’s works, which is reflected in his collection of music. This collection is now usually referred to as the Aylesford collection, because Jennens bequeathed it to his cousin Heneage Finch, 3rd Earl of Aylesford. However, since Finch was also a collector of music, not every item in the Aylesford collection once belonged to Jennens. The history of the Aylesford collection – of its assembly and of its dispersal – is complicated, and is traced in detail by Roberts, who also included in his article an indispensable handlist of manuscripts in the Jennens and Aylesford collections. Of the many auctions through which the collection was sold off, one is of primary importance in the present context: the Sotheby’s auction held on 13 May 1918. The catalogue for this auction is a slightly frustrating but nevertheless extremely useful document. The location of most of the items listed in the catalogue is known: having been bought (indirectly) by Newman Flower, they are now part of the Newman Flower Collection in the Manchester Central Library. Many more – bought (both directly and indirectly) by William Barclay Squire – are now in the British Library, the Fitzwilliam Museum, and the Library of Congress. The 1918 auction catalogue also reveals that Jennens owned several scores, bought by the dealer G. H. Brown, that are now lost. These include a number of expensively bound scores (red morocco with gilt tooling) of some of the oratorios under consideration in this dissertation: Saul, Israel in Egypt, Messiah, Samson, and Belshazzar. Roberts speculates that these were...
bought by someone more interested in their bindings than in their contents.\textsuperscript{28} It will become apparent throughout this dissertation that these lost red-morocco scores were an important part of Jennens’s collection.

The immense amount of work carried out by Roberts sheds much light on the Aylesford collection, but such a survey could by its nature never answer every question thrown up by Jennens’s copies of Handel’s works. Intrigued by the unusual features of Jennens’s collection, it occurred to me that it would be impossible either to gain a deeper understanding of the collection or to explain the more puzzling aspects of his copies without subjecting his manuscripts to a thorough examination. Given the magnitude of his collection and the limits of a PhD, it was clear that it would be possible to subject only a carefully selected group of compositions to such a detailed investigation.

I decided to focus my attention on Jennens’s copies of the sacred oratorios beginning with \textit{Saul} (1739) for four reasons: Burrows’s work on the paper characteristics had revealed that most of the collection was copied in the 1740s; the sacred oratorios were the works that Jennens was most interested in; it was his copies of these works that were the most puzzling; and \textit{Saul} was his first collaboration with Handel. However, I also include \textit{L’Allegro} because of the extent of Jennens’s involvement in it.\textsuperscript{29} In most cases, each work is given its own chapter; the results of each investigation are then considered together.

Since many of Jennens’s manuscripts have not been the focus of modern scholarly attention, I first establish how, when, and by whom each manuscript was copied, in order to achieve a greater understanding of how and when Jennens assembled his collection. I suspected that these studies would also shed light on the puzzling nature of his copies. They did: they revealed that Jennens made extensive alterations to the verbal text, the structure, and the music of several oratorios in his collection. My chapters on these works include an analysis of Jennens’s alterations. The length of each chapter is determined by two factors: whether the work under consideration has been published recently in the HHA, and whether or to what extent Jennens altered the oratorio. It is for this reason that the chapter on \textit{Joseph and his Brethren} – which has not been published in the HHA, and which Jennens altered extensively – is one of the longest chapters, and that \textit{Solomon} – which was been published recently in the HHA, and which Jennens barely altered – is dealt with in a single paragraph.

\textit{****}

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., p. 63.
\textsuperscript{29} Jennens had a major role in its genesis and provided the text for the final part: see Donald Burrows and Rosemary Dunhill (eds.), \textit{Music & Theatre in Handel’s World: the Family Papers of James Harris, 1732–1780} (Oxford, 2002), pp. 85, 1075–85, with subsequent amendments traced on pp. 88–9, and 110–11.
Since much of the dissertation concerns filiation, it is necessary to explain some of the fundamental principles that I have adopted.

The preparatory work involved checking every note and every word of the primary sources of this study: the autograph score, the performing score, and all of Jennens’s copies of the oratorio in question. Given the scope and the time limit of this project, it was not feasible to study in detail every other extant early source of the oratorio under consideration: it is possible that in a few cases there may be an intermediate score of which I am unaware. Fortunately, however, this would not have made much difference: it will become clear that the immediate sources of most of the copies for which I have established filiation were something within Jennens’s collection that is now lost. My initial preparatory work was carried out using reproductions of the sources; this was followed by an inspection of the actual sources, in order to check readings that are not clear on a copy, as well as other aspects of the manuscripts that are visible only “in the flesh”.

Although I collated all the variants between the sources, I did not use all of them in establishing filiation: the next stage was to analyse my findings, carefully weighing up the significance of all the variants, and identifying those that provide incontrovertible evidence of filiation. I am aware of the potential problems in this work and I approach the task with caution. The significance of a variant relates not to how disastrous it would be in performance, but rather to how likely it is that two copyists would produce the same reading independently. It is for this reason that I tend to exclude slurs – which are subject to the whim of a copyist – as evidence; likewise, I am careful about relying upon spelling. Variants are also excluded as evidence if there are so many plausible ways in which a variant could have arisen in two manuscripts that the variant becomes meaningless. Finally, in considering what is possible, one must always bear in mind the fact not only that copyists must decide what to write when their source is ambiguous, but also that they sometimes altered readings if they believed their source to be incorrect.

In discussing the filiation of the sources I use a few terms that may require explanation. The first concerns the relationship between manuscripts. I use “sibling” to describe manuscripts both of which are copied from the same source: if two scores – Score B and Score C – were both copied from another score (Score A), the two scores – Score B and Score C – may be described as siblings. (Although Score A could be described as the “parent”, I do not use this term: “source” suffices.) Second, there is a clear distinction between “derive” and “copy”: all sources of a Handel work derive ultimately from the autograph score, but not all of them are copied from it; I tend to use “derive” when there is the definite possibility of an intermediate source in the stemma. Finally, in describing the nature
of a variant that involves the addition or omission of an accidental, I refer to it as a “variant of pitch” (or similar) if the presence or absence of the accidental would result in a different pitch being played or sung, and as a “variant involving an accidental” (or similar) if the presence or absence of the accidental would make no difference to what would be played or sung.

Finally, I do not present every variant on which I have relied in establishing filiation: if I had done so, the Appendices – in which all music examples are given – would be excessively long. (More details on how the music examples were created is given in the Appendices.) However, I err on the side of “generosity”: it would defeat the point of my work if I felt that the evidence for my conclusions was overwhelming, but a reader felt it was meagre. No two readers are likely to agree on what constitutes an ideal amount of evidence. I would prefer to convince the reader that my conclusions are correct by means of what might seem an excessive amount of evidence than to risk not convincing the reader because the evidence was insufficient. Furthermore, I do not suppress evidence (a) that appears to contradict my conclusion, and (b) that is unlikely to be the coincidental result of the whim of a copyist. As it is clearly the case that some judgement is involved in establishing whether a variant meets the second condition, I tend to discuss such evidence. It seems that Jennens would agree with my approach. In response to George Steevens’s savage attack on his edition of *King Lear*, he wrote the following:

To this charge of too minute exactness, it would be sufficient to answer, that it is the duty of every editor who pretends to collate, to give all the different readings of the several editions of his work; otherwise he imposes on the public, who, from the title of a collated work, must naturally expect all the different readings; and if in the course of collating he meets with what he may justly think a trifling, insignificant difference of reading, he is not at liberty to suppress it; he must produce it, and leave it to the public to judge whether it be insignificant or not.

---

31 Charles Jennens, *The Tragedy of King Lear, as Lately Published, Vindicated from the Abuse of the Critical Reviewers; and the Wonderful Genius and Abilities of those Gentlemen for Criticism, set forth, celebrated, and extolled, by the Editor of King Lear* (London, 1772).
1 Saul

Jennens owned two manuscript scores of Saul. The first, which was bound in red morocco, is now lost. The second survives: it was copied by S2, as was the set of part-books that accompanies it, and a second set of part-books entitled “Songs in Saul”. Jennens also owned a few copies of individual numbers, and two printed editions of Saul.

The contents of the surviving Aylesford score and part-books have proved to be misleading to scholars wishing to establish when they were copied: they not only contain music discarded by Handel during the pre-performance revisions, but also omit music added at the same stage, for which the most obvious explanation is that they were copied at an extremely early stage in the work’s history. This was the conclusion drawn both by Anthony Hicks in his important study of these manuscripts and by the present author in a previous study of this oratorio. Fortunately, a re-dating of the Aylesford score and part-books does not undermine either study: every other aspect of Hicks’s article still stands, including his masterful detective-work regarding the pre-performance revisions of a work whose autograph score now lacks the end of Part I and the beginning of Part II; and most of my dissertation still stands.

Although the contents of the Aylesford score and part-books suggest that they were copied in 1738, the paper characteristics – as identified by Donald Burrows – suggest a later dating: around the mid 1740s. If this is indeed true, why do the Aylesford score and part-
books contain such an early version of the oratorio? and from what were they copied? Unfortunately, the apparent contradiction between the manuscripts’ contents and physical characteristics cannot be resolved simply by extending the dates of the watermarks and rastra measurements in question back to 1738: a closer examination of the contents of the manuscripts reveals that – tempting as the previous conclusion may be – the manuscripts cannot have been copied before Handel had filled in Part II, before the performing score had been copied, or before Handel had completed the pre-performance revisions.

Hicks’s theory that the manuscripts were copied at an extremely early stage is based on one reading that appears to show S2 copying the harpsichord, soprano I, and alto part-books from the autograph score before Handel had filled in Part II,\(^\text{13}\) one reading that appears to show S2 copying the tenor I part-book from the autograph score before Handel had finished composing,\(^\text{14}\) and the fact that the Aylesford score and part-books contain numbers that were deleted as part of Handel’s pre-performance revisions and that were never present in the performing score.\(^\text{15}\)

However, certain aspects of the Aylesford manuscripts make such a dating impossible. If the harpsichord, soprano I, and alto part-books were copied before Handel had filled in Part II (which he had done by 28 August 1738, according to his annotation on f. 92r of the autograph score), how could they include the chorus ‘Hallelujah’ as part of the Epinicion if it had not been moved there (at Jennens’s insistence) until after 18 September?\(^\text{16}\) And how could they and the other part-books, including the tenor I part-book, contain the full setting of the Elegy, which – as we know from f. 115r of the autograph score – was not finished until 27 September?

\(^\text{13}\) Hicks, ‘Handel, Jennens and Saul’, pp. 208-10. The extra bars in the duet ‘O Fairest of ten thousand fair’ (HG143) that are present in the harpsichord, soprano I, and alto part-books are described later in the chapter, where I consider how they can be explained if the part-books were indeed copied in the mid 1740s.

\(^\text{14}\) Hicks, ‘Handel, Jennens and Saul’, fn. 23. The third vocal note of the accompanied recitative ‘O let it not in Gath be heard’ (HG215) in the tenor I part-book is also described and considered later in the chapter.

\(^\text{15}\) Hicks states that the Aylesford score and part-books were “undoubtedly copied directly from the autograph before Handel had completed his pre-performance revisions, since they preserve several numbers or versions of numbers which found no place in the version of the first performance. In addition a second set of partbooks (and probably a corresponding full score, now lost) was prepared for Jennens at a slightly later stage, to cover items already discarded when the main material was copied, or items composed subsequently” (‘Handel, Jennens and Saul’ p. 207). Numbers that are present in the Aylesford score and part-books, and that were deleted before the performing score was copied include parts of the Epinicion, the air ‘Wise, valiant, good’, and the air ‘Love from such a Parent sprung’.

\(^\text{16}\) On 18 September, Jennens visited Handel and saw the autograph score of Saul for what appears to have been the first time. The next day, he wrote a letter to Lord Guernsey that included a description of what he viewed as Handel’s third foolish decision – or “maggot” – “in composing Saul: – ‘His third maggot is a Hallelujah which he has trump’d up at the end of his oratorio since I went into the Country, because he thought the conclusion of the oratorio not Grand enough; tho’ if that were the case ’twas his own fault, for the words would have bore as Grand Musick as he could have set ’em to: but this Hallelujah, Grand as it is, comes in very nonsensically, having no manner of relation to what goes before. And this is the more extraordinary, because he refus’d to set a Hallelujah at the end of the first Chorus in the Oratorio, where I had placed one & where it was to be introduced with the utmost propriety, upon a pretence that it would make the entertainment too long” (Otto Erich Deutsch, Handel: A Documentary Biography (New York, 1955), pp. 465-6). It is clear from the gatherings of the autograph score that until Jennens insisted that the ‘Hallelujah’ be placed at the end of the Epinicion, it had never been present there: it is not possible that Handel originally composed it to follow the Epinicion and then moved it to the end of the oratorio.
Further evidence that the part-books cannot have been copied at such an early stage can be found in the air ‘While yet thy Tide of Blood runs high’. The Aylesford score and part-books contain a version of the air that – as is described by Hicks\(^ {17} \) – Jennens created by combining (1) music from Handel’s unorchestrated sketch of the air (f. 36r of the autograph score), (2) music from the full version of the air (f. 37 of the autograph score), and (3) Handel’s revised, extended ending to the full version of the air (f. 37v of the autograph score). Hicks notes that the extended ending of the air (3) was not copied as an integral part of the performing score,\(^ {18} \) which surely suggests that Handel wrote it after the performing score had been copied. If this is the case, how could S2 have included Jennens’s version of the air in the Aylesford score and part-books if he began copying them while Handel was still composing the oratorio? Even if the absence of the extended ending in the performing score is due to an error on Smith’s part, it is impossible that Jennens could have created this version of the air before Handel had finished filling in the oratorio, not only because his version includes music that Handel had filled in, but also because Jennens did not see the autograph score until after Handel had filled it in.\(^ {19} \)

The final reason that S2 cannot have copied the Aylesford sources at such an early stage is that he included as an integral part of them a version of the Amalekite’s recitative that had to be pasted into the performing score.\(^ {20} \) In the autograph score, the original version of the recitative is so heavily obscured that Smith would never have copied it if the later version had been present: if Smith had copied the performing score after S2 copied the Aylesford sources, he would have included the later version of the recitative as an integral part of it.

If the Aylesford score and part-books cannot have been copied at an early stage in the genesis of \textit{Saul}, why do they contain so many elements of the oratorio that were discarded during the pre-performance revisions? A thorough examination of these manuscripts combined with my work on the other oratorios in Jennens’s collection reveals an answer to this question: I propose that the Aylesford score and part-books were copied in the mid 1740s from Jennens’s lost red-morocco score of \textit{Saul}, which had been annotated by its owner to

---

\(^{17}\) Hicks, ‘Handel, Jennens and \textit{Saul}’, pp. 210-11.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., fn. 24. He writes, “Since this amendment was made before the first performance and appears to be Handel’s final thought for the air, it is not immediately clear why it was not adopted in the [performing] score […]. The revised close may be connected with Handel’s instructions for transposing the air to F\# minor, possibly for counter-tenor, a version perhaps sung in the early performances but later abandoned. There are signs in the [performing] score that at some time the air was pasted over with an alternative version, not now extant.”

\(^{19}\) It appears that Jennens first saw the autograph score on 18 September (see fn. 16); according to Jennens’s annotation in the Aylesford score (which he presumably copied from one of the many pages of the autograph score that are now lost), Handel had completed Part I on 1 August. For more detail on Jennens’s annotation, see Hicks, ‘Handel, Jennens and \textit{Saul}’, p. 206.

\(^{20}\) The words of bb. 17-21 of the recitative ‘Whence comest thou?’ (HG204/6/3 - 205/2/1) originally read as follows: “I knew he could not live, therefore obey’d and slew him. As a Proof of what I say, his Crown and Bracelet I have brought my Lord”. Smith copied this version into the performing score (f. 96v); in f. 97r of the autograph score, the text and music were then altered to that given in HG and the wordbook (“I knew he could not live, and therefore slew him; took from his Head the Crown, and from his Arms the Bracelets, and have brought them to my Lord”); this was then added to the performing score on a slip of paper.
produce his preferred version of the oratorio. This proposal may appear fanciful, but it is borne out not only by the variants (discussed below) but also by other oratorios in Jennens’s collection (see the chapters on *L’Allegro*, *Samson*, *Joseph*, and *Belshazzar*).

That certain elements of the Aylesford score and part-books of *Saul* reflect Jennens’s preferences will come as no surprise to anyone who has read Hicks’s article. Jennens’s copies adopt the amendments that he added to the autograph score, including: his suggestion for the air ‘While yet thy Tide of Blood runs high’; the setting of the phrase ‘and dost thou ask my Counsel’ in the recitative ‘Hath God forsaken thee?’; David’s exclamation in the opening bars of the air ‘Impious Wretch’ and the phrase that precedes it (“Of the Race of Amalek”); and alterations to the verbal text (for example “dissolve” to “divide” and “Youth” to “Son” in the air ‘In sweetest Harmony’).\(^1\) The implications of what appear to be Jennens’s preferences in the rest of the oratorio are more intriguing; they are discussed later in the chapter, after the evidence of the variants has been presented.

**Filiation**

A study of the variants between the autograph score, the performing score, the Aylesford score, and the Aylesford part-books reveals the relationship between these sources to be anything but straightforward. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that part of the autograph score is missing, and by the likelihood that there exists another score in the stemma: the lost red-morocco score, annotated by Jennens. Proof of the latter is not to be found in the individual variants: there is little opportunity for part-books that are certainly no more than siblings (e.g. soprano I and cello part-books) to share readings that – if absent from the autograph, performing, or Aylesford scores – could prove the existence of a lost intermediate score in the stemma.\(^2\) However, some variants in the part-books – two of notation,\(^3\) and one of spelling\(^4\) – offer hints that they were copied from a score that is no

---

\(^1\) These amendments are all explained and discussed by Hicks (*Handel, Jennens and Saul*, pp. 210-16).

\(^2\) There is much more opportunity in other oratorios: see the chapter on *Belshazzar*, in which it is possible to find such variants (a) because no harpsichord part-book was copied, and (b) because the cello part-book for that oratorio contains *semplice* recitatives, with the result that there are far more occasions on which vocal part-books contain the same line as the cello part-book. In *Saul*, however, the soprano I part-book was copied partly from the harpsichord part-book; and since it is impossible to determine that this was not also the case for the cello part-book, no variant occurring only in those part-books can be considered. One might expect evidence to exist in the form of variants that (a) could feasibly be the result of copying errors, (b) are on the one hand present in the Aylesford score and the relevant part-book(s), and on the other hand absent from the autograph and performing scores, and (c) cannot have occurred because the part-books in question were copied from the Aylesford score. That such variants do not occur does not mean that there is no intermediate score in the stemma: the copyist of the red-morocco score could have made very few mistakes; and any that may have been present could easily have been corrected by Jennens as he annotated it. (As will become apparent, it is likely that Jennens made his changes while studying the autograph score. A very similar situation will be described in the chapter on *L’Allegro*.)

\(^3\) First, in b. 19 of the accompanied recitative ‘Why hast thou forc’d me from the Realms of Peace’ (HG198/2/3), the basso continuo note that is written as a semibreve in the autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores is written as tied minimis in the harpsichord and cello part-books even though neither part-book has a change of line or page. (The bass I part-book, which – as is explained below – is likely to have been copied from the harpsichord part-book at this point, contains a
longer extant. Furthermore, one of Hicks’s discoveries supports the presence of an annotated red-morocco score in the stemma. Hicks uses Jennens’s manuscript copies to explain that the air ‘Author of Peace’ (now sung by Merab towards the end of Part II (HG166)) not only was conceived by Jennens to be an air for Jonathan that was to follow his recitative ‘My Father comes’ (HG131), but was also originally set to quite different music – music that was recycled by Handel to create the air ‘From this unhappy Day’ (HG217), which appears in the final version of the Elegy. The original setting – of which Hicks prints the vocal line – survives in Jennens’s ‘Songs in Saul’ part-books. As Hicks states, the main Aylesford material contains Handel’s second setting of the air, after Jonathan’s recitative ‘My Father comes’. Although the air is written in C3 clef in the Aylesford score, it is clearly intended to be sung by Jonathan: the air follows Jonathan’s recitative without a change of character; the fifth line of the air is “With thy dear influence my Tongue be fill’d”, which makes sense only if Jonathan sings it, and the air appears in the tenor I part-book, which contains Jonathan’s part. Although Hicks notes that Handel’s second setting of the air was written for David and then transferred to Merab, he does not mention the implication of this: that at no point in the composition history of Saul did Jonathan sing the second setting of ‘Author of Peace’; although he originally sang the air, he sang Handel’s first setting of it. The arrangement found in the Aylesford sources – Jonathan’s singing the second setting after his recitative – never existed in performance. Since it is improbable that S2 would have invented this arrangement himself, it is extremely likely that Jennens intervened, presumably in an annotated intermediate score: the arrangement found in the Aylesford sources must represent the librettist’s ideal version of the scene, with the text as he first gave it to Handel. (Jennens could not have had Jonathan sing the original setting, since this was now part of the Elegy.)

25 Hicks, ‘Handel, Jennens and Saul’, pp. 221-5.

26 When Handel set the air for David, he changed the word: “With thy dear Influence his Tongue be fill’d”. Hicks explains Handel’s change: “This makes sense as an air for David at the point where it appears in the main Aylesford material, after the recitative ‘My Father comes’. Jonathan has promised to try to intercede with the angry Saul on David’s behalf, and in the air David prays that God, the ‘Author of Peace’, will grant Jonathan the eloquence to fulfill his promise. This arrangement, however, would give David two airs in succession – he has just sung ‘Such haughty Beauties’ – and that cannot have been Jennens’s original plan. It would be more natural to have Jonathan’s recitative followed by an air for Jonathan. There is evidence that this was indeed Jennens’s first intention, which he attempted to reinstate. In the autograph Jennens has amended the fifth line of the air to read ‘With thy dear influence my Tongue be fill’d’, so that the prayer becomes Jonathan’s own” (ibid., p. 222).
If one accepts that the Aylesford score and part-books were copied mostly from the red-morocco score, a question then arises: from what score was the red-morocco score copied? In order to answer this question, it is necessary to examine more closely the variant readings – large and small – in the performing score, the Aylesford score, and the part-books. A considerable number of the variants show that the Aylesford score and the part-books are generally (but not entirely) unrelated to the performing score.\textsuperscript{27} For part of the oratorio the evidence is very simple: some of the numbers that appear in the Aylesford score and part-books cannot have been copied from the performing score for the simple reason that the numbers (or versions of the numbers) in question were never present there. These include the air ‘Wise, valiant, good’ (HG276), the recitative ‘This but the smallest part of Harmony’ (HG271), the accompanied recitative ‘By thee’, and the B♭ version of the air ‘O Lord, whose Mercies numberless’ (HG91).\textsuperscript{28} Smaller variants that support this filiation include eight of pitch (exx. 1-8),\textsuperscript{29} three of rhythm (exx. 9-11), one involving pitch and rhythm (ex. 12), one involving the presence or absence of a note (ex. 13), one copying error (ex. 14), two variants of note-length (exx. 15-16), two involving accidentals (exx. 17-18), one involving underlay (ex. 19), one involving underlay and beaming (ex. 20), one involving an accent (ex. 21), differences regarding which melodic line is given when there is an alternative,\textsuperscript{30} and a tempo marking.\textsuperscript{31} Although these variants demonstrate that the Aylesford score and part-books were not copied from the performing score for much of the oratorio, they cannot on their own prove that the red-morocco score was an intermediate source. Indeed, although it is impossible to determine the original contents of the red-morocco score, it is certain that it could not have contained all the numbers that Jennens wanted in the order in which he wanted them: even if S2 used the red-morocco score as his primary source, on some occasions he must have used other sources.

\textsuperscript{27} If one does not accept the presence of the red-morocco score in the stemma, these variants are still useful: at the very least, they indicate that, for much of the oratorio, the Aylesford score and part-books were not copied from the performing score.
\textsuperscript{28} Following Handel’s instruction in the autograph score, Smith transposed this air to F major when he copied the performing score. The version given in the Aylesford score and part-books must derive from the autograph score (and not be a transposition from the performing score) as it does not contain other differences including the octave displacements made by Smith during transposition.
\textsuperscript{29} Music examples are given in Appendix 1.
\textsuperscript{30} After composing the air ‘O King’, Handel amended its vocal line to suit a different range of singer; where the copyist was faced with a choice of line, the alto and harpsichord part-books often contain a line that is not present in the performing score.
\textsuperscript{31} The B section of the air ‘Birth and Fortune’ (HG69/2/1) is marked Larghetto in the autograph and Aylesford scores, and in the violin I, violin II, oboe II, and ’cello part-books; the marking is missing in the performing score. (That the marking is also missing in the harpsichord, viola, bassoon, and tenor I part-books is not significant.)
\textsuperscript{32} That this must have been the case has already been demonstrated: it would not have originally contained the second setting of ‘Author of Peace’, for Jonathan, with the original words, and following his recitative, as this arrangement never existed in any other score.
One of the many interesting features of the Aylesford score and part-books of *Saul* is that eight numbers in the Aylesford score are derived from the performing score. This fact alone is noteworthy because it renders impossible previous assumptions that the contents of the Aylesford score and part-books are as they are because they were copied extremely early in the work’s composition history: if the Aylesford score contains readings that must originate in the performing score, it cannot have been copied before the performing score was copied. Surprisingly, however, when he copied the music for the same eight numbers into the part-books, S2 must have used not the performing score but either the red-morocco score or the autograph score. Music examples 22-42 provide evidence for these conclusions; each example contains evidence for the derivation both of the score and of the part-book(s). In the order in which they appear in the oratorio, the eight numbers and the relevant variants that they contain are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>HG</th>
<th>Variants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>the Carillon Symphony</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>• two variants of pitch (exx. 22-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the absence of a note (ex. 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• a tempo marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>the chorus ‘Welcome, welcome, mighty King!’</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>• dynamic markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>the chorus ‘Is there a Man?’</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>• one variant that is related to an error in the autograph score (ex. 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• one variant of rhythm (ex. 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• two variants of note-length (exx. 27-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>the Wedding Symphony</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>• one variant of pitch (ex. 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• one variant that is related to the extension of a melodic line (ex. 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• one variant involving a trill (ex. 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>the air ‘No; let the Guilty tremble’</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>• two variants of note-length (exx. 32-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>the Symphony of the New Moon</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>• two variants involving trills (exx. 34-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• one variant involving accents (ex. 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>the recitative ‘Where is the Son of Jesse?’</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>• one variant of rhythm (ex. 37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• two variants of pitch (exx. 38-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>the chorus ‘O fatal Consequence’</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>• three variants of pitch (exx. 40-42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• a tempo marking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

33 In the absence of definitive variants, it is impossible to determine whether S2 used the performing score in more than these eight numbers.
34 To distinguish between different movements entitled “Sinfonia” in the musical sources, I adopt the names by which they are commonly known: Carillon Symphony (HG76), Wedding Symphony (HG151), the Symphony of the New Moon (HG168), and the Battle Symphony (HG200). The same goes for the Dead March, which is so commonly referred to by that name that it would be confusing to refer to it by any other.
35 In the autograph score, the symphony is marked *Andante Allegro*, which appears in the violin I and carillon part-book; the performing and Aylesford scores both omit the marking. (That the marking is not present in the harpsichord and violin II part-books is not significant.)
36 The autograph score contains multiple dynamic markings that are present in the relevant part-books but not in the performing or Aylesford scores: *pianissimo* in b. 9 (HG78/2/5), b. 17 (HG79/1/3), b. 25 (HG79/3/1); *forte* in b. 13 (HG78/3/4), b. 21 (HG79/2/3), and b. 29 (HG79/3/5); and *piano* in b. 33 (HG80/1/4).
37 The chorus ‘O fatal Consequence’ (HG178) is marked *A tempo giusto* in the autograph score, and in every part-book other than the alto part-book; this marking is not present in the performing and Aylesford scores.
Why, when copying the Aylesford score, did S2 copy these numbers from the performing score? and why did he not use the performing score when copying the part-books? It is extremely unlikely that S2’s reason for using the performing score was that none of these numbers was present in the red-morocco score: although the copyist of the red-morocco score could feasibly have omitted one or two numbers, he certainly could not have omitted all of them, particularly as this would involve omitting a large segment of Part II. Indeed, one reading in the air ‘No; let the Guilty tremble’ indicates that S2’s source for the part-books at this point was the red-morocco score, and therefore that Jennens had not intended him to use anything but that score at this point. Furthermore, even when he was copying the Aylesford score from the performing score, the latter cannot have been the only source on his desk: the Aylesford score contains the name “Doeg” in the recitative that precedes the air ‘No; let the Guilty tremble’ (‘Whom dost thou seek?’ (HG161)), which was never present in the performing score; and it contains what are probably Jennens’s scene numberings. A more likely explanation for why S2 used the performing score to copy at least three of the numbers in question is that Jennens, after comparing the red-morocco score with the autograph score, instructed S2 to use another score because the copyist of the red-morocco score had failed to correctly decipher some aspect of the autograph score. The first number for which this is feasible is the chorus ‘Welcome, welcome, mighty King!’ in which the copyist of the red-morocco score could easily have copied Handel’s original carillon line (written in ink, in the score) rather than following his pencil cue to an expanded carillon part on a separate piece of paper (now lost); as Smith copied Handel’s second carillon line as an integral part of the performing score, it would have been much easier for S2 to use the performing score as his source for this number. The second number for which this is feasible is the recitative ‘Where is the Son of Jesse?’: the autograph score is a mess here because Handel altered the words and the music after he had composed it. The third number is the chorus ‘O fatal Consequence’, in which the autograph score is potentially difficult to decipher: Handel decided to repeat the

---

38 It is possible that a copyist other than Smith would not be used to interpreting such a complicated document as the autograph score of Saul: it is easy to imagine that an insertion such as the Wedding Symphony could be overlooked.

39 The harpsichord and soprano I part-books contain the version of the final three lines that is found in the wordbook (“Undaunted still, my Soul, remain / For greater is Jehovah’s Might, / And will their lawless Force restrain”), whereas the autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores contain another version (“Undaunted still remains my Soul, / For greater is Jehovah’s Might / And will their lawless Force control”). The most likely explanation is that the lines in the wordbook were Jennens’s preferred version, which he entered into the red-morocco score; presumably Jennens expected S2 to copy the Aylesford score from the red-morocco score here.

40 The name also appears in the harpsichord, soprano I, and bass II part-books at the same point. It is extremely likely that Jennens, who printed Doeg’s name in the wordbook, also added the name to the red-morocco score. For more on Doeg, see Natassa Varka, ‘Departed Ghosts in Living Forms appear’: Abiathar, Doeg, and Jennens’s conception of Saul’, EM, 45 (2017), pp. 629-39.

41 The autograph and performing scores both contain errors in their scene numberings in Part II: there is no scene numbered 8 in the autograph score, and no scene numbered 6 in the performing score. In the Aylesford score and part-books, however, the scenes are numbered continuously. As these manuscripts lack the recitative ‘Mean as he was’ and the air ‘Author of Peace’ for Merab, these numberings are not identical to those found in the wordbook; it is therefore likely that Jennens entered his own scene numberings into the red-morocco score.
first section of the chorus; he wanted the violins and viola to play more the second time than they had the first, but did not want to write the music out twice; instead, he wrote their extra music on an empty stave at the bottom of the page. This chorus is the final number of Part II.

(That S2 copied much of the preceding music from the performing score is discussed later in the chapter.) A fourth number for which Jennens could have instructed S2 to copy from the performing score is the chorus ‘Is there a Man’: Jennens could easily have noticed Handel’s omission of the first half of b. 11 in the viola line (ex. 25), which was presumably also absent from the red-morocco score; if this is the case, the reading found in the viola part-book could well be the invention of S2. The most likely reason that S2 never used the performing score for his source when he copied the part-books is simply that it was not available to him: when a number in the red-morocco was absent or deficient, his only alternative source was the autograph score. When he was copying the Aylesford score, however, he had three possible sources: the annotated red-morocco score, the autograph score, and the performing score.42

The variants may offer a clue as to why the performing score was not available to S2 when he copied the part-books: they reveal that none of the part-books was copied from the Aylesford score. Since the easiest approach for S2 to have taken would have been to copy the Aylesford score first, and then to copy the part-books from it (because the Aylesford score was a clean copy of exactly what Jennens wanted), the most likely reason that he did not take this approach is that he copied the part-books first, before the performing score was available. Since the part-books were not copied from the performing or Aylesford scores, there are two possible sources for them: the red-morocco score and the autograph score. In the absence of the former and part of the latter, it is difficult to say which, but the obvious approach would be for S2 to copy from the annotated red-morocco score where possible, and from the autograph score where not, for example in numbers not present in the red-morocco score. Such numbers probably included the Epinicion: it is likely that the red-morocco score contained the second version of the Epinicion, but that Jennens requested the earlier version, which was present only in the autograph score.43 In order to prevent repetition in listing the

---

42 Jennens probably intended S2 to use the annotated red-morocco score when possible, the autograph score for numbers that were never present in the red-morocco and performing scores, and the performing score when the autograph was unclear and the red-morocco score was deficient. As will become clear in later chapters, S2 had a tendency to change sources frequently; it appears that, when copying the Aylesford score of Saul, he did not quite follow Jennens’s instructions (see fn. 39).

43 Verse II of the Epinicion as Jennens supplied it to Handel began with the words ‘An Infant rais’d by thy Command’; Handel first set this text as a chorus, the music of which was repeated for verse IV of the Epinicion, ‘The Youth inspir’d by thee, O Lord’. Hicks describes the composition and revision history of the Epinicion (Handel, Jennens and Saul, pp. 216-21), noting that the words of verse IV fit the music of the chorus much better than those to which it was first composed (‘An Infant rais’d’). He concluded that Handel and Jennens sought to resolve this problem of text-setting independently: Jennens’s solution was to rewrite the words of verse II (so that it began with the words ‘When thou to quell the Rebel Host’); Handel’s solution was to reset verse II as an air (‘An Infant rais’d’, HG34). Although the Epinicion was first performed in Handel’s second version (ending with the ‘Hallelujah’), the first workbook contains Jennens’s text for verse IV (‘When thou to quell’).

The Aylesford score and part-books contain Handel’s first setting of the Epinicion, in which verse II is a chorus with the words ‘An Infant rais’d’, but with the ‘Hallelujah’ present; Jennens added his revised text (‘When thou to quell’) to the Aylesford score, but not to the part-books. This can only have come about if the red-morocco score contained the second
variants that reveal that the part-books were not copied from the Aylesford score, those shared by sibling part-books are given first, before each part-book is considered individually. Evidence from sibling part-books that they were not copied from the Aylesford score includes six variants of pitch (exx. 43-8), four of rhythm (exx. 49-52), one involving the presence or absence of a note (ex. 53), two of note-length (exx. 54-5), the inclusion of an unnecessary time signature (ex. 56), the interpretation of a bar not given by Handel (ex. 57), the absence of a bar in the Aylesford score and its presence in the part-books,\textsuperscript{44} three markings,\textsuperscript{45} and one variant of notation.\textsuperscript{46}

**Instrumental part-books**

**Violin I part-book (v. 276)**

A number of variants relating to the violin I part-book have already been given: nine that prove that it was not copied from the performing score (exx. 1, 5, 17, 21, 21-3, 26, 30, and 31); nine that prove that it was not copied from the Aylesford score (exx. 22-3, 26, 30-31, 50, 54, 56, and 57); and three that appear to show that it was copied directly from the autograph score in numbers that were not present in the red-morocco score (exx. 54, 56, and 57). Further evidence that it was not copied from the Aylesford score include five variants of pitch (exx. 58-62), one relating to Handel’s intentions (ex. 63), two involving accidentals (exx. 64-5), four involving trills (exx. 66-9), one involving accents (ex. 70), and one involving slurs (ex. 71).

---

\textsuperscript{44} The Aylesford score omits b. 41 of the air ‘In sweetest Harmony’ (HG225/1/3); the bar is present in the autograph and performing scores, and in the harpsichord, soprano I, violin I, violin II, viola, ’cello, and bassoon part-books.

\textsuperscript{45} The Aylesford score omits three markings that are present elsewhere, including in the part-books: it omits the *Adagio* at b. 57 of the air ‘Fly, fly’ (HG283/4/1), which is present in the autograph score and in the harpsichord, alto, and viola part-books; it omits the *Allegro* from the chorus ‘Preserve him’, which is present in the performing score and in all the part-books (the chorus is now missing from the autograph score); and it omits the *Grave* in the Dead March, which is present in the autograph score and in the oboe I, oboe II, violin I, violin II, ’cello, and harpsichord part-books, and missing from the performing score and from the viola and bassoon part-books.

\textsuperscript{46} In b. 11 of the recitative ‘Tis said, here lives a Woman’ (HG194/1/3), the violin I, violin II, and viola notes are written as tied minims in the autograph score; although the Aylesford score contains semibreves at this point, S2 wrote tied minims in the violin II and viola part-books, despite the fact that neither part-book has a change of line or page in this bar. (It is probably just a coincidence that the performing score has a change of page at this point.)
Violin II part-book (v. 277)

It has already been proved that S2 did not copy the violin II part-book from the performing score (see exx. 1, 3-5, 15, 22, and 23). Nine variants that have already been given (exx. 22-3, 54-8, 65, and 69) prove that he cannot have copied it from the Aylesford score either; further evidence of this includes twelve variants of pitch (exxx. 72-83), one of note-length (ex. 84), the omission of the violin II line in the Aylesford score and its presence in the part-book (ex. 85), and a trill (ex. 86). The omission of a tie that appears to suggest that the violin II part-book was on one occasion copied from the Aylesford score need not be taken too seriously: the more likely explanation is that the tie was not present in the red-morocco score (ex. 87). Probably an ambiguity in the red-morocco score caused another variant that is shared by the violin II part-book and the Aylesford score (ex. 50): in light of another variant in the same number (ex. 76), it is more likely that the red-morocco score was slightly unclear here than that S2 copied this number from the Aylesford score. Three variants that have already been cited (exx. 54, 56, and 57) suggest that S2 copied the violin II part-book directly from the autograph score in numbers that were not present in the red-morocco score.

In the absence of the red-morocco score and part of the autograph score, it is impossible to determine whether S2 copied the violin II part-book from the violin I part-book when the violins play in unison.

Oboe/flute I part-book (v. 280)

In addition to the four variants already given (exx. 30-31, 57, and 68), there are three variants of pitch (exx. 88-90), one of note-length (ex. 91), one involving a trill (ex. 92), one involving a tie (ex. 93), and one relating to when the oboes should play (ex. 94) that indicate that the oboe/flute I part-book (referred to here as the “oboe I part-book”) was not copied from the Aylesford score. Evidence that it was not copied from the performing score has already been given (exx. 2, 11, 30, and 31).

Handel’s slightly careless formation of a note-head in b. 15 of the Wedding Symphony could have caused S2’s mistake in the oboe I part-book (ex. 95): evidence, perhaps, that S2 was copying directly from the autograph score at this point. (For the Aylesford score, however, he used the performing score: the note is correct in both.) Three variants that have already been cited (exx. 57, 89, and 91) suggest that the Wedding Symphony was not the only number for which S2 used the autograph score as a direct source for the oboe I part-book.
Oboe/flute II part-book (v. 281)

The oboe/flute II part-book (referred to here as the “oboe II part-book”) cannot have been copied from the performing score (see exx. 8, 34, and 40); that it was not copied from the Aylesford score is proved by nine variants that have already been cited (exx. 34, 40, 57, 72, 82, 89, 91-2, and 94), in addition to five variants of pitch (exx. 96-100). Again, it may have been copied directly from the autograph score in the Epinicion (see exx. 57 and 89), and in the air ‘While yet thy Tide of Blood runs high’ (see ex. 91).

In the absence of the red-morocco score, it is impossible to determine whether the oboe II part-book was copied from the violin II part-book when oboe II plays in unison with violin II. Unfortunately the only two variants that might have clarified the matter not only contradict each other, but occur within two bars of each other (exx. 101-2); the likeliest explanation for these two variants is that the violin II and oboe II part-books were both copied from the red-morocco score here. It seems unlikely that S2 copied the oboe II part-book from the oboe I part-book when the oboes play in unison, as the oboe II part-book does not contain an error of pitch present in the oboe I part-book (ex. 103); however, it is possible that S2 used the oboe I part-book as an aid in deciding how much the oboes should play when they are tutti instruments (ex. 104).

Viola part-book (v. 278)

The viola part-book was not copied from the performing score (see exx. 14, 18, 25, 27-8, 36, 55, and 56); nor was it copied from the Aylesford score: in addition to the variants already given (exx 25, 27-8, 36, 50, 53, 55-6, and 57), it does not share with the Aylesford score six variants of pitch (exx. 105-10), one of pitch and rhythm (ex. 111), two variants relating to how much it plays (exx. 112-13), one relating to clefs,47 one involving a trill (ex. 114), and one involving an unnecessary accidental (ex. 115). There is only one viola variant that appears to contradict the others (ex. 116); the most likely explanation for it is either that the scribe of the red-morocco score added a tie, which S2 omitted when he copied the Aylesford score but included when he copied the viola part-book, or that the red-morocco

---

47 In the air ‘Ye Men of Judah’ (HG232), Handel marked the second instrumental stave as “V 3 / e / Viol”; he began writing the music of that line in C3 clef, but swapped between C3 clef and G2 clef as he wrote. When Smith copied the performing score, he wrote everything he found on that line in C3, as did S2 when he copied the Aylesford score. However, in the viola part-book, S2 wrote the viola part on a verso, and the violin III part on the facing recto; every time that Handel wrote the line in G2 clef, S2 wrote rests in the viola part, and wrote the music in the violin III part. (The bars that Handel wrote in G2 clef are bb. 44-60, 72-77; in b. 77 he wrote a G2 clef and then “unis.”, leaving the rest blank. While all this music appears in the violin III part, the viola part has rests in bb. 44-60 and 72-100.) It is clear that S2 did not copy the viola part-book from the Aylesford score: his source could have been either the autograph score or the red-morocco score; in the case of the latter, its notation would have had to be the same as in the autograph score.
score did not have a tie, but that S2 added one when he copied the viola part-book. (Smith did precisely this in the performing score.) Three of the variants already given suggest that S2 used the autograph score in certain numbers (exx. 56-7 and 115).

'Cello/double bass part-book (v. 279)

In addition to thirteen variants already cited (exx. 33, 43-52, and 56), a variant of pitch (ex. 117) proves that the 'cello/double bass part-book (referred to here as the “'cello part-book”) was not copied from the Aylesford score. Six variants that have already been cited (exx. 10, 12-13, 33, 51, and 56) prove that it was not copied from the performing score either. Evidence that it was copied directly from the autograph score in the Epinicion may be found in a variant of pitch (ex. 118), and in another variant already given (ex. 57); evidence of the same in the air ‘Fly, malicious Spirit, fly’ has already been cited (ex. 56). Finally, five variants of pitch suggest that the 'cello part-book was not copied from the harpsichord part-book (exx. 119-23).

Bassoon I and II part-book (v. 282)

A number of variants related to the bassoon I and II part-book (referred to here as the “bassoon part-book”) have already been mentioned: four that prove that it was not copied from the performing score (exx. 10, 12-13, and 33); one that proves that it was not copied from the harpsichord part-book (ex. 120); and eleven that prove that it was not copied from the Aylesford score (exx. 33, 43-5, 47-8, 50, 52, 57, and 117). To these may be added two further variants: one of pitch (ex. 124) and one of note-length (ex. 125). Again, it may have been copied directly from the autograph score in the Epinicion (see ex. 57).

The evidence regarding whether the bassoon part-book was copied from the 'cello part-book when possible is conflicting. The two part-books share a change of clef in the fourth part of the Overture (ex. 126); two variants – one involving a tempo marking,48 and one relating to what should be played (ex. 127) – suggest that by the final chorus S2 cannot have been using the 'cello part-book as a source for the bassoon part-book; but a third variant in the final chorus suggests that he did (ex. 128). A possible explanation for the last three variants is that S2 copied the part-books directly from the autograph score at the end of the oratorio; this possibility is discussed later in the chapter. Perhaps S2 began copying the bassoon part-book

---

48 The bassoon part-book contains the Allegro at b. 93 (HG257/1/1) that the 'cello part-book omits. (The marking is present in the autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores, as well as in every other part-book except the alto and 'cello part-books.)
from the ’cello part-book, but changed to another source (presumably the red-morocco score when possible, and if not, the autograph score) when it became apparent that the bassoon occasionally had its own line.

Trumpet I part-book (v. 247)

One trumpet I variant has already been cited: a variant involving a trill (ex. 35), which indicates that the trumpet I part-book was not copied from the performing or Aylesford scores. Four more variants confirm this. A variant of pitch in the chorus ‘How excellent’ proves that S2 was not copying from the Aylesford score (ex. 129); since the performing score never contained the necessary material for the version of the Epinicion that Jennens wanted, it is likely that S2’s source here was the autograph score. A variant of pitch and rhythm in the chorus ‘Hallelujah’ demonstrates that S2 was still not using the performing or Aylesford scores by that point; it is likely that the reading found in the trumpet part-books is derived from a missing page of the autograph score (ex. 130). Finally, a variant of pitch and rhythm (ex. 131) proves that S2 did not copy the final chorus of the oratorio from the performing or Aylesford scores; that the performing score was not his source is further confirmed by a variant of rhythm (ex. 132).

Trumpet II part-book (v. 248)

Two variants that show that the trumpet II part-book is not derived from the performing score have already been given (exx. 7 and 130). Four more confirm that S2 copied the trumpet II part-book from a source other than the performing or Aylesford scores. Three are straightforward (exx. 133-5); the fourth is a variant of pitch that suggests that S2 copied the trumpet II part-book directly from the autograph score in the Epinicion (ex. 136).

Timpani part-book (v. 353)

One variant of pitch (ex. 137), two of rhythm (exx. 138-9), and one involving a trill (ex. 140) prove that S2’s source for the timpani part-book was neither the performing score nor the Aylesford score.
Saul

Carillon part-book (v. 249)

S2 did not copy the carillon part-book from either the Aylesford score or the performing score: it lacks an error of pitch present in the Aylesford score (ex. 141), and another error of pitch present in both scores (ex. 142); and it contains two notes that are missing from one or both of those scores (exx. 143 and 24).

Most of the carillon part-book is written in C, rather than in G as in all the other sources. Perhaps Jennens requested S2 to transpose the carillon part so that it could be played on a harpsichord at Gopsall. The exception to this is the recitative ‘Already see’ (HG77), which is closely related to that written in F in the autograph score (f. 40r), except that S2 copied the lower line an octave lower, writing it in F4 clef. A variant relating to a figuring suggests, however, that S2’s source for this recitative may have been Jennens’s copy of the recitative found in the manuscript GB-Lbl: RM 18. c. 11 (ex. 144); this manuscript is discussed below. If it is indeed true that the red-morocco score did not contain the carillon part that Handel intended (see p. 14), we can probably assume that S2 copied the carillon part-book using only two sources: the autograph score and GB-Lbl: RM 18. c. 11.

Harpsichord part-book (v. 275)

Evidence that S2 did not copy the harpsichord part-book from the Aylesford score includes six variants of pitch (exx. 145-50), one of rhythm (ex. 151), one relating to a missing note (ex. 152), a performance instruction,49 a stage direction,50 and five variants related to notation,51 in addition to seventeen variants that have already been cited (exx. 29, 32-3, 37-9, 44-53, and 57). The performing score was also not S2’s source, as demonstrated by fifteen variants: exx. 9-10, 12-13, 19-20, 29, 32-3, 37-9, 51, 149, and 150.

Four variants may suggest that the harpsichord part-book was – occasionally at least – copied directly from the autograph score (exx. 57, 118, 153, and 154). While the first three

49 The harpsichord part-book contains a Tasto solo marking at the second section of the chorus ‘An Infant rais’d’, whereas the Aylesford score does not. This chorus was never present in the performing score, which has always contained Handel’s air setting of the text; the marking is present in the autograph score (f. 18r).
50 The harpsichord part-book contains the direction “(exit David.)” at the end of the recitative ‘Imprudent Women!’ (HG87); this direction is present in the autograph and performing scores, but not in the Aylesford score.
51 On five occasions, S2 notated a semibreve as tied minims in the harpsichord part-book, even though there was no change of line or page. The first is in b. 9 of the recitative ‘Behold, O King’ (HG59/3/5), in which the autograph score has a change of line, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores have semibreves. The second is in b. 10 of the recitative ‘Whom dost thou seek?’ (HG161/4/4), in which the bass II part-book contains the same reading as the harpsichord part-book, the autograph score has a change of line, and the performing and Aylesford scores have semibreves. The third is in b. 18 of the recitative ‘Where is the Son of Jesse?’ (HG177/6/1), in which the autograph score has the same reading as the harpsichord part-book, and the performing and Aylesford scores have semibreves. The fourth is in b. 2 of the recitative ‘’Tis said, here lives a Woman’ (HG193/3/2), in which the bass I part-book, the autograph score, and the performing score have the same reading as the harpsichord part-book, and the Aylesford score has a semibreve. The fifth is bb. 22 and 24 of the accompanied recitative ‘By thee’, which was never present in the performing score; while the tenor II part-book and the autograph score have the same readings as the harpsichord part-book, the Aylesford score has semibreves.
examples fit the theory that the original version of the Epinicion was not present in the red-morocco score (so S2 would have had to have copied the Aylesford score and part-books directly from the autograph score), it is not clear why he would take this approach in the air ‘With Rage’. However, in the absence of the red-morocco score, this variant cannot be more than suggestive: it is certainly possible that the ambiguity in the autograph score was transferred to the red-morocco score, causing the different readings in the Aylesford sources.

Finally, an error of notation reveals something of S2’s methods when copying music that is being repeated: when he came to copying the chorus ‘The Youth inspir’d’ into the harpsichord part-book, he chose to copy what he had written earlier in that part-book (the chorus ‘An Infant rais’d’) rather than to extract the basso continuo line from a score a second time (ex. 155).

The filiation of the instrumental part-books is therefore as follows:

![Diagram of filiation of instrumental part-books]

**Vocal part-books**

**Soprano I part-book (Michal; v. 283)**

S2 did not copy the soprano I part-book from the performing score (see exx. 6, 32, and 33); that he did not use the Aylesford score either is proved by six variants that have already been cited (exx. 32-3, 45, 49, 90, and 146), and two variants of underlay (exx. 156-7).

Three variants – two of pitch (exx. 158-9) and one involving a tie (ex. 160) – indicate that S2 copied the soprano I part-book from the harpsichord part-book where possible.
Soprano II part-book (Merab; v. 284)

It seems likely that the soprano II part-book was copied from the soprano I part-book where possible: the two part-books are the only sources to share two variants of underlay (exx. 156-7), two errors of pitch (ex. 161-2), two variants of note-length (ex. 163), and a copying error;\textsuperscript{52} and the soprano II part-book omits a flat that is not immediately obvious in the soprano I part-book (ex. 164).\textsuperscript{53} The soprano II part-book cannot have been copied from the performing score (see ex. 6), or from the Aylesford score (see ex. 98).

Alto part-book (David; v. 285)

The alto part-book cannot have been copied from the Aylesford score: in addition to the variants already mentioned (exx. 46, 48, 53, and 147), this is proved by three variants of pitch (exx. 165-7), one of rhythm (ex. 168), and four of underlay (exx. 169-72). A variant of pitch may reveal S2’s source in the Epinicion to be the autograph score (ex. 173). Unfortunately there are not enough convincing variants to establish with certainty whether S2 copied the alto part-book from the harpsichord part-book where possible; of the three variants that may be considered convincing, two – a variant involving a tie (ex. 160), and one involving musical content\textsuperscript{54} – suggest that he did, and one rather weaker variant suggests the opposite (ex. 174).

Tenor I part-book (Jonathan; v. 286)

Two variants of underlay (exx. 175-6) provide further evidence that the tenor I part-book was not copied from the Aylesford score (four variants that prove the same have already been given: exx. 37, 41-2, and 47). It is clear from six variants that were previously cited (exx. 9, 16, 20, 37, 41, and 42) that it was not copied from the performing score either.

It seems that S2 copied the tenor I part-book from the harpsichord part-book where possible: the evidence for this includes a variant of pitch (ex. 123), one of underlay (ex. 20), the omission of a bar (ex. 177), a variant of note-length (ex. 178), two suggestive variants.

\textsuperscript{52} In the chorus ‘Hallelujah’, S2 made a serious error when copying the soprano I part-book: he copied a number of bars from the alto line – rather than the soprano line – of the score he was using. This mistake also occurs in the soprano II part-book. As the bars in question were never present in the performing score, they are not given in HG; they can be found in the autograph score, where they occupy f. 31r; exactly these bars are spread across a verso and the facing recto in the Aylesford score (v. 269; this is unpaginated; the verso and recto in question are pp. 16-17 of the chorus).

\textsuperscript{53} Only one variant appears to contradict this: in b. 55 of the chorus ‘The Youth inspir’d’ (HG42/1/2), S2 wrote a wrong word in the soprano I part-book (“headfull”), whereas the Aylesford score and the soprano II part-book give the correct word (“headlong”). However, it is feasible that S2, copying the soprano II part-book from the soprano I part-book, would fail to notice his error in the latter part-book, given how often he would have been writing “headlong”.

\textsuperscript{54} The alto part-book contains exactly the same lines as the harpsichord part-book in the air ‘O King’ (see fn. 30).
involving notation,\textsuperscript{55} and a variant involving an accidental.\textsuperscript{56} Two variants in the accompanied recitative ‘O let it not in Gath be heard’ appear to suggest the opposite (exx. 179-80); these are discussed below.

Tenor II part-book (High Priest; v. 287)

A variant of pitch indicates that the tenor II part-book was copied from the harpsichord part-book in airs (ex. 181); and two variants of underlay (exx. 175-6) and three variants of pitch (exx. 182-4) may suggest that the tenor II part-book was copied from the tenor I part-book in choruses. (It was not copied from the performing score (see exx. 16, 41-2, and 176) or from the Aylesford score (see exx. 41-2, 50, 175, and 176.)

Tenor III part-book (Abner, Witch, Amalekite; v. 288)

There is very little evidence of S2’s source(s) for the tenor III part-book. However, variants of notation\textsuperscript{57} in the recitative ‘Whence comest thou?’ (HG204) suggest that his source for recitatives may have been the harpsichord part-book; this would go some way to explaining an odd variant in b. 18 of the same recitative (ex. 185). It is likely that in choruses S2 copied the tenor III part-book from one of the other tenor part-books (see exx. 175-6 and 182-4).

Bass I part-book (Saul; v. 289)

In addition to seven variants that have already been given (exx. 38-9, 51, 122, 145, 148, and 154), evidence that the bass I part-book was not copied from the Aylesford score includes one variant of pitch (ex. 186) and one of underlay (ex. 187). The performing score was clearly also not S2’s source (see exx. 13, 38-9, 51, 122, and 154.)

\textsuperscript{55} In b. 3 of the recitative ‘Ah! dearest Friend’ (HG122/1/3), the note in the basso continuo line is written as a semibreve in the performing and Aylesford scores, as a pair of tied minims over a change of line in the harpsichord part-book, and as a pair of tied minims without a change of line or page in the tenor I part-book; and in b. 5 of the recitative ‘O strange Vicissitude!’ (HG127/2/2), the note in the basso continuo line is written as a semibreve in the performing and Aylesford scores, as a pair of tied minims over a change of page in the harpsichord part-book, and as a pair of tied minims without a change of line or page in the tenor I part-book. As the autograph score lacks both numbers, these variants cannot be more than suggestive.

\textsuperscript{56} In b. 56 of the air ‘Wise, valiant, good’ (HG280/3/1), the tenor I part-book omits the sharp on n. 1 of the basso continuo line; this could have been caused by the harpsichord part-book, in which the bar appears on a new line, immediately following the key signature. (In the autograph and Aylesford scores, the sharp is clearly present: b. 56 is the second bar on a line in the former score, and the third bar on a line in the latter score. The air was never present in the performing score.)

\textsuperscript{57} In three bars in the recitative ‘Whence comest thou?’ (b. 5 (HG204/2/2), b. 11 (HG204/4/2), and b. 19 (HG205/1/2)), S2 wrote basso continuo semibreves as tied minims in the tenor III part-book, even though the bars in question were not written over a change of line or page; the harpsichord part-book is the only surviving possible source in which all three bars are written over changes of line or page.
It is likely that S2 copied the bass I part-book from the harpsichord part-book in airs and recitatives: although it is not clear how one variant came about (ex. 121), the two part-books share three variants of pitch (exx. 122, 188, and 189) and one of rhythm (ex. 190).

**Bass II part-book (Samuel, Doeg; v. 290)**

It seems likely that S2 copied the bass II part-book from the bass I part-book where possible: the two part-books share one variant of underlay (ex. 187), two of spelling,\(^{58}\) one of rhythm (ex. 191), and one involving a tie (ex. 192); that it was not copied from the Aylesford score is proved by a variant of pitch (ex. 186).

The filiation of the vocal part-books in airs and recitatives is therefore as follows:

And the filiation of the vocal part-books in choruses is probably as follows:\(^{59}\)

---

\(^{58}\) In the chorus ‘Hallelujah’, the two bass part-books are the only extant sources that omit the first letter of “hallelujah” in b. 35 of the full version of the chorus (not in HG), and on the final occurrence of the word (HG56/1/5).

\(^{59}\) Proof that the soprano I, tenor I, and bass I part-books were the respective sources of the soprano II, tenor II, tenor III, and bass II part-books (and not vice versa) can be found in the manuscripts themselves. When copying the soprano I, alto, tenor I, and bass I part-books, S2 seems to have made an error concerning which version of the Epinicion he copied: all four part-books have had the third folio of their first double bifolium gathering removed, whereas the soprano II, tenor II, tenor III, and bass II part-books have regular gatherings at that point.
‘Songs in Saul’ part-books

The additional set of part-books entitled ‘Songs in Saul’ contains six items. Four of these were discarded or reused during the pre-performance revisions: the original setting of the air ‘Author of Peace’ (reused in ‘From this unhappy Day’); the original setting of the air ‘Impious Wretch’ (reused in ‘Ye Men of Judah’); the recitatives from Handel’s first version of the Elegy; and the original setting of the air ‘Brave Jonathan his Bow ne’er drew’. The other two items were added to the oratorio during the pre-performance revisions: the first is the original, C minor setting of the air ‘Capricious Man’; the second is the second, F major setting of the same air.

If Jennens once owned a score corresponding to these part-books, it is now lost.\textsuperscript{60} If this hypothetical lost score was not S2’s source for these part-books, it is likely that he used the autograph score: since three of the items – the recitatives, the original setting of ‘Author of Peace’, and the C minor setting of ‘Capricious Man’ – were never present in the performing score, it is unlikely that they were present in any other manuscript, including the red-morocco score. Only two of the six items can be found in the performing score, the original setting of the air ‘Impious Wretch’ having been replaced by the new setting before the first performance; of these, only the F major setting of the air ‘Capricious Man’ contains any useful variants. These variants – one of pitch in the violin I part-book (ex. 193), one involving an accidental in the harpsichord part-book (ex. 194), and one involving a tie in the violin I and II part-books (ex. 195) – reveal only that S2 did not copy the air from the performing score.

Therefore it is likely, but impossible to prove, that the filiation of the ‘Songs in Saul’ part-books is as follows:

\textsuperscript{60} The existence of this score was first suggested by Hicks (‘Handel, Jennens, and Saul’, p. 207); this seems particularly likely in view of the fact that there is no vocal part-book.
As has already been mentioned, this manuscript contains four items relating to *Saul*. The first two are the recitative ‘Thou, Merab, first in Birth’ (HG70), and the air that follows it, ‘My Soul rejects the Thought with Scorn’ (HG70). These appear in the manuscript exactly as they appear in the autograph score and the Aylesford manuscripts: the recitative ends on a B minor chord, and the air is in G major. Indeed, the copying is so precise that there are no variants to indicate whether this manuscript was used by S2 when he copied the Aylesford sources. When Smith copied the performing score, he followed Handel’s pencil instructions in the autograph score, ending the recitative with an F♯ minor cadence, and writing the air in A major, which is how it appears in HG. It is not clear why Jennens would need an extra copy of these numbers: they are not additions, but integral parts of the oratorio; perhaps the copyist of the red-morocco score followed Handel’s transposition instructions, and Jennens wanted to own a copy of the recitative and air in their original form.

The third item is the recitative ‘Already see’ (HG77), written a fourth higher for the carillon, and presumably copied from f. 40r of the autograph score. It is likely that the red-morocco score did not include this: the version of this recitative that it probably would have included is that written in C, found on f. 41r of the autograph score. A variant that suggests that this manuscript was the source of this recitative in the carillon part-book has already been given (ex. 144).

The fourth item is the air ‘Fly, malicious Spirit, fly’ (HG281). In the absence of most of this air in the performing score, it is impossible to determine where this was copied from. On the other hand, it is possible to determine that it was not the source of the Aylesford score and part-books, not only because it omits four bars (bb. 17-20 of the version found in HG (HG281/4/1-4)), but also because of how it ends. Whereas RM 18. c. 11 contains the final ritornello as Handel composed it and as it appears in HG, the Aylesford score and part-books contain a different ending that must have been written at the instruction of Jennens: a repeat of the opening ritornello, finishing with Handel’s ending. As a result, Jennens’s version of the air is sixteen bars longer than Handel’s. This may have been the subject of one of Jennens’s annotations to the autograph score, which has been so heavily obscured (likely by Handel) that it is now possible to make out only that it is Jennens’s handwriting. The annotation appears under the violin line of the final ritornello (see overleaf):
Since this air was deleted before the first performance, it is extremely unlikely to have been present in the red-morocco score. This raises the possibility that, before Jennens decided to have copies made of his own version of Saul, he supplemented his red-morocco score with copies of numbers or versions of numbers that were – for whatever reason – not present there. It is impossible to know whether he once owned more such copies that are now lost. However, even if he owned copies of every number that was not already present in the red-morocco score, and that he wanted in the Aylesford score and part-books, these could not replace the autograph score as a direct source in the stemma: the only way to account for variant readings in precisely those places in which the autograph score is ambiguous is to conclude that the autograph score was on many occasions S2’s immediate source for the Aylesford score and part-books.

*****

The variants are interesting not only for what they reveal about the filiation, but also for what they reveal about those pages of the autograph score that are now lost: in three places, the part-books appear to preserve the autograph score’s reading. In the course of relating these variants, a few puzzling variants are considered, including the two that led Hicks to establish his time-line of copying.

The first occasion is the air ‘As Great Jehovah lives’, in which the part-books contain notes that seem more likely to be what Handel intended than the notes that appear in the performing and Aylesford scores (exx. 196-7); this, of course, suggests that the air may be added to the list of numbers in the Aylesford score that were copied from the performing score.

The second is the recitative ‘A Father’s Will’ (HG142). This recitative was originally followed by the C minor air ‘Love from such a Parent sprung’, which Handel deleted before the performing score was copied; it is now followed by the G major duet ‘O Fairest of ten thousand fair’ (HG143). The Aylesford score and part-books all contain the air ‘Love from such a Parent sprung’, but they differ in which version of the recitative they contain: while the Aylesford score shares with the performing score the version of the recitative that ends with a
D major cadence, the recitative in the harpsichord and soprano I part-books cadences in $E_{b}$ major, which – as noted by Hicks\(^{61}\) – must be the original ending of the recitative, written to lead into the air (ex. 198). What Hicks does not mention is that the harpsichord and soprano I part-books contain another reading in this recitative that is likely to have been present in the autograph score (ex. 199). As the red-morocco score probably contained only a single cadence and only a single reading in b. 7, the Aylesford score and part-books cannot all have been copied from the red-morocco score at this point. Indeed, the red-morocco score probably contained the arrangement found in the performing score: the D major recitative cadence followed by the duet. The most likely explanation for the different readings is that Jennens had written an instruction in the red-morocco score directing S2 to copy the recitative and the air from the autograph score,\(^{62}\) which was the only score to contain the air, and which would have contained both recitative endings.\(^{63}\) The variants in the air ‘Love from such a Parent sprung’ continue the pattern: the part-books again cannot have been copied from the Aylesford score, as they contain readings found only in the autograph score, which resumes partway through the air (exxs. 200-201). The duet that follows – ‘O Fairest of ten thousand fair’ – contains one of the variants that Hicks took to prove that the harpsichord and vocal part-books were copied before Handel had filled in Part II (ex. 202).\(^ {64}\) Since this chapter overturns that timeline, it is necessary to consider how else this variant can be explained. In the absence of the red-morocco score, it is impossible to know why the harpsichord, soprano I, and alto part-books contain music that was so clearly crossed out in the autograph score. It is worth noting, however, that it is likely that the soprano I and alto part-books were copied from the harpsichord part-book in the duet, which means that S2 would only have had to have copied the deleted bars once (there is evidence for this filiation not only elsewhere, but also within this duet (ex. 203)). A second puzzling variant in this duet casts further doubt on Hick’s version of events, and must also be considered: the Aylesford score shares with the harpsichord, soprano I, and alto part-books a variant of pitch that occurs two bars before the deleted bars, and that is not present in the autograph score, the performing score, or the ‘cello part-book (ex. 204). The most likely explanation is that the red-morocco score also contained the variant, which suggests that the red-morocco score also contained the deleted bars; but then why does the ‘cello part-book contain the reading present in the autograph and performing scores? One possible explanation is as follows: S2 copied the harpsichord part-

---

\(^{61}\) Hicks, ‘Handel, Jennens and Saul’, p. 221.

\(^{62}\) This is in no way beyond the bounds of possibility: see the chapter on L’Allegro, which describes how Jennens did exactly this in his first score of the work.

\(^{63}\) Whether S2 copied the Aylesford score from the autograph score in the recitative, or whether he ignored Jennens’s instruction and turned to the performing score cannot be established: as Smith had copied his recitative from the autograph score, it is possible that the readings in the Aylesford score could have come directly from there.

\(^{64}\) Hicks, ‘Handel, Jennens and Saul’, pp. 208-10.
book from the red-morocco score, which included the deleted bars (with the violin and viola lines blank or with rests) as well as the variant of pitch; as he did so, he omitted the tie in bb. 44-5; S2 then copied the soprano I and alto part-books from the harpsichord part-book; he then began to copy the instrumental part-books from the red-morocco score; when he came to the deleted bars he realised that there was something wrong, so consulted another score (probably the autograph score), added the cues to the harpsichord, soprano I, and alto part-books, and used the other score to copy the instrumental part-books (this would explain why the 'cello part-book contains the tie in bb. 44-5, but does not contain the variant of pitch in b. 53); and when S2 came to copy the Aylesford score, he returned to the red-morocco score for the duet, which explains the presence of the variant of pitch in the Aylesford score. It is impossible to know for sure what happened, but the apparent complications that S2 faced when copying this section of the oratorio may explain an otherwise curious fact: that when copying the Aylesford score, S2 clearly switched to using the performing score as his source from the chorus ‘Is there a Man’ (which follows the duet) to the end of Part II (see exx. 25-42). Perhaps when he got to the deleted bars in the duet, he remembered the difficulties he had previously had in copying them, and turned to a much cleaner and more reliable score that had recently become available to him as a source: the performing score.

The third occasion on which the part-books appear to preserve the reading of the autograph score is in the air ‘From this unhappy Day’: the violin II part-book contains a reading that is not only unlikely to be a mistake by S2, but also musically preferable and therefore likely to be what Handel wrote (ex. 205). As was explained above, this air was originally written as ‘Author of Peace’ for Jonathan; it is now part of the Elegy. When Handel wrote the final version of the Elegy, he did not write the air out again, but instead wrote the following cue: “la stanza 3za vide nell atto 2do”. Jennens added a second cue, now difficult to read, on the same page (“[?] stanza 3 from Mr Smith’s book”), and may also have crossed out Handel’s instruction.

Handel’s instruction (© British Library Board (RM 20. g. 3, f. 106r))

---

65 Another possible explanation is that after copying the harpsichord part-book, S2 realised that he should not have included the extra bars so cued them out, imagining that he would observe the cues when he copied the vocal part-books; after he copied the soprano I and alto part-books, he realised that he had ignored his own cues so cued out the bars in the vocal part-books and crossed out the cues and the bars in the harpsichord part-book; in order not to repeat the error, he copied the instrumental part-books from the autograph score.

66 See also fn. 39.
It is unclear when Jennens wrote this cue, or for whom it was intended. One would expect the red-morocco score to have contained the final version of the Elegy, which would include the air; however, it is possible that the copyist of the red-morocco score did not follow Handel’s instruction, and omitted the air.\(^67\) If this were the case, S2 would have needed to copy the air from elsewhere; since the air in the autograph score would have contained the wrong words, it would be sensible for Jennens to direct S2 to the performing score. As the performing score seems not to have been available to S2 when he copied the part-books, it is no surprise to find that the violin II part-book contains what is presumably the autograph score’s reading here; and as the performing score was clearly available to S2 when he was copying the Aylesford score, it is likely that he used it in this air, as Jennens had suggested.\(^68\) However, one question remains: why would Jennens write this instruction in the autograph score unless S2 was already supposed to be copying from it at this point? If Jennens intended S2 to copy the preceding number – the accompanied recitative ‘O let it not in Gath be heard’ (HG213) – from the red-morocco score, why would he not write the instruction to copy the air from “Mr Smith’s” book in that score, thus bypassing the autograph score? In fact, it is possible that S2 had indeed copied the preceding number from the autograph score: this would explain two otherwise puzzling variants (exx. 179-80), the first of which Hicks took to be further evidence that the part-books were copied at an extremely early stage in the composition history of Saul.\(^69\) In another movement of the Elegy – the chorus ‘O fatal Day!’ – it seems that S2 used the autograph score as his source for the part-books as well as for the Aylesford score (ex. 206); this is likely to have been at the instruction of Jennens, who wanted his copies to contain the full version of the chorus. Six variants towards the end of the oratorio suggest that S2 may have continued copying the part-books from the autograph score rather than from the red-morocco score after this (exx. 207, 128, 131, 134-5, and 137). Since one would expect

\(^{67}\) This is not unfeasible: see p. 46, in which it is noted that S1 made a similarly grave error when he copied Score A of L’Allegro (fn. 25).

\(^{68}\) Hicks notes that, in the Aylesford score, S2 originally wrote a C4 clef on the vocal line of the air ‘From this unhappy Day’ (which is sung by a soprano); Hicks uses this slip to prove that Handel composed the air for Jonathan, a tenor (Handel, Jennens and Saul, p. 225). Although this seems to suggest that the Aylesford score was copied from the autograph score in this air, this is not necessarily the case: when Smith copied the air ‘From this unhappy Day’ into the performing score, he wrote a C4 clef on the first vocal line, which is presumably why S2 made the same mistake. Hicks’s logic still stands, but it was Smith who failed to alter the clef when he copied the air: S2 merely copied what Smith had written.

\(^{69}\) Hicks, ‘Handel, Jennens and Saul’, fn. 23. Hicks does not mention that the harpsichord part-book shares the Aylesford score’s reading in this bar. Since the harpsichord part-book must have been copied before the vocal part-books (as a number of variants prove that S2 used it as a source when copying them), Hicks’s explanation for the reading found at this point in the tenor I part-book is not possible.
that the red-morocco score would be a cleaner copy of the end of the oratorio than the autograph score, it is not obvious why S2 would take this approach; perhaps S2 regarded the more messy autograph score to be a more reliable source than the clean but flawed red-morocco score. Several variants already cited (exx. 6, 8, 10, 11, 15, and 16) prove that when S2 was copying the Aylesford score he did not return to the performing score after the chorus ‘O fatal Day!’ Whether he copied the final numbers from the autograph score or from the red-morocco score is impossible to determine; even so, this strengthens the case for S2’s having copied (at least some of) the part-books from the autograph score at the end of the oratorio.70

Understanding the Aylesford copies of Saul is no easy task, given the loss of so much of the autograph score; and the situation is certainly not helped by the practice of S2, who – as will become apparent in later chapters – had a tendency to change sources even when making what ought to be straightforward copies. These factors, combined with the addition to the stemma of an annotated lost score that would not have contained everything that S2 needed, mean that it is impossible to determine exactly what happened between Handel’s putting ink to paper in 1738 and S2’s completing the Aylesford score and part-books. However, the variants prove that the Aylesford score was partially copied from the performing score, which is definitive evidence that the Aylesford score cannot predate the performing score: it is impossible for the Aylesford score and part-books, on the one hand, to have been copied so early that they contain numbers that were never present in the performing score, and, on the other hand, to have been copied from the performing score. Therefore there has to be another

70 Only one puzzle remains: why do some of the Aylesford sources have Abiathar’s name beside the air ‘Ye Men of Judah’? Although the soprano I, soprano II, alto, and bass I part-books name Abner in the cue for this air (the tenor I and II part-books do not mention the character), the cue in the bass II part-book has been altered by S2 from Abner to Abiathar; the harpsichord part-book names the character as Abiathar (but did not always do so); although the tenor III part-book is entitled “Abner”, it contains the air, which Handel wrote for a bass, written in G2 clef, with the name Abiathar before it; and when S2 copied the Aylesford score he identified the character as Abiathar. Clearly Jennens did not wish Abiathar to be named here: he had long before replaced Abiathar with the High Priest and given some of Abiathar’s music to Abner (see Varka, “Departed Ghosts’); and he altered the Aylesford score at this point so that the High Priest would sing the air. The air would have been allocated to Abner in the red-morocco score; S2 must originally have thought the air was Abner’s, as he placed it in the tenor III part-book. As Abiathar does not appear in any of the musical sources, S2 must have found his name in the wordbook. The presence (and absence) of the name “Abiathar” in the part-books and the score can be explained by several possible scenarios; although it is odd, it does not undermine the rest of the chapter. One possibility is the following: because Abner is named in the scores as singing the air ‘Ye Men of Judah’, and because Abiathar does not appear in any musical source, S2 did not name any part-book as being for Abiathar, and he planned to write the air in the tenor III part-book, which is entitled “Abner”; he began by copying the harpsichord part-book, and wrote “Abner” there, before spotting Abiathar’s name in the wordbook and assuming that Jennens wanted it to be there; he then altered the name in the harpsichord part-book; when he was copying the other vocal part-books, he was not looking at the harpsichord part-book because at this point the other singers have two choruses in a row, and therefore S2 would need to copy their part-books from a score; this explains why the soprano I, soprano II, and alto part-books name Abner in their cues; when he was copying the tenor III part-book, he switched to the harpsichord part-book for ‘Ye Men of Judah’ because it was his practice to copy airs in vocal part-books from the harpsichord part-book; seeing Abiathar’s name there, he wrote “Abiathar” in the tenor III part-book; that he altered the bass II part-book’s cue from “Abner” to “Abiathar” may suggest that he copied that part-book last and remembered the name change; and when he copied the Aylesford score he wrote “Abiathar” there either because he remembered to, or because he was looking at the wordbook, or because he had by this point altered the red-morocco score to read “Abiathar”; and when Jennens received the Aylesford score, he saw what S2 had done and altered it so that it was sung by the High Priest. This is only one of a few possible theories as to why S2 wrote Abiathar’s name in some of the Aylesford manuscripts at this point.
explanation as to why the Aylesford score and part-books contain so many elements from the earliest version of the oratorio. Taking into account the other peculiar readings present in the Aylesford score and part-books that must be the result of Jennens’s intervention (including the version of ‘Author of Peace’ that never existed), in addition to the evidence of later chapters, the presence of the lost, annotated red-morocco score as an intermediate source in the stemma is the only credible explanation. All that remains to be considered is the implication of this: that what is contained in the Aylesford score and part-books is Jennens’s version of Saul.

**Jennens’s version of Saul**

In annotating the red-morocco score, Jennens reversed several of the pre-performance revisions. If Jennens preferred many aspects of the original form of the oratorio to that which was first performed, one can conclude only that it must have been Handel who carried out or proposed the pre-performance revisions in question.

Since a number of these revisions were deletions, it would have been possible for Handel to implement them without Jennens’s assistance – indeed, without Jennens’s knowledge, as he did when he originally omitted the chorus ‘Hallelujah’ from the Epinicion (see fn. 16). Since Jennens provided the text of the numbers in question in the first place, it is hardly surprising that he would have preferred them to remain in the oratorio. On a few occasions, the deletion was straightforward: deleting the Part II, scene v air ‘Love from such a Parent sprung’, for example, required only the alteration of the preceding recitative (ex. 198). This scene originally contained a recitative, an air, a duet, and a chorus (text ex. 1). The air clearly fits the theme of the scene (and, indeed, of the oratorio): virtue, which is at the centre of Michal’s love for David, of Jonathan’s love for David (discussed below), and of the people’s love for David, as shown in the chorus ‘Is there a Man’. If Handel’s intention was to shorten this scene, Michal’s air was the obvious number to delete, as it would have been difficult to dispense with the duet or the chorus. Furthermore, Handel may have regarded it as unlikely for the young Michal to pause and ponder the nature of love just as she has discovered that she must “no longer […] attempt to hide the Secret of [her] Soul”. However, the air does contribute something to the scene that is otherwise absent: a comparison between, on the one hand, the marriage of Michal and David that is to come, and, on the other hand, the marriage between Merab and David that was to be. In Part II, scene ii, David had sung a recitative and an air comparing Merab to Michal, and the effects of their respective characters

---

71 Examples of verbal text are given in Appendix 2.
and behaviours (text ex. 2). Michal’s air ‘Love from such a Parent sprung’ complements the comparison: because of its source in virtue, the love between her and David is strong, and will remain ever young, in direct contrast to how the marriage between Merab and David would have been; and both airs mention virtue, David’s explicitly, and Michal’s implicitly (“such a Parent”). Indeed, the phrasing in Michal’s air parallels one of the epigraphs that Jennens had printed on the front of the wordbook: that taken from Cicero’s De Amicitia (6:20), which claims virtue to be the “parent and preserver of friendship”. Through Michal’s air, Jennens states that virtue is as much the parent of true love as of true friendship.

The character who suffered the most pre-performance deletions was the High Priest: he lost the semplice recitative ‘This but the smallest Part of Harmony’ (HG271), the accompanied recitative ‘By thee this universal Frame’ (HG271), and the air ‘O Lord, whose Providence’ (HG274). Again, the presence of these numbers in the Aylesford score and part-books reinforces the probability that it was Handel’s decision to delete them. Two of the three numbers originally followed Michal’s air Part I, scene iv air ‘Fell Rage’ (text ex. 3). Winton Dean described these lines as pointing “a platitudinous moral”,73 which seems to suggest that this was the reason that they were deleted; if this were the case, it is not surprising that their author would have disagreed with Handel. The third number in question originally followed Jonathan’s air ‘No, cruel Father, no’ (HG106), preceding the final chorus of Part I (text ex. 4). Although this air is printed in the first wordbook, Clausen states that it was probably omitted before the first performance, citing both the absence of transposition marks and an annotation in a printed wordbook.74 It is easy to see why Jennens would wish to retain this air. It contains many of the libretto’s key ideas, juxtaposing David’s virtue with Saul’s increasingly erratic behaviour and his irrational hatred for David,75 and drawing attention to the lawlessness of Saul’s actions; indeed, these are some of the aspects of Saul’s behaviour that lead to his downfall.

David’s Part I, scene v air ‘Fly, malicious Spirit, fly’ (HG281) is another number that Handel composed but never performed. The Aylesford score and part-books contain the scene as Handel first set it (text ex. 5), in which Handel illustrated David’s harp playing by scoring

72 “Qui autem in virtute summum bonum ponunt, praeclare illi quidem: sed haec ipsa virtus amicitiam & gignit & continet: nec sine vertute amicitia esse ullo pacto potest”, translated by Ruth Smith as “Now, there are those who locate the ‘chief good’ in virtue, and that is a noble doctrine. But this very virtue is the parent and preserver of friendship, and without virtue friendship cannot possibly exist” (‘Love between Men in Jennens’ and Handel’s Saul’, in Chris Mounsey and Caroline Gonda (eds.), Queer People: Negotiations and Expressions of Homosexuality, 1700-1800 (Lewisburg, 2007), pp. 226-45, at p. 233). The parallel between this and Jennens’s “such a Parent sprung” is not quite as exact as it first appears, but it is fairly close: “gignit” is the third person singular of the present indicative “gigno”, i.e. to give birth to, bring forth, or bear.


74 Clausen, Händels Direktionspartituren, p. 218, fn. 2. As the part of the High Priest was adapted to be sung by Kelly, a countertenor, in the first performances, one would expect this air to be marked for transposition. The copy of the wordbook that contains the annotation is in GB-Lcm.

his air for harp, theorbo, and pizzicato strings. However, when Handel first performed the scene, he omitted the air ‘Fly, malicious Spirit, fly’, and instead gave David the air ‘O Lord, whose Mercies numberless’: Michal’s prefatory prayer thus became part of the music that David employs in his attempts to calm Saul.\(^{76}\) Handel added a harp solo after David’s air to compensate for the loss of the harp, theorbo, and pizzicato strings. Handel’s wish to shorten this scene may have been driven by the fact that lines 4-6 of ‘Fly, malicious Spirit, fly’ are fairly similar in sentiment to the air ‘O Lord, whose Mercies numberless’; whatever Handel’s motivation, it is clear that Jennens disagreed with him. Minji Kim notes that the text of this air relates to 1 Samuel 16:14, in which it is stated that “the Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil Spirit from the Lord troubled him”.\(^{77}\) Although this evil spirit is mentioned in Michal’s air (as a “busy Fiend”), it is the subject of ‘Fly, malicious Spirit, fly’; the importance of this evil spirit to Jennens’s presentation of Saul\(^{78}\) may explain much of his motivation in reinstating the air.

The final number that Handel deleted and Jennens restored in his copies is Jonathan’s air ‘Wise, valiant, good’ (HG276). The air originally followed the Part I, scene ii recitative ‘O early Piety!’ (HG63), in which Jonathan responds to David’s refusal to accept praise for his victory over Goliath, which he ascribes instead to God (text ex. 6). Jonathan’s air and the reasons for its deletion have been discussed in depth by Ruth Smith, who examines the relationship between David and Jonathan, and traces Handel’s and Jennens’s skilful avoidance of any hint that the love between the two men was homosexual.\(^{79}\) She argues convincingly that this particular expression of their love was probably considered to sail too close to the wind: while piety and modesty are grounds for a loving friendship, Jonathan’s mention of “ev’ry Grace” and “Charm” at his first meeting with David calls into question the nature of the love between them. Jennens’s reinstating this air in his own copies suggests that it was Handel who took this particular precautionary measure.

‘Wise, valiant, good’ was replaced before the first performance by an air for Merab (text ex. 7). Although the sentiment of Merab’s new air is very similar to that of the recitative that follows it, the addition of the air was a good move not only dramatically, but also with regard to the relationship between David and Jonathan. The subversion of formal expectation

\(^{76}\) The scene actually went through a few alterations before it was first performed: before the performing score was copied, Handel deleted ‘O Lord, whose Mercies numberless’; once the performing score had been copied, he reinstated the air, which was now sung by the High Priest in F major (the transposition and the new clef (C3) occurred when the part of the High Priest was adapted for Kelly, a countertenor). It is possible that Handel gave the air to the High Priest partly in compensation for the music he had just lost (‘By thee, this universal Frame’ and ‘This but the smallest Part of Harmony’), and partly to stop Michal from singing two airs almost consecutively: since Handel deleted the High Priest’s two aforementioned numbers, all that separated Michal’s air ‘Fell Rage’ from ‘O Lord, whose Mercies numberless’ was Abner’s recitative.


\(^{78}\) Explored by Kim, ‘The Amalekite Case’.

in the scene is now doubled, which heightens the dramatic tension: Jonathan’s recitative is followed by an air sung by Merab, and her recitative is followed by an air sung by Jonathan.\(^ {80}\) Furthermore, the air amplifies Merab’s reaction to David, about which Smith writes: “[i]n Merab’s upbraiding of Jonathan, hidebound society’s outrage at the relationship is directed at
its flouting of the conventions not of gender but of class. Any transgressiveness that might be inferred is relocated, and […] even celebrated”.\(^ {81}\) It was probably for this reason that the High Priest’s recitative ‘Go on, illustrious Pair!’ and air ‘While yet thy Tide of Blood runs high’ (HG269) were retained: as Smith notes, these follow Jonathan’s air ‘Birth and Fortune’, blessing the love between the two friends as “a great Example”.\(^ {82}\)

As the addition of an air for Merab required new text to be written, presumably Jennens assisted Handel with this revision – indeed, it was part of a larger-scale expansion of Merab’s part, with which Jennens must have been involved. In the original scheme, Merab had only one recitative (‘Yet think’ (HG66)), and one air (‘My Soul rejects the Thought with scorn’ (HG70)); both are in Part I, scene ii, and it is to them that Jennens’s note at the beginning of the wordbook – that “Merab’s scornful Behaviour […] is a Hint taken from Cowley’s Davideis, and has no Foundation in the Sacred History” – likely applies. This reflected her appearance in the Bible, in which she is mentioned only three times.\(^ {83}\) By the time the oratorio was first performed, Merab sang four airs and two recitatives: the air and recitative that she originally had; the air ‘What abject Thoughts a Prince can have’; the air ‘Capricious Man’ (HG98); the air ‘Author of Peace’ (HG166), which was originally to be sung by Jonathan; and a recitative to precede ‘Author of Peace’, ‘Mean as he was’ (HG165). The air ‘Capricious Man’ first appeared as part of a new scene (Part II, scene vi), set to music that Handel borrowed from the omitted air ‘Love from such a Parent sprung’.\(^ {84}\) After creating this scene, Handel deleted it, and reset the air as it appears in HG (in Part I, scene v), almost immediately after Saul throws his javelin at David (text ex. 8). This replaced text that Handel never finished setting (text ex. 9). Handel first sketched these lines as a chorus (ff. 55r-58r), and later set the first four lines as an air in G minor, probably for Michal (f. 99r). In the absence of this text, the oratorio was lacking any response to Saul’s attack on David, which was eventually provided by Merab’s air.

Again, Jennens must have assisted Handel in these revisions: ‘What abject Thoughts’, ‘Capricious Man’, and ‘Mean as he was’ required new text; and he corrected Handel’s cue, on

---

80 This is noted by Smith, who writes that the “airs do not discharge tension but increase it” (‘Biblical Heroes Amended in Jennens’ and Handel’s Saul’, HJb, 52 (2006), pp. 89-104, at p. 92).
81 Ead., ‘Love between Men’, p. 236.
82 Loc. cit.
83 She is mentioned as the eldest daughter of Saul (1 Samuel 14:49), as David’s promised wife (1 Samuel 18:17-18), and as having been given instead to Adriel (1 Samuel 18-19).
84 This scene is described by Dean (Oratorios, p. 307).
f. 77v of the autograph score, so that ‘Mean as he was’ and ‘Author of Peace’ were placed before – not after – the Symphony of the New Moon. The expansion of Merab’s part has clear merit, not only because she no longer disappears from the oratorio after the second scene. The effects of her air ‘What abject Thoughts’ on Part I, scene ii, have already been considered here, but the fact that she is the only character in Part I to dislike David has not. In her air ‘Capricious Man’, we see her respond to Saul’s ever increasing madness; and by Part II, scene viii, her sympathies have undergone a complete reversal (text ex. 10). Merab’s change in sympathies is highly effective: it highlights both the irrationality of Saul’s behaviour and the virtue of David; and it makes Saul completely isolated, rendering his actions at Endor much more understandable.

Jennens must have preferred his original scheme for the oratorio, as he reversed all of these revisions in the red-morocco score. This suggests that it was Handel who objected to Merab’s disappearance after Part I, scene ii, and who prompted the expansion of her part; but it does not necessarily suggest that it was Handel who came up with Merab’s change in sympathies. Since Jennens could not force Handel to perform the oratorio in its original form, he could have made the best of the situation and used it to further his presentation of Saul. However, even if it were Jennens who invented Merab’s character development, it is clear that whatever this achieved was not as important to him as restoring his original scheme for the oratorio. When Jennens restored two of the airs that Handel had deleted – ‘Wise, valiant, good’ and ‘Love from such a Parent sprung’ – he had no choice but to delete two of Merab’s airs, as Handel had borrowed ‘What abject Thoughts’ from the former air, and the first setting of ‘Capricious Man’ from the latter air. It is easy to see why Jennens would prefer the airs that he restored to the airs that he deleted: both contributed towards one of the themes of the oratorio, friendship that is based in virtue.85 While he could not have both Jonathan and Merab sing the air ‘Author of Peace’, he could have retained the second setting of ‘Capricious Man’, because the text that it replaced was never fully set: why he preferred to have nothing in its place is worth considering as it suggests that he disliked the expansion of Merab’s part, despite having collaborated with Handel on it. As Jennens reversed most of the pre-performance revisions, it could simply be that, in most cases, Jennens was displeased that Handel had taken such liberties in altering his carefully crafted libretto. However, it is also

85 For a discussion of this theme, particularly in relation to Cicero, see Ruth Smith, ‘Love between Men’, pp. 232-7. In relation to the epigraphs he had printed on the wordbook of Saul, Jennens wrote to Holdsworth: “I cannot resist the Temptation of adorning my Title-page with any significant motto that comes into my head & seems a propos: nay, I gave Handel a couple before an Oratorio, one Greek & the other Latin; not to show my acquaintance with the two Languages, but to point out more strongly my own sentiments express'd in some parts of the Oratorio, & to justify them by two considerable Authorits from the Heathen Moralists” (4 February 1742, GB-Ltoms: acc. no. 7672). The Latin epigraph was given above (fn. 72); the Greek epigraph was taken from the Carmen Aureum, and is translated by Ruth Smith as “Whoever is outstanding in virtue, make him your friend” (‘Love between Men’, p. 233).
possible that, although he clearly felt free to alter the Biblical narrative to some extent,\textsuperscript{86} he preferred not to have quite so much material in the oratorio that had “no Foundation in the Sacred History”: whereas the earlier episodes he had written for Merab were at least taken from Cowley, Merab’s later appearances were completely invented. Presumably Merab’s additional music appears in the ‘Songs in Saul’ part-books for precisely this reason: that Jennens wished to preserve Handel’s compositions, but felt that they had no place in the oratorio.

Finally, Jennens could have had Handel’s second setting of the Epinicion had he wished, as it fitted the words that he had originally written (see fn. 43). That he chose to have the original setting of the Epinicion copied into his score and part-books suggests that he preferred the second set of words that he wrote. A comparison of the two texts (text ex. 11) suggests why this might be the case. Although the two texts are similar in meaning, Jennens might have preferred his second text because it focuses on God more than his original text did, which has as its subject David; and by containing the word “Giant”, it emphasises the physical advantage that Goliath had over David. Indeed, one could say that David as a type of Christ is more apparent in Jennens’s second text. Jennens may also have considered Handel’s second setting of the original words – as an air (HG34) – to be inappropriately calm; the unsatisfactory nature of Handel’s first setting of the original words is described by Hicks, who also illustrates how Jennens’s second text fits the music very well.\textsuperscript{87}

**Jennens’s amendments to the Aylesford score and part-books**

Jennens did not end his editorial endeavours when S2 copied the Aylesford score and part-books of *Saul*: he continued them, making a number of amendments to these manuscripts. Those he made in the Aylesford score include the alteration of verbal text,\textsuperscript{88} the addition of words that S2 had omitted,\textsuperscript{89} the alteration and addition of tempo markings,\textsuperscript{90} the addition of other performance markings,\textsuperscript{91} of a date of composition,\textsuperscript{92} and of a stage

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{86} Jennens’s adaptation of the Bible in *Saul* is the subject of Smith, ‘Biblical Heroes amended’, of Kim, ‘The Amalekite Case’, and of Varka, ‘Departed Ghosts’.
\item \textsuperscript{87} Hicks, ‘Handel, Jennens and *Saul*’, p. 219.
\item \textsuperscript{88} As described in fn. 43, Jennens altered the verbal text of the chorus ‘An Infant rais’d’ in the Aylesford score, but not in the part-books.
\item \textsuperscript{89} In the first occurrence of the chorus ‘How excellent’, Jennens added the words to the soprano line where S2 had omitted them (bb. 68–70 (HG32/1/1–3)).
\item \textsuperscript{90} The air ‘With Rage’ (HG84) is marked *Andante* in the autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores, and in the harpsichord, violin I, violin II, viola, cello, and bass I part-books; Jennens added *Allegro* to the marking in the Aylesford score, so that it now reads *Andante Allegro*. He also added *Larghetto* to the B section of the air ‘Such haughty Beauties’ (HG131/1/4); this marking is not present in the performing score, or in the harpsichord, violin I, violin II, viola, cello, bassoon, and alto part-books; and the air is now missing from the autograph score.
\item \textsuperscript{91} In the Aylesford score, Jennens added the following markings to the air ‘Fly, fly’ (HG281): “La Harpa e la Teorba unis col violin i e Bassi La Viola pizzicato all’ ottava col Basso” and “Violini pizzicati”. His source for these markings was probably the autograph score. This annotation regarding scoring is particularly interesting: it is presumably the case that
\end{itemize}
direction;\textsuperscript{92} they may also include an improvement of underlay (music ex. 208 (see Appendix 1)). He also amended the part-books, adding performance markings on six occasions,\textsuperscript{94} and verbal text that S2 had omitted.\textsuperscript{95} Two amendments to both the score and the part-books are probably the work of Jennens: a correction of spelling,\textsuperscript{96} and an alteration relating to underlay (music ex. 209 (see Appendix 1)). Presumably Jennens did not enter these two corrections into the autograph score because he no longer had access to it.

\textsuperscript{92} Jennens added “Aug. 2.” to the beginning of Part II. (The corresponding section of the autograph score is missing.)

\textsuperscript{93} Jennens added “David’s Bed discover’d with an Image in it” to b. 11 of the recitative ‘Whom dost thou seek?’ (HG161/5/1) in the Aylesford score. This direction is present in the autograph score and in the harpsichord part-book, but it is absent from the performing score. S2’s omission of it in the Aylesford score could indicate that he was copying from the performing score at this point, referring to the red-morocco score only for Jennens’s alterations to it (hence the presence of Doeg in this scene).

\textsuperscript{94} First, in b. 7 of the third part of the Overture (HG10/2/3) he added to the harpsichord part-book the marking “Bassons e violoncelli col Org.”, which is present as an integral part of the autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores. Second, he added “col Org. piano senza altri Bassi.” to S2’s “violonc: pia:” in the next bar of the same part-book (b. 8 of the third part of the Overture (HG10/2/4)); the full marking is present in the autograph and Aylesford scores, but not in the performing score. Third, he added \textit{Ardito} to the chorus ‘Along the Monster Atheist strode’ in the harpsichord, violin I, violin II, viola, \textit{c}ello, and bassoon part-books. (S2 had written this marking in the Aylesford score, perhaps at Jennens’s direction: the autograph and performing scores have the marking only in the later version of the chorus.) Fourth, Jennens added “vers. 3\textsuperscript{65}” to the viola part-book at the beginning of the chorus ‘Along the Monster Atheist strode’. Presumably he noticed that this was missing when he added \textit{Ardito}; the two markings are on the same bar. Fifth and sixth, he added \textit{a forte} to the harpsichord part-book at b. 49 of the air ‘O God-like Youth’ (HG58/2/7), and \textit{piano} to the violin I part-book at b. 16 of his version of the air ‘While yet thy Tide of Blood runs high’ (not in HG).

\textsuperscript{95} He did this on five occasions: in bb. 72-3 of the first occurrence of the chorus ‘How excellent’ (HG33/1/1-2) in the bass I part-book; in bb. 38-9 of his version of the air ‘While yet thy Tide of Blood runs high’ (not in HG) in the tenor I part-book; in b. 35 of the chorus ‘Welcome, welcome, mighty King!’ (HG80/2/1) in the alto part-book; in bb. 2-4 of the chorus ‘Is there a Man’ in the alto part-book; and in bb. 29-30 of the air ‘Impious Wretch’ (HG207/1/3-4) in the alto part-book.

\textsuperscript{96} In b. 11 of the recitative ‘Behold, O King’ (HG59/4/2), Handel wrote “Earnest”, which Smith copied into the performing score. Although the Aylesford score, the harpsichord part-book, and the bass I part-book originally contained the same spelling, they have now been corrected to “Earnest”.

---

\textsuperscript{65} Second, he added “vers. 3\textsuperscript{65}” to the viola part-book at the beginning of the chorus ‘Along the Monster Atheist strode’. Presumably he noticed that this was missing when he added \textit{Ardito}; the two markings are on the same bar. Fifth and sixth, he added \textit{a forte} to the harpsichord part-book at b. 49 of the air ‘O God-like Youth’ (HG58/2/7), and \textit{piano} to the violin I part-book at b. 16 of his version of the air ‘While yet thy Tide of Blood runs high’ (not in HG).

---

\textsuperscript{65} He did this on five occasions: in bb. 72-3 of the first occurrence of the chorus ‘How excellent’ (HG33/1/1-2) in the bass I part-book; in bb. 38-9 of his version of the air ‘While yet thy Tide of Blood runs high’ (not in HG) in the tenor I part-book; in b. 35 of the chorus ‘Welcome, welcome, mighty King!’ (HG80/2/1) in the alto part-book; in bb. 2-4 of the chorus ‘Is there a Man’ in the alto part-book; and in bb. 29-30 of the air ‘Impious Wretch’ (HG207/1/3-4) in the alto part-book.
Saul
2 Israel in Egypt

Jennens owned two manuscript scores, a set of part-books copied by S1,¹ and a printed edition² of Israel in Egypt; of these, only the part-books survive. The manuscript scores are described in the Sotheby’s catalogue as “2 vol. folio, 3 vol. oblong 4to, MS., red morocco, gilt tooled sides”.³

It will become apparent throughout the course of this dissertation that, when Jennens owned more than one score of an oratorio, his first score was often used as the source of his second score and his part-books. When Israel in Egypt was published by the HHA,⁴ this information was not available to the editor, Annette Landgraf, who does not mention Jennens’s scores of the oratorio. Even if Landgraf had been aware of Jennens’s scores and the filiation of other similar manuscripts in his collection, it would have been extremely difficult – if not impossible – to prove whether Jennens’s part-books were copied from one of his scores: it is difficult to prove the existence, in a stemma, of an intermediate score if that score is lost, unless the contents of the manuscripts that derive from it are significantly different from those of other surviving manuscripts; in this case, they are not. Moreover, Landgraf’s task was already complicated by the absence of the performing score for Part I. Even if it were possible to prove that Jennens’s part-books were copied from one of his lost scores, it would be well beyond the scope of this project.⁵ However, it is interesting to note that one of Jennens’s scores was in three volumes: of the surviving copies of Israel in Egypt, Landgraf

¹ GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 vv. 134-44 (‘cello, oboe I, oboe II, bassoon, soprano II, alto II, tenor II, bass II, violin I, violin II, and viola), 146-9 (soprano I, alto I, tenor I, and bass I), 247 (trumpet I), 248 (trumpet II), and 353 (timpani). The first fifteen of these were part of lot 239 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale.
² Published by Randall & Abell (lot 248 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale).
³ Sotheby, Wilkinson, and Hodge, Catalogue of Valuable Books and Manuscripts 13-16 May 1918, p. 34 (lot 239).
⁵ It is possible that most of Landgraf’s comments about the part-books could simply be reapplied to one of Jennens’s scores, although the picture is muddied further by the possibility that Jennens annotated the intermediate score. It is not clear how the possibility of an intermediate score in the stemma would fit with Landgraf’s consideration of three amendments to Part I: (1) cuts to the Symphony and two choruses (‘The Sons of Israel do Mourn’ (HHA4) and ‘They shall receive a glorious Kingdom’ (HHA73)); (2) the alteration of “the Wise shall shine” to “will” in the chorus ‘The Righteous shall be’ (HHA48); and (3) the alteration of the tempo marking of the chorus ‘The merciful Goodness of the Lord’ (HHA83) from Largo to Larghetto (Landgraf (ed.), Israel in Egypt, ii, pp. 588-9). The part-books contain the full versions of the numbers that Handel shortened; but while the soprano II, alto I, alto II, tenor I, tenor II, bass I, bass II, and bass II part-books contain “shall” and the tempo marking Largo, the soprano I part-books contain “shall” and the tempo marking Larghetto. There are many reasons why the soprano I part-book could contain different readings from the other part-books. It is impossible to know even whether the intermediate score would have contained Part I: if it were the two-volume score, it is possible that it did not. Therefore Landgraf’s assertion that S1 used both the autograph and the performing score in copying Part I could still stand, even if an intermediate score is added to the stemma. It is worth noting that Landgraf did not have the full picture regarding paper characteristics. Her dating of the part-books as c. 1740 or later was, presumably, partly based on the watermark that she believed them to bear: C40 (Cd) (Landgraf (ed.), Israel in Egypt, ii, p. 574). This identification was taken from James S. Hall’s unpublished 1957 study, The Aylesford Manuscripts in the possession of Sir Newman Flower. A First Survey (GB- Lfom: acc. no. 243); however, Donald Burrows has since identified the watermarks in the part-books as being a mixture of C120 (Ck), C130 (Cl), and B160 (Bl), suggesting a date-range of 1746-9.
Israel in Egypt

has stated that the part-books are the only sources that give the oratorio in its full version (without cuts) and with all three parts, as it was originally composed by Handel.⁶

If the part-books – like some of the other oratorio part-books in Jennens’s collection – reflect their owner’s preferred version of the oratorio, this would mean that Jennens preferred the recitative setting of ‘And the Children of Israel sigh’d’ (HHA/2/413) to the Solo and Chorus setting (HHA/1/89).⁷ This is certainly intriguing, considering that Jennens is thought to be the oratorio’s librettist; but there is so little evidence for it being anything other than an accident of filiation, that it can never be any more than intriguing.

---

⁶ Landgraf (ed.), Israel in Egypt, ii, p. 574: “Der Stimmensatz ist die einzige Quelle, die das Oratorium Israel in Egypt in seiner vollständigen Gestalt (ohne die Kürzungen) mit allen drei Teilen wiedergibt, so wie es von Händel ursprünglich komponiert war.”

⁷ The recitative setting is much shorter, not only in length, but also in text: it omits the line ‘They oppressed them with Burdens and made them serve with Rigour’. The first wordbook contains the Solo and Chorus version, which was the version that was first performed; Landgraf writes that the recitative setting may have been written for the second performance, on 11 April 1739 (Landgraf (ed.), Israel in Egypt, i, pp. viii/xxv).
3   L’Allegro, il Penseroso ed il Moderato

Jennens owned two manuscript scores of L’Allegro: the first – Score A¹ – was copied by S1, and the second – Score B² – was copied by S2, who also copied a set of part-books³ to accompany it. Jennens also owned separate copies of various movements copied by S1 (“Additional Score”),⁴ as well as two printed editions.⁵ The care that Jennens took over his two manuscript scores of L’Allegro reflects the importance of this oratorio to him.⁶

Filiation

A host of variants⁷ shows that none of Jennens’s copies was derived from the performing score. These include variants involving pitch (exx. 1-12),⁸ rhythm (exx. 13-14), note-length (ex. 15), trills (ex. 16), ties (exx. 17-18), underlay (ex. 19), verbal text,⁹ tempo markings,¹⁰ pauses,¹¹ and notation (ex. 20), in addition to more complicated variants (exx. 21-2).

The two scores and the set of part-books owned by Jennens are interrelated: they share a number of variants that are not present elsewhere, including five of pitch (two of which are presumably unsatisfactory corrections to earlier readings: exx. 23-7), three of rhythm (exx. 28-30), one of note-length (ex. 31), two involving ties (exx. 32-3), two involving trills (exx.

¹  GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1286.
²  GB-Mp: MS 130 H4 v. 189. Both scores were sold as part of lot 258 of the 1918 sale, where they were incorrectly described as a two-volume manuscript.
³  GB-Mp: MS 130 H4 vv. 29-31 (soprano I, soprano II, and alto), 33-40 (tenor I, tenor II, bass I, bass II, violin I, violin II, viola/violin III, and 'cello), 42-5 (bassoon I, bassoon II, oboe I, and oboe II), 353 (timpani); US-CP: M2.1.M2 v.1 (horn); US-Ws: W.b. 527 (trumpet I); and US-Cu: MS 437 v. 24 (trumpet II). The first fifteen of these were sold as part of lot 250 of the 1918 sale; they are bound with Jennens’s part-books for Alexander’s Feast.
⁴  These are now bound in two composite volumes: GB-Lbl: RM 18.c.11 (ff. 137r-65v) and GB-Lbl: RM 19.a.2 (ff. 52r-53v).
⁵  These were published by Walsh (lot 251) and by Randall (lot 260).
⁶  Jennens had a major role in its genesis and provided the text for the final part: see Burrows and Dunhill (ed.), Music & Theatre in Handel’s World, pp. 85, 1075–85, with subsequent amendments traced on pp. 88–9, and 110–11.  
⁷  My normal practice is to print verbal text exactly as it appears in the earliest wordbooks. In the present chapter, there are two exceptions. First, the recitative ‘Hence! loathed Melancholy’ (HG31 / HHA/1/34) appears as “Hence, loathed Melancholy” in the 1740 wordbook. Second, the 1741 air that was set by Handel as ‘Orpheus’ self’ appears as ‘Orpheus himself’ in the earliest sources of the text; it is referred to here as Handel set it.
⁸  Music examples are given in Appendix 3.
⁹  In bb. 30-31 and 42-43 of the air ‘Come rather, Goddess, sage and holy’ (HG10-11 / HHA/1/12-13), Handel originally wrote “thee bright-hair’d Vesta long before”, which appears in the performing score. He then corrected this in the autograph score so that it reads “of yore”, which appears in the Jennens copies. It might have been Jennens who brought this error to Handel’s attention.
¹⁰  The performing score lacks the Andante that is present at the beginning of the air ‘And ever against eating Cares’ (HG111 / HHA/1/114) in the autograph score and in Jennens’s copies.
¹¹  The performing score is the only one of the copies in question to have pauses on the final chord of the duet ‘As steals the Morn’ (HG167 / HHA/1/178).
34-5), three of underlay (exx. 36-8), two of spelling,12 two errors that are unlikely to be coincidences (exx. 39-40), and one involving a word (ex. 41) among other types of variant.13

Two questions regarding filiation remain: which of Jennens’s manuscript scores was copied from which? and from which score were the part-books copied? The first question is easy to answer: since Jennens made a large number of amendments and annotations to Score A that were copied or acted upon as an integral part of Score B, Score B can only have been copied from Score A.

Jennens must have spent a considerable amount of time working on Score A before it was used as a source for Score B. His many amendments to Score A that appear as an integral part of Score B relate to the verbal text, the music, and the structure of the oratorio; and while many were probably made without reference to another score, it is clear that Jennens also compared his score to at least one other score.

Many of Jennens’s alterations to the verbal text of Score A were straightforward corrections to errors of spelling that were introduced either by Handel or by S1.14 He also altered the occasional wrong word, which usually involved restoring Milton’s text (or at least the text of the wordbook) when Handel or S1 had written something else.15 On two occasions, however, Jennens restored his own text,16 and on another occasion Jennens appears to have ignored Milton’s text.17 The most interesting alteration occurs in the air ‘Come, thou Goddess, Largo e piano

12 The Jennens copies give the following spellings: “possess” (not “posses”, as in the autograph and performing scores) in b. 10 of the accompanied recitative ‘Hence! vain deluding Joys’ (HG3/3/2 / HHA/1/7), and “haste” (not “hast”, as in the autograph and performing scores) in b. 4 of the recitative ‘Hence! loathed Melancholy’ (HG31/3/1 / HHA/1/34).
13 The autograph and performing scores give at the beginning of the air ‘Or’ on a Plat’ (HG53 / HHA/1/54) the instruction Largo e piano, whereas the Jennens copies all give Largo, with the piano as a dynamic marking within the staves; the Jennens copies contain pauses on bb. 17 and 22 of the chorus ‘Populous Cities’ (HG94/1/4 and 95/1/4 / HHA/1/97 and 1/98), whereas the autograph and performing scores do not; the Jennens copies contain a Da Capo marking at the end of that chorus, whereas the autograph score does not (the performing score had that marking, but it has been crossed out in ink); and whereas the autograph and performing scores contain instructions for the oboes to play with violin I in the air ‘And ever against’ (HG111 / HHA/1/114), Score A and Score B do not, with the result that S2 marked that air tacet in the oboe I and II part-books.
14 Jennens’s corrections to spelling include: “Euphrosine” to “Euphrosyne” in bb. 7-8 of the air ‘Come, thou Goddess, fair and free’ (HG7/2/3 – 8/1/1 / HHA/1/8); “shunt” to “shun’st” in b. 41 of the air ‘Sweet Bird’ (HG43/4/1 / HHA/1/44); and “Melancoly” to “Melancholy” in bb. 44 and 47 of the same air (HG43/2/3 and 43/3/2 / HHA/1/44 and 1/45). It is likely that Jennens was responsible for three more corrections to spelling in Score A that were transferred to Score B: “francies” to “fancies” in b. 9 the accompanied recitative ‘Hence! vain deluding Joys’ (HG3/3/1 / HHA/1/6); “counterfit” to “counterfeit” in bb. 31-2 of the air ‘Oft’ on a Plat’ (HG54/2/5-6 / HHA/1/55); and “genious” to “genius” in bb. 62 and 66 of the air ‘Hide me from Day’s garish Eye’ (HG107/2/9 and 107/3/4 / HHA/1/111).
15 These instances are: “as thick and numberless” (rather than “as”) in b. 11 of the accompanied recitative ‘Hence! vain deluding Joys’ (HG3/3/3 / HHA/1/7); “above, about, or underneath” (rather than “and”) in b. 54 of the air ‘Hide me from Day’s garish Eye’ (HG107/2/1 / HHA/1/111); and “appear in Saffron Robe” (rather than “with”) in b. 21 of the air ‘There let Hymen oft’ appear’ (HG101/2/2 / HHA/1/106). It was probably Jennens who scratched out the final letter of “Dimples” to make the phrase “love to live in Dimple sleek” in the air ‘Haste thee, Nymph’ (HG12 / HHA/1/14). Although it may look like an error, Jennens’s alteration of “woe” to “woo” in the air ‘Sweet Bird’ (HG39 / HHA/1/40) may also be added to this list as “wooo” was a valid alternative spelling of “woo”, the correct word in this context.
16 In the Part III recitative ‘No more short Life’ (HG154 / HHA/1/165), Handel had written “in franticke Mirth and childish Play, in Dance, in Revels night and day”, which Jennens altered so that it read “in Dance and Revels”; he also altered Handel’s “further” to “farther” in b. 3 of the same recitative.
17 In the air ‘There let Hymen oft’ appear’ (HG109 / HHA/1/106), the wordbook gives “on Summer-Eves”, which is clearly derived from Milton’s “On Summer eves”, when Handel composed the air he wrote “on Summer Eve”, which Jennens altered (in Score A) to “on Summer’s Eve”. Jennens’s reading is the reading found in James Harris’s draft libretto for Allegro & Penseroso (Burrows and Dunhill (eds.), Music & Theatre in Handel’s World, p. 1084).
fair and free’, in which Jennens was apparently dissatisfied with the effect that Handel’s division of the text had on the meaning. The first three lines of the air are as follows:

Come, thou Goddess, fair and free, 
In Heav’n yclep’d Euphrosyne; 
And by Men Heart-easing Mirth,

The “and” that begins the third line makes sense the first time that Handel set it because it is the first word we hear after “Euphrosyne”; we understand that “yclep’d” – meaning “called” or “named” – is implied in the third line. However, Handel altered the order of the text the second time that he set the line (b. 22, HG6/2/3 / HHA/1/9), so that it read “Come, come, thou Goddess, fair and free, fair and free, come, come, and by Men Heart-easing Mirth”. In order to retain the sense of the text, Jennens altered “and” – on this occasion only – to “call’d”, which is a perfect one-syllable alternative to “yclep’d” that appears as an integral part of Score B and the soprano II part-book.

Ensuring that the text made sense could have been the motivation behind Jennens’s writing “L’Allegro” or “Il Penseroso” when appropriate. On all four occasions\(^{18}\) they were necessary because there was a change in personality\(^{19}\) that was not apparent in Score A, usually because S1 had not included it. It is interesting that Jennens included these indications: the change in personality was presumably obvious to him from the text.

Jennens took issue with Handel’s setting of the text only once. The first four lines of the Part III air ‘Come, with native Lustre shine” (HG143 / HHA/1/154) are as follows:

Come, with native Lustre shine, 
Moderation, Grace Divine; 
Whom the wise God of Nature gave, 
Mad Mortals from themselves to save.

In all three occurrences of the third line, Jennens emphasized “wise” by bringing “whom” slightly earlier (exx. 42-4).

Many more of Jennens’s amendments in Score A relate to the music. It was his custom to enter comprehensive figuring into his copies, and this score was no exception. Here, however, he went beyond his usual practice: he also entered many performance indications, a large number of which are dynamic markings. A comparison of the dynamic markings in the autograph and performing scores reveals that Jennens did not invent them: he copied them

---

\(^{18}\) He added ‘Il Penseroso’ to the air ‘Come rather, Goddess, sage and holy’ (HG9 / HHA/1/11), and ‘L’Allegro’ to the air and chorus ‘Haste thee, Nymph’ (HG12 / HHA/1/14), to the air and chorus ‘Populous Cities’ (HG90 / HHA/1/93), and to the air ‘I’ll to the well-trod Stage anon’ (HG108 / HHA/1/112).

\(^{19}\) Donald Burrows refers to Allegro and Penseroso as “personalities” rather than as “roles”, which is a useful term that I have adopted here (‘Reconstructing Handel’s performances of L’Allegro’, \textit{MT}, 154/1922 (2013), pp. 69-76, at p. 70). Ruth Smith’s term “quality” (‘Milton moderated: \textit{Il Moderato} and its relation to \textit{L’Allegro} and \textit{Il Penseroso}’, \textit{HJb}, 56 (2010), pp. 139-64, at p. 146) is more apt in the context of Milton’s poems, but potentially confusing in this chapter, as is the term “mood”; possible alternatives included “temperament” and Winton Dean’s term “humour” (\textit{Oratorios}, p. 321).
from the autograph score. Jennens also added other performance directions that S1 had omitted: *ad libitum* markings, \(^{21}\) *tasto solo* markings, \(^{22}\) markings relating to instrumentation, \(^{23}\) and a tempo marking. \(^{24}\)

The most substantial of Jennens’s alterations to Score A involve the contents of the oratorio. When Jennens received Score A, it reflected the 1740 form of the oratorio. \(^{25}\) Almost all of Jennens’s more substantial alterations involve updating Score A by cueing in the 1741 English-language additions \(^{26}\) so that his second score and part-books would (more or less)

---

\(^{20}\) Although many of the dynamic markings are present in the performing score as well, it is clear that the autograph score was Jennens’s source: there are over twenty occasions on which the marking that Jennens entered into Score A is present in the autograph score but not in the performing score; and on two occasions there is a dynamic marking, not entered by Jennens into Score A, that is present in the performing score but not in the autograph score. Even more convincing is the nature of three of the dynamic markings copied by Jennens from the autograph score: on two occasions S1 had – like Smith in the performing score – copied Handel’s dynamic marking on the violin line but omitted his repetition of the dynamic marking in the same bar on the basso continuo line, which Jennens duly added (these are the *piano* marking in b. 12 of the air and chorus ‘Or let the merry Bells’ (HG67/3/2 / HHA/1/67) and the *forte* marking in b. 18 of the air ‘There let Hymen oft appear’ (HG101/1/3 / HHA/1/106)). The third telling dynamic marking is in b. 47 of the air and chorus ‘These Delights’, which is the first bar of the chorus section (HG125/1 / HHA/1/129). In the autograph score Handel wrote “Forte” underneath the basso continuo line, and then added “Tutti” beneath that; when Smith copied this bar into the performing score he wrote “Tutti forte” on a single line, but Jennens wrote “forte tutti”, which is so unusual that it must have come from the autograph score. Further evidence that Jennens did not invent the dynamic markings can be found in his inclusion of two fairly unusual markings that are present in both the autograph and performing scores: *un poco piano* in b. 1 of the chorus ‘Join with thee’ (HG30 / HHA/1/32) and *mezzo piano* in b. 1 of ‘As steals the Morn’ (HG157 / HHA/1/168). Only one of Jennens’s markings was demonstrably made on his own initiative: this is the *forte* marking under the bassoon line in b. 58 of the duet ‘As steals the Morn’ (HG166/1 / HHA/1/177); however, this is probably an editorial extension by Jennens of the *forte* marking in the previous bar, which was present in the autograph score.

---

\(^{21}\) Over the flute line in b. 1 of the air ‘Sweet Bird’ (HG39/1 / HHA/1/40), following the word “Andante”, Jennens wrote “*, e ad libitum*. Jennens’s additions of *ad libitum* markings to the vocal line in b. 22 (HG41/1 / HHA/1/42) and the flute line in b. 23 (HG41/2 / HHA/1/42) of the same air may suggest that these markings were present at this point in the autograph score, which now contains only bb. 1-21.

---

\(^{22}\) These are found in b. 1 of the air ‘Sweet Bird’ (HG39/1 / HHA/1/40) and b. 24 of the air ‘But O! sad Virgin’ (HG86/2 / HHA/1/89). Jennens also added the same marking to b. 6 of the air ‘Oft on a Plat’ (HG53/1 / HHA/1/54), which is now missing from the autograph score; presumably it was present there, since it appears in the performing score.

---

\(^{23}\) Two of these indicated that the oboes should play the soprano line (b. 1 of the chorus ‘Join with thee’ (HG30/1 / HHA/1/32) and b. 51 of the air and chorus ‘Or let the merry Bells’ (HG72/1 / HHA/1/74)). Jennens also added “*senza Bassons*” to b. 6 of the air ‘Oft’ on a Plat’ (HG53/1 / HHA/1/54); the air is now missing from the autograph score, but the marking was presumably present as Smith copied it in the performing score. It is interesting that Jennens added “*organo* / &c. / *et / Basson grosso*” to b. 1 of the chorus ‘There let the pealing Organ blow’ (HG32/1 / HHA/1/141): surely he cannot have expected to have a contrabassoon at Gopsall. (That the performing score has both ‘organo’ and the bassoon line in b. 1 of the chorus ‘Join with thee’ (HG30/1 / HHA/1/32) and ‘Mezzo piano’ in the first bar of the chorus section (HG125/1 / HHA/1/129) in b. 1 of the air ‘As steals the Morn’ (HG166/1 / HHA/1/177), which was present in the autograph score, but not in the performing score. It is interesting that Jennens added “*forte tutti*” on the basso continuo line, and then added “*Tutti*” beneath that; when Smith copied this bar into the performing score he wrote “*Tutti forte*” on a single line, but Jennens wrote “*forte tutti*”, which is so unusual that it must have come from the autograph score. Further evidence that Jennens did not invent the dynamic markings can be found in his inclusion of two fairly unusual markings that are present in both the autograph and performing scores: *un poco piano* in b. 1 of the chorus ‘Join with thee’ (HG30 / HHA/1/32) and *mezzo piano* in b. 1 of ‘As steals the Morn’ (HG157 / HHA/1/168). Only one of Jennens’s markings was demonstrably made on his own initiative: this is the *forte* marking under the bassoon line in b. 58 of the duet ‘As steals the Morn’ (HG166/1 / HHA/1/177); however, this is probably an editorial extension by Jennens of the *forte* marking in the previous bar, which was present in the autograph score.

---

\(^{24}\) Over the flute line in b. 1 of the air ‘Sweet Bird’ (HG39/1 / HHA/1/40), following the word “Andante”, Jennens wrote “*, e ad libitum*. Jennens’s additions of *ad libitum* markings to the vocal line in b. 22 (HG41/1 / HHA/1/42) and the flute line in b. 23 (HG41/2 / HHA/1/42) of the same air may suggest that these markings were present at this point in the autograph score, which now contains only bb. 1-21.

---

\(^{25}\) The *adagio* marking that Jennens added to b. 44 of the air ‘Come rather, Goddess, sage and holy’ (HG11/2/4 / HHA/1/13) is present in the autograph score but not in the performing score.

---

\(^{26}\) These are: the accompanied recitative and air ‘There held in holy Passion still’ (HG27 / HHA/1/29); for the five bars that precede it see fn. 27; the air ‘Far from all Rest of Mirth’ (HG55 / HHA/1/56); the air ‘Straight may the Eyes’ and the accompanied recitative ‘Mountains’, which forms part of the air (HG60 / HHA/1/61); the second version of the accompanied recitative ‘Hence! vain deluding Joys’ (not present in HG or HHA); the air ‘Sometimes let gorgeous Tragedy’ (HG176 / HHA/1/81), whose introduction necessitated the alteration of the aforementioned accompanied recitative; the air ‘Orpheus’ self’ (HG115 / HHA/1/117); and the air ‘May at last’ (HG133 / HHA/1/143). Andreoni sang his movements in Italian
reflect the 1741 version of the oratorio, which included more of Milton’s text set to more music.27 Jennens’s other substantial alteration was to write above the air ‘Each Action will derive new Grace’ (HG155 / HHA/1/165) an intriguing annotation: “Write this from the other book”. This begs several questions: why did Jennens write this? what was “the other book” that he was instructing S2 to copy from (clearly it was something other than Score A, S2’s source for most of the oratorio)? and was this “other book” the same one that S2 would use to copy the 1741 movements, which were not present in Score A? The answers lie in the contents of two airs: ‘Each Action will derive new Grace’ and ‘May at last’. The major difference between the air ‘Each Action will derive new Grace’ as it appears, on the one hand, in Score A and, on the other hand, in Score B and the accompanying part-books is that the version given in the latter sources contains a number of extra bars: presumably Jennens’s desire to own a copy of the air at its longest was his motivation in writing the annotation “Write this from the other book”. The extra bars are a cadenza to the cadence at b. 20, which Smith inserted in the performing score, and which was subsequently crossed out there (ex. 45); if it was once present on a slip of paper in the autograph score, that slip is now lost. It is not difficult to determine what Jennens meant when he wrote “the other book”: it is likely to have been in Jennens’s collection, and to have contained only additional or alternative movements – not a complete score of the 1741 version. This deduction is based on the fact that the air ‘May at last’, which Handel composed in 1741 to link directly into the chorus that follows it, appears in Score B and the accompanying part-books with a final bar added to it, making it a self-sufficient number: the copyist of the “other book” is more likely to have invented this extra bar if he were writing the air in a manuscript that did not contain the chorus. Jennens did indeed own a copy of the 1741 additions, copied by S1; it is referred to in the following discussion as the Additional Score;28 and this copy does indeed contain the longer version of ‘Each Action derives new Grace’ and the additional bar of ‘May at last’ (ex. 46). The additions in this “other book” appear to be of mixed heritage: ‘Orpheus’ self’ cannot

27 Only one of Handel’s 1741 alterations was added (rather than cued) into Score A. When Handel wrote the 1741 accompanied recitative and air ‘There held in holy Passion still’ (HG27 / HHA/1/29), he designed it to fit between the ariosos ‘Come, but keep thy wonted State’ (HG25 / HHA/1/28) and the chorus ‘Join with thee’ (HG30 / HHA/1/32). As these movements ran into each other in the 1740 version of the oratorio (b. 27 of the former linked to b. 1 of the latter, with the soprano solo ending a third higher than in HG (as in the upper line, HHA/1/32), Handel composed five bars for the end of the former (a final vocal cadence followed by an instrumental cadence) so that ‘There held’ began as a new movement, running into the chorus (HG presents the 1741 arrangement). These five bars were added to Score A by a scribe other than S1, presumably at Jennens’s request; it is unclear why they were not copied into the Additional Score; perhaps this was an oversight, rectified by copying them into Score A.  
28 The 1741 English-language additions (excluding the second version of the accompanied recitative ‘Hence! vain deluding Joys’ (not present in HG or HHA)), the longer version of the air ‘Each Action will derive new Grace’, and the Italian-language 1741 additions (the recitative ‘L’insaziabil fantasia’, the air ‘Troppa audace’, and a copy of ‘Mountains’ with the Italian text) are now in GB-Lbl: RM18.c.11 (ff. 137-65); and the second version of the accompanied recitative ‘Hence! vain deluding Joys’ is now in GB-Lbl: RM 19.a.2 (ff. 52r-53v).
be derived from the performing score (ex. 47), whereas ‘Each Action’ must be derived from it (ex. 48). Presumably S1 copied the 1741 additions from the autograph score and copied ‘Each Action’ from the performing score either because he did so on a different occasion or because the cadenza was – then as now – present only in the performing score. Further evidence that the Additional Score is the “other book” referred to by Jennens (i.e. the source of those movements in Score B) is of two types. First, Jennens’s annotations to the Additional Score – the addition of performance markings, the alteration of text, and cues – were followed by S2 when he copied Score B. The second type of evidence is variants, which relate to pitch (ex. 49-50), rhythm (ex. 51), ties (ex. 52), notation, and the placing of a dynamic marking in addition to the extra bar already mentioned (ex. 46). It is worth noting that the Additional Score cannot have been copied for the sole purpose of being a source for Score B, as Jennens also had the Italian-language additions copied (see fn. 28); it seems that he wanted to own everything that was at one point part of the oratorio, even if the music in question had, in his opinion, no place in the oratorio. Whether Jennens had conceived of Score B and the part-books when he had S1 copy the Additional Score is another matter that is impossible to know.

29 Like the performance markings that Jennens added to Score A, he appears to have derived these from the autograph score: a *piano* marking above the violin I line in b. 15 of the accompanied recitative ‘There held’ (HG28/1/3 / HHA/1/30); an *adagio* marking on b. 62 of the air ‘Straight mine Eye’ (HG63/3/1 / HHA/1/63); a *piano* marking under the basso continuo line in b. 13 of the air ‘Orpheus’ self’ (HG116/1/2 / HHA/1/118); a forte marking under the basso continuo line in b. 14 of the same air, added to complement the *forte* marking on the violin line (HG116/1/3 / HHA/1/118); and a *piano* marking on the violin line in b. 17 of the same air (HG116/1/2 / HHA/1/118).

30 In the air ‘Sometimes let gorgeous Tragedy’ (HG176 / HHA/1/81), Handel had written “buskin”, which S1 copied into the Additional Score; Jennens corrected this to “buskin’d”, which appears as an integral part of Score B.

31 Most of Jennens’s cues do not require comment: almost all are clear, and follow the same pattern that his cues follow in Score A. After the air ‘Orpheus’ self’, for example, Jennens wrote “Air & Chorus These Delights if thou canst give, &c.”. Apparently, however, he was not clear enough in his cues for the 1741 air ‘Straight mine Eye’, which – in its final 1741 version – is repeated after the accompanied recitative ‘Mountains’, forming a *da Capo* structure. This structure is not immediately obvious in the Additional Score: the air ends on a verso, and the accompanied recitative begins on the next recto, appearing to be a separate number. In Score A Jennens wrote “Straight mine Eye &c.”; and in the Additional Score he wrote at the end of ‘Straight mine Eye’ “After the repetition follows Or let the merry Bells ring round as set the 2d time.” Since Jennens always wrote “&c” after an incipit, and since he wrote his cue in the Additional Score before ‘Mountains’, it would not have been apparent to S2 that there was more (“After the repetition” must not have been clear enough). Indeed, it is evident from the gatherings of Score B and the part-books that S2 initially omitted the accompanied recitative ‘Mountains’. Although Score B’s disruption of gatherings is difficult to interpret, the gatherings of the soprano I, violin I, violin II, viola, and *cello part-books show that ‘Mountains’ was inserted into these part-books. This is further confirmed by the lack of disruption in the gatherings of the bassoon I and II part-books at that point (the bassoons play in ‘Straight mine Eye’ but not in ‘Mountains’) and by the part-books of instruments and vocal parts that do not sing or play in ‘Straight mine Eye’ or ‘Mountains’: when S2 thought that the only music between ‘Let me wander’ and ‘Or let the merry Bells’ was ‘Straight mine Eye’, he wrote in place of the recitative ‘If I give thee Honour due’ (HG58 / HHA/1/59), ‘Let me wander’, and ‘Straight mine Eye’ “Recitativo & two Songs tacet”; when he realised that ‘Mountains’ should be present, followed by a da Capo to ‘Straight mine Eye’, he altered the cue to read “Recitativo and Song tacet”, and wrote out 69 bars’ rest, followed by “Accompagnato tacet” and “Da Capo”, so that the players and singers would not be confused. Presumably Jennens noticed S2’s omission and instructed him to insert it into Score B and the part-books.

32 Handel’s semibreves in bb. 5 and 9 of the accompanied recitative ‘There held in holy Passion still’ (HG27/2/1 and 27/3/1 / HHA/1/29) are written as tied minims in the Additional Score because there is a change of line halfway through both bars; although Score B has no change of line or page on either bar, the notes are written as tied minims; this is also the case in the soprano II, violin I, and violin II part-books, and in the viola part-book at b. 9. In addition, the Additional Score has a change of page halfway through b. 6 of the accompanied recitative ‘Hence! vain deluding Joys’ (HG174/2/3 / HHA/1/79), which is presumably why S2 originally wrote a bar-line (now scratched out) halfway through that bar in Score B.

33 The autograph score does not contain a *forte* marking in b. 26 of the air ‘Each Action derives new Grace’ (HG156/2/4 (b. 32 on HHA/1/167)); the performing score has one on the b” (as in HG); and the Additional Score, Score B, and the violin I and II part-books have the marking a note later.
The types of amendments mentioned so far are not unique to Jennens’s copies of *L’Allegro*: he specified the structure of the oratorio that he wanted, corrected errors, and even entered the names of characters that had been omitted in his copies of other oratorios. However, one type of amendment that Jennens made to Score A and that S2 copied into Score B is unique to *L’Allegro*: he wrote beside each air the name of the singer who sang it at the first performance. In the 1740 performances the personalities were cast consistently: L’Allegro was sung by “The Boy” (soprano), Beard (tenor), and Reinhold (bass); Il Penseroso was sung by Duparc (soprano); Il Moderato was sung by Savage (bass); and the duet between L’Allegro and Il Penseroso ‘As steals the Morn’ was sung by Duparc and Beard. As was noted above, the 1741 additions, which were sung in 1741 by Monza (soprano) and Andreoni (soprano castrato), are not present in Score A, but are only cued in there by Jennens; when S2 copied them into Score B he noted that “Monsa” had sung ‘There held in holy Passion still’ and that Andreoni had sung ‘Straight mine Eye’; he left the rest unnamed. (‘Orpheus’ self” has “Franc:” (i.e. Duparc) written in pencil, but it is difficult to see by whom.) The result of this is that Score B suggests a cast that never existed (Beard, for example, was replaced in 1741 by Corfe and so never sang in this oratorio with Monza and Andreoni). James S. Hall and Martin V. Hall have suggested that the names represented Jennens’s ideal cast of the oratorio. More likely is that Jennens entered the names of the singers into Score A in order to ensure that their music ended up in the correct part-book, which may also have been one of his motivations in adding the personalities “L’Allegro” and “Il Penseroso” into Parts I and II of Score A. In any other oratorio it is clear which air belongs in each part-book because the characters are named and each part-book contains the music for one character (or more in the case of characters with little music, such as messengers, angels, and witches). For a scribe copying part-books to *L’Allegro*, it is not immediately obvious in which soprano part-book a soprano air should be written: in the 1740 version there is a choice of two, and in the 1741 version a choice of four. Having the personality of the singer written above the air helps, but having a singer’s name is much clearer. The problem is exacerbated if the score used as a source is written with the soprano and tenor parts in G2 clef, as is the case in Score B. The possibility that the motivation behind Jennens’s addition of singers’ names might have been to assist S2 in copying the right music into the right part-books is reinforced by two factors. First, if this was his aim it was successful for the 1740 movements of the oratorio, because the part-books present consistent personalities in those movements. Second, it was unsuccessful

---

in the case of the 1741 numbers, which Jennens had not marked: if S2 had followed the 1740 movements in allocating the music according to personality, he would have written Monza’s music in the soprano I part-book (Il Penseroso) and Andreoni’s music in the soprano II part-book (L’Allegro). It appears, however, that S2 simply guessed which 1741 movement should be in which part-book: he copied Andreoni’s music into the soprano I part-book and he split Monza’s music between the two soprano part-books, thus mixing the two personalities. Whatever intention was behind Jennens’s entering of singers’ names in Score A, it clearly helped S2 in copying the part-books: when Jennens’s annotations were not present, S2 floundered.

Jennens’s editorial activity in Score A must have taken him hours, if not days. Although he was thorough, this was not the end of his editorial activity: it continued once Score B and the part-books had been copied. Amendments made during this second stage of editorial activity fall into two groups, which may or may not have been made at different times.

In the first group of amendments are those that Jennens entered into both Score A and Score B. He must have made these amendments after Score B had been copied: otherwise he would have entered them into Score A, and S2 would have copied them into Score B. Although a few corrections of spelling made in both scores are impossible to attribute with certainty to Jennens,36 he was certainly responsible for three amendments to underlay in both scores. Two of these correct Handel’s setting of the word “Melancholy” in the phrase “Hence! loathed Melancholy” (exx. 53-4), in which he had stressed the second syllable of the word. The third concerns Handel’s division of text in the air ‘Come, thou Goddess, fair and free’. Lines 4-6 of the air are as follows:

Whom lovely Venus at a Birth,  
With two Sister-Graces more,  
To Ivy-crowned Bacchus bore.

The first three lines of the text were given above, in relation to exactly the same type of correction that Jennens made in Score A in the first stage of his editorial activity. It is interesting that at the time he did not notice the presence of the same problem only a few bars later: on the fourth and final statement of line 6, Handel chose to divide the line and repeat segments of it in a way that obscured the meaning of the text. Jennens solved this problem skilfully by replacing Handel’s words in bb. 294-324 with a partial restatement of line 4 (ex. 55). Jennens entered this alteration into the soprano II part-book; why he did not enter the

36 It was probably Jennens who in both scores altered “yclept” to “yclep’d” in the air ‘Come, thou Goddess, fair and free’ (HG4 / HHA/1/7), “of” to “oft” in the air ‘Sweet Bird’ (HG39 / HHA/1/40), and “Corfew” to “Curfew” in b. 14 of the air ‘Oft’ on a Plat’ (HG53/2/7 / HHA/1/54).
alterations to “Melancholy” into the tenor I part-book is unclear. Jennens entered two other types of amendment into both scores: several more indications of personality\(^{37}\) and Handel’s composition dates from the autograph score.\(^{38}\) These two types of amendment could have been made once Score B had been copied, but equally they could belong to the first stage of editorial activity: if S2 had failed to copy them into Score B, Jennens might well have noticed and added them there. It is of course possible that S2 did not act on all of Jennens’s instructions in Score A: that score is a complicated document, and copyists make mistakes; indeed, S2 did not follow one of the performance directions that Jennens imported from the autograph score.\(^{39}\)

The second group of amendments that Jennens made after Score B had been copied appear only there (and on one occasion in the part-books), and must have arisen from a study of that score. Although he could have entered one correction of spelling into Score A,\(^{40}\) most of these amendments concern only Score B and the part-books because the problem is not present in Score A. In a few instances this was because the problem was introduced by S2: a spelling,\(^{41}\) a tempo marking,\(^{42}\) the omission of text (ex. 56), and the omission of a bar, which was the only one of these variants that Jennens also entered into the relevant part-books (ex. 57). Another of his amendments in Score B appears only in that score because the movement in question is not present in Score A. The text of the air ‘Far from all Resort of Mirth’ is as follows:

Far from all Resort of Mirth  
Save the Cricket on the Hearth,  
Or the Bellman’s drowsy Charm,  
To bless the Doors from nightly Harm.

In Handel’s second setting of the second line, he separated the word “save”, stating it three times on its own. Jennens replaced the word “save” here with the word “all” – not present in Milton or in the wordbook – in order to retain the sense of “save” as meaning “except”, which

\(^{37}\) Jennens wrote the following indications in both of his scores: “L’Allegro” at the accompanied recitative ‘Hence! loathed Melancholy’ (HG1 / HHA/1/3); “Il Penseroso” at the accompanied recitative ‘Hence! vain deluding Joys’ (HG2 / HHA/1/6), at the air ‘Oft’ on a Plat’ (HG53 / HHA/1/54), and at the accompanied recitative ‘Me, when the Sun’ (HG104 / HHA/1/109); and “L’Allegro & Il Penseroso” at the duet ‘As steals the Morn’ (HG157 / HHA/1/168).

\(^{38}\) Jennens wrote Handel’s dates for the completion of each Part into both scores, but he entered Handel’s date for beginning Part I only in Score A.

\(^{39}\) In the first four bars of the air and chorus ‘Come, and trip it as you go’ (HG20 / HHA/1/22), the viola has its own line; at b. 6, Handel wrote only the violin line, with the instruction “la viola una ottava bassa piano” above it. Although Jennens copied this instruction into Score A, S2 wrote in Score B “unis. Col. viol:” and wrote the first note of the viola line, indicating that it should play in unison with the violins. When he copied the viola part-book, he ignored this in turn, alternating between octaves.

\(^{40}\) Jennens altered “breath” to “breathe” in b. 52 of the air ‘Hide me from Day’s garish Eye’ (HG107/1/8 / HHA/1/111) in Score B and not in Score A.

\(^{41}\) In bb. 24 and 41 of the air ‘Sweet Bird’ (HG41/2/2 and 43/1/4 / HHA/1/42 and 1/44), S2 wrote “noice” (instead of “noise”) in Score B and the soprano I part-book; as Score A already contained the correct spelling, Jennens corrected this to “noise” only in Score B.

\(^{42}\) Jennens added to Score B the Allegro marking that S2 had omitted in the air and chorus ‘These Delights’ (HG121 / HHA/1/123).
had been lost through Handel’s repetition of it (ex. 58). It is interesting to note that he also entered this revision retrospectively into the Additional Score. Jennens was probably responsible for a further correction made to both the Additional Score and Score B (ex. 59). There are several more corrections to errors of pitch and spelling in Score B, but these are not mentioned here as it is impossible to determine whether it was Jennens who was responsible, or a later owner.

The second question regarding filiation – from which score were the part-books copied? – is fairly straightforward because there are many variants that prove that the part-books were copied from Score B throughout. Reliable variants common to several part-books include variants of pitch (exx. 60-67), variants of rhythm (exx. 51 and 68), an error that cannot be a coincidence (ex. 69), and variants arising from a change of line or page in Score B.\(^43\) This filiation is further supported by the fact that Score B contains bar counts, whereas Score A does not: S2 presumably added the bar counts in order to check that he had copied the correct number of bars. Variants relating to single part-books are now given.

### Violin I part-book (v. 37)

Four variants – two of pitch (exx. 70-71), one involving trills (ex. 72), and the fact that S2 omitted b. 66 of the bass air ‘Mirth, admit me of thy Crew’ in the violin I part-book (see ex. 57) – provide further evidence\(^44\) that the violin I part-book was copied from Score B. (The missing bar was added into the part-book, probably by Jennens.)

### Violin II part-book (v. 38)

In addition to three variants already given (exx. 51, 60, and 62), a variant of pitch (ex. 73) proves that S2 copied the violin II part-book from Score B when it has its own part.\(^45\) That S2 omitted b. 66 of the bass air (see ex. 57) may be taken as further evidence that this part-

---

\(^{43}\) On three occasions, such a change resulted in a note that had been written as a semibreve in Score A being copied as tied minims; on each of these occasions, the note appeared as tied minims in the relevant part-books even though those part-books did not have a change of line or page. The occasions and the part-books in question are as follows: b. 8 of the accompanied recitative ‘Hence, vain deluding Joys’ (HG174 / HHA/1/79) in the violin I and viola part-books; b. 6 of the accompanied recitative ‘Me, when the Sun’ (HG104 / HHA/1/109) in the soprano I and ’cello part-books; and b. 3 of the accompanied recitative chorus ’Sweet Tempr’ance’ (HG146/4/3 / HHA/1/157) in the violin I, violin II, viola, and ’cello part-books.

\(^{44}\) Five variants already given show that it is not derived from the performing score (exx. 4, 6, 9, 13, 15, 16, and 17); three show that its source must be something in Jennens’s collection (exx. 23, 27, and 35); and three show that its source was Score B (exx. 51, 62, and 66).

\(^{45}\) Further variants for the violin II part-book have already been given: six show that it is not derived from the performing score (exx. 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, and 15), and eight show that it must have been copied from something within Jennens’s collection (exx. 25, 34, 35, 50, 52, 66, 71, and 72).
book was copied from Score B; again, the bar was later added, but it is difficult to tell by whom.

In unison numbers S2 must have copied the violin II part-book not from Score B but from the violin I part-book: the two part-books share two variants of pitch (exx. 74-5), three of rhythm (exx. 76-8), and one of note-length (ex. 79).

**Viola/violin III part-book (v. 39)**

The viola/violin III part-book (henceforth referred to as the “viola part-book”) must also have been copied from Score B: the two manuscripts share one variant of pitch (ex. 80) and four variants of rhythm (exx. 81-4); the part-book contains an error that can only have arisen from Score B (ex. 85); and b. 66 of the bass air was omitted (ex. 57), and later added, probably Jennens.46

**Cello part-book (v. 40)**

The ‘cello part-book contains two variants of pitch that must have come from Score B (exx. 86-7). This relationship is further confirmed by seven variants already given (exx. 51, 60, 61, 63-5, and 67), as well as by the fact that the ‘cello part-book originally lacked b. 66 of the bass air (see ex. 57), which has now been squeezed in.47

**Bassoon I part-book (v. 42)**

A variant of pitch (ex. 88) and one relating to clefs (ex. 89) prove that S2 copied the bassoon I part-book from Score B when he could not use the ‘cello part-book as his source, either because he needed to see the vocal line to determine when the bassoon should play, or because the bassoon has its own part.48 A second variant of pitch (ex. 90) proves that he continued to use Score B as his source even when he was copying choruses, and therefore could have used the ‘cello part-book. It is clear that it was Jennens who added b. 66 of the

---

46 Further evidence that the viola part-book was copied from Score B has already been given (exx. 51, 62, and 69); this filiation is supported by four variants that show that it is not derived from the performing score (exx. 1, 8, 18, and 47), and three that show that S2’s source was something within Jennens’s collection (exx. 24, 31, and 32).

47 Variants already given that relate to the ‘cello part-book show that it is not derived from the performing score (exx. 2, 14, 21, and 26), and that its source must have been something in Jennens’s collection (exx. 28, 41, and 46).

48 The bassoon I part-book contains four variants that have already been cited: two that show that it is not related to the performing score (exx. 14 and 22), and two that show it was copied from something in Jennens’s collection (exx. 30 and 40).
bass air ‘Mirth, admit me of thy Crew’ to this part-book (see ex. 57), which suggests that he was responsible for adding it to the other instrumental part-books.

**Bassoon II part-book (v. 43)**

That S2 copied most of the bassoon II part-book from the bassoon I part-book is suggested by an error involving clefs (ex. 91), and by the fact that the bassoon I part-book includes, on three occasions, instructions concerning when the bassoon II part-book should stop playing (exx. 92-4). Presumably when S2 wrote these instructions to himself, he was envisaging copying the bassoon II part-book from the bassoon I part-book, and therefore being unable to see when the singer was singing.49 Two exceptions exist, both in the chorus that ends Part II: a tie (ex. 95) and a variant of pitch (ex. 96) show that S2 did not copy the bassoon II part-book from the bassoon I part-book at this point. In the accompanied recitative ‘Hence! loathed Melancholy’ (HG1 / HHA/1/3), S2 copied the bassoon II part-book from Score B (ex. 60); he could not have used the bassoon I part-book on this occasion as the bassoons have separate parts.50

It was definitely Jennens who added the missing bar to the bass air ‘Mirth, admit me of thy Crew’ in this part-book. Unfortunately he accidentally added it between bb. 70 and 71 (rather than between bb. 65 and 67), presumably because bb. 65 and 67 are immediately above bb. 70 and 71:

![Bassoon II part-book example](https://example.com/bassoon-II-example.png)

MS 130 Hd4 v. 43 (unpaginated). The first bar shown here is b. 64.

**Oboe/flute I part-book (v. 44)**

The oboe/flute I part-book (henceforth referred to as the “oboe I part-book”) must also have been copied from Score B, as it shares with that score an error of pitch (ex. 97) and the

---

49 The other possibility – that S2 initially copied only one bassoon part-book, from which two bassoonists were to play – is not borne out by the paper characteristics of the two part-books or by the spacing of the title “Basson Primo” in the bassoon I part-book.

omission of a trill (ex. 98). Further evidence of the same filiation relates to the doubling of the soprano line (ex. 99), and one variant that has already been given (ex. 69).  

When S2 copied the chorus ‘These Pleasures, Melancholy, give’ (HG135 / HHA/1/144) into the oboe part-books, he decided that the oboes should double the soprano line. The variants reveal that he copied this chorus from a score (presumably Score B), but that he did not always copy from the soprano line of that score. He must have begun copying it from the violin I line, as the oboe part-books contain the extra note given to violin I by Handel (ex. 100). Although in Score B the soprano line is written in the same clef as the violins and oboe (i.e. not in C1 clef, the usual clef for sopranos), this approach would have saved S2 some effort: when Handel writes out an instrumental line that doubles a vocal line in a chorus, he often ties notes that are not tied in the vocal line due to a change of syllable. Because this is the case in this chorus, and possibly because S2 knew this to be a common practice, he might well have assumed that this would be the case also in the oboe line; by copying the oboe line from the violin line he did not have to make any decisions on this matter (see, for example, ex. 101). S2 was paying attention to the soprano line, however: when, in b. 47, Handel decided that violin I should play an octave higher than the soprano line, the octave at which S2 wrote the oboe part-books and the lack of a tie in b. 48 prove that here he copied the oboe I part-book from the soprano line (ex. 102). Evidence involving notation shows that he continued to copy from the soprano line even when violin I returned to the lower octave (ex. 103).

Oboe/flute II part-book (v. 45)

S2 did not leave any clues to reveal from which score he copied the oboe/flute II part-book (henceforth referred to as the “oboe II part-book”) when it has its own part. However, it appears that S2 followed his normal practice in using the oboe I part-book as his source in numbers in which the oboes play in unison: the oboe part-books share an error of pitch (ex. 104), a rhythm (ex. 105), a slur (ex. 106), and three more variants already mentioned (exx. 100-102). In the accompanied recitative ‘Hence! loathed Melancholy’ (HG1 / HHA/1/3), S2 had violins, oboes, and bassoon play the music written on the upper stave (violins and oboes playing an octave higher) and the ´cello playing the basso continuo line. As he had oboe I play the upper line with violin I and bassoon I, and oboe II play the lower line with violin II

---

51 That the oboe I part-book is not related to the performing score is shown by three variants (exx. 16, 22, and 33); and that it was copied from something within Jennens’s collection is confirmed by a further variant (ex. 35).
and bassoon II, he must have decided that it would be easiest to extract the oboe II part from the violin II part-book at this point, as the two part-books share an error of rhythm (ex. 107). S2 interpreted Handel’s *tutti* at the beginning of the air and chorus ‘Haste thee, Nymph’ (HG12 / HHA/1/14) (added to Score A by Jennens) as meaning that oboe II should join oboe I in playing the violin I line. In both oboe part-books, the air ‘Come, with gentle Hand restrain’ (HG152 / HHA/1/163) is marked *tacet* because in the performing score, Score A, and Score B it is not apparent that they should be playing. (The autograph score reveals that they ought to be: Handel marked b. 9 “v.p” (i.e. violin *piano*).)


Entitled “Corno solo”, the horn part-book contains only the bass air ‘Mirth, admit me of thy Crew’. It is clear that it was copied from Score B: it originally lacked b. 66 (see ex. 57) and it contains a second variant that can only have come from that score (ex. 108).

**Trumpet I part-book (US-Ws: W.b. 527)**

On the basis of the other part-books and the omission of a trill (ex. 109), it seems likely that S2 copied the trumpet part-book from Score B.

**Trumpet II part-book (US-Cu: MS 437 v. 24)**

A variant of pitch (ex. 110) proves that the trumpet II part-book was copied from Score B.

**Timpani part-book (v. 353)**

The only variant relating to the timpani part-book reveals that it was not copied from the performing score (ex. 7). However, given the filiation of the other part-books, it seems reasonable to assume that it was also copied from Score B.

---

52. Other variants relating to the oboe II part-book include: one more in the same accompanied recitative (ex. 60); three that show it not to be related to the performing score (exx. 16, 22, and 33); one that shows it must have been copied from something within Jennens’s collection (ex. 35); and one that is shared by the oboe I part-book and Score B (ex. 99).
The filiation of the instrumental part-books is therefore as follows:

Soprano I part-book (v. 29)

The soprano I part-book must have been copied from Score B: the two manuscripts share a variant of rhythm (ex. 111), one of note-length (ex. 112), one involving an unnecessary accidental (ex. 113), and one relating to notation,\(^\text{53}\) in addition to seven already mentioned (exx. 21, 28, 37, 46, 64, 65, and 68). For S2’s possible source in the duet ‘As steals the Morn’, see the section on the tenor I part-book.

Soprano II part-book (v. 30)

One variant of rhythm (ex. 114), one that involves both pitch and a trill (ex. 115), one involving clefs (ex. 116), and two already given (exx. 51 and 61) prove that S2 copied the solo numbers in the soprano II part-book from Score B.\(^\text{54}\) A variant relating to spacing suggests S2 copied the soprano II part-book’s choruses from Score B, rather than from the soprano I part-book.\(^\text{55}\)

---

\(^{53}\) In the recitative ‘But let my due Feet’ (HG131 / HHA/1/141), S2 wrote tied minims instead of a semibreve in the basso continuo of b. 5; it would be extremely unlikely for him to have done so had he not been copying from Score B, which has a change of line at this point (the autograph score, the performing score, and Score A do not have a change of page or line here).

\(^{54}\) Two further variants confirm that the soprano part-book was copied from something within Jennens’s collection (exx. 29 and 41).

\(^{55}\) In the soprano II part-book, S2 wrote an extra bar-line in the middle of b. 75 of the chorus ‘These Delights’ (HG129/1/3 / HHA/1/137). Score B is the only of the sources to have a change of page in this bar: the autograph score, the performing score, and Score A, and the soprano I part-book have no changes of line or page here.
Alto part-book (v. 31)

Only two new variants relate to the immediate filiation of the alto part-book:56 both are of pitch, and both are in the air and chorus ‘Haste thee, Nymph’; unfortunately they contradict each other. One suggests that S2 was copying from Score B (ex. 117), which would be in line with his approach in the other part-books; the other appears to show him copying from anything other than Score B. It contains an error of pitch that is extremely likely to have occurred if S2, writing in G2 clef, was copying from a source written in C3 clef; unfortunately, the alto line in Score B is also written in G2 clef (ex. 118). These variants can be accounted for in two ways: either S2 could have changed his source, or the variants could be a result of the way in which S2 wrote b. 43 in Score B. This bar is the first bar of the chorus section, but S2 compressed the instrumental and vocal score vertically so that he could squeeze the bar onto the lower right corner of the page that contained the final bars of the solo section (ex. 119). It is possible that, as an aid to copying, he had written the bar out elsewhere in the original clefs and was copying from this.

Tenor I part-book (v. 33)

The tenor I part-book has very few reliable variants.57 To complicate the picture, a variant of note-length suggests that it was not copied from Score B in airs (ex. 120); however, this variant could plausibly represent a conscious correction by S2. Interestingly, the tenor I part-book must be related to the soprano I part-book in the duet ‘As steals the Morn’: the two vocal part-books share a variant relating to stave designation (ex. 121), and two bizarre slurs (ex. 122). The fact that the soprano I part-book has part of a word missing whereas the tenor I part-book does not (ex. 123) might suggest that the tenor I part-book was copied first.

Tenor II part-book (v. 34)

Five variants reveal that the tenor II part-book was not copied from the tenor I part-book in choruses: two errors of pitch (exx. 124-5), a copying error (ex. 126), a variant involving spacing and key signatures (ex. 127), and the fact that, although S2 omitted b. 69 of the air and chorus ‘Haste thee, Nymph’ (HG18/2/2 / HHA/1/20) in the tenor I part-book, the

---

56 Three variants already given show that it is not derived from the performing score (exx. 3, 19, and 20); and two already given show that S2’s source must have been something within Jennens’s collection (exx. 38-9).

57 It is clear only that it was copied not from the performing score (see exx. 2, 14, and 21), but from something in Jennens’s collection (ex. 26).
bar is present in the tenor II part-book. Based on the evidence of the other part-books and the clefs used by S2 in Score B (see ex. 126), it seems likely that Score B was S2’s source.

**Bass I part-book (v. 35)**

Only one variant reveals the source of the bass I part-book to be Score B: the omission of b. 66 in the bass air ‘Mirth, admit me of thy Crew’ (see ex. 57). The bar was added by S2 on this occasion, probably because the omission is obvious in a part-book containing the vocal line.

**Bass II part-book (v. 36)**

The bass II part-book appears to have been copied from the bass I part-book in choruses (exx. 128-9); unfortunately there are no variants to reveal S2’s source in solo numbers.

The filiation of the vocal part-books is therefore as follows; dotted lines signify probable filiation where positive proof is lacking.

Presumably it was for practical reasons that S2 chose to copy the part-books (mostly) from Score B: when copying this score he had had to switch between sources (Score A and the Additional Score); it would have been much easier, faster, and safer to copy the part-books from a single source that contained the version of the oratorio that he needed.

---

58 Two variants support this filiation: S2’s source was not the performing score (ex. 12), but it was something in Jennens’s collection (ex. 36).

59 The two other bass II part-book variants add little to the filiation as they are shared by the bass I part-book (exx. 12 and 36).

60 The line without an arrowhead between the soprano I part-book and the tenor I part-book indicates that in one number, one of these part-books was copied from the other, but that it is impossible to determine which was copied first.
Timing

Although it is impossible to determine when exactly Jennens’s manuscript copies were made and when he revised them, it is possible to ascertain the order in which most of the compositional, scribal, and editorial activities took place. The evidence for establishing the timing of copying and revision of a manuscript in Jennens’s collection usually comprises four factors: Handel’s composition dates; the dates of the first performances and of revivals; paper characteristics; and variants. In the case of L’Allegro, a fifth type of evidence is available in the form of an illuminating letter. On 29 December 1740, Jennens wrote as follows to James Harris:

As soon as I receiv’d your commands (which was on Christmas day) I sent for Rawlins, & gave him the first part of the Allegro in Mr Handel’s original score, which I had borrow’d to correct my own copy. He is now writing it out for you, & shall have the other parts in their turn. I was glad to save my own score, because Dryden’s song, which I lent him, before, was return’d in a dirty condition. I have directed him to omit the present song ‘Come, but keep thy wonted state’, & the chorus following, ‘Joyn with thee calm peace & quiet’, ‘Spare fast &c’ because Mr Handel has interpos’d the 4 lines left out, ‘There held in holy passion still &c’, made the two lines of the chorus a part of the air, & added the Muses singing about Jove’s altar; then chorus da capo as before: & I take it for granted, you will choose to have it writ with the additions in their order. There are 5 more songs added, for which I have order’d him to leave room in your copy: 1. The Landscape, the 4 first lines of which are air, the other 6 accomp. Recit[,] concluding with the air [= ‘Straight mine Eye’ and ‘Mountains’]; 2. The Cricket & the Bellman [= ‘Far from all Resort of Mirth’]; 3. Gorgeous Tragedy [= ‘Sometimes let gorgeous Tragedy’]; 4. Orpheus hearing Lydian airs [= ‘Orpheus’ self’]; 5. The Hermit [= ‘May at last’]. These are all charming, though I know you will wish some of them had been in chorus; but he was positive against more chorus’s, having three new singers to provide for, Andrioni, Sigra Monsa, & Miss Edwards. I am afraid this entertainment will not appear in the most advantageous light, by reason of the mixture of languages: for though he has set Milton’s English words, some of ’em must be translated by Rolli into Italian for Andrioni; Monsa will sing in English as well as she can.61

This letter is well known among Handel scholars, not least on account of Jennens’s cavalier attitude to what is usually taken to be the autograph score.62 Since the score that Jennens refers to as “my own copy” is clearly Score A,63 it can now be confirmed – on the basis of Jennens’s annotations to Score A, described above – that “Mr Handel’s original score” was indeed the now-priceless autograph score.

Jennens’s letter is not only interesting: it is also extremely useful for the present purposes. First, it reveals that Score A was in Jennens’s possession by the end of 1740. Second, while it reveals that Handel had composed the 1741 additions by the time that Jennens wrote to James Harris, it seems to suggest that they were not included in the autograph score when it was borrowed by Jennens: if they were, surely Jennens would have

62 This assumption is often made when the letter is quoted in the form of an amusing anecdote: Jennens’s almost sacrilegious lack of respect towards “Mr Handel’s original score” seems all the more outrageous if that score is the autograph score. Burrows and Dunhill, however, were more cautious, noting in the commentary that the score referred to was “perhaps the autograph, but more likely the ‘conducting score’ [the performing score]” (Music & Theatre in Handel’s World, p. 111).
63 Of the two scores that he owned, it must have been copied first; it is clear that he annotated it using another score before it was used as the source for Score B; and Score B and the part-books were not copied until a few years later.
sent them with the autograph to Thomas Rawlings, who would not have needed to leave space for them. Furthermore, the fact that Jennens does not mention the five bars that Handel added to precede ‘There held in holy Passion still’ suggests that he had not seen the additions in the autograph score, as the five bars are written above the new accompanied recitative there (now f. 66r): presumably his opinion that the additions were “charming” was based on some other encounter with them. Third, Jennens mentions the five new movements written for the 1741 revival but does not refer to the altered ending to the recitative that precedes the added ‘Sometimes let gorgeous Tragedy’ or the cadenza in the air ‘Each Action’; this may suggest that these revisions were not apparent in the autograph when Jennens saw it, and therefore that he found these two revisions at a later date, very possibly in the performing score.

By taking into account all the available evidence, it is possible to sketch a timeline of activities surrounding the production and revision of Jennens’s copies of L’Allegro; this is given in Appendix 4. Regarding the copying of Jennens’s manuscripts, the variants reveal that S1 copied Score A from the autograph score after (at least two of) the 1740 additions were composed and after the performing score had been copied (ex. 21); given the short space of time that Smith and his circle had to copy the performing score and part-books, this is of little surprise. (As has already been noted, a terminus ante quem for S1’s copying Score A is provided by Jennens’s letter.) The paper characteristics of Score B and the part-books date them to the mid-1740s.\(^{64}\)

It is clear that Jennens annotated his manuscripts on at least two occasions: he annotated Score A using the autograph score before Score B and the part-books existed; and he annotated Score B after the part-books had been copied.\(^{65}\) Two more amendments may have been made on separate occasions, but no clues remain as to when: his addition of the personalities into Score A could have been made before he saw the autograph score; and the cues to the 1741 additions that he wrote in Score A could – or could not – have been made at the same time as his annotations from the autograph score. However, his annotations in Score A relating to two alterations made by Handel in 1741 – “alter’d to introduce another Song” over the accompanied recitative that opens Part II\(^{66}\) and “Write this from the other book” over the air ‘Each Action derives new Grace’\(^{67}\) – do reveal something of his editorial activities. First, it seems likely that Jennens did not know about these alterations in December 1740: he

\(^{64}\)This is discussed in Chapter 12.

\(^{65}\)Jennens must have annotated Score B after the part-books had been copied because in most cases the original reading of Score B remains in the part-books: if Jennens had annotated Score B before the part-books were copied they would contain his readings. (As was noted above, Jennens updated the part-books with his revisions only on a few occasions.)

\(^{66}\)The “other song” he referred to is ‘Sometimes let gorgeous Tragedy’, a 1741 addition which required an alteration to the end of the recitative that preceded it.

\(^{67}\)As discussed above, Jennens’s intention was probably for Score B and the part-books to contain the cadenza (ex. 45).
did not mention them in his letter to James Harris, and he added three dynamics — presumably taken from the autograph score — to the air in Score A. This suggests that Jennens did indeed discover these two alterations when he inspected the performing score. Second, his instructions cannot be intended for anyone other than the copyist of a second score (i.e. S2): until this point it is impossible to tell whether, in making his annotations to Score A, Jennens had a second score in mind. (Even the cues to the Additional Score could have been conceived as a way of making his score of the 1740 version function as a score of the 1741 version.) Third, the ink and the size of the writing in these two annotations are markedly different from his other annotations in Score A (the two annotations are written in much lighter ink, in a much larger script). Most revealing is the fact that the first annotation — “alter’d to introduce another Song” — was made at a later date than Jennens’s addition of the personality: “Il Penseroso” is written in dark ink and is no larger than most of Jennens’s annotations. To this he not only added “alter’d to introduce another Song” in a lighter ink in larger handwriting, but — crucially — he also added a comma: “, alter’d to introduce another Song”. Jennens must have discovered the altered accompanied recitative and the cadenza in ‘Each Action derives new Grace’ after he made the rest of the annotations to Score A — probably when he inspected the performing score.

A close examination of Jennens’s surviving copies of L’Allegro reveals him not only to have spent hours working on his manuscript copies of the work, but also to have continued to return to them over a period of years, striving to create and preserve the best possible version of the oratorio.

---

68 These are all piano markings: in b. 9 (HG155/3/1 / HHA/1/165), b. 12 (HG155/3/4 / HHA/1/166), and b. 22 (HG156/1/5 (b. 29 on HHA/1/166)).
4 Messiah

Jennens owned three manuscript scores,⁠¹ a set of part-books copied by S1,⁠² and a printed edition of Messiah;⁠³ he also owned copies of three settings that were presumably not present elsewhere in his collection.⁠⁴ Of the three manuscript scores that Jennens once owned, only one survives: a three-volume set copied by S2.⁠⁵ Jennens’s two red-morocco scores of the oratorio – a single-volume folio and a three-volume oblong quarto set – are both lost.

Donald Burrows has shown that Jennens’s surviving copies of Messiah are not related to each other: the score was copied by S2 from the performing score, whereas the part-books were copied by S1 from the autograph score.⁶

Burrows states that, although S2 copied most of the score on paper bearing the watermark C90, a few numbers have been replaced using paper bearing the watermark Cn. Two of these – the common-time setting of the air ‘Rejoice greatly’ and the chorus setting of ‘Their Sound is gone out’ – were new additions for the 1745 revival, which suggests that S2 had originally copied the score before these settings were composed. Speculating as to why the other three numbers – the soprano setting of the recitative ‘Then shall the Eyes of the Blind be open’d’, the soprano-only setting of the air ‘He shall feed his Flock’, and the soprano setting of the air ‘If God be for us’ – were inserted, Burrows notes that the two airs are those of which Jennens appears to have altered the underlay in the performing score. However, given that S2 copied Jennens’s amendments as an integral part of only the first of these airs (so that Jennens had to enter his amendments to the air ‘If God be for us’ into his score), Burrows speculates that the score might originally have contained different voice arrangements of these numbers.⁷ Jennens made several alterations to the underlay in this score. The most famous of these are in the air ‘I know that my Redeemer liveth’; these are explained by Burrows, who prefers Handel’s underlay.⁸

S1 must have copied the part-books after S2 had copied the score, as the part-books contain the 1745 amendments.⁹

---

¹ Lot 245 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale.
² GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 vv. 142-9 (violin I, violin II, viola, ’cello, soprano, alto, tenor, and bass), 247-8 (trumpet I and trumpet II), and 353 (timpani). The first eight of these were bound with the part-books to Israel in Egypt, and sold as part of lot 239 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale.
³ A Randall & Abell print, lot 246 of the Sotheby’s sale.
⁴ GB-Lbl: RM 19. a. 2, ff. 54r-66v. These are the D minor alto settings of the airs ‘But who may abide’ and ‘Thou art gone up on High’ (both written for Guadagni in 1750), and the shorter setting of the air ‘Why do the Nations’.
⁵ GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 vv. 198-200.
⁷ Ibid., pp. 207-8. These pages also contain music examples showing Jennens’s alterations to the two airs.
⁸ Burrows, Handel: Messiah, pp. 79-80. Smith appreciates the intentions of both men, describing Jennens’s alterations as “turning Handel’s elegant variation into an unwavering statement of faith” (The Man behind Handel’s Messiah, p. 53).
5 Samson

Jennens once owned a manuscript score of Samson, bound in red morocco with gilt tooling, which is now lost;\(^1\) luckily other copies of the work owned by Jennens survive in the form of a set of part-books bound in half calf\(^2\) and a Walsh print.\(^3\) These remaining sources reveal that Jennens made his own version of Samson.

This chapter does not constitute the first study of these sources: since Samson has recently been published by Novello (2005, edited by Donald Burrows) and the HHA (2011, edited by Hans Dieter Clausen), the part-books and the Walsh print have already been studied by two modern scholars. In 2004 Burrows first drew attention to the fact that the contents of the part-books differ from any version of the oratorio ever intended by Handel or Hamilton.\(^4\) The differences relate not only to the verbal text, but also to the musical text and the structure of the oratorio. It was only after publishing these findings that Burrows discovered Jennens’s markings in his Walsh print of the oratorio.\(^5\) In his printed edition, Jennens had altered the verbal text of many of the airs, added figurings, and queried readings. As Jennens’s red-morocco score is now lost, Burrows could only speculate as to whether the part-books were copied using the annotated Walsh print (in addition to instructions by Jennens) or whether there was an intermediate manuscript score. As a result of his work for the HHA, Clausen concluded that the filiation of Jennens’s manuscript copies of Samson was as follows:

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{fielation.png}
\caption{Filiation of Jennens’s manuscript copies of Samson.}
\end{figure}

Clausen writes that the red-morocco score (“X” in his edition) was copied from both the autograph score (in the middle of Part I and for most of Part II) and the performing score (elsewhere).\(^6\) As the red-morocco score is missing, it is almost impossible to determine how

\begin{itemize}
\item Lot 265 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale.
\item GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 vv. 275-90 (harpischord, violin I, violin II, viola, ’cello, oboe I, oboe II, bassoon I and II, soprano I, soprano II, alto, tenor I, tenor II, tenor III, bass I, and bass II), 247-8 (trumpet I and trumpet II), and 353 (timpani).
\item Lot 234 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale, now GB-Mp: B.R. f530 Hd665. Two more printed editions of Samson are listed in the catalogue but are now lost: lot 232 (“engraved throughout, half russia”) and lot 233 (“Another edition, wants leaf of license [sic]”).
\end{itemize}
the part-books relate to each other (e.g. whether in unison numbers the oboe II part-book was
copied from the red-morocco score or from the oboe I part-book). However, a mistake made
by S2 in the violin II part-book suggests that he was copying from the violin I part-book in
the air ‘Let the bright Seraphim’ (HG269 / HHA/1/303), in which the violins play in unison only
until b. 60. When he reached b. 60 he copied the violin I line into the violin II part-book; he
then noticed his error and rectified it by writing the violin II part below, linked by an “NB”.
He is much more likely to have made this mistake if he was copying from the violin I part-
book than if he was copying from a score.

Jennens’s alterations to his surviving Walsh print and the relationship between it and
his manuscript copies are discussed later in the chapter.

**Jennens’s amendments to *Samson***

Clausen gives most of Jennens’s amendments to *Samson* in his critical report, but that
is a complicated document and some effort would be needed to reconstruct Jennens’s version
of *Samson* from it. Therefore I have given all of Jennens’s amendments to the verbal text and
structure of the oratorio in Appendix 5. As Clausen included a side-by-side comparison of the
wordbook and Milton’s text, I have not done so. However, in Appendix 5 I have printed in
red every word of Hamilton’s that is taken from Milton, so that the reader may easily see
which parts of the text are Milton’s, and which are Hamilton’s; I have also given Milton’s text
in footnotes where it is directly relevant to Jennens’s amendments. In some cases it is
possible that the wordbook does not represent Hamilton’s intentions; I have not compared the
wordbook to the Larpent copy of the oratorio, partly because that is beyond the scope of this
dissertation, and partly because it is what Jennens had in front of him that is important in
considering his revisions. Although Burrows and Clausen have commented on some of
Jennens’s amendments, these have not until now been studied in depth: that is the aim of this
chapter.

The special attention that Jennens afforded the oratorio – having his score bound so
handsomely and spending so much effort on revising it – demonstrates the importance that the
work had for him. One of the reasons for his interest in the oratorio is likely to have been the
fact that Newburgh Hamilton, the librettist, had based the oratorio on *Samson Agonistes* and

---

7 Clausen (ed.), *Samson*, i, pp. xxxv-lxvii.
8 This would have been impossible without the work of Clausen.
other poems by Milton: Jennens was not only a great admirer of Milton’s poetry,⁹ but had himself been involved in adapting it for Handel.¹⁰ If Jennens’s admiration of Milton’s poetry sparked his interest in the oratorio, it also lay behind many of his amendments: it will become clear that Jennens was anything but happy with the way in which Hamilton – who in writing a libretto was constrained in his use of poetical form, and limited to fewer than half as many lines as *Samson Agonistes* – had adapted Milton’s words.¹¹ However, the overriding reason for Jennens’s interest in the oratorio was very probably the fact that Samson was an important type of Christ, and as such was a primary instance of the Old Testament foreshadowing the New: a powerful argument against deists. The many ways in which the life of Samson prefigured the life of Christ are given in Appendix 6, which is taken from a comparison of the two by Samuel Mather.¹² The crucial similarities for the oratorio are the angelic annunciations that foretold their births, the way in which Samson and Christ were betrayed for silver – Samson by Delilah, and Christ by Judas – and their deaths, in which they were both “apprehended by their Enemies, led away bound, brought forth at a great Feast, blinded, (Christ was blindfolded) scorned, fastned to a Post, offered themselves willingly to Death, died amongst wicked Men, and thereby destroyed the Power of the Church’s Enemies”.¹³

However, this was probably not the main motivation for Hamilton in adapting Milton’s dramatic poem in the early 1740s: the reading of Samson that seems to be foremost in Hamilton’s mind is that of a national hero who, through the Spirit of the Lord, is moved to free his people from an oppressive nation.¹⁴ Whether the oppressor was Britain’s enemies in the 1740s or the tyranny of monarchy that Milton had in mind, it is easy to see why Jennens,  

---

⁹ It seems that, despite Milton’s politics, Jennens admired Milton as a poet. This is evident not only in his revisions to *Samson*: when the engineer John Grundy visited Gopsall in 1750, he noted that Jennens’s library contained (or was to contain) a bust of Milton, and that the site of this bust was decorated with “Milton done in stucco”. (This description appears in John Grundy, *A Book of Minutes taken in a Journey to and from Chester and Liverpool* (Brotherton MS Gen. 2. vol. 4, 3-25), which was first brought to the attention of the Handel community by Brenda Sumner (‘Charles Jennens’ Piano and Music Room’, pp. 1-3); I am grateful to Ruth Smith for sending me a transcript of the relevant section of the journal.)


¹³ Ibid., p. 106.

as a non-juror, would prefer to view Samson as a type of Christ than as a national hero, even if the defence of Christianity were not of primary importance for him.

Although Jennens’s main interest in the oratorio was probably its typological subtext, the motivation behind many (if not all) of his amendments appears to have been his frustration with the way in which Hamilton had adapted Milton’s text. Such was his frustration that he could not resist expressing it on the cover of his Walsh print: between “the Words taken from Milton” and “Set to Musick by Mr. Handel”, Jennens added “mix’d with Nonsense by Hamilton and”. As will become clear, most of Jennens’s editorial energy was expended in exorcising Hamilton’s “Nonsense” by restoring Milton’s text, meaning, and focus. For this reason I begin my discussion of Jennens’s amendments with an examination of those which involve restoring Milton.

While Jennens’s desire to reinstate the words of the great poet in place of the words of the librettist who had dared to stray from them must have been an over-arching reason for his amendments, other motivations, which reveal various aspects of Jennens’s character, seem also to have played a part. While Jennens evidently considered much of Hamilton’s “Nonsense” to relate to the way in which he had compressed Milton’s work into a libretto, it is also likely that Jennens included within Hamilton’s “Nonsense” his political and theological presentation of Samson. Unfortunately – for the reader interested in the more profound motivations behind Jennens’s amendments to *Samson* – there exists no single revision in which the sole motivation could be said to relate to Samson as a national hero or as a type of Christ. This is because Hamilton achieved his presentation of Samson as a national hero by departing from Milton: any reversal by Jennens of Hamilton’s presentation may have been made simply because he was annoyed by Hamilton’s departure from Milton. Even so, I mention below any possible “deeper” motivations in the discussion of Jennens’s amendments. The possibility that these motivations were factors in some of Jennens’s amendments is bolstered not only by the fact that Jennens did not blindly delete everything that was of Hamilton’s invention, but also by the fact that Jennens himself departed from Milton on several occasions. These occasions, and the motivations that seem to have been their driving force, are considered after those in which Jennens restored Milton. Jennens’s amendments are not less interesting simply because very few of them relate directly to religion or politics: they give an insight into the mind of a highly educated and meticulous man working with great pragmatism, imagination, and precision, and compelled to do so by a higher purpose. Winton Dean’s comment, in relation to Hamilton’s adaptation of Milton, that “the immense trouble taken, and the scrupulous reverence for the poet’s text, must be unique at this period”\(^\text{15}\) is

---

\(^{15}\) Dean, *Oratorios*, p. 330.
rendered rather ironic by Jennens’s labours: his revisions reveal him to have been at least as industrious and scrupulous as Hamilton, if not more so; and he would have been extremely unlikely to describe Hamilton’s treatment of Milton as scrupulously reverent.

Restoring Milton

Most of Jennens’s amendments involved restoring Milton’s text, meaning, or focus to the libretto. Jennens clearly knew his Milton extremely well, and must have had a copy of Milton’s works to hand when he revised Samson. Jennens was skilful enough to have improved Hamilton’s text without reference to Milton’s had he wanted to (since he could have invented text himself): that he chose reinstate Milton’s text whenever possible demonstrates his admiration for Milton, and his annoyance with Hamilton’s freedom with the words of the great poet. Although this admiration and annoyance presumably lay behind all instances in which Jennens replaced Hamilton’s text with Milton’s, it was probably not always the only motivation. For this reason, the following discussion is organised according to the probable motivation behind Jennens’s amendments, not according to their size or to the techniques involved in making them.

It is entirely typical of Jennens that his motivation seems occasionally to have been to improve Hamilton’s grammar. On three occasions he restored Milton’s subjunctive: he replaced “answers” with “answer” (ex. 1),16 he replaced “is” with “be” (ex. 2); and he retained Milton’s “be” and altered another line (“bids” to “bid”) in a similar manner so that the text is consistent (ex. 3).

On several occasions Jennens’s restoring of Milton improved Hamilton’s poetry. Examples include replacing “No Words of Peace” (line 388) with Milton’s “No honey’d Words” (ex. 4), or “endless Blaze of Light” (line 703) with “endless Morn of Light” (ex. 5). Jennens’s desire to improve the imagery of the libretto could also have been the motivation behind his alteration of a line near the end of the oratorio, in which he reintroduced Milton’s words “knock the Breast” (ex. 6): these words are far more vivid than “dispraise or blame”, which Hamilton had taken from another of Milton’s lines. A wish to improve poetry probably lay behind one of the very few instances in which Jennens replaced a line of Hamilton’s invention with a line of his own (ex. 7): Jennens could have taken issue either with Hamilton’s feeble repetition of “ever”, or with the inappropriateness of the euphemism “closed his eyes” when applied to Samson. Jennens’s use of the word “ravish’d” here sounds odd only to modern ears. A very similar use of the word can be found, for example, in

16 Examples are given in Appendix 7.
Dryden’s translation of Virgil’s *Georgics* Book IV: “For ever I am ravish’d from thy sight” (line 719). It is not impossible that Jennens had this line in mind, since – as is noted below – other lines of his bear similarities to Dryden’s translations of Virgil.

Grammar and poetry were not the only issues at stake, however. It often happened that, by restoring Milton’s text, Jennens also restored Milton’s sense, which Hamilton had altered or omitted. One example occurs in a line that has already been considered in relation to the subjunctive (ex. 8): Hamilton had altered Milton’s sense by introducing “us”; by replacing “let us” with “bear a”, Jennens restored the idea that God will not long endure anyone doubting that he is the one Lord. Another example is the way in which Hamilton and Jennens choose to condense how Milton’s Samson describes the behaviour of women (ex. 9). It is not so much Hamilton’s choice of words that is problematic, but the order in which he places them: it is odd to place “repent” where he does, particularly given the line that follows. It also undermines Samson’s description of Dalila as the devious “bosom Snake” he evidently perceives her to be, instead rendering her emotionally chaotic. Jennens brought the text closer to Milton by restoring his sequence and by removing Hamilton’s alteration of “repentant” to “repent”. He also focused the text more clearly on Dalila’s betrayal of Samson not only by restoring “betray”, but also by replacing “all Vows” with “all Faith”: to break all vows is bad enough, but to break all faith is worse. Near the end of Part I, Jennens altered Hamilton’s text so that it was closer to Milton’s both in the choice and order of words and in the meaning (ex. 10): Hamilton’s Manoa has already spoken to the lords, but in Milton and Jennens he only plans to. This is a crucial difference, since it is clear later on in the libretto that Manoa has not yet arranged a ransom. Since “To treat of Ransom” contains more syllables than “To ransom thee”, Jennens had to alter the music (HG/89/4/4-89/5/1 / HHA/1/102):

---

18 Hamilton retained Milton’s spellings “Dalila” and “Manoa”, which are used here.
As Jennens normally managed to retain Hamilton’s syllable count and stress, it seems that he was unable to do so on this occasion.

Many of Jennens’s amendments seem to have been motivated by the fact that Hamilton, in compressing Milton’s poem, had omitted a thought that was necessary to Milton’s meaning. Usually Jennens was able to include the thought without altering the length of the text: this he achieved by sacrificing one segment of Milton’s text for another. One example occurs in Samson’s first accompanied recitative, which Jennens altered in two places (ex. 11). Hamilton had omitted two vital words of Milton’s: “with me”. In order to restore these two words, Jennens compressed Milton’s “suffers not mine eye to harbour sleep, or thoughts to rest” even further than Hamilton had done. This he achieved neatly: “forbid my Soul to rest” is shorter than Hamilton’s compression of Milton’s line, leaving Jennens with enough room to restore not only “with me”, but also the word “hope”; furthermore, he managed to restore Milton’s important word “Soul”. It is also worth noting that Jennens replaced Hamilton’s “Dagon shall stoop” with Milton’s “Dagon must stoop”. In both it is certain that Jehovah will prevail, but the former lacks the anxiety of the latter. While Hamilton’s makes a good introduction to the air that follows (‘Why does the God of Isr’el sleep?’), Milton’s makes more sense in terms of Samson’s psychological state at this point in the oratorio.

Jennens sacrificed one segment of Milton’s text for another at the end of the recitative that precedes Samson’s famous Part I air, ‘Total Eclipse’. In the libretto, the seamless flow between Micah’s question and Samson’s reply gives no indication that in Samson Agonistes the question occurs almost one hundred lines later than the lines that Hamilton used as an answer. Hamilton’s compression of two parts of Milton’s poem into one naturally resulted in the omission of a number of lines; Jennens apparently disagreed with Hamilton over which of Milton’s lines were more important. His alteration of Hamilton’s final line (ex. 12) had two effects. First, it brought the text closer to Milton’s: the thought that Samson is blind among his enemies is not only spoken by Samson himself, but is also spoken at the same point at which he compares it to other afflictions. Second, Hamilton’s final line – ‘My very Soul in real Darkness dwells’ – suddenly introduces Samson’s spiritual darkness into what was otherwise a discussion of his physical blindness. Whereas both are mentioned by Milton’s chorus, only Samson’s corporeal darkness is under consideration at this point in the libretto: perhaps Jennens objected to this sudden leap. Jennens’s restoring of Milton’s “blind among enemies” is interesting in another respect. Since “To be thus blind among my Enemies!” and the line that it replaces are both iambic pentameters, one might expect that the two lines would work equally well in Handel’s setting. However, they do not:
This is because “dwell” is stronger than the final syllable of “Enemies”; apparently this did not bother Jennens.

Although Jennens could usually restore Milton’s meaning while retaining Hamilton’s syllable count and stress, he could not do so at Dalila’s first appearance. As Jennens was unable to find a suitable segment of Hamilton’s text that could be omitted, he was forced to compose music to fit the extra text. In Samson Agonistes, the chorus describes to the blind Samson how Dalila enters and attempts to speak. Hamilton managed to condense Milton’s six lines into four, but Jennens was unhappy with the way in which he had achieved this (ex. 13). Hamilton’s lines are confusing: it sounds as if Dalila has already spoken because he omitted “about t’ have spoke” and inserted “to thee” after “address’d”. Jennens’s revisions make it clear that she has not yet spoken. That Jennens chose not to restore Milton’s iambic pentameter “And words addrest seem into tears dissolv’d” was quite a radical decision on his part, given that it would have fitted the music equally well. It is likely that he departed from Milton in this instance in order to make it completely clear that Dalila had not yet spoken (in the absence of Milton’s sixth line): “suppress’d” is unequivocal. Since Jennens had added six syllables, he was forced to add two bars to Handel’s music:

---

Although Jennens’s two bars are rhythmically possible, the music he wrote for Micah is not only rather high but also unidiomatic: Handel would have been unlikely to return to the chord of a minor at bb. 13-14, and the repetition of the music of b. 11 in b. 14 is also unlikely. It is clear that such composition was the last resort for Jennens, less desirable even than departing from Milton’s text, which he did when Hamilton omitted an important thought in Part I (ex. 14). Hamilton changed Milton’s “who hast of sorrow thy full load besides” to “who hast of Griefs a load”; had Hamilton somehow included the word “besides”, or even the word “already”, he would have retained Milton’s sense of sorrow adding to the grief that Samson already endures. Jennens, who was apparently unwilling to add more syllables (and therefore more notes) to the recitative if possible, was skilful in managing to retain Milton’s sense (by introducing the word “swell”) and Hamilton’s syllable count while phrasing it more colourfully than Hamilton had.

It is clear already that Jennens’s definition of Hamilton’s “Nonsense” was quite wide: his motivations for restoring Milton’s text appear so far to have included grammar, imagery, and meaning. It seems that his definition could also be literal: the motivation behind many changes appears to have been his opinion that what Hamilton had written was nonsensical. For example, the final two lines of the recitative that precedes Samson’s air ‘Your Charms to Ruin led the Way’ are nonsensical from a grammatical point of view; perhaps Jennens thought the only solution was to delete them (ex. 15). By basing his replacement text on the line that Milton placed directly after the line beginning “In vain”, Jennens ensured that the recitative made sense. Unfortunately his lines were now metrically different from Hamilton’s, so he had to alter the music (HG129/5/3-129/6/1-3 / HHA/1/140): 

Jennens’s reluctance to change Handel’s crotchet at b. 9\textsuperscript{1} into a quaver rest and a quaver suggests that he may have been trying to change Handel’s music as little as possible.

More of Hamilton’s nonsense (in the literal sense of the word) occurred because he had omitted a thought that was vital to the sense in Milton. When Jennens was able to restore
the sense by using text by Milton, he did. One example is Samson’s response to the threat that the Philistines would find a way to overcome his strength and drag him to their festival (ex. 16). In attempting to shorten three lines into six syllables, Hamilton lost the sense, present in Milton and restored by Jennens, that Samson might resist them if he bothered to. (The Philistines’ “Art” is their threatened attempts to find an “engine” that would move him as if he were a “solid rock”.) This is confusing: if Samson could resist them, why would he then yield to go? Another example is Jennens’s restoration of Milton’s “gracious”, which not only emphasized God’s capacity to forgive, but also improved Hamilton’s compression of Milton, in which Samson states that God’s eye is “ever open to the Suppliant’s Cry” (ex. 17). To accommodate the new text, Jennens lengthened one of the notes (not in HG / HHA/2/375):

A further reason for restoring Milton’s text seems to have been that in adapting Samson Agonistes, Hamilton had shifted the focus in a direction of which Jennens did not approve. A simple example occurs when Samson laments how he has “profan’d the Mysteries of God” (ex. 18). Milton’s Samson exclaims “O indignity, O blot to Honour and Religion!” Why Hamilton altered this to “Honour and to Arms” (line 165) is unclear, but Jennens’s restoration of “Religion” brings the focus back to Samson’s worst crime: his betrayal of God’s trust. Jennens altered the music slightly to accommodate Milton’s word (HG69/4/2-4 / HHA/1/84):

A major feature of Jennens’s many deletions is that they lessen the presence of the Philistines, and hence restore Milton’s focus on Samson and his people (Israelites in the
Jennens shortened Hamilton’s opening scene, in which the Philistines celebrate Dagon (lines 5-25), and he deleted the “offstage” numbers in Part III: the air and chorus ‘Great Dagon’ (575-9), the symphony of “Horror and Confusion” (between 598 and 599), and the chorus ‘Hear us, our God’ (lines 601-3). Perhaps Jennens did not delete the whole Philistine sequence that opens the oratorio because it is mentioned in Samson Agonistes, in which Samson retires “from popular noise” (line 16); instead he shortened it from chorus-air-chorus-air-chorus to chorus-air-chorus. This is in contrast to ‘Great Dagon’, the symphony of “Horror and Confusion”, and ‘Hear us, our God’, which were entirely of Hamilton’s invention, having been inserted probably in order to strengthen his portrayal of Samson as a national hero (for which, of course, a national enemy is required). Jennens was, as ever, canny in his revisions: instead of omitting entirely the air ‘Ye Men of Gaza’ that Hamilton wrote as part of the opening sequence of the oratorio, he reused it as ‘Ye Men of Israel’, an air encouraging praise of Jehovah that follows on perfectly from the final recitative of the oratorio (see Appendix 5). These revisions may shed light on Jennens’s comment, in his letter to Holdsworth of 15 September 1743, that Handel “said he should be damn’d for preferring Dagon (a Gentleman he was very complaisant to in the Oratorio of Samson) before the Messiah”.22

Jennens’s change in focus from the Philistines to the Israelites (and consequently from Dagon to Jehovah) is also evident in his alterations to the end of Part II (lines 462-71), in which Hamilton wrote a chorus of Israelites calling upon Jehovah to save them, followed first by a similar call from the Priests of Dagon to their God, and then by a chorus in which the Israelites and the Philistines claim the superiority of their respective Gods. Jennens made three alterations to this scene: he marked ‘To Song and Dance’ to be sung by a Chorus of Philistines, removing the distinction that Hamilton had made between the Priests of Dagon and the Philistines; he rearranged the choruses so that the sequence begins with the Philistine chorus; and he altered the final chorus so that it is sung only by the Israelites, thus reducing the presence of the Philistines.23 In Hamilton’s final chorus the Israelites and Philistines state their cases with very similar music and with equal strength, although in Handel’s setting the Israelites get the final word. Jennens’s replacing of the Philistines’ statements of faith with repeated statements of faith from the Israelites, emphasized by his introduction of “Fate” into

---

20 Hamilton transformed Milton’s tribe into the Israelite nation.
21 Jennens’s rearrangement of this scene is considered below.
22 GB-Lom: acc. no. 7687. I am very grateful to Donald Burrows for pointing out the connection between this comment and Jennens’s amendments to the first scene of Samson.
23 Perhaps Jennens kept ‘To Song and Dance’ not only to retain both sides of the argument but also because Milton mentions the danger in which the Philistines place themselves in such celebrations: They only set on sport and play / Unweetingly importun’d / Thir own destruction to come speedy upon them. / So fond are mortal men / Fall’n into wrath divine, / As thir own ruin on themselves to invite, / Insensate left, or to sense reprobate, / And with blindness internal struck. (lines 1679-86).
the chorus, transforms Handel’s and Hamilton’s antiphony of disagreement into an emphatic expression of faith by those who rightly believe their God is omnipotent.

Several of Jennens’s amendments in which he restored Milton constitute no significant improvement to Hamilton’s text in grammar, imagery, or meaning. Some of these are tiny (see, for example, exx. 19-23 and 15 (“thou striv’st”)), but some are more substantial. These include three reversals of innovations made by Hamilton. The first is Jennens’s deletion of the Dead March and the alteration to the recitative that follows it (“The Body comes” to “And when it comes” (lines 666-7)), which restore to the oratorio Milton’s adherence to the unity of time. The second relates to the identity of a minor character. In Samson Agonistes, Harapha’s departure is followed by the arrival of another visitor, who is described to the blind Samson in these words:

And yet perhaps more trouble is behind.
For I descry this way
Some other tending, in his hand
A Scepter or quaint staff he bears,
Comes on amain, speed in his look.
By his habit I discern him now
A Public Officer, and now at hand.
His message will be short and voluble.
(lines 1300-07)

In his opening to Part III, Hamilton shortened this report to two lines and identified the visitor as Harapha:

Micah More Trouble is behind, for Harapha
Comes on amain, Speed in his Steps and Look.

Samson I fear him not, nor all his Giant Brood.
(lines 480-82)

Samson’s reply is taken from earlier in Samson Agonistes, when Samson reacts to Harapha’s departure by saying “I dread him not, nor all his Giant-brood, / Though Fame divulge him Father of five Sons / All of Gigantic size, Goliah chief” (lines 1247-9). Jennens reversed Hamilton’s merging of Harapha and the (Philistine) Officer. However, his alteration of “Harapha” to “an Officer” throughout the scene was not sufficient to achieve this: he also had to remove Samson’s comment about his “Giant Brood”. This Jennens achieved by simply

---

24 Although the Dead March was probably not performed in Handel’s first performances of Samson, it is likely that it was present in the red-morocco score as it was an integral part of the original autograph score. (Donald Burrows, ‘Handel, the Dead March and a Newly Identified Trombone Movement’, EM, 18 (1990), pp. 408-16, at p. 409). Although Jennens had no hope of performing the work with trombones, this is unlikely to have deterred him from having the Dead March included: his score of Saul includes the Dead March even though he did not have trombone part-books copied.

25 As a result of his reversal of Hamilton’s merging of Harapha and Milton’s Officer, Jennens had to refer to Hamilton’s “Officer” in Part III as an “Israelite” in order to make it clear that these two minor characters are different people. (In Milton – and in the autograph and performing scores – this character in Part III is referred to simply as “Messenger”. Why Jennens did not adopt “Messenger” is unclear.)
deleting Samson’s comment from the recitative, making no attempt to join Micah’s music to the Officer’s and leaving a highly unidiomatic gap. He also made it clear that the visitor was an officer by spreading the word over two beats (HG206 / HHA/1/238):

Jennens made another alteration to this scene: he deleted the air that Hamilton gave Harapha before he leaves in order to tell the Philistine Lords of Samson’s refusal. This air may have been inspired by the line that Milton gave the Officer before his departure (ex. 24). The motivations behind the artistic licence that Hamilton took in expanding the Officer’s comment into an air could have been many, but probably included expanding Harapha’s part and providing Handel with another opportunity to delight the audience. It seems likely that Jennens was unimpressed by the expansion of the part of a character who should not have been present at that point in the oratorio. However, the fact that he chose not to reassign the air to the Officer suggests that he regarded the air itself to be more of Hamilton’s “Nonsense”. The air is, after all, contrary to the words that precede it: Jennens could have regarded it as nonsensical that a character who had announced that he had to rush away should then remain to sing an air. After the Officer departs, Hamilton’s Micah says to Samson, “He’s gone, whose Malice may inflame the Lords” (line 508). Jennens altered this to “He’s gone, thy Answer may inflame the Lords”.

This must relate to his deletion of the air: in both cases Jennens downplayed the malice of the Harapha/Officer character, with the result that any retaliation that Samson faces from the Philistines over his decision not to go to their Feast is caused by Samson alone. Since Hamilton’s Harapha embodies the enemy nation, this can be seen as another instance of Jennens undoing Hamilton’s presentation of Samson as a national hero.

The third instance in which Jennens overrode Hamilton was his deletion of the sequence sung by Dalila and her attendant virgins, beginning ‘My Faith and Truth’ (ex. 25). The reason for Jennens’s deletion could have been simply that this passage is not derived

---

26 In Samson Agonistes, the line is “He’s gone, and who knows how he may report / Thy words by adding fuel to the flame?” (lines 1350-51).
from Milton and is unnecessary to the action. It is likely that, in writing it, Hamilton was responding to Handel’s needs for substantial female solo part(s) and for variety of texture.

**Departing from Milton**

It is not surprising to find that Jennens, in creating his version of *Samson*, departed from Milton far less frequently than he restored Milton; nor is it surprising to find that Jennens appears never to have departed from Milton without good reason.

One such reason appears to have been his unwillingness to compose extra music: there are several occasions on which it was impossible for Jennens to restore Milton’s sense without adding a significant number of syllables to the libretto; instead of doing so he tended to choose to depart from Milton.

The first instance is in the first recitative of the oratorio. Hamilton had derived all his lines from Milton (placed in a different order: see ex. 26). Jennens departed from Milton in two places – by introducing the word “Prison”, and by replacing “Heav’n’s” with “free” – in order to make it completely clear that, although Samson is usually confined to a prison cell, he is at present free from it. (That he has been released from his cell and from his toil for the day, as is the custom on the Philistine day of celebration, is not immediately apparent in the libretto.) Jennens also added parentheses to the phrase “Unwillingly their Superstition yields this rest”, perhaps in order to clarify the sentence structure.

A second instance occurs in another recitative, in which Hamilton’s Manoa suddenly refers to his son Samson as a plant (ex. 27). This slightly puzzling reference is the result of Hamilton’s compression of Milton’s text, which includes the essential words “as of a”. Jennens presumably could not conceive of a way to include this sense into the recitative without composing more music; his version, in which he replaced “Plant” with “Son”, might be further from Milton, but is much clearer. The clarity is aided by his replacing “sacred” with “glorious”; as if in compensation, he altered the following line to make it closer to Milton.

A third example is when Manoa states that he would resign his whole inheritance in order to gain his son’s release (ex. 28). Although Hamilton’s “my Patrimony” is taken from Milton, the lines are so compressed as to be very hard to understand at first hearing. Jennens managed to restore Milton’s sense without adding any more syllables, although it seems possible that he altered the music slightly (HG243/4/2 / HHA/1/278):
The final example occurs in Part I, where Hamilton attempted to condense five of Milton’s lines (60–65) into only fourteen syllables (from “But, Peace” to “Woes”: ex. 29).

Milton’s “But peace” makes sense as it is followed by the idea that Samson should not question the mysterious ways in which God works. Hamilton’s “But, Peace, my Soul” does not make sense because he omitted the idea that follows it. Since Jennens could not restore that idea without composing a substantial amount of music, he replaced “But, Peace, my Soul” with a text of his own invention that highlights the nature of Samson’s predicament. His revision two lines later clarifies the meaning of “each”, which is unambiguous in Milton’s text. Jennens could have left Handel’s music as it was for both of these revisions, since they do not alter the syllable count. However, he decided to amend the music for the first revision in what is perhaps the most interesting of his musical amendments to Samson. Handel set “But, Peace” over a delicate enharmonic shift in which the lack of movement in the voice illustrated the words while the sharpwards shift in harmony illustrated the shift in Samson’s mood (HG44/5/1-3 / HHA/1/61):

Jennens changed “But Peace, my Soul” to “Not slight the Curse!”. Had his motivation in altering the music been simply to place the stress on “not” rather than “slight”, he could simply have altered the rhythm in the following manner:
Jennens’s Samson is far less philosophical at this point than Hamilton’s; again, he has further to go.

Another of Jennens’s departures from Milton could have been the result of Milton’s line having been rendered nonsensical by Hamilton’s compression of an earlier line (ex. 30). When Milton’s Manoa hears that many of the Philistines have been killed, he responds by saying “Sad, but thou knowst to Israelites not saddest”; when he then hears that Samson was the author of the destruction, he says “That still lessens / The sorrow, and converts it nigh to joy”, which is consistent with his earlier response. Hamilton shortened Manoa’s first response to “Sad! not to us”, but kept his second response, which no longer makes sense: if Manoa is not sad in the slightest, it is impossible for his sorrow to lessen. It is interesting that Jennens chose to alter the second response (Milton’s) so that it was consistent with the first (Hamilton’s), rather than the other way round; perhaps he did this in order to bring Manoa’s response in line with how an Old Testament Israelite might be expected to react to the destruction of his enemies.

On a few occasions, Jennens’s motivation for departing from Milton seems to have been that Hamilton had taken the words out of the context in which Milton had placed them, so that they now sounded odd. Being as close to Milton as possible was potentially confusing in Part III, when Manoa speaks of preparing Samson’s body for burial (ex. 31). Hamilton’s text is slightly odd in that Manoa refers to Samson’s body as “him”, probably resulting from Milton’s “fetch him hence”. Jennens is quite right in distinguishing between Samson and his body by referring to the latter as “it”: see for example Milton’s “Let us go find the body where it lies” (line 1725). A similar example is Jennens’s alteration of “Winds” to “Wind” in Micah’s description of Dalila (ex. 32): Hamilton had taken the word “winds” out of context, and it no longer made sense in the plural. Finally, for the chorus that ends Part I, Hamilton had combined two separate thoughts from Milton’s poem *On Time*: “everything that is sincerely good” shining “about the supreme Throne”, and a soul climbing heavenwards (ex. 33). The resulting lines, taken out of context, are rather odd: Hamilton’s chorus predicts that Samson’s soul will climb “round about” God’s throne. Jennens’s alteration, in which Samson’s soul will climb “high as to” heaven, might be further from Milton in terms of the precise wording, but it makes much better sense, and restores Milton’s idea of the soul climbing to the throne of God.
Length is not the only matter that needs to be taken into consideration when adapting a long work for an oratorio libretto. The difference between reading a line and hearing it sung is another; this may have been the reason behind at least one of Jennens’s departures from Milton, in which he inverted Hamilton’s shortening of Milton, making it immediately comprehensible in performance (ex. 34). Jennens’s own libretti show him to have been acutely sensitive to the requirements of an oratorio libretto and of Handel, and to have been a fine dramatist; it is interesting, then, to consider his rearranging of the opening of the oratorio. Hamilton’s opening scene is parallel to the opening of Samson Agonistes: both begin with Samson resting “Before the Prison in Gaza” while the Philistines celebrate Dagon. In adapting the poem for a Handel oratorio, Hamilton made two changes: he compressed Milton’s lines so that there were fewer (see ex. 26), and he expanded Milton’s reference to the Philistines’ “popular Noise” to a large sequence of choruses and airs for the Philistines, following Samson’s opening recitative and heard “at a distance” (as Handel wrote in the autograph score). Jennens moved what he retained of this sequence so that it opened the oratorio, and he brought it “onstage” by making it a separate scene, set at the Temple of Dagon; in making these changes Jennens departed from Milton. In Hamilton’s libretto, the drama arises from the creation of an expectation that is then thwarted: Samson’s recitative is followed not by an air, but by his captors’ rumbustious celebration, accompanied not only by strings, but also by trumpets and timpani. The drama in Jennens’s version of the libretto arises from the stark contrast between the celebration that opens the oratorio and Samson’s desolation. In addition, having the oratorio open with a pagan celebration creates not only a structural balance with the end of the oratorio, but also a point of reference: if the oratorio opens with a Philistine festival, the final chorus – in which the victorious Israelites praise Jehovah – reminds the audience of how the oratorio began, and how far Samson and the Israelites have come. Had Handel set Jennens’s version to music, it is easy to imagine that the overture would have been in the same key as the opening chorus, merging the two together as in Giulio Cesare, or indeed in his recent collaboration with Jennens, Saul.

Samson Agonistes was not the only Milton poem from which Hamilton derived his libretto, nor the only one from which Jennens departed in his revisions to Samson. Hamilton took the Part III air ‘Thus when the Sun’ almost verbatim from On the Morning of Christ’s Nativity. That Jennens rewrote half the lines (ex. 35) does not necessarily imply that he was unaware of Hamilton’s source. His revision was probably prompted by a need to make the air more fitting to its context. In the accompanied recitative that precedes it, Samson states:
Then shall I make Jehovah’s Glory known,
Their Idol Gods shall from his Presence fly,
Scatter’d like Sheep before the God of Hosts.
(lines 543-5)

It is clear that in the air Hamilton wished to compare Jehovah’s impending triumph over Dagon with the triumph of light over darkness that takes place every morning. In this respect, his choice of source was apt: in the verse that he chose from *On the morning of Christ’s Nativity*, the rising of the sun is a metaphor for the Christ-child. Milton’s verse, while beautiful and outwardly fitting, is not quite appropriate: it is far too gentle. By replacing the sun’s “cloudy red” with a “radiant head”, and the image of pillowing his chin upon the sea with “Diffusing wide his orient Beams of Light”, Jennens turned Milton’s gentle dawn into a sweeping, blinding triumph of light that was more appropriate for the Old Testament victory over darkness that Samson predicted. In the final line Jennens then made the contrast more clear by rhyming “Beams of Light” with “gloomy Night”. His text also links more clearly the pale shadows with the Philistines and “their Idol Gods”, who are more likely to “hide their coward Heads” than to “slip” to their graves “before the God of Hosts”. Jennens’s alternative lines appear to be of his own invention: although individual phrases appear in various places in Milton, there is no one clear source. Perhaps the image of the sun rising over the sea reminded Jennens of Dryden’s celebrated translation of *The Aeneid*, which includes the following:

So, from the Seas, exerts his radiant head
The Star, by whom the Lights of Heav’n are led:
Shakes from his rosie Locks the perly Dews,
Dispels the darkness and the Day renews. 28

If Jennens had read that translation recently, Mnestheus’s question in Book IX could also have come to mind: “Where can you hope your Coward Heads to hide?” 29

Although most of the airs that Jennens deleted were inventions by Hamilton, one was an adaptation of Milton: he deleted the air sung by Micah in Part II, scene iii, ‘It is not Virtue’, and altered the recitative that follows it (ex. 36). Perhaps Jennens considered Hamilton to be focusing on the wrong issue: Micah’s commentary on women does not follow logically from what has just occurred. It is worth noting that in *Samson Agonistes*, the lines that Hamilton gave Samson (the recitative beginning “Favour’d of Heav’n”) are spoken by the chorus. Jennens’s various amendments to this scene restore not only sense but also the

27 For example, “gloomy Night” appears in *Samson Agonistes* (line 161), and “orient Beams” appears twice in *Paradise Lost*: ‘Sweet is the breath of morn, her rising sweet, / With charm of earliest birds; pleasant the sun / When first on this delightful land he spreads / His orient beams’ (IV, lines 641-4); and ‘and now went forth the Morn / Such as in highest Heav’n, arrayed in gold / Empyreal, from before her vanished night, / Shot through with orient beams’ (VI, lines 12-15).


29 Line 1055 (*Virgil’s Aeneid*, p. 267).
contrast, present in Milton’s poem, between Samson and his fellow Israelites: while his friends attempt to comfort him by assigning blame elsewhere, Samson acknowledges that the blame lies with him in giving in to temptation and thus betraying God’s trust. Jennens’s alterations also focus attention on Samson’s important realisation: “God sent her here”. Having previously believed that God had cast him off because of his failure, Samson recognises at this point that God continues to work in his life. By deflecting attention away from the faults of womankind in general and thus bringing the focus back to Dalila as an individual, Jennens’s alterations also perhaps reference the traditional connection between Samson’s wife (as Dalila is in Milton and Hamilton) and Judas (see above, p. 67).

Jennens the future editor of Shakespeare may be in evidence in one small but intriguing amendment in Part II, scene i. His replacing of “liquid” with “limpid” in a description of a brook appears at first to be yet another instance of his correcting Hamilton’s “Nonsense”; however, Hamilton probably took this description from Milton, where it appears just a few lines later (ex. 37). Describing a brook as “liquid” is pure tautology. This was also the case in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: although “liquid” was also used then to mean clear, transparent, or bright, this was only the case when applied to something that was not itself a liquid, such as light, fire, or air.30 Jennens’s “limpid”, meaning “clear” but lacking any danger of tautology, was a good solution. Jennens’s alteration of “Man” to “Men” in the line that follows could be said to bring Samson’s words closer to Milton’s (who wrote “them”), as it restores the feeling that Samson is referring to particular occasions on which he turned down wine. Finally, Jennens’s attention to detail and dedication to accuracy may be in evidence in his alteration of “Philistia’s Lands” to “Philistia’s Land” (ex. 38): he may have considered the singular to be more accurate, since “Lands” suggests an empire or some other political amalgamation of geographically separate areas. (Philistia was one geographical entity, Gaza being one of its city states.)

Amendments unrelated to Milton

Although Jennens deleted much that was purely of Hamilton’s invention, he did not delete all. When he felt that the passages he had retained were unsatisfactory, he naturally had to invent the solution himself. None of these examples is complicated, but each demonstrates Jennens’s skill as an author. On three occasions, the motivation must have been simply that Hamilton’s line did not make adequate sense, whether it was inspired by Milton or not:

---

Jennens altered the rather odd first line of the chorus “Weep, Isr’el, weep a louder Strain” so that it read “Weep, Isr’el, sing a mournfull Strain” (ex. 39); he replaced the wordbook’s “far” with “fast” in the line “so far Effeminacy held me yok’d / her Slave” (ex. 40); and he replaced “to her” with “yield to” in one of Dalila’s recitatives (ex. 41). Further examples occur in the Israelite chorus ‘With Thunder arm’d’, which is prompted by Micah’s line “’Tis Heav’n alone can save both us [the Israelites] and thee [Samson]” (ex. 42), in a chorus which is sung by the Philistines and is preceded by an air with the same text (ex. 43), and in two lines that were probably inspired by two of Milton’s lines in An Epitaph on the Marchioness of Winchester (ex. 44). Unfortunately Hamilton’s adaptation of Milton here not only sounds initially as if the Israelite Woman hopes that every hero will die under the same circumstances as Samson, but also calls to mind, through the unfortunate combination of “fall” and “thro’”, some kind of descent that contradicts how one might imagine a progression from sorrow to felicity.

Jennens rearranged the beginning of Part II, moving Manoa’s air ‘Just are the Ways’ slightly earlier so that it opens the Part, and making it an aside. The air was not entirely Hamilton’s invention, but the placing of it was: he took lines 3-6 of the air from the final comment of Milton’s chorus, which closes Samson Agonistes (ex. 45). (Why Jennens altered lines 5-6 slightly is unclear. Perhaps he replaced “still” with “and” because “still” is ambiguous; the alteration to the final line may have been made simply to restore more of Milton’s text.) It seems that Jennens did not disagree in principle with Hamilton’s repurposing of Milton’s words, described by Ruth Smith as “a lesson in stoical faith […] wrenched out of its Miltonic context” to a point in the oratorio “where it seems hardest to accept”:31 if he had, he could have deleted the air. It seems likely that he moved it earlier and made it an aside so that it fitted into the scene more neatly. In Hamilton’s libretto, it follows the words “Mean time, all healing Words from these thy Friends admit”, which suggests that Samson is about to hear words of comfort from his friends, not from his father.

It is worth noting that not all of what Jennens would have regarded as nonsense was generated by Hamilton: in the penultimate recitative of Part II, Handel was the guilty party. Jennens’s main objection to the two lines that he deleted was probably that Micah’s reference to magic no longer made sense (ex. 46). Had Handel set Hamilton’s lines 442-9, in which Harapha claims that Samson’s strength is merely a magic spell and Samson rebuts Harapha’s claim, Hamilton’s later reference to it would have made sense. As it is, one could read the remaining lines as suggesting that Micah believes Samson’s strength to be a magic spell that Dagon is capable of dissolving. Jennens’s replacing “know” with “try” further clarifies Micah’s meaning. It is also possible that Jennens objected to “His Glory is concern’d”

because the meaning is unclear without the surrounding text in *Samson Agonistes*. Jennens’s deletion of the two lines suggests that he was unable to convey the lost meaning in only twenty syllables. Instead of altering the music, he simply tacked together the bars surrounding the deleted lines:

While this deletion was accomplished in a fairly smooth manner, many of Jennens’s large-scale amendments resulted in unlikely juxtapositions of chords or keys. Examples include F$\#$ minor to F minor (‘This Day a solemn Feast’ to ‘Why by an Angel’), C minor to A major (‘Just are the Ways’ to ‘Despair not thus’), G major to B$\flat$ minor (‘Despair not thus’ to ‘My Evils hopeless are’), F$\#$ major to A major (‘Forgive what’s done’ to ‘Ne’er think of that’), E major to D major (‘Hear, Jacob’s God’ to ‘Fix’d in his everlasting Seat’), and D major to F minor (‘Heav’n! what Noise!’ to ‘Noise call you this?’). Why Jennens did nothing about such problems when he had the opportunity to do so is unclear. On one occasion the linking of two recitatives previously separated by an air was achieved particularly awkwardly. The final basso continuo note of the recitative ‘More Trouble is behind’ was simply omitted, even though it would have made perfect musical sense where it was:
Whether this was the work of Jennens or S2 is impossible to know.

At least one musical difference between the part-books and the autograph and performing scores seems likely to be the result of an alteration made by Jennens in the red-morocco score. In b. 7 of the recitative ‘O change beyond Report’ (HG40/3/3 / HHA/1/57), the part-books contain an extra note:

Vocal line in the autograph and performing scores:  Vocal line in the alto and harpsichord part-books:

In that it rectifies a discrepancy between the number of syllables and the number of notes in a recitative, this alteration is typical of Jennens.

Scene numberings

In Hamilton’s libretto, Parts I and II follow operatic convention in that the arrival or departure of a character heralds a new scene. However, his Part III does not follow this convention consistently. Jennens’s alterations bring Part III into line with Parts I and II. Whereas Hamilton’s Part III has three scenes, Jennens’s has seven. It seems that these are prompted by the departure and arrival of characters: see for example Jennens’s scenes ii and iii, which mark the departure and return of the Officer (“He’s gone” (line 508), at the beginning of Jennens’s scene ii, and “again he comes” (line 525), immediately before his scene iii). However, it seems that Hamilton did not intend the Officer’s next departure to take place when Jennens did (ex. 47). Clausen states that Samson’s words “In nothing I’ll comply that’s scandalous, or sinful by our Law” are still directed at the Officer, since he tells his people something similar shortly afterwards (“Expect of me […]”).32 Perhaps Jennens’s intention was for Samson’s initial words to be spoken not to the Officer, to Micah, or to his people, but to himself or to God.

Likewise, Jennens’s placing of scene v implies that Samson leaves after his air ‘Thus when the Sun’ (line 546). This reverses Hamilton’s alteration to Milton: in Samson Agonistes it is implied that Samson is not present for the chorus’s words “Go, and the Holy One / Of Israel be thy Guide” (lines 1427-8 of Samson Agonistes). Rooke sees Hamilton’s alteration as part of his elevation of Samson as a national hero, writing that the support of the Israelites

“makes it clear that he is going as their champion rather than just pursuing his own personal spiritual rehabilitation”. Jennens’s preference for Milton could simply be another instance of his correction of Hamilton’s “Nonsense”; it could also suggest that, by having Samson go to the Philistine feast without the explicit support of his people, Jennens was identifying Samson more closely with Christ, who departed to his death alone among his enemies.

Finally, Jennens’s placing of scene vi after Micah’s words “Old Manoa, with youthful Steps, makes haste / To find his Son, or bring us some glad News” (lines 563-4) brings that scene change into line with operatic convention: Hamilton had chosen to change to scene ii before those words, presumably in order to mark the passing of time between Samson’s departure and Manoa’s arrival. Hamilton and Jennens eventually coincide in their scene changes by marking the arrival of the Israelite Officer (Hamilton’s scene iii, Jennens’s vii).

**Timing and order of Jennens’s amendments**

As mentioned above, Jennens annotated his Walsh print of *Samson*, altering and inserting figurings and punctuation, and amending the verbal text. He also queried and corrected readings in the musical text. The relationship between his amendments in the printed edition and those that he must have made in the red-morocco score is unclear in several respects, and a number of questions arise, including: when did he amend *Samson*? did he annotate the printed edition or the red-morocco score first? and did he transfer his amendments from one to the other or did he make them separately? In considering these questions it must be remembered that Jennens certainly owned two more prints of *Samson*, now lost (see fn. 3), and that he probably also owned a wordbook of the oratorio. Practically speaking, it would have made much more sense for Jennens to rewrite so much of the verbal text using the wordbook rather than a score: it is easy to imagine that he decided upon the new text at his desk with the wordbook in front of him, and then added the words to the score. Although it is impossible to know precisely where, when, how, and in what order Jennens amended *Samson*, it is possible to glean something by comparing his alterations to the two scores.

However he went about it, it is clear that he had completed most of his work within 1743: some of his amendments appear in a manuscript score, dated to that year, which never formed part of Jennens’s collection. Jennens attended the first performance of *Samson* on 18

---

34 This is the Hunter score (GB-Ckc: Mann MS 400). It was Burrows who first noted that this score contains a few of Jennens’s amendments (Burrows, ‘Something Necessary to the Connection’, p. 3). According to Clausen, its musical text was
February 1743, writing three days later to Edward Holdsworth that “[l]ast Friday Handel perform’d his Samson, a most exquisite Entertainment, which tho’ I heard with infinite Pleasure, yet it increas’d my resentment for his neglect of the Messiah” and describing the libretto as “Nonsense, foisted by one Hamilton into Milton’s Samson Agonistes”.³⁵ Walsh’s first edition of Samson was issued in three parts: the first part (without the Overture) was advertised on 19 March; the second (containing the Overture) was advertised on 2 April; and the third part (containing “A Table of Songs”) was advertised on 9 April. Of the three printed editions of Samson that Jennens once owned, it is this edition that survives: the annotated copy discussed here is this edition, reordered and repaginated by Jennens. It is impossible to know when he received his manuscript copy of the full oratorio.

In comparing Jennens’s amendments to verbal text in his printed edition with those that he must have made in his red-morocco score, the modern scholar has much less evidence than would be ideal because the earliest of Walsh’s editions to contain recitatives and choruses was published in 1763,³⁶ twenty years after Jennens annotated his first edition. Even so it is clear that most of the amendments are identical, including alterations to underlay and the division of text. One example occurs in the duet ‘Traitor to Love’ (HG147 / HHA/1/160), in which Hamilton gave Dalila and Samson the following lines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dalila</th>
<th>Traitor to Love, I’ll sue no more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For Pardon scorn’d, your Threats give o’er.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Traительн to Love, I’lI hear no more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Charmer’s Voice, your Arts give o’er.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(lines 368-9)

For each character’s opening statement, Handel wrote a six-bar phrase, comprising three sections of two bars in which bb. 3-4 are sequential. As each character has two lines of text that divide easily into four segments, the two lines fit well into the first four bars. However, a problem arises in the final two bars: because the sense of each first line continues into each second line, it does not make sense simply to repeat the second line of text. Unfortunately this is precisely what Handel did for Samson (bb. 21-2 (HG149/2/1-2 / HHA/1/161)): “the Charmer’s Voice, your Arts give o’er”. He was skilful in Dalila’s final two bars, for which he used the second halves of each of her lines: “I’ll sue no more, your Threats give o’er”.

Jennens altered b. 21 in both his Walsh print and in his red-morocco score so that Samson

---

³⁵ GB-Lfom: acc. no. 7683. On 17 January that year, Jennens had described Samson as an “exceeding fine Oratorio, being an alteration of Milton’s Samson Agonistes, with which he is to begin Lent” (GB-Lfom: acc. no. 7681). On what this opinion was based is unclear; perhaps he had heard about it from the 4th Earl of Shaftesbury, who on 23 December 1742, after hearing Handel play through the oratorio, wrote to James Harris that it was not only “the best thing [he] ever heard anywhere” but also “inexpressibly great and pathetic” (Burrows and Dunhill, Music and Theatre in Handel’s World, p. 152).

sings “I’ll hear no more, your Arts give o’er” – which is precisely the solution that Handel had adopted for Dalila.

However, the altered text of the two scores is not identical. Jennens did not, for example, alter “and” to “with” in the air ‘Why does the God of Israel sleep?’ in his Walsh print as he had done in the red-morocco score (ex. 21). Furthermore, the printed edition contains alterations to text that he must have marked in the red-morocco score to be omitted from the oratorio. In the air ‘My Faith and Truth’, Hamilton wrote for the first two lines the following:

My Faith and Truth, O Samson, prove;
But hear me, hear the Voice of Love;
(lines 332-3)

Jennens altered the second line in his printed edition so that it read “O hear me”. Whether he made this alteration before deciding to omit that sequence from the oratorio is unclear. Finally, the Walsh print contains a slightly different version of Jennens’s version of the air ‘Thus when the Sun’: whereas the third line in the part-books is “Diffusing wide his orient Beams of Light” (see ex. 35), the printed edition has “Diffusing wide his Beams of orient Light”.

Three differences in underlay between the printed edition and the part-books suggest that when Jennens entered the new text into each score, he did so on different occasions, working from a separate document containing the words only. The first difference appears in the air ‘Joys that are pure’, where Jennens altered the second line from “Shall then o’ertake you as a Flood” to “In Heav’n shall always be renew’d” (ex. 48). Fitting the new text to the music was straightforward except in the first statement of the line, where Handel decided to separate “Shall then o’ertake” from the second part of the line, and to write a melisma on the last syllable (HG93/2/4-93/3/5 / HHA/1/105-6):

In the Walsh print Jennens divided the final crotchet into two quavers in order to retain the stress on the first syllable of “always”:

37 Although it is possible that Jennens did not recognise Hamilton’s source for this air (and so was unaware that he was diverging from Milton in this amendment), Jennens’s alterations of Hamilton’s lines do not mean that he thought that Milton’s needed to be improved: presumably Jennens wished to state more clearly Milton’s sense, not so prominent in Hamilton’s air, of the rewards being not of this earth.
He must have entered it differently in his red-morocco score, as the part-books give the following, which does not leave much time for the “l”:

The second difference in underlay occurs in the air ‘Just are the Ways’, in which Jennens altered the final line from “Blesses the Righteous in the close” to “Is ever found best in the close” (mentioned above; ex. 45). At the final statement of the line, Handel repeated “blesses the Righteous”, wrote a melisma on “bless”, and divided the line with a rest (HG107/3/4-108/1/4 / HHA/1/119-20):

A syllable-by-syllable insertion of Jennens’s new line would have been disastrous, not only in the choice of vowel and word for the melisma, but also in having “ever” across the rest:

In both the printed edition and the red-morocco score Jennens divided the text so that the melisma was on the first syllable of “ever”. What he did after the melisma, however, is slightly different: in the printed edition he retained the “is”, altering the order of the words so that they read “and his unsearchable Dispose is ever found best, ever is found best in the close”, which resulted in the emphasis being placed on “found”: 
In the red-morocco score he must have omitted the “is” – thus placing the emphasis on “best” – since the bass and harpsichord part-books give the following:

The third difference occurs in the air ‘Thus when the Sun’ (ex. 35), in which Jennens’s choice of word to replace “Grave” (when changing “each fetter’d Ghost slips to his sev’ral Grave” to “and hide their coward Heads in gloomy Night”) demonstrates a sensitivity to Handel’s first setting of it. When inserting his new text, Jennens could have kept the underlay exactly as in the original (HG221/3/1-4 / HHA/1/252):

Instead he altered the underlay drastically in both the printed edition and the red-morocco score:

Jennens’s underlay in the Walsh print:

Underlay in the tenor I and harpsichord part-books:

It seems that whichever copy Jennens entered his new text into first, he entered it into the second without reference to his earlier efforts.

A verbal discrepancy between the Walsh print and the part-books offers a clue to the order in which Jennens annotated these copies: the printed edition reveals Jennens’s first thought for the A-major air ‘Ye Men of Gaza’, which he reused at the end of the oratorio. He originally changed it to “Ye Men of Judah”, but then altered this on all but the final occurrence of the word in the Walsh print to “Ye Men of Israel” (HG221/1/5 / HHA/1/39).
As the part-books contain only “Israel”, the printed edition was probably annotated at an earlier stage in Jennens’s revisions to *Samson*.

**Jennens as editor: corrections to his Walsh print**

An analysis of Jennens’s corrections to the musical text of his printed edition\(^\text{39}\) sheds further light on the order in which he received and edited his copies of the oratorio.

Most of his corrections tell us little about how he found and corrected errors because the errors fall into one or more of the following categories: (1) they are fairly obviously wrong; (2) they were corrected in the second 1743 edition of Walsh; and (3) they are correct in his part-books. Although he could have discovered and corrected these errors himself, he could also have noticed them when comparing his printed edition to another copy. Such corrections relate either to impossible note values or to errors of pitch, most of which are obviously errors.

Impossible note values in b. 32 of the air ‘Torments’ (HG38/1/4 / HHA/1/54):

Violin I line as written by Handel, and as corrected by Jennens:

Violin I line in Walsh:

---

\(^{38}\) Walsh issued this print in separate parts; the Overture was issued with Part II. Part I was numbered by Walsh, in the lower right corner, but – as the Overture was not present – ‘Ye Men of Gaza’ was on p. 1. Jennens reordered his printed editions and repaginated Part I so that p. 1 is the beginning of the Overture; this matches the page numbers given in Walsh’s contents page “A Table of Songs”, which was issued with Part III. The page number given here is that written by Jennens, which corresponds with the “Table of Songs”.

\(^{39}\) As it was beyond the scope of this dissertation to collate all the variants between the Walsh prints and the early manuscript sources, this analysis deals only with alterations that Jennens made to readings in his Walsh print: there could be errors present only in the Walsh prints that Jennens did not notice or correct that might offer more clues to Jennens’s actions in 1743.
Error of pitch in the final bar of the same air (HG40/1/10 / HHA/1/56):

Basso continuo line as written by Handel, and as corrected by Jennens:

Basso continuo line in Walsh:

The readings that were not obviously wrong, that were not corrected in later editions of Walsh,\(^{40}\) or that appear differently in the part-books are more interesting.

Jennens appears to have made his many alterations to his printed edition in at least two stages, beginning by looking through it and querying and in some cases altering readings himself, without reference to any other source. One hint that this was the case is provided by the margins of his copy, which contain crossed-out annotations relating to many of his corrections. The fact that these annotations are crossed out is significant: it suggests that he queried a reading and/or suggested a correction in the margin without reference to anything else, and then later entered the correction into the text, deleting the note in the margin; perhaps between these two actions he consulted another source. Four of his corrections support this theory. In three of them Jennens responded to an error in Walsh differently from how he would have done if he had consulted any other copy. The first appears in b. 36 of the air ‘Return, O God of Hosts!’ (HG112/1/2 / HHA/1/124), where Jennens added a natural to the voice’s \(a'\) rather than raising the note by a third, which is far more idiomatic, and which would have been in line with the other musical sources (overleaf):

---

\(^{40}\) The Walsh editions not belonging to Jennens that were consulted as part of this study are: GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1520 (1743, Smith 1); GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1527 (1743, between Smith 1 and 2); GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1521 (1743, Smith 2); GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1523 (c. 1746, Smith 4), and GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1524 (1763, Smith 6) (Smith, *A Descriptive Catalogue*, pp. 134-6).
Vocal line as Handel composed it, and as it appears in Jennens’s part-books:

Vocal line, corrected by Jennens, in his Walsh print:
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In the second case, Jennens noticed that Walsh had printed a note-head in a strange position: in b. 18 of the air ‘Ye Men of Gaza’ (HG19/3/2 / HHA/1/36) the first violin II note is printed well below the bottom stave line. If Jennens had consulted the autograph score, the performing score, or his red-morocco score, he would have seen that Handel wrote one ledger line (c #); instead, Jennens added two ledger lines, making the note a third lower than Handel’s, and figured it as if there were a d’ in the chord:

Violin II line as Handel composed it and as it appears in Jennens’s part-books:

Violin II line, corrected by Jennens, in his Walsh print:

Jennens’s reading is not impossible, and could have been inspired by the opening bars of the air, in which – although the music continues differently – the equivalent chord is a decorated version of Jennens’s:

The third concerns the notation of a recurring rhythm in the air ‘With plaintive Notes’ (HG121 / HHA/1/134). Although Handel normally omitted the “3” when he wrote triplet rhythms in simple time, he included them – presumably for the sake of clarity – when he wrote the following rhythm:

In the Walsh print, the “3” is not present so it is not clear that it is a triplet figure:

Jennens assumed that the rests were printed incorrectly and altered it to the following, which makes sense but is quite different from Handel’s intention:

The fourth of Jennens’s corrections that he would probably not have made if he had had more than the Walsh available to him concerns the form of the air ‘Let the bright Seraphim’ (HG269 / HHA/1/303). In the printed edition, this air appears to be incomplete because Walsh did not include choruses. Rather than setting the text of this air in a full da Capo form, Handel elided the air with the final chorus of the oratorio, writing both in D major and indicating that the chorus should follow the B section of the air, without any restatement of the A section. In the absence of the chorus in the printed edition, Jennens added all the necessary markings to the air to ensure that it finished in the correct key. He chose to make it a dal Segno air – rather than a da Capo air – by omitting the opening ritornello in the restatement of the A section.
At a later date Jennens returned to his printed edition and compared it note-for-note with his red-morocco score, marking in three places the reading given in his copy. It seems that in all three places Jennens was not sure which was the better reading, so added the reading he found in his red-morocco score as an alternative rather than as a correction. In two places, the reading given in Walsh is an error, but not as obvious an error as others. (Presumably when he found errors that were more obviously incorrect during this comparison with his red-morocco score, he altered them immediately.) In b. 109 of the air ‘Joys that are pure’ (HG96/3/8 / HHA/1/108), the violin line in the printed edition is odd because nn. 2-5 of that bar are a decoration of the tonic chord: hence the final note does not make sense. Perhaps the rest in the basso continuo line at b. 1093 made Jennens think that a violin c♯ could be correct.

The basso continuo line given by Walsh in b. 20 of the air ‘With plaintive Notes’ (HG122/3/2 / HHA/1/359) is also unlikely because of its repetition of a note over the bar-line. However, it is easy to see why Jennens might have hesitated, considering how the basso continuo line relates to the violin line, which is – in the printed edition – far more comprehensible to an amateur musician, as evidenced by Jennens’s figuring (there is no figuring on beat 4 in the Walsh):
Basso continuo line as written by Handel and as it appears in the performing score and in Jennens’s part-books:

Jennens’s annotation:

Basso continuo line in the Walsh print:

(The violin line is a pedal note decorated with a sharpened unaccented auxiliary note; this fits with the correct basso continuo line as part of a 6/4/3 chord.) Jennens was quite right to be unsure about the third reading, which occurs in the basso continuo line in b. 36 of the air ‘Return, O God of Hosts!’ (HG112/1/2 / HHA/1/124): not only are both readings equally possible, but they were both written by Handel. Clausen explains how the two readings came about, noting that Smith accidentally omitted the sharp when he copied it into the performing score, and that Handel noticed the error but remedied it differently from how he had initially composed it.\(^\text{41}\) Walsh printed the version found in the autograph score, whereas Jennens’s part-books give the performing score’s reading, proving (in conjunction with Jennens’s annotation in the printed edition) that the red-morocco score was derived from the performing score at this point.

---

\(^{41}\) Clausen arrived at this very plausible conclusion by observing that the sharp in the performing score is written by Handel (Clausen (ed.), *Samson*, ii. p. 475).
Basso continuo line as written by Handel in the autograph score, and as given in the Walsh print:

Jennens’s annotation:

Basso continuo line as it appears in the performing score and in Jennens’s part-books:

Perhaps Jennens was so occupied by the basso continuo reading in this bar that he did not notice the red-morocco score’s correct reading for the vocal line, discussed above.

Jennens’s annotations and corrections to his Walsh print support the idea that he acquired the printed edition before he acquired his manuscript copy of the full oratorio; this in turn, together with the differences in underlay between the printed edition and the manuscript, suggests that he made his alterations to the verbal text of the oratorio elsewhere, perhaps in a wordbook that is now lost, entering them into his printed edition and then later, after revision, into his manuscript.

The annotations and corrections demonstrate an extraordinary yet characteristic dedication to accuracy that would be exemplified many years later in Jennens’s editing of Shakespeare. They also reveal much about the standard of his musicianship, which was clearly higher than he is often given credit for, as well as revealing his confidence in his musical convictions.

A final point of interest relates to his use of figuring. Jennens consistently enters more figurations into his copies of music than is usual, but it is difficult to establish whether he
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entered them as a way of studying the music, or whether he entered them because he was better at playing from a figured bass line than he was at score-reading. The Walsh print contains several instances in which Jennens’s excessive figuring is bizarre, for example:

![Sheet music](image)
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It is difficult to imagine that anyone would find it easier to play from these figurings than to read the upper staves.

**Jennens as editor: corrections to the harpsichord part-book**

At least two annotations in the harpsichord part-book are certainly in Jennens’s hand: the word “impossible” under a figuring in b. 7 of the recitative ‘Brethren and Men of Dan’ (HG56/6/2 / HHA/1/73), and an Allegro marking for the air ‘To Song and Dance’ (HG290 / HHA/1/198):

![Annotation](image)

Harpsichord part-book, MS 130 Hd4 v. 275, p. 168.
The vocal line is in G2 clef, and every f should be sharpened. Jennens was quite right that the figuring – present in both the autograph and performing scores – is impossible. The letter “e” squeezed into “Hight” could also be in Jennens’s hand.
It is difficult to say who added the much smaller annotations in that part-book, but it seems likely that it was Jennens who corrected several of S2’s spelling mistakes. As these mistakes remain uncorrected in the other part-books in which they occur (the relevant vocal part-book and instrumental part-books in the case of accompanied recitatives and cues), it seems that Jennens never got further than the harpsichord part-book. The corrections include “Steal” to “Steel” in the recitative ‘O Change beyond Report’ (line 46), “Blase” to “Blaze” in the air ‘Total Eclipse’ (line 92), “renoun’d” to “renown’d” in the accompanied recitative ‘O miserable State’ (line 129), “Evels” to “Evils” in the recitative ‘Justly these Evils’ (line 158), and “drops” to “droop” in the accompanied recitative ‘My genial Spirits droop” (line 226).

Jennens’s intervention can probably also be detected in the amendment of three rhythms in recitatives, although the amendments are so small that it is impossible to say with certainty who made them. In b. 3 of ‘Why by an Angel’ (HG36 / HHA/1/52) Handel set the words “as in a fiery Column ascending” to the following rhythm, which is how it appears in the performing score and in the tenor I part-book:

\[
\text{SAMSON}\quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{as in a \textit{fiery Column ascending}}
\end{array}
\]

The harpsichord part-book originally gave the same reading but has been altered as follows:

\[
\text{SAMSON}\quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{as in a \textit{fiery Column ascending}}
\end{array}
\]

The other two amendments rectify the discrepancy between the number of syllables and the number of notes in Handel’s setting. The first is “Here’s” in b. 3 of the recitative ‘No Words of Peace’ (HG163 / HHA/1/175):
Again, this is the reading given in the performing score and alto part-book, but it has been corrected in the harpsichord part-book, probably by Jennens:

The second is “where’s” in b. 2 of the recitative ‘Brethren, and Men of Dan’. Handel wrote the following, which appears in the performing score:

In the harpsichord part-book it has been altered to:

All three changes are typical of Jennens and similar to those he made in other oratorios.
Samson
6  Joseph and his Brethren

Handel composed *Joseph and his Brethren* in August and September 1743; it was first performed at Covent Garden on 2 March 1744. The librettist of *Joseph and his Brethren* was James Miller, a clergyman, playwright, and satirist whose direct source for Parts II and III was Zeno’s *Giuseppe*.¹

Jennens owned two manuscript scores of *Joseph*. The first (henceforth referred to as Score A) is a full score copied by S1,² bound beautifully in red morocco with gilt tooling and the only one of his red-morocco oratorio scores to survive. Despite its beautiful binding, Jennens made just over 1,250 amendments to it and figured it comprehensively. This annotated score was the source for his second score (henceforth referred to as Score B),³ which was copied by S2 and has the half-calf binding with marbled boards that is the norm in the Aylesford collection. Since Jennens’s amendments to Score A included the deletion of around 20% of Miller’s lines, Score B is much shorter than its source. S2 also copied a set of part-books to accompany Score B,⁴ and a set of part-books entitled “Songs in the Oratorio of Joseph”,⁵ which contain the airs and the duet marked by Jennens to be omitted from the oratorio. Score B and the accompanying part-books can be therefore seen to contain Jennens’s own version of *Joseph*.

Filiation of Jennens’s copies

A multitude of variants prove that Score A was copied from the autograph score. These include six variants of pitch (exx. 1–6),⁶ one of note-length (ex. 7), two involving trills (exx. 8–9), four of verbal text,⁷ three tempo markings,⁸ and large-scale variants relating to the

---

¹ A thorough discussion of Miller’s source can be found in Duncan Chisholm, ‘New Sources for the Libretto of Handel’s *Joseph*’, in Stanley Sadie and Anthony Hicks (eds.), *Handel Tercentenary Collection* (Basingstoke, 1987), pp. 182-208.
² GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1267; lot 262 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale.
³ GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 151; lot 262 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale.
⁵ GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 vv. 240-43 (violin I, violin II, viola, and ‘cello).
⁶ Music examples are given in Appendix 8.
⁷ In b. 26 of the chorus ‘Immortal Pleasures’ (HG79/1/3), Handel wrote the word “blest” in the alto line, so that it read “and be as blest as blest”; S1 copied this into Score A, but Smith corrected it to “great” when he copied the performing score. The other variants involve errors introduced by Smith, which are not present in the autograph score or in Score A. In b. 13 of the air ‘Remorse, Confusion’ (HG137/3/1), Smith wrote “of my guilty Breast”, rather than “of the guilty Breast”, which is given in the autograph score and Score A; in b. 25 of the air ‘Impostor!’ (HG157/2/1), he wrote “bring” rather than “brings” in the line “Heav’n sees, and brings dark Deeds to Light”, which is correct in the autograph score and Score A; and in b. 15 of the recitative ‘To Prison with him’ (HG220/4/3), he wrote “some Marks of Pity in his Face”, rather than “on”, which is given in the autograph score and Score A.
⁸ First, Handel’s original tempo marking for the duet ‘Celestial Virgin’ (HG66) was *Andante non presto*, which he later altered to *Andante Larghetto*; whereas the performing score has only *Andante*, Score A has *Andante Larghetto*. Second, the
contents of the scores. Since Score B follows Jennens’s amendments, it must have been copied from Score A.

As the part-books follow the scheme of Score B exactly, one might expect that this was their source; however, none of the part-books was copied from Score B. This is supported not only by numerous variants, but also by the presence in Score A (and not in Score B) of bar counts at the end of each movement, which were presumably used to check against the bar counts in the part-books. It is possible that this approach was the usual practice, designed to reduce errors; it could also be the case that S2 copied the part-books before he copied Score B, so had to use Score A as their source.

**Instrumental part-books**

**Violin I part-book (v. 152)**

The violin I part-book must have been copied from Score A and not from Score B: it shares with the former score two variants of rhythm (exx. 10-11), two variants involving trills (exx. 12-13), a variant of pitch (ex. 14), and the absence of a slur (ex. 15).

**Violin II part-book (v. 153)**

The violin II part-book was also copied from Score A: the two manuscripts share two variants of pitch (exx. 16-17), a tie (ex. 18), the absence of a slur (ex. 15), and the notation of a semibreve. Unfortunately there is no evidence regarding whether the violin II part-book was copied from the violin I part-book in unison numbers, unless one accepts as compelling evidence the fact that the B section of the air ‘The silver Stream’ (HG159) is marked Andante Larghetto in both scores but only Larghetto in the two violin part-books.

---

9 The duet ‘Celestial Virgin’ (HG66) originally had an opening ritornello, which S1 copied into Score A, but which was never present in the performing score. Other large-scale variants relate to key: on several occasions, Handel marked airs in the autograph score to be transposed; S1 copied these airs in the keys in which they appear in the autograph score, and not in the keys in which they appear in the performing score. These are ‘O lovely Youth’ (HG48), which is in E major in the autograph score and Score A, but in E flat major in the performing score; ‘The Peasant’ (HG144), which is in C major in the autograph score and Score A, but in B flat major in the performing score; and ‘The People’s Favour’ (HG201), which is in E major in the autograph score and Score A, but in D major in the performing score.

10 In the accompanied recitative ‘Pharaoh, thy Dreams are one’ (HG45/3/5), b. 38 is written over a change of page in Score A, so S1 wrote the violin II and basso continuo semibreves in that bar as tied minims. As Score B does not have a change of line or page at this point, S2 wrote the notes as semibreves in that score; however, he wrote the notes as tied minims in the violin II and ‘cello I part-books even though neither part-book has a change of line or page at that point. The tied minims in the violin II and ‘cello I part-books must therefore have been caused by the change of line in Score A.
Viola part-book (v. 154)

That Score A must also have been the source for the viola part-book is demonstrated by two variants of pitch (exx. 19-20), one of rhythm (ex. 21), one involving a slur (ex. 15), and one of notation.¹¹

In the fourth movement of the Overture, S2 gave the viola the basso continuo line an octave higher. Despite this, he did not follow S1’s policy in the Alexander Balus viola part-book of having the viola double the bass line an octave higher in the airs in which it has its own part only for the closing ritornello: in the only air in Joseph to do this, the viola does not play until the final ritornello.

’Cello I part-book (v. 155)

It seems likely that the ’cello I part-book was copied from Score A, although the evidence is slim, relying on clefs (exx. 22-5) and two variants of notation.¹²

Bassoon I part-book (v. 158)

S2 copied the bassoon I part-book from the ’cello I part-book in the Overture, presumably for the sake of efficiency (the bassoon plays the same music as the ’cello in this number); the evidence for this involves a dynamic marking (ex. 26), a clef (ex. 27), a tie (ex. 28), and a tempo marking.¹³ An error of pitch (ex. 29) proves that the bassoon I part-book was copied from the ’cello I part-book (and not vice versa).

However, in the movements following the Overture, the bassoon I part-book was copied from Score A.¹⁴ This makes sense: in order to determine when the bassoon should play in an air or a duet one would need to see the vocal line. That S2 did not use the ’cello I part-book after the Overture is proved by the fact that the bassoon I part-book mostly follows the vocal line and not the basso continuo line in the bass air ‘Since the Race of Time begun’

---

¹¹ The tied minims caused by a change of line in b. 84 of the air ‘Be firm’ (HG12/1/2) in Score A were transferred into the viola part-book but corrected to a semibreve in Score B.

¹² The ’cello I part-book shares with the violin II part-book the variant described in fn. 10; and in b. 28 of the recitative ‘To Prison with him’ (HG221), n. 1 is a dotted minim in Score A and the part-book but a minim tied to a crotchet over a change of page in Score B.

¹³ Neither part-book has the Adagio at the end of the second movement of the Overture (HG3/3/6).

¹⁴ The fact that in four places (exx. 22-5) all the basso continuo instruments have the clefs found in Score A and not those in Score B proves that the bassoon I part-book was not copied from Score B. This is supported by the fact that Score B does not contain bar counts for S2 to check the part-books against.
(HG82); by various markings,\textsuperscript{15} by an error involving an accidental (ex. 30); and by the omission, in the bassoon I part-book, of a single note that is written in C4 in Score A, but in F4 in the \textquote{cello I part-book} (ex. 31).

S2 seems to have based his decisions about when the bassoon should play in choruses on the clefs used: most of the time, the bassoon plays only when the bass line is written in F4 in Score A. A clear demonstration of this is in b. 24 of the chorus \textquote{O God of Joseph}, when the bassoon enters on n. 3 of the bar even though the phrase begins on n. 2 (ex. 32).

**Bassoon II part-book (US-Cu: MS 437 v. 23)**

S2 must have copied the bassoon II part-book from the bassoon I part-book: the two part-books contain exactly the same music, and they both contain a disastrous clef error (ex. 33), a variant of note-length (ex. 34),\textsuperscript{16} a tempo marking,\textsuperscript{17} and a variant involving clefs (ex. 35).

**\textquote{Cello II part-book} (v. 244)**

Like the \textquote{cello I part-book}, the \textquote{cello II part-book} omits \textit{semplice} recitatives. The copying of this part-book seems to have been an afterthought, as what I have referred to as the \textquote{\textquote{cello I part-book} is actually titled \textquote{\textquote{cello\textprime{}}, and referred to as \textquote{\textquote{vc} in the corner markings of each gathering. S2 treated \textquote{\textquote{cello II as a tutti instrument in airs and duets, but had it play in accompanied recitatives and three of the numbers in which the bassoons are silent (\textquote{The Peasant\textquote{, \textquote{O Pity\textquotemark{!, and \textquote{Thou hadst, my Lord}); as a result, its filiation is rather complicated. Most strikingly, it shares four variants only with the bassoon part-books (exx. 29, 33-4, and a tempo marking (fn. 17)); and, like the bassoon part-books, it follows the vocal line in the air \textquote{Since the Race of Time begun}.\textsuperscript{18} It is clear from other variants that S2\textquote{\textquote{ source was the bassoon II part-book, not the bassoon I part-book.\textsuperscript{19}}

\textsuperscript{15} Three markings are present in Score A and the bassoon I part-book, and not in the \textquote{cello I part-book: the \textquote{A tempo ordinario, e staccato} at the beginning of the chorus \textquote{O God of Joseph} (HG38), the \textquote{Allegro} at the beginning of the Part III Sinfonia (HG188), and a pause on the final note of the duet \textquote{Celestial Virgin} (HG69).

\textsuperscript{16} This was probably not an error on S2\textquote{\textquote{ part, but rather a decision to cut off the bassoons and \textquote{cello II before the singer enters. This is one of a great many examples of S2\textquote{\textquote{ having cut phrases off identically in the bassoon I, bassoon II, and \textquote{cello II part-books so that they do not overlap with the voice.

\textsuperscript{17} The bassoon I, bassoon II, and \textquote{cello II part-books are the only sources to give just \textquote{Andante as the tempo marking of the B section of the air \textquote{The silver Stream}.

\textsuperscript{18} Other variants that show that the \textquote{cello II part-book was not copied from the \textquote{cello I part-book are the absence of a tempo marking for the Sinfonia that opens Part III in the \textquote{cello I part-book and its presence in the bassoon I and \textquote{cello II part-books, and the presence of dynamics in the latter two part-books in bb. 45 and 47 of the air \textquote{Remorse, Confusion} (HG139/3/4 and 139/3/6) and their absence in the \textquote{cello I part-book. A final telling variant is the way in which S2 dealt with bb. 59 of the chorus \textquote{Hail} (HG105/2/1), which in the score goes into C1 clef for the final crotchet of the bar: in the \textquote{cello I part-book S2
In accompanied recitatives, and in the three aforementioned numbers in which the bassoons do not play, S2 must have copied the ’cello II part-book from Score A, and not from the ’cello I part-book: the evidence for this includes a tie (ex. 36), a spelling, a dynamic marking, an accent (ex. 37), and an extra note (ex. 38). This would have been the most practical approach. Although ’cello II plays throughout ‘O Pity’ and ‘Thou hadst, my Lord’, it is treated as a tutti instrument in ‘The Peasant’: as when copying a bassoon part-book, S2 had to see a score in order to determine when ’cello II should play.

Two variants involving clefs indicate that the ’cello II part-book was copied from either Score A or the ’cello I part-book in the final chorus, and not from the bassoon I part-book (exx. 39-40). The reason that the bassoon part-books include the music of bb. 18-20 (which is also given in C4 in the score) but do not play in bb. 22-3 is probably that in the earlier bars the oboes are playing, whereas they have rests in the later bars. Perhaps this is why S2 chose to copy the ’cello II and bassoon part-books independently in this movement.

Oboe I and II part-books (vv. 156-7)

It is very likely that the oboe part-books are derived from Score A rather than Score B. Evidence from the variants is slim, involving only a trill (ex. 13), a tie (ex. 41), and a slur (ex. 42). Notwithstanding the somewhat slender nature of this evidence, the fact that all the other part-books were copied from Score A, and that it is there that the bar counts are present, makes it very likely that Score A was also the source for the oboe part-books.

The most interesting aspect of the oboe part-books is their inclusion of the opening and closing ritornelli of the air ‘The Peasant’. There is no indication to do so in any of the scores, and S2 did not include this air in the bassoon part-books. It is not clear whether the decision was Jennens’s or S2’s; nor is it clear what the reason behind the decision was.

extended the final F4 note to a minim, to match the bass’s music; in the bassoon I, bassoon II, and ’cello II part-books he wrote a crotchet followed by a crotchet rest.
19 In b. 14 of the March (HG71/2/1), there is a figuring in the bassoon I part-book that is not present in the ’cello II and bassoon II part-books; and in bb. 2-4 of the air ‘Impostor!’ (HG155/1/3-156/2/1), the bassoon I part-book gives both the bass line and the bassoon line, but the ’cello II and bassoon II part-books gives only the first.
20 In b. 18 of the accompanied recitative ‘Our rev’rend Sire’ (HG173/2/2), Score A and the ’cello II part-book read “sitts” (the ’cello I part-book contains the usual spelling: “sits”).
21 S2 must have derived the ’cello II part-books’ piano marking in b. 2 of the arioso ‘O Pity’ (HG218) from Score A, which has at the beginning of the movement Andante larghetto e piano, and not from the ’cello I part-book, which has no dynamic. He could also have arrived at the piano marking in the ’cello II part-book by looking at the score and seeing that Joseph is singing at the same moment. (Normally, when someone is singing, the bassoon I, bassoon II, and ’cello II part-books have rests.)
22 This chorus, which is borrowed from the Dettingen Anthem, is not present in the autograph or performing scores. Presumably it was never present in the autograph score, as there would be no reason for Handel to copy it out; it would, however, have been present in the performing score. When Handel wrote the Dettingen Anthem, he gave the bassoon its own part on a separate line; perhaps S2 remembered or knew that this was the case. As the bassoon I and II part-books do not share the dotted rhythm that Handel wrote in b. 3 in the bassoon part (but not in the basso continuo line), it is possible that S2 simply reconstructed the bassoon part from Score A, which does not give the bassoon a separate line.
It is only this air that contains evidence that the oboe II part-book was copied from the oboe I part-book: not only do they both omit the *Larghetto* at b. 74 that is present in all scores (HG150/1/1), but they both contain the correct notation of the rhythm in bb. 75-7 (HG150/1/2-3-2/1). When Handel wrote this passage, he notated the rhythm incorrectly:

This mistake was transferred into Score A. Although S2 copied this mistake into the violin I part-book and Score B, he noticed the mistake after copying it into the oboe I part-book, and corrected it to the following (which is how the rhythm appears in bb. 43-4 (HG147/3/1-2)):

He wrote the correct rhythm when he copied the oboe II part-book. It is possible that he copied the oboe II part-book from the oboe I part-book in this air to save him time deciding when it should play and counting bars’ rests.

**Trumpet I and II, and timpani part-books (vv. 247-8, and 353)**

A variant of pitch (ex. 43) proves that S2 copied the two trumpet part-books from Score A, and not from Score B. The timpani part-book was also copied from Score A: it shares with that score a variant of pitch (ex. 44), one of rhythm (ex. 45), and one involving an accent (ex. 46).

One very odd feature of the trumpet II part-book and the timpani part-book is that for Part III, the trumpet II part-book has the timpani’s music, and the timpani part-book has the trumpet II’s music. The gatherings and watermarks show this to be the original arrangement of the part-books.

**Organ part-book (v. 249)**

A number of variants, including a tie (ex. 47), a discrepancy between singular and plural,\(^\text{23}\) and a variant of pitch (ex. 48), prove that the organ part-book was copied from Score A. It has a rather odd mixture of contents. As usual, it contains only the basso continuo line in

---

\(^{23}\) In bb. 4-5 of the arioso ‘O Pity!’ (HG218/1/4-218/2/1), the organ part-book and Score A read “Trait’rous Tear!”, whereas Score B reads “Trait’rous Tears!”.
choruses and most of the Overture, it includes the vocal line in airs and recitatives, it rarely contains dynamics, and it includes stage directions and full scene headings. However, it also gives the violin I melody in several places: the fourth movement of the Overture (HG7), the introduction to the accompanied recitative ‘Pharaoh, thy Dreams are one’ (HG44), all except the closing ritonelli of the air ‘O lovely Youth’ (HG48), the March (HG70), and the Sinfonia that opens Part III (HG188). Why this should be the case is unclear.

Therefore the filiation of the instrumental part-books of Joseph is as follows:

Vocal part-books

Although one might expect each vocal part-book to have been copied from Score A, this was not the case. S2 altered his approach while he was copying, resulting in the filiation being yet more complicated.

Soprano I part-book (Asenath; v. 159)

When S2 copied the soprano I part-book, he copied the choruses from Score A, and the airs from the organ part-book. The evidence for this is indisputable: in the air ‘O lovely

---

24 When it does, for example b. 29 of the air ‘Together, lovely Innocents’, it is probably an error.
25 There is no evidence regarding the filiation of the recitatives, unless one considers there to be significance in the fact that Jennens’s tie in b. 29 of the Part II recitative ‘Phanor, we mention not’ (HG131/2/4), added to correct Handel’s setting of the word “these” as two syllables, is present in the soprano I part-book but not in the organ part-book.
Youth’, the soprano I part-book and the organ part-book share a bizarre mistake that is extremely unlikely to have been made independently twice (ex. 49). The reason for this filiation must be that Jennens had asked for soprano, alto, and tenor parts to be written in G2 clef in the vocal and organ part-books: because S2 had already transcribed the soprano part of the airs and recitatives from C1 clef into G2 clef for the organ part-book, it would have been quicker, easier, and safer to copy what he could from there. As the organ part-book does not contain choruses, S2 had no choice but to copy chorus parts from a score; evidence that Score A was his source includes a variant of pitch (ex. 50) and one of rhythm (ex. 51).

**Soprano II part-book (Benjamin; v. 160)**

There is no evidence regarding the source of the airs and recitatives of the soprano II part-book. However, a tempo marking and a variant of notation reveal that S2 used Score A as the source for the choruses.

**Alto I part-book (Joseph; v. 161)**

Two errors of pitch (exx. 52-3) and a variant of punctuation prove that S2 did not copy the alto I part-book’s airs and recitatives from the organ part-book. Given that the other part-books were copied from Score A, it is likely that this was S2’s source.

**Alto II part-book (Phanor; v. 162)**

Like the soprano II part-book, the alto II part-book contains no evidence regarding its immediate source for the airs and recitatives. However, it is possible to trace S2’s approach to copying the choruses. A copying error in the chorus ‘Immortal Pleasures’ (ex. 54) and an error of note-length in the chorus ‘Joyful Sounds’ (ex. 55) reveals that he copied the Part I choruses from Score A; whereas an error of pitch in the chorus ‘Hail’ (ex. 56) and an error of

---

26 Score A has not been altered at this point.
27 The soprano II part-book and Score A share the Allegro vivace of the chorus ‘Blest be the Man’ (HG118); this tempo marking is absent in the soprano I part-book.
28 In b. 46 of the chorus ‘Immortal Pleasures’ (HG81/1/4), there is a change of line in Score A, which results in what would have been a semibreve being split into tied minims; when S2 copied the soprano I part-book and Score B, he corrected this to a semibreve; however, the soprano II part-book gives tied minims without a change of line, which could only be the result of S2’s copying from Score A.
29 The punctuation in b. 79 of the recitative ‘But Simeon comes’ (HG154/4/2) in Score A is unclear, resulting in a correct “(He trembles.)” in the alto I part-book and an incorrect “(He trembles?” in the organ part-book.
Joseph and his Brethren

It is impossible to determine the source of the airs in the two tenor part-books, since there are no relevant variants. S2’s source for the recitatives in the tenor I part-book is only slightly clearer: a single variant of text\textsuperscript{31} suggests that he did not use the organ part-book.

Four variants of pitch (exx. 57-60) prove that the choruses in the tenor I part-book were copied from Score A. S2 seems to have altered his source for the tenor II part-book’s choruses: a clef error in the first chorus of Part II, ‘Hail’, shows that he must have been copying from the tenor I part-book at that point (ex. 61); but a clef error in the final chorus of Part II, ‘O God, who in thy heav’nly Hand’ (ex. 62) and a variant of text at the end of the final chorus of the oratorio\textsuperscript{32} show that S2 must have copied the second half of the tenor II part-book from Score A. It seems likely that S2’s change of approach was due to the fact that the tenor II part-book contains the part of Judah. Judah does not enter the oratorio until halfway through Part II, so until that point all he has is cues and choruses. As the tenor line does not divide in choruses, the most efficient way of copying the first half of the oratorio would have been to copy from the tenor I part-book; however, once Judah had entered, S2 would have had to copy from another source; perhaps this other source was Score A, and, rather than changing between the score and the tenor part-book, S2 chose not to refer to the tenor I part-book again.

Bass I and II part-books (Pharaoh, Reuben; vv. 165 and US-Wc: M2. 1. H2. v. 15)

Although there are no variants that reveal the filiation of the bass I part-book, there are a few relating to the bass II part-book. As Reuben does not sing any airs, the bass II part-book

\textsuperscript{30} In the final bars of this chorus (HG129/2/3-5), the alto I and II part-books share a rather strange mistake that cannot be a coincidence: “rewarded” instead of “rewarding”.


\textsuperscript{32} The tenor I part-book reads “fine”, whereas the tenor II part-book reads “finis”, like Score A. In almost every other part-book, S2 had written “fine”.

text in the chorus ‘Blest be the Man’\textsuperscript{30} reveal that he copied the Part II choruses from the alto I part-book. S2 would have to have copied from a score for the Part I choruses, since the alto line divides in both ‘Joyful Sounds’ and ‘Immortal Pleasures’; perhaps when copying Part II he realised that when the alto line does not divide it would be more efficient to copy from the part-book because the clefs had already been changed there.
contains only recitatives and choruses. A variant of notation suggests that S2 copied Reuben’s recitatives from Score A, which is the expected source for recitatives. He seems to have changed his approach to choruses twice: in the first chorus of Part I, ‘O God of Joseph’, a variant of verbal text suggests that the bass II part-book was copied from the bass I part-book at the beginning of Part I; a variant of underlay in the penultimate chorus of Part I, ‘Immortal Pleasures’ (ex. 63), suggests that by the end of Part I he had switched to Score A; and two bizarre spellings in the first chorus of Part II, ‘Hail’, suggest that by Part II S2 had reverted to using the bass I part-book as his source. Perhaps his twofold change of approach occurred for the same reason that he switched from the tenor I part-book to Score A when copying choruses in the tenor II part-book: he may have begun copying from Score A at the end of Part I because he remembered that Reuben entered in Part II, but then when he continued copying realised that Reuben does not enter until the end of Part II, and so reverted to using the bass I part-book for the time being.

Therefore the filiation of the vocal part-books of Joseph is as follows:

33 In Score A there is a change of page in the middle of b. 14 of the recitative “To Prison with him” (HG220/4/2), so S1 wrote the basso continuo semibreve as tied minims; when S2 copied Score B and the organ part-book, he wrote semibreves, but when he copied the bass II part-book he wrote tied minims even though that part-book did not have a change of line or page that bar.

34 The bass I and II part-books are the only sources to give the singular (“Dream”) rather than “Dreams” at b. 18 (HG40/1/2).

35 The bass I and II part-books are the only sources to give “wondrows” instead of “wondrous” at bb. 31-2 (HG102/1/3-102/2/1) and “snach’d” instead of “snatch’d” at b. 96 (HG109/1/4). Although S2 often spells words oddly, these spellings cannot be coincidental: he spelled the words correctly at all other occurrences in the chorus.
‘Songs in the Oratorio of Joseph’ part-books

As stated previously, there exist a few part-books entitled “Songs in the Oratorio of Joseph”, which include the airs and the duet that Jennens marked to be omitted from Score B and the main part-books. These airs are: ‘Ingratitude?’, ‘I feel a spreading Flame’, ‘To keep afar’, ‘The wanton Favours’, ‘Ah Jealousie!’, ‘The People’s Favour’, ‘Prophetick Raptures’, and the duet ‘What’s sweeter’. Jennens appears to have copied his figurings in Score A into the harpsichord part-book. In the ritornelli of the air ‘The wanton Favours’, the violin line is present in the harpsichord part-book.

It is no great surprise that the violin I, violin II, viola, ’cello, and harpsichord part-books for ‘Songs in the Oratorio of Joseph’ were copied from Score A. It seems likely that the violin II part-book was copied from the violin I part-book when they play in unison, as the two part-books share variants involving an accidental (ex. 64), a rhythm (ex. 65), and a dynamic marking (ex. 66).

Therefore the filiation of the ‘Songs in the Oratorio of Joseph’ part-books is as follows:

```
       Autograph score
        ↓                      ↓
      Score A                Harpsichord
          ↓                  ↓
       Violin I            Violin II
          ↓              ↓
       unison numbers    Viola
          ↓              ↓
          'Cello        'Cello
```

“Additional Songs”

The composite volume GB-Lbl: RM 19.a.2 contains two “Additional Songs” from Joseph: the D major version of ‘Our Fruits’ for Asenath (original, longest version), and the setting of ‘What’s sweeter’ as an air. Jennens already had copies of the original versions of these numbers (the F major ‘Our Fruits’ for Phanor and the duet setting of ‘What’s sweeter’) as they are present in the red-morocco score. They were replaced before the first performance of the oratorio.

It is possible to establish the filiation only of ‘Our Fruits’, since the autograph of the air version of ‘What’s sweeter’ is lost. Luckily there are enough variants in ‘Our Fruits’ to
confirm that Jennens’s copy of the D major version of this air was derived from the autograph score and not from the performing score. This is proved by two ties introduced by Smith in the performing score that are not present in Jennens’s copy (exx. 67-8), a trill (ex. 69), a rhythm (ex. 70), and an omission by Handel (ex. 71). Presumably Jennens’s copy shares two ties with the performing score that are not present in the autograph score because both copyists assumed that Handel had meant to write them (exx. 72-3). This air must have been copied without reference to anything in Jennens’s collection, as it does not include his amendment to the verbal text: it gives Miller’s slightly nonsensical “rethlates for the niggard Soil” instead of Jennens’s “compensates”.

**Jennens’s amendments to Joseph**

Amendments to text

Jennens’s many amendments to Score A vary considerably in scale. Those that relate only to the text can be viewed in context in Appendix 9, which gives the text of the 1744 wordbook, of the autograph score, and of Score A, and highlights their differences and Jennens’s amendments. It is very likely that Jennens was consulting a copy of the wordbook: although it is possible that on some occasions he could have corrected the text of Score A to that of the wordbook through common sense, there are some occasions on which this would be stretching the bounds of probability.

The smallest amendments are the most numerous, and are a testament not only to his editorial inclinations but also to his profound respect for verbal text: the addition and correction of punctuation. As usual, Handel had omitted much of the punctuation in the autograph score; as the autograph score was the direct source for Score A, the latter score lacked much punctuation when Jennens received it.\(^{36}\) In most numbers, Jennens added and corrected punctuation comprehensively; and in numbers in which text is divided or stated more than once, he ensured that the punctuation made sense of the text. This resulted in many different ways of punctuating the same text.\(^{37}\) Although his punctuation inevitably coincides with that of the wordbook fairly frequently, there are far too many occasions on which it differs from the wordbook to assume that Jennens was simply copying the punctuation from a copy of the libretto that was related to the wordbook: the punctuation added by Jennens to Score A must be his own.

\(^{36}\) Although it is not always easy to discern who has written a full stop or a comma, it is clear that most of the punctuation was added by Jennens: much of it is clearly in his hand, and the original state of the manuscript remains clearly visible in many of the sections he marked to be omitted and therefore did not bother to correct.

\(^{37}\) In such numbers, Appendix 9 gives Jennens’s punctuation only of full and final statements of the text.
More of Jennens’s editorial energy was taken up in correcting errors of spelling. These were introduced by both Handel and S1, and are all shown in Appendix 9. Most are uninteresting; however, some of Jennens’s corrections reversed deliberate changes made by Handel. For example, Handel presumably did not recognise the (even then) archaic word ‘Kine’ in the accompanied recitative ‘Pharaoh, thy Dreams are one’, so changed it to “Kind”, which makes some sense. Although Jennens noticed and corrected Handel’s mistake, it remained in the performing score and was reproduced by Chrysander. Another example of a deliberate change by Handel that was usually reversed by Jennens is the composer’s decision to shorten “Zaphnath”, the first part of Joseph’s Egyptian name, to “Zaphna”. Handel’s change was presumably made for ease of singing: the original is particularly awkward when sung at speed, as in the choruses ‘Joyful Sounds’ (“Zaphnath rules and Pharaoh reigns”) and ‘Swift our Numbers’ (“Asenath with Zaphnath’s join’d”). For Jennens, faithfulness to the Bible was clearly more important than the avoidance of tongue-twisters.

Another of Handel’s changes that Jennens reversed was the composer’s decision, in Part III, scene iv, to reassign the following text from Judah to Reuben:

Peace, Simeon;
Remember Dothan’s Fields, the horrid Pit!
And Joseph’s Cries! – Were we not deaf to them?
Then we’d not hear – and now we are not heard.

Jennens’s reversal of Handel’s decision could have been because Judah would otherwise have very few lines in the scene. It could also have been because in the Bible, on the occasion referred to, Reuben spared Joseph’s life, and later says to the Brethren “Spake I not unto you, saying, Do not sin against the child; and ye would not hear?” (Genesis 42:22): he is unlikely to speak the words given to him by Handel. Why Handel made the change in the first place is unclear. On both occasions when Handel gave Reuben Judah’s lines, Judah had just spoken after Simeon; since Judah and Simeon were both sung by tenors, Handel might have thought it clearer if Simeon’s lines were followed by a bass.38

Jennens also rectified discrepancies between the number of syllables in a word and Handel’s setting of them. In one instance he achieved this by altering the text: in b. 36 of the recitative ‘But Simeon comes’, Handel set the words “we’re twelve Brethren” to five syllables, so Jennens altered this to “we are twelve Brethren” (ex. 74). He usually corrected such problems by changing the music (see for example exx. 75-7); but on two occasions he

38 Winton Dean takes this to be “virtual proof” that John Beard sang both Simeon and Judah (Dean, Oratorios, p. 413); however, this assumption is called into question by the fact that the two brothers have separate parts when all brothers speak at once (HG234).
felt it necessary to alter both the text and the rhythm (exx. 78-9). He also altered recitatives in order to correct incorrect stresses by Handel (exx. 80-81).

Although the correction of wrong words in recitatives did not always require amending the music (i.e. when exchanging words with the same syllable count and stress, such as “retains” and “detains” in bb. 48-9 of the recitative ‘But Simeon comes’ (HG153/1/3-4)), occasionally the music had to be altered. Examples include replacing a rather unlikely description of death as “irreparable” with the “inevitable” of the wordbook (ex. 82), or “rule to thy great Glory” with the more respectful “rule to thy greater Glory” of the wordbook (ex. 83).

Jennens’s alterations to word-setting were not confined to recitatives. For the A section of Asenath’s air ‘The silver Stream’, the wordbook gives the following text:

The silver Stream, that all its way
Transparent to the Ocean flows,
Mix’d with the turbid Surges grows
As ruffled and impure as they.

At two points (bb. 23-7 and 48-50), Handel wrote long, ascending melismas to illustrate the word “grows”. However, to do so he broke away from the text slightly, so that it read as follows (the melismatic phrases in question are underlined): on the first occasion, “mix’d with the turbid Surges grows, and grows as ruffled and impure as they”, and on the second, “mix’d with the turbid Surges grows as ruffled and impure as they, and grows as ruffled and impure as they”. It is likely that Jennens objected to this because Handel’s insertion of the word “and” alters the sense. However, Jennens’s alternative, of changing the words both times to “as ruffled” (exx. 84 and 85), is hardly better, since the second syllable of “ruffled” is awkwardly placed both times. The first time could have worked if he had placed this syllable on the penultimate note of b. 27; but his placing of it on the first note of b. 50, which is a long note on a strong beat at the highest point of the phrase, does not work at all. Handel’s setting and Jennens’s amendment are a clear demonstration of the different points of view held by Handel and Jennens regarding whether the integrity of the verse is more important than word painting, accentuation, and the effect of the whole movement.

A more elaborate alteration made for similar reasons is Jennens’s amendment of Handel’s word-setting in the chorus ‘Immortal Pleasures’ (ex. 86). He evidently considered this to be the worst of Handel’s follies in this oratorio, as he wrote at the beginning of the offending passage “N.B. intolerable nonsense”. The text of the passage in question is:

May these below, like those above,
Contend who most and longest love,
And be as Blest, as Great.
Handel wrote three musical phrases to fit these words: Phrase A, which is first stated in the tenor:

Phrase B, which is first stated in the bass:

Phrase C, which is used when “and longest love” is stated on its own, as in b. 35 in the alto:

Phrase A clearly illustrates the first line as it descends towards the last word of “May these below”, and ascends on the last syllable of “like those above”; and the minim in Phrase C clearly illustrates the word “longest”. Most of the “intolerable nonsense” described by Jennens refers to what happened to the words when Handel composed the rest of the passage: because, on the one hand, he treated the three phrases solely as musical figures to be developed, but, on the other hand, always paired the words with the music that he had composed for them, he often ended up with phrases such as “may these below, and be as blest as great” (c.f. soprano, bb. 20-22). As Handel wrote the words in full throughout the whole passage, he must have noticed that this had happened, but apparently it did not bother him. It clearly bothered Jennens, since he amended it, changing the words of some phrases so that each line made sense when read. (The exception to this is bb. 33-7, when Jennens split the line “may these below like those above” between the soprano and the alto, which unfortunately results in the word “above” being sung to a descending minor 7th.) Although Handel’s choice of words in bb. 49-50 certainly sounds odd in performance (Jennens’s alteration is a clear improvement), it is not obvious whether Handel’s other instances of “intolerable nonsense” would sound nonsensical in performance. Perhaps the audience’s attention would be drawn to each choral entry rather than hearing all of each line; if this were the case, Handel’s version would be clearer.

This is a different embodiment of the same clash of priorities seen in the two passages in ‘The silver Stream’ (see above). As in that air, it is perhaps ungenerous to assume that Jennens did not realise that his amendments played havoc with Handel’s word-setting. For Jennens, words were of paramount importance: Handel’s music ought to elevate the words he set, rather than make nonsense of them.
Although many of Jennens’s amendments to Score A involve reinstating Miller’s text when Handel had altered it, Jennens sometimes altered what Miller had written. The most interesting example of this occurs Part I, scene iv of the wordbook (text ex. 1). This episode was taken from Genesis 41:42-3 and 41:45 (text exx. 2-3). In addition to providing an explanation of “Zaphnath-Paaneah” in the main text of the wordbook, Miller also included a footnote stating “Zaphnath-Paaneah signifies Saviour of the World”. Despite the apparent certainty of this statement, Joseph’s Egyptian name was not explained in the earliest sources of the Bible, and its meaning was as uncertain then as it is now. It is well known among Handelians that Handel gave his preferred explanation of the name by altering the penultimate line of the recitative so that it read “Then henceforth, as the Father of the Country”. Less well known is that Jennens’s version reads “Then henceforth, as Revealer of deep Secrets”.

The reading given by Miller, “saviour of the world”, has clear merit to anyone wishing to emphasise the typological reading of Joseph. Ruth Smith points out that it also “invoke[s] the Patriot opposition’s ideal of the virtuous ruler, a messianic figure”, which would also have appealed to Miller. Handel’s choice of “father of the country” presumably originated in Luther’s “der ist des Landes Vater” in Genesis 41:43, and has been interpreted variously as an effort to distance himself from the oppositionist implications of Miller’s reading, as a way of comparing Joseph to George II, and as being due to the fact that Joseph as a type of Christ is not mentioned elsewhere in the oratorio. It is no surprise that Jennens would be dissatisfied with “father of the country”, a reading taken from Luther’s translation of a verse other than that in which the name usually appears. Why he chose not to retain Miller’s reading is less obvious and certainly worthy of consideration.

“Saviour of the world” and “revealer of secrets” were the two ancient explanations of the name. The latter was derived from the Hebrew root “z-p-n”, which means “to hide, conceal”, and was by far the most common: it appears in various forms in, for example, the Peshitta, the Targum Neofiti I, and the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, and is also mentioned by Symmachus, Philo, Augustine, and Josephus. The explanation “Saviour of the world”, however, appears only in Jerome, but its consequent presence in the Vulgate gave it a

---

39 Examples of verbal text are given in Appendix 10.
40 Smith, Oratorios, p. 305.
41 Ibid., pp. 305-6.
42 Chisholm, ‘New Sources’, p. 192.
44 I am very grateful to Dr Nathan MacDonald of St John’s College, Cambridge for his kind help in this matter.
45 Presumably Jennens added “deep” to make his words fit with Handel’s music, which sets seven syllables.
46 Alison Salvesen suggests that “Paaneah”, which is usually not given a derivation, “was then rendered to complete its appropriateness to the story of Joseph’s interpretation of Pharaoh’s dream” (Symmachus in the Pentateuch (Manchester, 1991), p. 54).
currency that led it to be regarded as a viable alternative. Jerome explained that “[a]lthough in Hebrew this name means *a discoverer of hidden things* [i.e. revealer of secrets], none the less, because it was put on him by an Egyptian, it ought to have a meaning proper to that same language. Therefore by the Egyptian word Saphaneth Phanee or, as the Septuagint wished to transcribe it, Psomtrom-Phanech, is meant *the saviour of the world*, because he had rescued the world from impending destruction by famine.”

Jennens would certainly have been aware of the pedigree of the two explanations. He knew Ancient Greek and Latin extremely well, and it is likely that he had learned some Hebrew during his time at Oxford; furthermore, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century commentaries (including many in Jennens’s library) tended to give both explanations of the name. It seems likely that Jennens would prefer “revealer of secrets” on the basis that it was the usual explanation and therefore the most likely to be correct, whereas “saviour of the world” was unique to Jerome; and while the latter had obvious appeal in terms of Joseph as a foreshadowing of Christ, Smith has pointed out that the former would have appealed to Jennens through its implication of Christ-like revelation.

**Deletions**

The most substantial of Jennens’s amendments to Joseph was his marking, in Score A, of a large portion of the oratorio to be omitted from Score B and the main part-books. He had the airs and duet that he marked to be omitted copied in his ‘Songs in the Oratorio of Joseph’ part-books, presumably because he wanted to preserve Handel’s compositions (and be able to perform them) but did not consider them to have a place in the oratorio. In order to understand why Jennens felt that so much of Miller’s text should be omitted, it is necessary to understand the contemporary significance of Joseph.

Joseph figured large in two of the most heated debates of the time. Since the Bible relates only his actions (and not his motivations), he could be seen either as a moral exemplar

---

48 Ibid., p. 78. This is Hayward’s translation. He writes, however, that Jerome’s rendering probably has less to do with the Egyptian language than he claims, and was “most likely influenced by Christian thinking, which regarded Joseph as a type of Christ in that he alone preserved alive the whole of Egypt and those who visited it during the famine” (p. 227).

49 Jennens’s tutor at Balliol was Joseph Sanford, who taught Hebrew (Smith, *The Man behind Handel’s Messiah*, p. 7).


51 Private correspondence, 6 June 2015.

52 These sections are shown in italics in Appendix 9.
and ideal leader, or as power-hungry and corrupt; in each of these debates, both readings of his character, behaviour, and motives were invoked in order to further a range of agendas.

The first of these debates was religious: Christians were forced to leap to Joseph’s defence against the sometimes vehement attacks made on his character by deists, who sought to prove that nature and reason were all that one needed to comprehend God. In order to do so they attacked all aspects of revealed religion; the ways in which the figure of Joseph was fundamental to these arguments will become apparent below. Miller’s libretto is a defence of Christianity designed to address the most common deist objections to Joseph. It is not difficult to see why Miller, a clergyman, would take this position; nor is it difficult to see why Jennens, who had himself harnessed Handel’s creative powers to defend Christianity, would devote so much time to this oratorio. Throughout the discussion I use as a reference the third volume of Thomas Morgan’s *Moral Philosopher*, since this contains the most concentrated attacks upon Joseph and revealed religion that were published in the years immediately preceding the oratorio’s genesis.

The smallest of Jennens’s deletions lies at the heart of the matter. In Handel’s and Miller’s version of the oratorio, the Part I, scene vi duet ‘Celestial Virgin’ is followed by a wedding scene (text ex. 4). However, in Jennens’s version, the duet is followed immediately by the chorus ‘Immortal Pleasures’. The result is that Joseph and Asenath do not actually get married “onstage”: they marry in between Parts I and II, by which time at least seven years have passed, they have two sons, and Egypt is in famine.

The passage deleted by Jennens is the only passage in the oratorio in which it is clear that Asenath’s father, Potiphera, is the Egyptian High Priest. This was problematic for Jennens for two reasons. For an explanation as to why Joseph’s link to the Egyptian priesthood was central to deist attacks, it is worth quoting at some length from Thomas Morgan.

Some Time in this sixth Year, before the Egyptians had been allow’d Seed-Corn, Joseph had obtain’d a Decree, or Ordinance, from Pharaoh, which made the Church-Lands unalienable, and irresumable by the Crown, by which Means the Priesthood in Egypt became hereditary, and independent of the Crown. [...] at the End of the sixth, or Beginning of the seventh Year, when the public Stores and Granaries were well nigh exhausted, and yet the Calamities still increasing, the Priests Lands were not seiz’d or taken too, because they were not Pharaoh’s, Ver. 26. [...] Pharaoh, as had been observ’d before, had given the High Priest’s Daughter to Joseph, as his Wife, in the Beginning of his Preferments, and as one of the first Instances of his Favour. And now, upon the Strength of such an Alliance, he had managed Matters so well, as to have divided the whole Power and Property of Egypt between the Church and the Crown. And this laid the Foundation of all the Superstition of Egypt, and of the vast Power and Influence of the Priests there in after Ages. For the Priesthood now being hereditary, and the Priests

---


54 Jennens repurposed the March, transplanting it from the wedding scene to precede his Part I, scene ii, where it now marks the first appearance of Pharaoh and a change of scene to a “Room of State in Pharaoh’s Palace”. This works perfectly as the first recitative of that scene begins with a D major chord (the key of the March).
invested with a vast Property in Lands, independent of the Crown, this gave them an Opportunity and Power to work up the People into the highest and grossest Degrees of Superstition, and into an absolute blind Obedience and Resignation to themselves. For being now incredibly rich, and having all the Means of Knowledge and natural Experiments in their Power, they set themselves to the Study of Chymistry, natural Magic, and occult experimental Philosophy, all which they kept as deep Secrets, and sacred Mysteries to themselves, and made it all pass with the ignorant enslaved Vulgar for Miracles, Revelation, Prophecy, and immediate divine Power, and this Egypt became the Mother and Nurse of Superstition, and which, after the great Egyptian Empire arose about Solomon’s Time, they spread and propagated to all their conquer’d Nations. And this I take to have been the first Rise and Foundation of the Mosaic Theocracy, for Moses afterward only formed and established an independent Government and Kingdom of his own, upon the very same Plan of Priesthood, which Joseph had settled in Egypt above 200 Years before.  

By casting aspersions on Joseph’s ministry and the tradition of priesthood that he founded, deists sought to discredit three matters of fundamental importance to revealed religion: the divine authority of Mosaic Law, the validity of Moses’s miracles, and the established church itself. Although Joseph’s honesty in this regard would have been better tackled directly, Jennens did not have that option: he had to work with what material he had. Therefore by deleting the wedding scene from the oratorio, Jennens glossed over Joseph’s most obvious connection to the priesthood.

Jennens’s deletion of the wedding scene must also relate to another deist objection to Joseph: since Asenath was the daughter of the Egyptian High Priest, it appears that Joseph married outside his religion. This objection was by no means new, and there were various possible explanations. Deborah Rooke lists some of these: that there were no Hebrew women to marry, that Pharaoh forced the marriage on Joseph, or that Joseph converted Asenath before their marriage. In fact many of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Biblical commentators whose books filled Jennens’s shelves side-stepped the problem entirely by suggesting that Potiphera was not a priest, but a prince or a ruler of some kind. Rooke believes that Miller dealt sufficiently with the problem by showing that Joseph asked for Asenath’s hand in marriage and by portraying the marriage in an “entirely positive light from beginning to end”. However, the section deleted by Jennens shows Asenath’s father, the Egyptian High Priest, carrying out what is clearly an Egyptian marriage ceremony; this must have been too problematic for Jennens, for whom renouncing one’s religion was a serious matter. Since he had no option of writing a new scene for Part I to show that she had been converted, his only option was to delete the scene.

---

56 Rooke, Handel’s Israelite Oratorio Libretti, pp. 130-31.
57 Ainsworth, Calvin, Henry, and Wells give this explanation, as does Parker, who also writes that Joseph presumably converted Asenath and her family before the marriage (Bibliotheca Biblica, p. 822).
58 She writes that the marriage “was not foisted upon Joseph by Pharaoh as something that Joseph dare not refuse; rather, Joseph himself sought it out, and as a man who has just displayed his gifts of divine insight and wisdom, it is inconceivable that he should make an inappropriate choice of spouse. Just how appropriate the match is, is shown as the pair sing a rapturous duet, in which each assigns the other a divine descriptor (‘Celestial Virgin!’ ‘Godlike Youth’), declares the other full of innocence and truth, and calls the other heaven’s completion of their own felicity […]” (Handel’s Israelite Oratorio Libretti, p. 136-7).
59 Ibid., p. 137. She also argues convincingly that the fact that Handel did not set Asenath’s Part III rejection of idolatry was proof that Handel also deemed Miller’s earlier treatment of the matter sufficient.
Two further sections of text deleted by Jennens support the idea that he wanted to remove all suggestions of Asenath’s idolatry: Part I, scene v of the wordbook (text ex. 5), and an air in Part III, scene ii of the wordbook (text ex. 6). Winton Dean derided Miller for these lines, finding unintended humour in the fourth line of ‘Whence this unwonted Ardour’, and calling Asenath’s raptures “that phenomenon peculiar to oratorio texts”. However, Chisholm sees in Miller’s texts a reflection of Elizabeth Rowe’s The History of Joseph: a poem (1736), in which Asenath is “A virgin priestess to the goddess vow’d”. His question regarding whether these words are “only the stock phrases of the poet, or [do] her arts depend on her role as priestess and seer?” is a good one. In Part I, scene v of the oratorio (when Asenath sings ‘Whence this unwonted Ardour’) Asenath is not yet betrothed to Joseph, so could still have been converted before their marriage. The problem with the air ‘Prophetick Raptures’ is that she has been married to Joseph for a number of years by this point in the oratorio, so ought to have rejected such superstitions.

Jennens cut two further sections involving Asenath: in Part III, scene ii of the wordbook (text ex. 7), and in Part III, scene v of the wordbook (text ex. 8). Miller invented these passages: neither is in the Bible, and neither has an equivalent in Zeno’s text. Miller’s expansion of Asenath’s character served a number of purposes. By ensuring that the only female role in the oratorio could continue throughout, Miller not only added another dramatic arc to the oratorio, which might make the public more likely to attend and receive his message, but also provided Elisabeth Duparc, who sang the role of Asenath, with much more music. Asenath also offered further opportunities for commentary on power, one of the major themes of the oratorio. It does not seem likely that any of Miller’s reasons for expanding Asenath’s part would have been of particular interest to Jennens. If he were intending to give private performances of the work at Gopsall, he and his friends certainly did not require the lure of romance, and he would hardly be likely to have a star soprano singing the role of Asenath; and as will become clear below, his interest in the oratorio was probably not related to Miller’s theme of power. It is also possible that Jennens could have viewed the love duet, which is necessary if Asenath is present in Parts II and III, as a distraction: one could easily see the reconciliation of Asenath and Joseph that precedes the final chorus as usurping the place of the brothers’ reconciliation, which is the climax of the Bible story and the point of

---

60 Dean, Oratorios, p. 399. Dean’s amusement stems from a misprint in the wordbook, which unfortunately results in Joseph’s having “trespass’d on [Asenath’s] unsuspecting Bosom”.
61 Ibid., p. 401.
62 Chisholm, ‘New Sources’, p. 188.
63 Ibid., p. 189
64 It is worth noting that Miller had included in his libretto evidence that Asenath had converted, but that Handel did not set it. In the recitative preceding ‘Prophetick Raptures’ he had her state “That awful Being, whose sacred Praises / I’ve heard thy grateful Lips so oft’ resound, / I likewise sing!” This was of no use to Jennens as he was working only with what Handel had composed.
the oratorio. Furthermore, in the rather obscure opening lines of Asenath’s final scene, “Whilst the Nile and Memphis, / To him and his are destin’d for a Country”, Asenath tells Joseph that his family may live in Egypt; however, in the Bible, Joseph himself offers the invitation.\textsuperscript{65} It seems likely that Miller’s change would have rankled Jennens, for whom Scripture was inviolable.

The most likely reason for Jennens’s deletion of so much of Asenath’s music is that her presence in Parts II and III, when she is married to Joseph, is a painful reminder of the problem of her irreligion. While this would have been troubling enough for Jennens if it related only to Joseph, he had a more pressing reason to defend Joseph at all costs: as Jennens believed Joseph to be a foreshadowing of Christ, any blot on the character of Joseph was a blot on the character of Christ himself.

The second contemporary debate in which Joseph was often discussed was political. As Joseph was appointed by Pharaoh to the post of chief minister, he was an obvious choice for a figure through which the long-standing and controversial ministry of Robert Walpole could be discussed. Joseph was used as a point of comparison for Walpole by both factions: supporters of Walpole viewed both Walpole and Joseph in a positive light, whereas some of Walpole’s opponents took a negative view of both ministries. However, the Patriot opposition most often saw in Joseph all the qualities of an ideal leader, aptly described by Smith as the “longed-for saviour who would redeem the nation from the depredations of Walpole’s government”.\textsuperscript{66}

There is certainly no doubt as to the motivation behind Miller’s casting of Joseph as a moral exemplar: Miller was a known oppositionist, and had in 1740 published scathing attacks on Walpole.\textsuperscript{67} Although Miller’s libretto was, of necessity, far less inflammatory (to the extent that supporters of Walpole could have accepted it as expressing their own views), his intentions would have been clear to his fellow oppositionists, particularly as Miller emphasised Joseph’s lack of corruption and ingratitude, the two vices of which Walpole was most often accused.

It is striking that Jennens cut all three of Miller’s most heavy-handed references to Walpole; however, it is worth noting that the loss of these passages did not leave Joseph undefended against deist attacks. The first of these is in Part I, scenes ii-iii of the wordbook (text ex. 9). Phanor is Pharaoh’s chief butler, whose apology relates to a part of the story not

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{65} Joseph’s invitation is found in Genesis 45: 9-10; at this point, Pharaoh does not know of the events that have unfolded, although Pharaoh then tells Joseph to bring his family into Egypt (Genesis 45: 16-18).
  \item \textsuperscript{66} Smith, Oratorios, p. 305.
  \item \textsuperscript{67} Are these Things so? The previous Question, from an Englishman in his Grotto, to a great Man at Court (London, 1740) and The great Man’s Answer to Are these Things so? In a Dialogue between His Honour and the Englishman in His Grotto (London, 1740).
\end{itemize}
covered in the oratorio. Miller, in part of the advertisement to the wordbook, explains the situation as follows:

The Ishmaelites being arrived with Joseph in Egypt, sold him to Potiphar, a principal Officer in Pharaoh’s Court, with whom he lived in high Favour, a considerable time, 'till at length, upon the false Accusation of Potiphar’s Wife, he was disgraced and cast into Prison. During his Confinement, the chief Butler, and chief Baker of Pharaoh’s Court, were thrown into the same Place by the King’s Order, both of whom having a Dream in the same Night, receiv’d an Interpretation of them from Joseph, which proved true, the chief Baker being within three Days hanged on a Tree, and the chief Butler restored to his Employment as was foretold; but being taken into Favour again thought no more of his Interpreter, as he had promised to do. Here then our Drama finds Joseph, two Years after this Incident had happened. At this Time, Pharaoh himself having had two Dreams in the same Night, the First, of Seven fat Kine coming out of the River, which were devoured by Seven other lean Kine which came up after them; and the Second, of Seven full Ears of Corn devoured by Seven thin ones, the Wisemen of Egypt could not interpret them. The chief Butler calling Joseph to Remembrance upon this Occasion, spoke of him to the King, who immediately order’d that he should be brought before him[.]

Most obviously, Phanor’s air is a criticism of ingratitude, a vice of which, as mentioned above, Walpole was often accused. However, this passage would have had additional meaning for anyone involved in the deist debate, as Thomas Morgan had used the episode to an entirely different end. Having already described Joseph’s “enterprizing Genius”, “aspiring Temper”, “boundless Ambition”, and “Thirst of Wealth and Dominion”, Morgan wrote:

Two Years after the Re-advancement of the chief Butler, Pharaoh himself had a Dream, which exceedingly perplex’d him, and which none of his Astrologers, Magicians, or wise Men, could interpret: This Anxiety and Distress of the King determin’d the Officer to mention Joseph, and get him sent for, who had interpreted his own Dream, and that of the chief Baker, agreeable to the Event: It is probable, that this Officer of the Household having had an Acquaintance with Joseph before, and knowing the enterprizing Genius, and vast Ambition of the Man, had resolved never to have mentioned him, or brought him to Court, had not this Incident, and the great Perturbation the King was under, driven him to it at this Time. However, to excuse himself, and make the best of the Matter, he now laid the Blame on his own Memory, and pretended, that he had never once thought of the Hebrew, or his Promise to him, from that Time to this, which is hardly credible: But if he dreaded the Consequences of bringing such a Politician and ambitious Enterprizer to Court, and feared the Effects of his ingratiating himself with the King, the Event shew’d, that he was not mistaken in the Man, for this Incident laid the Foundation of the Ruin of Egypt, and reduced the finest, richest, and freest Country then in the World, to a State of Misery, Poverty, and Vassalage: It proved the intire Overthrow of a free Constitution, and introduced such an absolute Power, both in Church and State, as had never been known in the World before.

Miller dealt with this accusation in two ways: by showing Joseph responding generously (which is not particularly effective since if Joseph were as Morgan suggests, he would wish to appear virtuous) and by showing Phanor renouncing his ingratitude alone (which is effective). However, Jennens’s deletion does not leave Joseph undefended, as his good character is demonstrated much more clearly elsewhere. Indeed, in Jennens’s version, our attention is

---

69 Ibid., pp. 10-11.
70 Rooke (Handel’s Israelite Oratorio Libretti, pp. 141-3) notes many examples, including: Joseph’s reaction to being falsely imprisoned (Part I, scene i); his humble reaction to having been called to interpret Pharaoh’s dream (Part I, scene ii: “Blest Vicissitude! / Jehovah, whom I serve, bears Witness to me; / And from the Horrors of the Pit, once more, / Will deign Deliverance to His Servant’s Soul”); his hope that, once he interprets Pharaoh’s dream, Pharaoh will praise Joseph’s God (same scene, second half of the air ‘Come, divine Inspire’); his assurance “O mighty Pharaoh, it is not in me; Interpretation does belong to Heav’n” (Part I, scene iv); his comment to Asenath that her hand in marriage would “help allay the anxious
focused on Joseph’s humility as we are taken directly from the air ‘Come, divine Inspirer’ to a recitative in which Joseph gives Jehovah credit for all interpretations.

Miller’s second unsubtle reference to Walpole’s alleged ingratitude is in Part III, scene 1 of the wordbook (text ex. 10). Jennens’s deletion of this scene has no impact on Joseph’s character, unless Phanor’s comment that the brethren “await their doom” implies that, having seen Joseph’s ruling, he expects the brothers’ punishment to be particularly harsh. Nothing is lost dramatically, since Simeon’s first lines in Part III (scene iii of the wordbook, scene i of Jennens’s version) reveal that the brothers have been captured and shackled, and Phanor’s response shows that he considers them ungrateful. Smith has suggested that another reason for this deletion could be that Jennens, as a believer in redemption and a philanthropist, simply disagreed with the sentiment. 71

Miller’s third clear reference to Walpole that was cut by Jennens deals with corruption, the vice of which Walpole was most often accused. In Part III, scene ii, Miller rather unsubtly highlighted Joseph’s aversion to corruption (text ex. 11). As Smith points out, Pharaoh did in fact make Joseph dispenser. 72 This contradiction would hardly have enamoured Jennens to the words and it is possible that this was the sole reason for his deletion. However, given his removal of the two scenes dealing with ingratitude, it seems likely that he deleted this passage because it was a further gibe at Walpole.

However, corruption was an accusation that was also levelled at Joseph by deist writers. Morgan, for example, states:

Now here we are let into the Secret how the Famine in Egypt came to last so long, and by what Means the Hebrew Prophet and Landlord, the great Task-Master of the Egyptians, was enabled to fulfil his own Predictions. For having at first engross’d and monopoliz’d all the Corn, he was resolved, for such a Time, to give out no more of it, than what might be just necessary to support Life from Hand to Mouth, but to let the Egyptians have no Corn for Seed, till he had stript them of all their Property, absolutely enslav’d them, and exhausted all his own Stores. They might have had Seed-Corn, sown their Lands, and raised a fresh Supply sooner, as well as now, had their Landlord and Task-Master thought fit to have suffered it. But this could not have answered the Politician’s End in perfectly enslaving the People, and making himself Master of the Country. 73

It is therefore important to note that Jennens’s removal of the passage in Part III, scene ii of the wordbook does not weaken the defence of Joseph as a Biblical figure. This is because Jennens retained the first scene of Part II, in which Miller demonstrates Joseph’s honesty in a rather more subtle way (text ex. 12). If the Egyptians themselves judge Joseph to be governing fairly, who are we to question it?

71 Private conversation, 5 June 2015.
72 Smith, Oratorios, p. 306. The KJV gives the following: “And when all the land of Egypt was famished, the people cried to Pharaoh for bread: and Pharaoh said unto all the Egyptians, Go unto Joseph; what he saith to you, do. And the famine was over all the face of the earth: And Joseph opened all the storehouses, and sold unto the Egyptians” (Genesis 41:55-6).
Why then did Jennens remove all three of Miller’s most obvious references to Walpole? It cannot be because Jennens had ever been a supporter of Walpole: given his beliefs, commitments, and friends it is of little surprise that he read and circulated oppositionist literature.\footnote{Smith, Oratorios, p. 191.} And while the defence of revealed religion was certainly of primary importance to Jennens, it does not seem to be the case that he believed that oratorios should deal only with questions of religion: Cyrus in 
\textit{Belshazzar} was not only the fulfilment of an Old Testament prophecy and a type of Christ, but also an oppositionist blueprint of the ideal leader.\footnote{Furthermore, through its depiction of the exiled and then repatriated Jews, Jennens’s libretto of 
\textit{Belshazzar} also reflects the other major commitment of Jennens’s life: his loyalty to the deposed royal family.} The likeliest explanation seems to be that by the time Jennens came to amend the oratorio, Miller’s references to Walpole – who fell from power in 1742 and died in 1745 – were outdated and irrelevant, or at least of little interest to Jennens.

The only remaining deletion to be discussed is that of Part II, scene vi of the wordbook (text ex. 13). Chisholm has shown that the recitative and air are taken wholesale from Zeno’s 
\textit{Giuseppe} and that the chorus is Miller’s.\footnote{Chisholm, ‘New Sources’, pp. 198-9.} This passage is rather oddly placed: the episode it refers to has not been mentioned anywhere else in the libretto, and Judah certainly does not have an “unspotted heart”. It seems likely that the reason why Miller included it was that it contributes to his discussion of power; the libretto loses little with its deletion.

Jennens’s removal of anything that distracted from or endangered the defence of Christianity is entirely consistent with what we know of him. Even if it were not the case that Miller’s references to Walpole were probably no longer relevant by the time Jennens made his amendments, they could never be as important to Jennens as the two commitments that informed almost every aspect of his life: his devotion to Anglican Christianity and his loyalty to the deposed Stuarts. Since it is very difficult to see any parallels between the latter and Joseph, it makes sense that Jennens did what he could to focus the oratorio on that which was of most importance to him: the defence of revealed religion.

\section*{Scene headings}

Jennens’s deletion of whole scenes naturally made it necessary to make some kind of alteration to the remaining scene numbers and headings. Rather than simply renumbering them, he went to the trouble of redefining the way that the oratorio was divided. (This is shown in Appendix 9.)
Miller’s scene designations follow operatic convention, in which scenes are defined by the coming and going of characters. One example can be found in Part II: scene iii ends with Joseph’s line “But Simeon comes, Treach’rous blood-thirsty Brother!”, and scene iv begins with Simeon’s appearance. However, Miller is not completely consistent: many of Phanor’s comings and goings are not marked by a new scene number. Presumably the reason for this is that Phanor, as the butler, is a minor character who appears, disappears, and reappears frequently. Miller’s decisions on this matter seem sometimes to be related to the passing of time, as, for example, in Miller’s Part III, scenes iii-iv (text ex. 14). The difference between the lines following Phanor’s leaving the stage and his reappearing (underlined) must be that Simeon’s exclamation “Imposture! – Fury!” is an immediate reaction to Phanor’s lines, whereas Phanor’s later statement beginning “At length” is clearly spoken after some time has passed.

When Jennens overhauled the oratorio he used the English system of scene designations, in which there is a new scene only if the “stage” has been emptied, if there is a new location, or if time has passed, even when the same characters remain “onstage” in the same location. One example of this is his Part I, scene iii, in which the entrance of Pharaoh and Potiphera that heralded a new scene number (vii) in the wordbook is included as a continuation of scene iii. Another example is his Part III, which, because it is in one location and runs continuously (since he deleted much of it), is all one scene. He must have imagined that the entrance of Phanor and Joseph’s Brethren in Part II took place some time after Asenath’s exit in his scene iv, as he named it scene v.

That Jennens took the time to overhaul the scene numbers in such a way suggests that there was a reason behind his alterations. The most likely reason is that he wished to highlight the fact that oratorios were sacred works, distinct from opera.

Other amendments

Jennens figured the basso continuo line of his sources comprehensively. His figurings are based solely on the notes that were present in the score. Sometimes this resulted in his correcting figurings that were wrong, probably because Handel had changed his mind between sketching a number and filling it out. For example, in b. 32 of the air ‘Remorse, confusion’ (HG139/1/2), the autograph figuring places the resolution of the 6-4 on the third beat of the bar, whereas in fact it occurs on the fourth beat; this incorrect figuring was copied
into Score A by S1 but corrected by Jennens. However, Jennens made several mistakes in his figuring because he did not apply musical common sense. For example, he figured beat 2 of b. 85 of the duet ‘Celestial Virgin’ 6-4, which is incorrect (see Appendix 8, music ex. 87); and in b. 29 of the air ‘Together, lovely Innocents’, he figured the last note 6-4, when it should be 6-3 (see Appendix 8, music ex. 88). These examples show both Jennens’s careful attention to detail and his musical limitations. A comparison of every figuring in the autograph score, Score A, Score B, and the organ part-book is beyond the scope of this dissertation; however, it seems likely that Jennens copied his comprehensive figurings in Score A into Score B and the organ part-book. This would have been the practical approach, and might be suggested by the fact that the penultimate note of the air ‘O lovely Youth’ is figured 3 in the organ part-book even though there is a serious error at that point (see Appendix 8, music ex. 49): had the figurings been entered into that part-book on the basis of the notes present (and not simply copied from another source), the error would probably have been noticed and corrected.

Jennens must have had access to the autograph score at some point. First, he added “Andante larghetto” and “piano” to the B section of ‘The silver Stream’ (HG162); second, he added Handel’s dates to the end of Parts I and II. It is not clear why Jennens did not give a date at the end of Part III: it could be that there was no date, because the end was to be copied from the Dettingen Anthem, or it could be that the end of the autograph was already lost by that point.

**Timing of Jennens’s copies**

In the autograph score Handel noted that he completed Part I in full on 26 August 1743 and Part II in full on 12 September; however, it is not known when he completed Part III as the end of the autograph score is missing. As mentioned above, the oratorio was first performed on 2 March 1744.

Score A must have been copied after the performing score was copied. First, the Menuet of the Overture and the Sinfonia that begins Part III were both inserted into the autograph and performing scores, but were copied as integral parts of Score A. Second, the autograph score originally gave the following version of bb. 5-6 of the recitative ‘Whence this unwonted Ardour’ (HG60):

---

77 Although Score B contains the correct figuring, the organ part-book gives beat 3 as a 6.
When Smith copied the performing score, it was this version that he wrote. (At some point, the first note of b. 6 had been a c" in the autograph score; however, Handel altered it to a d", presumably before the performing score was copied.) Both the autograph and the performing scores were then changed to this (the autograph was altered in ink, the performing score in pencil):

The fact that the following version was copied as an integral part of Score A proves that this score is later than the performing score.

A similar variant occurs in bb. 6-7 of the recitative ‘Pardon, that I so long forgot thee’ (HG28), which Handel originally wrote as follows:

Smith originally copied this version into the performing score:

This was then changed to this version:
At some point, Handel altered the autograph score to the following, which is the version copied as an integral part of Score A and the only version to stress the word “Mildew” correctly:

The last two bars of the recitative ‘Divine Interpreter!’ (HG47) provide the final piece of evidence that Score A must have been copied after the performing score. The air that follows this recitative, ‘O lovely Youth’ (HG48) was originally written in E major. The end of the preceding recitative is a mess in the autograph score, but it seems most likely that Handel’s original cadence was as follows:

Before the performing score was copied, Handel decided to change the air to E♭ major, and altered the end of the recitative accordingly. The version of the recitative originally given in the performing score, preceding the air in E♭ major, is as follows (later it was changed to the version in HG):

Score A gives the air in E major. If this had been because Handel had not yet asked for the air to be in E♭ major (i.e. if Score A had been copied before the performing score), it would contain Handel’s original recitative cadence, in B [major]. However, it contains a major version of the cadence given in the performing score:

To end in G major for an E major air is highly unlikely, and this recitative ending must be seen as nothing more than S1’s attempt to make it fit the air. Why S1 copied the air in E
major is not clear: perhaps he had been instructed to copy what he saw in the autograph score; perhaps he had been instructed to copy the original version of everything; or perhaps by the time he came to copy Score A, Handel had already added the pencil instruction into the autograph score to revert to E major. It is therefore clear that S1 copied Score A after the performing score was copied; unfortunately it is impossible to determine exactly when he did this.\textsuperscript{78}

Although Score B and the part-books offer no clues as to when they were copied, it seems likely that Jennens did not annotate Score A until at least late 1744, and probably 1745 at the earliest. First, in the summer of 1744, he was so busy writing his last libretto for Handel, \textit{Belshazzar}, that he did not even have time to write to his close friend Edward Holdsworth. On 26 September, he wrote:

I have been prevail’d with once more to expose my self to the Criticks, to oblige the Man who made me but a Scurvy return for former obligations; the truth is, I had a farther view in it; but if he does not mend his manners I am resolv’d to have no more to do with him. But the reason of my mentioning this was to excuse my delay of answering your letter dated almost 4 months ago. For my Muse is such a Jade, & Handel hurry’d her so, that I could not find time for writing letters.\textsuperscript{79}

Second, the autograph score of \textit{Belshazzar} shows that during the summer of 1744 Jennens still adhered to operatic practice in his scene numbering. However, at some point after the performing score had been copied, Jennens changed his mind: among many of Jennens’s alterations to the autograph score of \textit{Belshazzar} is an overhaul of the scene-headings, which are now defined according to place and time rather than to the coming and going of characters. Donald Burrows writes that Jennens’s alterations to the autograph score “took place, at the earliest, towards the end of 1744”.\textsuperscript{80} Since Jennens’s amendments to \textit{Joseph} include a similar overhaul of scene-headings, his decision that oratorio scene-headings should

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{78} The internal evidence may offer some clues. S1 appears to have been inconsistent regarding which of Handel’s revisions he adopted. Before the performing score was copied, Handel wrote a new version of the accompanied recitative ‘What! without me?’; he altered the end of the recitative ‘Give, give him up’; he changed the air ‘The Peasant’ from C major to B♭ major; and he deleted the opening ritornello of the duet ‘Celestial Virgin’. Score A contains the new versions of both recitatives (therefore S1 cannot have been asked simply to record Handel’s original thought), but gives ‘The Peasant’ in C major, and includes the opening ritornello of the duet. Between the copying of the performing score and the first performance, Handel made four more major revisions: he added the Menuet to the Overture; he added a Sinfonia to open Part III; he gave the air ‘Our Fruits’ to Asenath and reset it, in D major; and he made the duet ‘What’s sweeter’ into an air. Score A adopts the first two revisions, but gives the original versions of ‘Our Fruits’ and ‘What’s sweeter’. Unless S1 chose which revisions to adopt, or Jennens went through the autograph and made a list, the only way of explaining the contents of the score is this: S1 copied Score A at some point between the copying of the performing score and the first performance; at the time when S1 copied Score A, Handel had inserted the Menuet and the Sinfonia, but had not made any changes to ‘Our Fruits’ or ‘What’s sweeter’; the reason that ‘The Peasant’ is given in C major is probably that S1 copied what Handel had written, rather than following transposition instructions (this would explain why ‘O lovely Youth’ is in E major in the autograph score and Score A but in E♭ major in the performing score, and why ‘The People’s Favour’ is in E major in the autograph score and Score A but in D major in the performing score); and the reason that the opening ritornello of ‘Celestial Virgin’ is present is probably that S1 had been asked to copy the full version of everything that was present. However, this is purely speculative.
  \item \textsuperscript{79} GB-Lfom: acc. no. 7692.
  \item \textsuperscript{80} Burrows (ed.), \textit{Belshazzar}, p. xi.
\end{itemize}
not be governed by the characters involved cannot have taken place before his writing of Belshazzar.

On 19 February 1746, Jennens wrote the following to Holdsworth:

I can’t be so void of Curiosity as you are with regard to the thing call’d an Oratorio. Every thing that has been united with Handel’s Composition becomes sacred by such a union in my eyes; unless it be profane in it’s own nature, like Semele. As for a little nonsense, if that be all, I generally endeavour to alter it to common Sense; & for Poetry, how little soever there may be in the words, I always find it amply supply’d by his Musick.\footnote{GB-Lfom: acc. no. 7707.}

Jennens’s use of the word “generally” implies that in this clause he was thinking of all the instances in which he had corrected Handel’s word-setting. However, it does not seem unreasonable to imagine that Jennens had Joseph in mind: his words echo his description of Handel’s word-setting in one chorus in Joseph as “intolerable nonsense”; he cannot have been thinking of Hercules, since this was also profane; and he would be unlikely to consider his own libretti as lacking in poetry. Therefore his comments can apply only to Samson\footnote{Jennens must have amended Samson around three years before he wrote this letter: when he altered Hamilton’s scene divisions in Part III of that oratorio he did so according to the coming and going of characters (see p. 86); and, as was first noted by Burrows, some of his amendments made their way into a score outside his collection (the ‘Hunter’s score’) that was copied in 1743 (‘Something Necessary to the Connection’, p. 3). Therefore Joseph was probably foremost in his mind.} or to Joseph.

For such a devout Christian, Jennens’s comment that words set by Handel become “sacred by such a union” is extraordinary, and testifies to the profound effect that Handel’s music had on him. Indeed, it seems not only that Jennens’s periodic bouts of depression could be lifted by Handel’s music, but also that his depression could be caused or worsened by not hearing Handel’s music for some time.\footnote{On 15 March 1736, when discussing the possibility that Handel might “ly quiet for a year or two”, Holdsworth wrote to Jennens: “But I am chiefly concern’d for you, for I fear whilst Handel retires you’ll have the Hyp” (GB-Lfom: acc no. 7640); on 20 April 1736, Holdsworth wrote to Jennens: “I am glad the Prodigious [Handel] is going to undertake Operas again. I hope y’ will raise your spirits another winter, as I fear his silence contributed to sink them this” (GB-Lfom: acc. no. 7626); later that year, he wrote: “I am glad to hear that the Prodigious is like to entertain you so well this winter. He will very much contribute, I don’t doubt, to keep up your spirits; but pray don’t let him engross all your time. Let your house have a share in you, and I don’t doubt but between them, they will prevent any return of your last year’s disorder” (4 November 1736, GB-Lfom: acc. no. 7636); and on 24 July 1736, Jennens wrote: “at my return to Gopsal, I hope to find all your notes, & I’ll sit down to read Virgil with more pleasure than ever I did in my life. This, I hope, will keep off the Hyp till the end of October, when I suppose I shall go to London, & there Mr. Handel will do it for me” (GB-Lfom: acc. no. 7629).} Therefore it does not seem impossible that, during the lull in performances of Handel’s music between 23 April 1745 (the last performance of his 1744-5 season) and 14 February 1746 (the first performance of the Occasional Oratorio, which opened the new season and was of no interest to Jennens), he had turned to his copies of the oratorios as the most effective cure available to him. Since Jennens’s comments in his letter of 19 February 1746 constitute probably the most generous of his descriptions of Handel’s “nonsense”, this method of self-healing appears to have worked.
7 Belshazzar

Jennens’s manuscript score of *Belshazzar* is lost;¹ all that remains is a set of part-books copied by S1,² a score entitled “Additional Songs”,³ and set of part-books that accompanies it.⁴ The lost score was bound in red morocco; this special treatment is no surprise since Jennens was the librettist. As has already been discussed, the only one of Jennens’s red-morocco oratorio scores to survive is that for *Joseph*; for that oratorio, Jennens annotated the red-morocco score thoroughly, and this was the source for his other manuscript copies of the oratorio.⁵

Main part-books (1745 version)

In order to understand Jennens’s part-books of *Belshazzar*, three questions must be addressed: (1) were the part-books copied directly from the autograph or performing score or was there an intermediate score? (2) if there was an intermediate score, could it have been Jennens’s lost red-morocco score? (3) what was the source of the intermediate score? Addressing these questions sheds more light not only on the filiation of the part-books, but also on what Jennens made of Handel’s setting of his libretto, how he approached oratorio, and how his collection was assembled.

Establishing the presence of a lost intermediate score in any stemma is a slightly tricky task even when the source under investigation is a score; establishing the presence of a lost intermediate score in the stemma of a set of part-books is trickier still. The ultimate source of the *Belshazzar* part-books must of course be the autograph score; the performing score could be an intermediate source; and there could be a second intermediate source (perhaps Jennens’s lost score). In the absence of Jennens’s score, it cannot be said that all readings in the part-books that differ from the autograph and performing scores must derive from the lost score: some could have been introduced by S1 when he copied the part-books. The only way to establish the presence of a lost intermediate score in the stemma is to use readings that are not present in any existing score but that are present in more than one part-book when the

---

¹ This was sold to G. H. Brown as part of lot 247 in the 1918 Sotheby’s sale. Jennens also owned two Walsh prints, now both lost (lots 224-5).
⁴ GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 vv. 112-13 (trumpet I and trumpet II), v. 115 (timpani), and vv. 214-23 (soprano, alto, tenor, bass, violin I, violin II, viola, ’cello, oboe I, and oboe II).
⁵ See the chapter on that oratorio (beginning on p. 103).
part-books in question cannot be siblings: for example, identical and otherwise unique readings in the violin I and II part-books in a number in which the violins play in unison cannot be taken as evidence of a lost source since the violin II part-book could have been copied from the violin I part-book in that number (i.e. the violin I part-book would be the source of the violin II part-book, rather than the sibling of it). Examples of part-books that can only be siblings are a soprano and an alto part-book, a violin and a ’cello part-book, or a violin and a tenor part-book. As the criteria necessary for relying upon such variants are so limiting, only five variants can be relied upon: a variant relating to note-length (ex. 1),⁶ one relating to verbal text,⁷ one relating to a tempo marking,⁸ and two relating to underlay (exx. 2-3). Given the absence of a harpsichord part-book, and the fact that the ’cello part-book gives the vocal line only in recitatives, the errors relating to underlay can be duplicated only in choruses, because these are the only numbers which sibling vocal part-books all contain: the same type of error in a solo number cannot be duplicated. However, there is a sixth variant that is suggestive despite being present in only one part-book (ex. 4).

These variants on their own can only suggest that there was an intermediate score; however, they paint a picture that is confirmed by variants of another kind. The main feature of the intermediate, red-morocco score of Joseph was that Jennens made over 1,250 amendments to it; as a result, that score and the manuscripts that were copied from it contain readings that are not found elsewhere.⁹ Although Jennens had access to the autograph score of Belshazzar and made a number of alterations in it, there are several readings of several types found in the part-books of Belshazzar that are not found in the autograph or performing scores, and that are typical of the kinds of amendments made by Jennens in Joseph. This suggests that an intermediate score did indeed exist, and that it was Jennens’s red-morocco score of Belshazzar.

The best example of such a reading is Jennens’s solution to the problem in the recitative ‘Fain would I hope’ (HG205). The text of the wordbook is as follows:¹⁰

---

⁶ Music examples are given in Appendix 11.
⁷ In the recitative ‘Be comforted’ (HG35), both the autograph and performing scores give the correct text for Cyrus’s aside “(Dreams oft descend from Heav’n)”, whereas both the soprano II and the ’cello part-books – which can only be siblings – both give “Dreams of descend from Heav’n”. It is far more likely that they were both copied from a source with this reading than that S1 made the same mistake twice.
⁸ Neither the autograph score nor the performing score has a tempo marking for the chorus ‘To Arms’ (HG139), but most part-books have Allegro, which suggests that the intermediate score was marked in the same way. Details of the large number of dynamics in sibling part-books that are not present in the autograph or performing scores are not given here since they could simply reflect a consistency in S1’s copying practice. Other kinds of markings are similarly unhelpful, such as the Adagio at the final vocal cadence of the air ‘Amaz’d to find’ in the autograph and performing scores: S1’s omission of it in the soprano II and ’cello part-books could be a coincidental oversight.
⁹ One type of amendment Jennens made to Joseph was to alter the scene numbering; this was probably inspired by his overhaul of the scene designations in Belshazzar, which he made in the autograph score of that oratorio. This is not evident in his part-books of Belshazzar for the simple reason that it is only the harpsichord part-book that would have included scene numbers and headings, and S1 never copied harpsichord part-books for Jennens.
¹⁰ As usual, all text is given as it is in the first wordbook; the only exception is the chorus ‘Sing, o ye Heav’ns’, which is written in this chapter how Handel set it (‘Sing, o ye Heav’ns’).
NITOCRIS  Fain would I know th’ Effect of this late Prodigy,
Of your Reproof, and stern Prophetick Threats,
Fain would I hope – Is there not room for Hope?
Can he be so insensate to resist
Such pow’rful Arguments, so strongly urg’d
By his own Fears? Can such Perverseness dwell
In human Hearts? – It cannot surely be!

DANIEL  O that it could not! – But if I may judge
The Future by the Past, it were vain Flatt’ry
To bid you hope for his Conversion.

Can the black Aethiop change his Skin?
His native Spots the Leopard lose?
Then may the Heart obdur’d in Sin,
Grow soft, repent, and virtue choose!
Threats or Advice but move Disdain,
And Signs and Wonders glare in Vain.

However, when Handel set this recitative, he shortened the text so that the first four bars of the recitative ran as follows (Handel set all of Daniel’s lines):

By omitting all but the fourth of Nitocris’s lines, Handel made nonsense of Jennens’s text: Daniel’s response no longer made sense. (There is no reason to imagine that Handel did not realise that lines 5 and 6 of Daniel’s air respond to lines 2 and 3 of Nitocris’s recitative: cutting them was a necessary evil, as Jennens’s libretto was far too long.) It seems that at some point in 1745 this error was pointed out to Handel, perhaps by Jennens. In an attempt to solve the problem, Handel omitted Daniel’s lines and transposed Daniel’s air from E♭ major to G major, to follow the final chord of the recitative:

The part-books, however, contain a solution to the problem that is typical of Jennens. Not only does it involve techniques that he used elsewhere, but it is elegant, and it retains his precious text:

\[\text{On the question of whether this version of the recitative was minor or major, see Natassa Varka, ‘April in Princeton with a Handel Institute Research Award’, } HIN, 29/1 (2018), pp. 3-5.\]
This amendment – unique to the alto I and ‘cello part-books – contains all the hallmarks of Jennens’s involvement. As it was copied as an integral part of both part-books, S1 must have been copying from a score that contained this amendment in Jennens’s hand.

There are many more readings that can only stem from an amendment made by Jennens in an intermediate source. As is typical of Jennens (see the chapter on Joseph in particular), these all involve the verbal text; in the case of Belshazzar, of course, this was of special importance to Jennens because he was the author.

Although some text-related variants that are unique to the part-books might be attributable to S1, a few seem unlikely to be by anyone other than Jennens. Some of these involve only the words: in a few places, the part-books give Jennens’s preferred word, instead of the word Handel wrote in the autograph score. For the air ‘The leavy Honours of the Field’, the wordbook gives the following as the first three lines:

The leavy Honours of the Field,  
Before the boist’rous driving Wind,  
In giddy Dissipation fly.

Handel, however, wrote “the furious driving Wind”, perhaps because “furious” is better for singing. In the autograph score, “furious” remains unchanged, but “bois’trous” was copied as an integral part of the soprano I part-book: this part-book must have been copied from an intermediate source in which Jennens had restored his preferred word. Another example is in

\[\text{\footnotesize\[12\]These amendments rectify discrepancies between the number of syllables in a word and Handel’s setting. Sometimes this was achieved by altering the word. In b. 2 of the recitative ‘Where is the God’ (HG156), Handel set the word “Power” to a crotchet; although this is how it remains in the autograph and performing scores, the tenor I and ‘cello part-books read “Pow’r”. Similarly, in b. 32 of the recitative ‘My Hopes revive’ (HG210/3/4), Handel set the word “even” to a quaver; although this is how it remains in the autograph and performing scores, the bass and ‘cello part-books read “ev’n”. Sometimes, however, the music – rather than the word – has been altered. In b. 14 of the accompanied recitative ‘Thus saith the Lord’ (HG60/1/1), Handel set the word “Places” to a crotchet; although this is how it remains in the autograph and performing scores, the alto I part-book gives two quavers. (The ‘cello part-book does not give the vocal line in this number: although strictly speaking it is an accompanied recitative, it is so unlike one that S1 treated it as if it were an air.) Finally, in b. 17 of the recitative ‘They tell you true’ (HG98/6/3), Handel set the second and third syllables of the word “consider” to a crotchet; although this is how it remains in the autograph and performing scores, the soprano I and ‘cello part-books give two quavers.}

\[\text{\footnotesize\[14\]Handel also originally wrote “leafy”, but this was altered in the autograph score at the word’s first appearance.}\]
the semichorus ‘Euphrates hath his Task fulfil’d’ (HG126), for which the wordbook gives the following:

Euphrates hath his Task fulfil’d,
But to Divine Decree must yield.
While Babel Queen of Cities reign’d,
The Flood her Guardian was ordain’d;
Now to superior Pow’r gives Place,
And but the Doom of Heav’n obeys.

The first time that Handel set line 5, he wrote the correct words; the second time, he wrote “Way” instead of “Place”. “Way” is a plausible alternative, but it is not what Jennens wrote, and presumably is not what Handel meant to write, as he had written “Place” earlier. The performing score and tenor I part-book give what Handel wrote: “Place” the first time, and “Way” the second. However, the alto II, tenor II, and bass part-books give “Place” both times. It seems most likely that this is because Jennens had amended an intermediate score.

One of the most conspicuous of Jennens’s amendments to the autograph score is his suggestion for underlay in b. 19 of the recitative ‘O King’ (HG166/3/4). Handel had written the following, which was copied into the performing score:

```
19

NITOCRIS

Writing, and interpret it.
```

On a slip of paper inserted into the autograph score (f. 112r), Jennens wrote:

```
19

NITOCRIS

Writing, and interpret it.
```

This is the reading given in Jennens’s part-books. Even if Jennens’s slip of paper were no longer present in the autograph score, it would be possible to recognise the involvement of Jennens in this amendment: the dotted semiquaver and demisemiquaver rhythm is not typical of Handel’s recitative writing, but is entirely typical of Jennens, to whom text and the clear expression of it were of paramount importance. Furthermore, the melodic shape is not typical of Handel. Even if he had written this rhythm, he would have been far more likely to write the following:
Since it is not clear either when Jennens inserted the slip or whether the scribe of the intermediate score would have copied it, it is impossible to know whether Jennens made this amendment in the intermediate score. What is interesting is that he failed to notice an almost identical error only six bars earlier:

This error remains in the autograph score, and is repeated in the performing score and Jennens’s part-books. (Chrysander altered it so that the stress fell on the correct syllable.) The same is true for this reading in bb. 6-7 of the recitative ‘Ye Sages’ (HG162/5/3-4):

In fact there are many mistakes in the verbal text that are common to all the part-books; this suggests that these errors went uncorrected by Jennens. This seems uncharacteristic: almost everything that Jennens did – whether it was his amendments to his first scores of L’Allegro and Joseph, his initial writing of the libretto of Belshazzar, or his work on Shakespeare later in life – show him to have been extremely thorough and to have strived for perfection in his many labours of love. Although he noticed and corrected some errors in the intermediate score of Belshazzar, many are the same errors that he had noticed and corrected in the autograph score: on this occasion he was clearly anything but thorough, which is hardly what we would expect regarding his own libretto. Although it is impossible to know why Jennens acted so much out of character, it is possible to make a guess. The paper characteristics of the part-books suggest that they were copied by around 1747 at the latest (discussed in Chapter 12), so Jennens must have made the amendments to the intermediate score before then. 1746

---

15 Since many smaller errors, such as spelling, seem to have remained in the intermediate score, it is again impossible to say whether correct spellings in the part-books (such as corrections to Handel’s ubiquitous “lenght” and “Rejoyce”) can be ascribed to S1 or to Jennens.

16 The fact that the part-books contain only those figurings present in the autograph score suggests strongly that Jennens had not figured his red-morocco score of Belshazzar as he had his other scores: again, he took much less care over this score than he did over others in his collection.
was a particularly difficult year for Jennens: on 16 April Jacobite hopes suffered a major blow at Culloden, and on 28 June his dear friend Edward Holdsworth died. It is clear from Jennens’s correspondence that he was susceptible to something akin to a crippling depression, and it is hard to imagine that all these events would not have brought it on: it would be understandable for Jennens to have lost interest in his usual activities at this time.

The part-books give unique solutions to two more problematic bars in recitatives; however, in these it is not possible to tell whether the solution was provided by S1 or by Jennens. They are included here for the sake of interest and completeness. The first concerns the omission of a word. For bb. 2-4 of the recitative ‘Art thou that Daniel’ (HG166/4/2-3-166/5/1), the words given to Handel by Jennens were “I have heard of thee, that thou canst find Interpretations deep”; however, Handel omitted the word “find” in the autograph score, and wrote the following:

In that manuscript the word has been added but the notes have not been altered. When Smith copied the performing score, he wrote exactly what Handel had (so the word was still omitted); at some point it was changed to the following:

The part-books, however, both have different solutions, neither of which is better. The tenor I part-book gives:

and the ’cello part-book gives:
It is not clear why the two part-books should have different solutions. One possibility is that the intermediate score gave the autograph reading with the word inserted but not enough notes: S1 could have made his own solution while he copied the part-books and made a different choice in each. The other possibility is that Jennens added the word into the intermediate score but was unclear.

The second problematic bar is b. 36 of the recitative ‘My Hopes revive’ (HG210/4/2-3-210/5/1-2). Handel originally wrote:

\[
\text{MESSENGER} \quad \begin{array}{c}
34 \quad \text{It is too true. A Tu-mult heard with-out, the Gates were o-pen'd, a dread-full Scene ap-pear'd: the}
\end{array}
\]

In the performing score, Handel made one alteration to this passage before changing the vocal line completely to fit new words:

\[
\text{MESSENGER} \quad \begin{array}{c}
34 \quad \text{It is too true. A Tu-mult heard with-out, the Gates un-bar'd dis-clo-s'd a dread- full Scene: the}
\end{array}
\]

Clearly this is rather odd: the vocal line in b. 36 now only has three beats. The bass part-book, however, gives the following, which must be an attempt to solve the problem:

\[
\text{MESSENGER} \quad \begin{array}{c}
34 \quad \text{It is too true. A Tu-mult heard with-out, the Gates un-bar'd dis-clo-s'd a dread- full Scene: the}
\end{array}
\]

The basso continuo line has been altered in 37\textsuperscript{3-4}. Since the 'cello part-book gives the same reading as the performing score, it is possible that S1 was responsible for the reading in the bass part-book. (The reading in HG appears to be Chrysander’s invention.)

These versions of this bar given in the bass and 'cello part-books are interesting not only because they vary, but also because they both clearly derive from the performing score: this would suggest that the intermediate score was copied from the performing score, and not from the autograph score. But is this the case? An investigation into the filiation of Jennens’s part-books of Belshazzar not only provides an answer, but also adds further proof that there must have existed an intermediate score on which Jennens had entered amendments.

There are two lenses through which one can look at filiation when only part-books survive. The first is broad: to consider readings that are present in multiple part-books in order to consider their contents as a whole. The second is narrow: to examine each part-book
individually. Although the second might not be necessary if the first reveals sufficient readings, I use both here, beginning with the first in order to prevent having to state the same variant for multiple part-books.

The examples given above (bb. 2-4 of ‘Art thou that Daniel’ and b. 36 of ‘My Hopes revive’) are not the only readings that suggest – at first glance at least – that the part-books were copied from the performing score: the part-books contain numerous pre-performance revisions that were made only in the performing score.

Two of these relate only to words, but most relate to recitatives. The first relates to a simple alteration to the text of ‘It is the Custom’ (HG92) that was made in the performing score (the line in question is underlined):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As first set:</th>
<th>As amended in the performing score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bring those Vessels-</td>
<td>Bring those Vessels-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those costly Vessels my victorious Grandsire</td>
<td>Those costly Vessels my victorious Grandsire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took from the Temple of Jerusalem,</td>
<td>Took from the Temple of Jerusalem,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And in great Belus’s Temple laid them up,</td>
<td>And in the Temple of great Bel laid up,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But us’d them not: [etc]</td>
<td>But us’d them not: [etc]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presumably this change was made for clarity when sung. Handel’s setting of the new words resulted in an extra two beats (ex. 5); although S1 barred this passage differently in the tenor I and ’cello part-books, both part-books contain the new version, which is present only in the performing score. Again, the later version is given in the wordbook: if this change were Handel’s, Jennens must have agreed with it. A similar alteration has already been described in b. 36 of the recitative ‘My Hopes revive’, for which the readings in the bass and ’cello part-books are both based on Handel’s alteration in the performing score.

The second relates to the way in which Handel first set the word “interpret” on yet another occasion: this time in b. 31 of the accompanied recitative ‘Yet, to obey his dread Command’ (HG170/4/5). Handel’s setting of Daniel’s words “which I thus interpret” has a peculiarly complicated composition history for a single bar. The autograph score is a mess at this point: Handel’s text and music are misaligned, and two bars are inserted where he had omitted to set them:

17 First, in the chorus ‘Ye tutelar Gods’, Jennens wrote “Sesach, this Night is wholly thine”; this remains in the autograph score, but Handel altered “wholly” to “chiefly” in the performing score, and Jennens updated the wordbook accordingly. Second, in bb. 37-8 of the recitative ‘My Hopes revive’ (HG210/5/2-3), Jennens wrote “the Guards surpris’d by Numbers far superior”, but Handel altered “surpris’d by” to “o’erpowr’d by” in the performing score, and Jennens updated the wordbook accordingly.
It is understandable that Smith omitted the word “which” when he copied the performing score. The missing word was added in pencil to that score, and the music was amended in pencil so as to stress “interpret” correctly:

The following reading in the alto I and ’cello part-books can only be derived from the performing score:

A third, slightly more complicated, alteration to text in the performing score occurred in the recitative ‘For you, my Friends’ (HG82):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As first set:</th>
<th>As amended in the performing score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELSHAZZAR For you, my Friends, the Nobles of my Court, I have prepar’d a Feast magnificent, Worthy of You and Me. I do invite You to share it with me. Let all my Wives, And Concubines attend. Our Royal Mother And Regent of our Empire, we entreat</td>
<td>For you, my Friends, the Nobles of my Court, I have prepar’d a Feast magnificent, Worthy of You and Me. Let all my Wives, And Concubines attend. Our Royal Mother –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NITOCRIS Your Presence, as chief Honour to our Feast. Who can endure Th’unbridl’d Licence of this Festival, [etc]</td>
<td>I must prevent thee, Son. Who can endure Th’unbridl’d Licence of this Festival, [etc]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This alteration has clear merit: it shortens the text, it allows Nitocris to interrupt her son, and her interruption is much stronger, since her declining her son’s invitation to the feast is
replaced by the expression of a desperate wish to stop her son from the fate that awaits him. The part-books contain the newer text, as does the wordbook.

The part-books also reflect the performing score in the recitative that was split into two when the Symphony ‘Postillions’ (HG160) was inserted into the middle of it, after the word “Fears”. This bar remains unaltered in the autograph score:

In the performing score, this was written out again, so that it began:

It is this opening which is present in the tenor I and ’cello part-books.18

Only one pre-performance alteration in the performing score involves the deletion of text. In the recitative ‘It is the Custom’ (HG92), the lines given in italics were cut in the performing score, and – interestingly – omitted from the wordbook:

It seems that Jennens controlled the content of the wordbook, which gives the full text of the libretto. Given that Jennens did not print the lines in question in the wordbook, it is no surprise to find that these lines are also absent from his part-books.

The remaining four pre-performance alterations to recitatives which were made in the performing score and which are given in the part-books involve the setting of text which Handel had originally omitted from the oratorio. The shortest of these is only two words: “live forever”, in the recitative ‘O King’ (HG165). Handel wrote the following in the autograph score:

18 Further evidence that the performing score was the source for this recitative can be found in b. 6, where Handel originally wrote the word “Whoever” to two quavers; this was changed in the autograph score to “Whoe’er”, which is the reading given in the wordbook; the performing score, however, reads “Who ev’r”; and this is how it is given in the tenor I and ’cello part-books.
In the performing score, he inserted the words “live forever”:

Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg (M A/1009, II, f. 49a)

The soprano I and 'cello part-book contain the addition.

The second involves the opening of the recitative ‘Now tell me, Gobryas’, which was originally much shorter than it is now. Its expansion in the performing score (given below) is much more likely to have been a restoration of text that had been omitted by Handel in an attempt to shorten Jennens’s lengthy libretto, than to have been an addition by the librettist.

As first set:  

As amended in the performing score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYRUS</th>
<th>GOBRYAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What hinders then</td>
<td>Might we not then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the same Means to drain Euphrates dry,</td>
<td>By the same Means now drain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And through its Channel march into the City</td>
<td>Euphrates dry,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And through its Channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>march into the City?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winton Dean states that the purpose of this expansion was to “clarify the geography for the audience”. ¹⁹ This may be true, but it must surely also have been to clarify Cyrus’s reference to “the same Means”: in the accompanied recitative that precedes this recitative, Cyrus describes a vision in which a divine voice commands the river to leave its bed. Unfortunately, by shortening the recitative yet retaining the phrase “by the same Means”, Handel had inadvertently made Cyrus suggest that in order to march along the riverbed they should clear the river by divine command, rather than by the more mundane method of draining the river into a purpose-built reservoir.

In the recitative ‘My Hopes revive’ (HG209-210), two passages were added into the performing score (the inserted passages are underlined):

ARIOCH
When you had left the Room,
A while deep Silence reign’d: The King sat pensive,
As doubting whether to break up the Banquet,
Or to continue. At length some Parasites,
Those Insects vile that still infest a Court,
Began to minister false Comfort to him.

ARIECH
They sat them down to drink: The Bowl went round:
The King forgot his Fears, the Wine inspir’d him,
And he blasphem’d again. Not long we sat,
When from without the Gates a Noise tumultuous
Was heard, loud Shouts and Cries, and clashing Arms.
The King deputed some to learn the Cause,
I gladly seiz’d the Opportunity,
And fled a Place to swift Destruction doom’d.

MESSENGER
All’s lost! – The Fate of Babylon is finish’d!
Cyrus is here, – even within the Palace!

NITOCRIS
Cyrus! – impossible!

MESSENGER
It is too true.
A Tumult heard without, the Gates unbarr’d
Disclos’d a dreadful Scene: The Guards o’erpow’rd
By Numbers far superior, fell before them
With faint Resistance. The victorious Foe
No sooner saw the Gates set open wide,
But rush’d at once, and easy Entrance gain’d.

It is certainly possible that Handel’s setting of the previously unset lines was at the insistence of Jennens; the first section in particular is very important indeed. Although these passages were copied as an integral part of the relevant part-books, there is some indication that this was not always clear in their source: the cue given in the Messenger’s part-book (bass) has been altered to read “to swift Destruction doom’d” – presumably the original (scratched out) read “false Comfort to him”; and in the tenor I part-book, the cue before the chorus which follows was not always “and easy Entrance gain’d”: presumably it was originally “with faint Resistance”.

The final passage that Handel originally left unset but which was added to the performing score is in the recitative ‘You, Gobryas’ (HG178), shown here underlined:

CYRUS
You, Gobryas, lead directly to the Palace;
For you best know the way. This revelling Herd
Cannot oppose our Passage; those who would,
Fall easy Victims: For the rest, they fly,
Or take us for their Friends, and reeling shout
For Joy: We’ll be their Friends, and join the Shout.
I seek no Enemy except the Tyrant;
When he is slain our Task is at an end.
My worthy Friends, let us not stain our Swords
With needless Slaughter: I begin already
To count this People mine, myself their Shepherd,
Whose Office is to feed and to protect them,
Not to destroy.
This text would have been of great importance to Jennens: it shows Cyrus not only as the ideal patriot King, but also as a type of Christ with a clear reminder of the importance of Isaiah’s prophecy. It is particularly interesting in terms of the part-books, as it was not originally present in all of them: the extra passage has been physically inserted into the soprano II part-book. As the inserted text comes at the end of a recitative that precedes a chorus, all other part-books have a cue; however, not all the part-books give the same cue. The soprano I part-book gives “our Task is at an end”; the tenor I part-book has been altered to read “not to destroy”; the violin I part-book gives “is not to destroy”; and the violin II, viola, bassoon, oboe I, oboe II trumpets, trumpet II, timpani, alto II, tenor II, and bass part-books give “not to destroy”. Unfortunately it is impossible to tell whether the alto I part-book’s cue of ‘not to destroy’ is original: it has been taped over (presumably by a conservator), and the microfilm, which might have revealed the manuscript’s pre-conservation state, is no clearer. The ’cello part-book gives the full recitative, and appears always to have done so. This suggests an order of copying that mirrors that of other sets of part-books: S1 must have copied the vocal part-books first, and he must have begun with the soprano I part-book, since this gives no hint of the added passage. Quite how he continued is unclear: did he first write the original cue in the tenor I part-book because he copied this before the soprano II part-book or was it simply a mistake? And does the violin I part-book’s inaccurate cue mean that it was copied before those with the correct cue? The extra – and incorrect – “is” might suggest that S1 had made a note somewhere that the cue to be written before the chorus ‘O glorious Prince’ should be “our Task is at an end”, and that he then changed this note in a way which could be taken to read “is not to destroy”. Whatever happened, this passage is interesting because it was not copied as an integral part of every part-book. The fact that this passage – like many others that are present in the part-books – exists only in the performing score would seem to suggest that the intermediate score from which the part-books were copied was derived from the performing score. But if this were the case, why was this passage not originally present? Despite the presence of these passages, any filiation involving the performing score begins to look a little uncertain.

In fact, many readings common to multiple part-books show that – although the part-books contain some readings that were present only in the performing score – most of the musical and verbal text of the part-books is not related to the performing score: the intermediate score must have been copied (or at least derived) from the autograph score. These readings include seven variants of rhythm (exx. 6-12), three of note-length (exx. 13-15), seven of pitch (exx. 16-22), four involving accidentals (exx. 23-26), two involving ties
(exx. 27-8), one involving an accent (ex. 29), one involving a slur and an accent (ex. 30), one involving a slur (ex. 31), one involving a trill (ex. 32), two involving figurations (exx. 33-4), one involving underlay (ex. 35), several relating to verbal text,\textsuperscript{20} a tempo marking,\textsuperscript{21} and two variants arising from ambiguities in the autograph score (exx. 36-7). Many variants in single part-books lend support to the theory that the intermediate score was copied from the autograph score. Each part-book is now considered individually.

Violin I part-book (v. 152)

Ten variants already listed (exx. 6, 11, 12, 25, 27, 29-32, and 37), six variants of pitch (exx. 38-43), and two involving accents (exx. 44-5) involving the violin I line show that the intermediate score was copied chiefly from the autograph score, and not from the performing score.

Violin II and III part-book (v. 153)

The violin II and III part-book (henceforth referred to as the “violin II part-book”) contains several variants which reveal that its source was not principally derived from the performing score; in addition to those already mentioned (exx. 11-12, 25, 27, 29-32, and 37), these include eight variants of pitch (exx. 46-53), one of rhythm (ex. 54), and one relating to the way in which the autograph and performing scores are written.\textsuperscript{22} The most interesting violin II variant is an error of pitch made by Handel (ex. 55).

\textsuperscript{20} First, in the chorus ‘All Empires upon God depend’ (HG45), the third line reads “look up to Him in all your Ways” in the autograph score, but in the performing score Smith wrote “Way”; the part-books give the correct reading. Second, in the recitative ‘Fain would I hope’, discussed above (HG205), the performing score reads “is there not Room to hope?” (rather than “for Hope”); again, the part-books give the autograph score’s reading, which is correct. Third, in b. 1 of the recitative ‘Be comforted’ (HG35), Smith wrote “save” instead of “safe”: this mistake is not in the relevant part-books. There are also two spelling mistakes in the performing score that are not present in the part-books: “Invador’s” rather than the wordbook’s “Invader’s” in bb. 19-20 of the chorus ‘Why faithless River’ (HG126/1/10-126/2/1), and “apostate” rather than “apostate” in b. 20 of the recitative “They tell you true” (HG99/1/3). Although the correct readings in the part-books might be due to Jennens’s corrections in the intermediate score, he cannot have corrected all mistakes there. Furthermore, some are more likely to have come from the autograph score. In b. 3 of the chorus ‘Bel boweth down’ (HG211/1/3), Handel originally wrote “stopeth” instead of “stoopeth” in the alto line; although the correct word is given in the performing score, S1 originally wrote “stopeth” when he copied the alto I part-book. This seems highly unlikely to be a coincidence: it is far more likely that the intermediate score contained the same error, and that S1 noticed the error only after he had copied the alto I part-book. This would explain why the error is present but corrected there, and why the correct reading appears as an integral part of the alto II part-book.

\textsuperscript{21} In the chorus ‘Ye tutelar Gods’ (HG143), the autograph score and the part-books are marked Allegro, but the performing score has no tempo marking.

\textsuperscript{22} In b. 12 of the chorus ‘Ye tutelar Gods’, Handel indicated that violin I, violin II, and viola should double the basso continuo line an octave higher, and so did not continue to write out their music; at bb. 24-6 he wrote an independent line for violin I (HG144/2/5-145/1/1). Presumably violin II should still double the viola, which is what the performing score gives; in the violin II part-book, however, the violin I line is given. This reading is much more likely to have originated in the autograph score (at which point the violin II line is blank), than in the performing score (which gives the violin II part at that point).
The other matter to consider when establishing the filiation of a violin II part-book is whether it was copied from the violin I part-book when they play in unison; a tempo marking,\(^{23}\) a cue,\(^{24}\) and a rather amusing error of verbal text\(^{25}\) suggest that it was not.

**Viola part-book (v. 154)**

Fifteen convincing variants – two already given (exx. 7 and 12), ten of pitch (exx. 56-65), one involving note-length (ex. 66), one involving a slur (ex. 67), and one involving an accidental (ex. 68) – reveal that the source of the viola part-book was for the most part not copied from the performing score.

**’Cello part-book (v. 155)**

In addition to twelve variants previously mentioned (exx. 9-10, 12-13, 19, 21-4, 28, and 37), the ’cello part-book contains a variant of pitch which reveals that – on the whole – it is not related to the performing score (ex. 69), in addition to a variant involving spacing that further strengthens the case for the existence of an intermediate score in the stemma.\(^{26}\)

The most interesting feature of the ’cello part-book is its reading for the end of the accompanied recitative ‘O Memory’ (HG27). Unfortunately this is missing from the autograph score, but the performing score shows that the recitative originally ended in the following way to introduce the air ‘Oppress’d with never ceasing Grief’ in \(E_b\) major:

---

\(^{23}\) For the air ‘Dry those unavailing Tears’ (HG32), almost every source (including the violin II part-book) gives the tempo marking as *Allegro*, but the violin I part-book gives *Andante*.

\(^{24}\) In the cue for the air ‘The leavy Honours’ (HG82-3), all relevant part-books (including the violin II part-book) give the correct words “asserting Reason’s Empire”, except the violin I part-book, which gives the words “asserting Reasons Pow’r”.

\(^{25}\) In bb. 24-6 of the recitative and chorus ‘Where is the God’ (HG158/1/5-7), Belshazzar should, as he sees the hand writing on the wall, exclaim “Behold! See there!”; this he does in most part-books, including the violin II part-book; however, in the violin I part-book he exclaims ‘Behold! and see!’”. Perhaps while copying the violin I part-book S1 had in mind a different oratorio.

\(^{26}\) In b. 2 of the recitative ‘Be comforted’ (HG35), the autograph and performing scores give for the basso continuo note a semibreve, but the ’cello part-book has tied minims without a change of line or page: presumably the intermediate score had a change of line or page at this point.
When Handel rewrote the air in G major, the ending of ‘O Memory’ had to be changed. In the performing score, the vocal and basso continuo lines of ‘O Memory’ were altered to the following (presumably the violin and viola lines were altered in the part-books which Handel used in performance, which are now lost):

The ’cello part-book originally gave this second reading for the final bar, meaning that the intermediate score must have contained this altered ending. Since the autograph score lacks this accompanied recitative, it would seem to be impossible to know whether Handel altered the ending there. However, as the intermediate score was in all likelihood copied from the autograph score, and since the readings it contains from the performing score are only ones that Jennens wanted (which apparently did not include the G major version of ‘Opprest with never ceasing Grief’), it seems very likely that Handel had altered the ending in the autograph score. The fact that the intermediate score contained this altered ending also reveals that it must have been copied after the oratorio had been revised to compensate for the loss of Cibber: Handel’s recomposing of the air that follows was part of these amendments (referred to as “Stage IV” amendments by Donald Burrows). It must therefore follow that the part-books give the oratorio in its earlier stage not because the intermediate score was copied before the Stage IV amendments were made, but because Jennens did not want the Stage IV amendments to be part of the oratorio.

Since the bassoon usually plays the same notes as the 'cello, it is not surprising that its part-book contains no unique variants demonstrating its independence of the performing score (it shares with the 'cello part-book nine variants already cited: exx. 10, 13, 19, 21-3, 28, and 37). There are, however, some variants that show its independence of the 'cello part-book. Although it might seem obvious that a bassoon part-book would not be copied from a 'cello part-book (because the scribe needs to see the vocal line in airs in order to determine when it should play, and because it sometimes has its own part), it is worth establishing whether this is indeed the case; two variants of pitch (exx. 70-71) and one of spelling\(^\text{28}\) prove that S1 did indeed copy the bassoon part-book from the intermediate score. Why the bassoon part-book gives *Largo* as the tempo marking for the chorus ‘Recall, o King’ when all other sources (including the 'cello part-book) read *Grave* is a mystery.

**Oboe I part-book (v. 156)**

Six variants – one already given (ex. 6), two of pitch (exx. 72-3), one involving trills (ex. 74), one of note-length (ex. 75), and one relating to the range of the oboe (ex. 76) – reveal that the source of the oboe I part-book was not copied from the performing score.

**Oboe II part-book (v. 157)**

That the oboe II part-book must also derive from the autograph score (via the intermediate score) and not from the performing score is demonstrated by a variant already cited (ex. 6), one involving pitch (ex. 77) and one relating to a missing bar.\(^\text{29}\) In the absence of the intermediate score it is difficult to say whether it was copied from the oboe I part-book when they play in unison, since the six variants that it shares with the oboe I part-book (exx. 72, 75, 76, and 78-9) could also be present in the intermediate score.\(^\text{30}\) As usual, it is unclear why the oboes part-books include movements in which Handel clearly indicated that only violins were to play.

---

\(^{28}\) The 'cello part-book contains the unusual spelling of “Overture” whereas the bassoon gives the usual “Ouverture”.

\(^{29}\) In the chorus ‘By slow Degrees’ (HG107), Smith omitted b. 26 in the oboe II line and repeated b. 28 when he copied the performing score; as the oboe II part-book gives the correct reading, the performing score cannot be its source.

\(^{30}\) Neither the fact that they both share the unusual spelling of “Overture” (normally “Ouverture”), nor the fact that neither has a tempo marking for the chorus ‘Bel boweth down’ is necessarily compelling, although one might take it as suggestive. They are always instructed to stop and start playing at the same times, but this could be indicated in the lost intermediate score; and as the violin part-books usually have a *forte* when the oboes play and a *piano* when they do not, this could also simply be a result of S1’s practice regarding oboes.
Trumpet I and II part-books (vv. 247-8)

The trumpet I part-book has no relevant variants. However, two variants in the trumpet II part-book – one of pitch (ex. 80) and one of rhythm (ex. 81) – suggest that neither part-book is derived from the performing score. Although the trumpets never play in unison and therefore cannot be more than siblings, they both give the cue “and Course my Victory” before the air ‘Destructive War’ (HG225); this is nonsense (it should read “and curse my Victory”), but it is nonsense that is also shared by the violin I and II part-books. The explanation must be that the intermediate score was unclear.

Timpani part-book (v. 353)

Two variants of pitch prove that the timpani part-book is not related to the performing score (exx. 82-3). Although the timpani part-book does not give the incorrect cue for the air ‘Destructive War’, it does share with the trumpet part-books the omission of a tempo marking for that air, and in the last bar all three part-books give a pause. This probably reflects S1’s usual practice, as it is the last note that the three instruments play in the oratorio.

Soprano I part-book (Nitocris; v. 159)

In addition to the variants already listed (exx. 6, 19, 33-4, and 36-7), a variant of pitch (ex. 84), one involving rhythm and underlay (ex. 85), and one involving accidentals (ex. 86) reveal that the source of the soprano I part-book (i.e. the intermediate score) is not – with a few exceptions – related to the performing score.

Soprano II part-book (Cyrus; v. 160)

The soprano II part-book has three variants in addition to those already given (exx. 6, 10, 12, 34, 36, and 84-6) which prove that its source was not copied from the performing score: two involving figurings, and one of underlay (ex. 87). A variant of pitch (ex. 88), one involving a tie (ex. 89), and one involving the omission of a bar make it unlikely that it was copied from the soprano I part-book in choruses. As is often the case with part-books of the

---

31 In the violin I part-book, S1 added a comma: “and Course, my Victory”.
32 On two occasions – b. 53 of the air ‘Amaz’d to find’ (HG138/2/1) and b. 54 of the air ‘O God of Truth’ (HG177/1/2) – it contains a figuring that is present in the autograph score but not in the performing score.
33 The soprano I part-book lacks b. 67 of the chorus ‘By slow Degrees’ (HG111/1/3), but it is present in the soprano II part-book.
same type, however, the soprano part-books do have something in common: they are two of only three part-books to refer to the Martial Symphony as “Sinfonia” rather than “Symphony” (the third part-book to do so is the alto II part-book).

**Alto I part-book (Daniel; v. 161)**

Several alto I variants have already been cited (exx. 8, 9, 17, 24, 34, and 36); the alto I part-book also contains a variant of underlay (ex. 90), two variants of spelling, a tempo marking, a redundant natural (ex. 91), and a figuring, which all show that its source was mostly not related to the performing score.

**Alto II part-book (choruses only; v. 162)**

The alto II part-book is also not related to the performing score (see four variants already given: exx. 8, 17, 34, and 36). Although it contains only choruses, a variant involving underlay (ex. 92), two tempo markings, and the omission of two bars show that it cannot have been copied from the alto I part-book.

**Tenor I part-book (Belshazzar; v. 163)**

Eleven variants already listed (exx. 7, 14-16, 18-20, 26, and 33-5), a variant of note-length (ex. 93), one of verbal text (ex. 94), and a figuring (ex. 95) prove that its source – the intermediate score – was copied chiefly from the autograph score.

---

34 The alto part-book contains the “h” that has, in b. 35 of the air ‘O sacred Oracles’ (HG56/2/2), been added to “O” in the phrase “O living Spring of purest Joy” in the autograph score but that is absent from the performing score or the wordbook; and in b. 16 of the accompanied recitative ‘Thus saith the Lord’ (HG60/1/3), the word “Bars” is spelled correctly in the autograph score and the alto I part-book, but as “Barrs” in the performing score.

35 In the air ‘O sacred Oracles’, the alto I part-book and the autograph score are marked *Adagio* at the final vocal cadence (HG57/1/2) whereas the performing score is not.

36 In b. 12 of the air ‘No: To thyself thy Trifles be’ the figuring in the autograph score (a natural on n. 1) is present in the alto I part-book but not in the performing score (HG167/3/5).

37 In the chorus ‘Behold by Persia’s Hero made’, the alto I part-book gives the wrong tempo marking (*Allegro*), while the alto II part-book gives the correct one (*Andante*); and in the chorus ‘To Arms’, the alto I part-book gives no tempo marking, whereas the alto II part-book contains one.

38 In the chorus ‘By slow Degrees’, the alto I part-book omits one bar from bb. 77-8, but the alto II part-book does not (HG111/2/3-4); and the alto I part-book incorrectly gives one bar’s rest at b. 128 of the same chorus, whereas the alto II part-book gives the correct two bars’ rest (HG116/2/1).
Tenor II part-book (Arioch; v. 164)

That the tenor II part-book is also not derived from the performing score is proved by ten variants already given (exx. 7, 14-16, 18, 20, 26, and 34-6) and by a variant of pitch (ex. 96). That it was probably not copied from the tenor I part-book in choruses (see ex. 36) is confirmed by the way that S1 dealt with Handel’s omission of verbal text on two occasions (ex. 97-8).

Bass part-book (Gobryas and Messenger; v. 165)

A figuring (ex. 34), a variant of pitch (ex. 99), and a variant of note-length (ex. 100) suggest that the bass part-book is also not related to the performing score.

****

There is a wealth of evidence that proves that the part-books were copied from an intermediate source and that this in turn had been copied from the autograph score. However, the part-books contain passages that are in the performing score but that were never present in the autograph score, as well as readings which can only have come from Jennens. There is only one explanation: Jennens must have annotated the intermediate score not only with his own amendments, but also with readings from the performing score. That Handel would have granted Jennens access to the performing score does not seem particularly unlikely, and there may even be supporting evidence in the performing score itself: a comment, heavily crossed out, which I believe is in Jennens’s hand. Smith should have written “he shall rule the Third” (HG163/1/4), but he made a mistake: it seems that he wrote “ride” instead of “rule”.

After the recitative is a comment:

39. It is impossible to tell whether he would have copied these readings out, or whether he simply wrote instructions to refer S1 to the performing score. He had done the latter elsewhere: in the autograph score or Saul there is a note in Jennens’s hand instructing a scribe to copy from “Mr Smith’s book” (see pp. 30-31); and in one of his scores of L’Allegro he instructed S2 to copy from something in his own collection by writing “write this from the other book” (see p. 47).

40. Although it is now difficult to see what he wrote, the Shaftesbury score (GB-Lfom: acc. no. 589) and the Smith score (James S. Hall Collection of George Frideric Handel, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library (19)) both read “ride” here, presumably as a result of Smith’s error.
Although it is difficult to make out on the reproduction, my examination of the manuscript “in the flesh” has led me to believe that the comment says “rule (Blunderbuss!)”; on the reproduction it is possible to see the final ‘s’, which is unmistakably Jennens’s. If this is indeed what it says, not only is this a characteristic comment, but also it is easy to see why it would have been crossed out so heavily.

The filiation of Jennens’s main part-books is therefore as follows:

The fact that Jennens appears to have controlled the content of the part-books throws up a few questions regarding their contents. As the intermediate score was copied from the autograph score, it probably contained the air ‘Lament not thus’ and the preceding recitative (HG14-18): these are still present in the autograph score, but were removed from the performing score before the first performance, and the wordbook indicates that these two movements were not set. It seems most likely that they were omitted from the part-books at Jennens’s request. Although one might expect that Jennens would wish to retain as much of the oratorio as possible, it is fairly easy to see why he would have accepted Handel’s omission of this air and the recitative, and why he would have carried this through to his part-books.
When Handel originally composed *Belshazzar*, he left unset over thirty lines of the scene in which the air appears. As it is not necessary to give them all here, only those preceding the air are given (the lines left unset are in italics):

Enter Daniel

**NITOCRIS**

O much belov’d
Of God and Man! Say, is there ought can save
This sinking State?

**DANIEL**

Great Queen, ’tis not in Man
To pry into the Counsels of Omniscience.

-[NITOCRIS]-

[Thirteen lines unset]

-[DANIEL]-

[Nine lines unset]

No more remains, but to submit
To what God only wise and just ordains.

**NITOCRIS**

Ah! falling Country! – Ah! my Son!
You think not of impending Fate,
Nor fear to bring the Judgments down
That Crimes like yours await;
But trust, unseasonably brave,
In Walls, in Gates, in Depth of Wave,
In Idol Gods that cannot save!
Alas! that I should live to bear
The Loss of all I hold most dear!

**DANIEL**

Lament not thus, O Queen, in vain!
Virtue’s Part is to resign
All things to the Will Divine,
Nor of its just Decrees complain.
The Sins of Babylon urge on her Fate:
But Virtue still this Comfort gives;
On Earth she finds a safe Retreat,
Or blest in Heav’n for ever lives.

Unfortunately the words of Nitocris’s unset air are crucial to Daniel’s air: without them, his urging for her to “Lament not thus” is nonsensical, as she has not lamented anything while he has been present. It is characteristic of Jennens that he would rather forego a beautiful air by Handel than retain it if it makes nonsense of the text.

As the end of the autograph score is now lost, Jennens’s part-books are the unique source for Handel’s original version of Cyrus’s accompanied recitative ‘Yes, I will build thy City’; this set four lines which were then cut before the first performance (they are shown here in italics):

**CYRUS**

Yes, I will build thy City, God of Israel,
I will release thy Captives; not for Price,
Not for Reward, but to perform thy Pleasure.
Thus prostrate I confess, Thou art the Lord,
There is none else; there is no God besides thee.
Hear, holy People; [etc]
Belshazzar

(In fact there were six more lines here which Handel did not set until the 1751 revival.) As these lines were cut, and as they do not appear in any other secondary source, it is possible that they were included in the part-books at Jennens’s request.

There remains one mystery surrounding the part-books: instead of the soli and chorus ‘Tell it out’ (HG242), they have a single-movement organ concerto in D minor (HWV 303). Since it seems highly unlikely that a scribe would do this by accident, and since Jennens must have written other instructions in the intermediate score, this substitution must have been at the request of Jennens. The reason seems to be related to the text which Handel cut. In his letter to Jennens of 2 October 1744, Handel wrote “The Anthems come in very properly. but would not the Words (tell it out among the Heathen that the Lord is King) [be] Sufficient for one Chorus?”.

Jennens’s reply is now lost, but Handel did not include in the oratorio the words given here in italics:

DANIEL  O victorious Prince!
The God of Israel, Lord of Heav’n and Earth,
Long ere thy Birth foretold thee by thy Name,
And shew’d thy Conquests! ’Tis to him thou ow’st,
To him thou mush ascribe them. Read those Lines,
The great Prediction which thou hast already
In part accomplish’d, and (we trust) will soon
Fulfil the rest.

[Giving him part of Isaiah’s Prophesy, which Cyrus reads.]
How false and weak is human Policy!
Which lays deep Schemes of raising, governing.
Preserving Empires, not regarding him
By whom Kings reign, and Empires rise and fall!

CHORUS
Tell it out among the Heathen, that the Lord is King.
He maketh the Devices of the People of none Effect:
He casteth out the Counsels of Princes:
He putteh down one, and setteh up another.

CYRUS  Yes, I will build thy City, God of Israel, [etc]

The chorus ‘Tell it out among the Heathen’ already existed: it was part of Handel’s anthem I will magnify thee, which was also the source for ‘I will magnifie thee’, the final chorus of Belshazzar. It is likely that Jennens suggested using ‘Tell it out among the Heathen’ at this point in the oratorio since lines 2-4 relate to the four lines he gave Daniel before the chorus. However, Handel omitted these lines in Belshazzar. Without them, a chorus singing “Tell it out among the Heathen, that the Lord is King” at this point makes much less sense. Presumably Jennens thought that the organ concerto made better sense: some time has to pass

---

42 Since they are not present in the autograph score of Belshazzar, the organ concerto and the anthem ‘I will magnifie thee’ must have been copied from elsewhere. Unfortunately, determining the filiation of these numbers is beyond the scope of this dissertation; it is my intention to complete this task in the future, when I edit the oratorio for the HHA.
in order for Cyrus to read the prophecy, but it is still the same scene; the concerto – or the “Adagio for the organ” as it is referred to in the part-books – is ideal.

‘Additional Songs in Belshazzar’: score and part-books

Jennens was careful to ensure that his collection was complete: he had copies made of numbers not present in the 1745 version of Belshazzar (and therefore not present in his main copies). In one of his composite scores can be found the airs ‘Lament not thus’ and ‘Great God’, which were deleted before the first performance, in addition to five versions of movements altered for the 1751 revival: the chorus ‘O glorious Prince’ (HG179), the air ‘Alternate Hopes and Fears’ (HG201), the air ‘To Pow’r immortal’ (HG223), the duet ‘Great Victor’ (HG237), and the accompanied recitative ‘Yes, I will build thy City’ (HG248). These were copied by S1, as were a set of part-books of the same movements from the 1751 revival.

As the airs ‘Lament not thus’ and ‘Great God’ were removed from the performing score, there is no way of establishing their filiation. However, it is clear that the movements from the 1751 revival were derived from the autograph score (and not from the performing score) in the case not only of the score but also of the part-books: this is proved by variants that are too numerous to list in full. They include variants of pitch (e.g., exx. 101-4), variants of rhythm (e.g., ex. 105), variants involving accidentals (e.g., ex. 106), ties (e.g., exx. 107-8), note-lengths (e.g., ex. 109), trills (e.g., exx. 110-11), slurs (e.g., ex. 112), accents (e.g., ex. 113), dynamic markings, spellings, the way in which Smith and S1 reacted to errors by Handel (exx. 114-15), and the fact that the additional score and part-books give Cyrus only the higher of the two lines present in the autograph score, whereas the performing score gives only the lower (ex. 116).

43 See fn. 3.
44 The latter air was reintroduced into the oratorio for the 1751 revival, but in a slightly different version. This score contains the original version of the air.
45 See fn. 4.
46 The additional score and part-books contain the mezzo piano marking that is present in the autograph at the beginning of the air ‘To Pow’r immortal’ (HG223) but that is missing from the performing score.
47 The additional score and the soprano part-books share the autograph’s correct spelling “gush” in b. 48 of the air ‘Alternate Hopes and Fears’ (HG204/1/3) and not the performing score’s “goush”; and they share with the autograph score the incorrect spelling “virtuous” in b. 41 of the duet ‘Great Victor’ (HG238/2/8) and not the performing score’s equally incorrect “virtuos”. (The alto part-book gives what seems to be S1’s preferred spelling: “virteous”).
48 Handel wrote the new setting of this duet for a revival in 1748 that never took place. At that point, Cyrus was still to be sung by a soprano, which is why his part is written in C1 in the autograph score (and subsequently in the performing score). By the time this new version was first performed, in 1751, Cyrus was sung by an alto: that is why Handel adjusted some of his notes so as to lower the range, and that is why the 1751 ‘Yes, I will build thy City’ is written in C3. In the soprano additional part-book, S1 wrote both vocal lines of ‘Great Victor’ in C1, as that is how they appeared in the autograph score, but he wrote the alto line in C3 in the alto part-book.
Although the part-books share with the additional score all of the above variants, they cannot have been copied from that score: on four occasions they differ from the additional score presumably as a result of ambiguities in the autograph score (exx. 117-20), and on three occasions they do not contain errors that are present in the additional score (exx. 121-3). The part-books cannot be more than siblings to each other because – with the exception of the soprano and alto part-books in the duet ‘Great Victor’ – no two part-books contain the same music. However, the trumpet I, trumpet II, and timpani part-books share one variant: in all three, S1 wrote 10 bars’ rest instead of 11 before the change in time signature at b. 42 of the chorus ‘O glorious Prince’ (HG187/2/4). Presumably S1 referred to one of these part-books while copying the other two.

The filiation of Jennens’s ‘Additional Songs’ part-books is therefore as follows:

An unusual feature of these part-books is that they contain cues so that they could be used, in combination with the main part-books, in a performance that reflects the 1751 version. (Contrast this to the Joseph additional part-books, which contain numbers that Jennens thought should not be included in the oratorio.) This is presumably because some of the 1751 numbers would have been preferable to Jennens: both the chorus ‘O glorious Prince’ and the accompanied recitative ‘Yes, I will build thy City’ set more of his text than their 1745 counterparts, and in both cases the text is important to the main themes of Belshazzar. It is interesting to note, however, that S1 copied the additional part-books without reference to Jennens’s main part-books: the cue given before ‘Yes, I will build thy City’ is “After the Chorus, Tell it out among the Heathen”, which, as explained above, was not present in the version of the oratorio given in the main part-books. (Had S1 copied the additional part-books to match the main part-books, the cue would have been “After the Adagio for the Organ”.)
8 Judas Maccabaeus

It seems that Jennens owned only one manuscript score of *Judas Maccabaeus*; it is bound in half calf. It was copied by S2, who also copied a full set of part-books to accompany the score. It is striking that Jennens did not annotate any of these manuscripts: the myriad errors of spelling and grammar remain uncorrected, and the only figurings present are those that S2 copied from the autograph score. Fortunately the location of one of Jennens’s Walsh prints of *Judas Maccabaeus* is known. The fact that Jennens annotated this copy is interesting not only in itself, but also in that it demonstrates that one should not assume, on the basis of Jennens’s not having annotated his manuscript copies of a work, that he never turned his attention towards a particular oratorio.

Jennens’s annotations to his Walsh print are few in number, but are consistent with the types of changes he made elsewhere. He corrected mistakes in spelling: throughout the duet ‘From this dread Scene’ he altered “wither” to “whither” in the line “Ah! whither shall we fly?”. He also altered the text itself. In the air ‘Pious Orgies’, Handel set the following text:

Pious Orgies, pious Airs,
Decent Sorrow, decent Pray’rs,
Will to the Lord ascend, and move
His Pity, and regain his Love.

Jennens altered it to:

Rites religious, pious Airs,
Contrite Sorrow, fervent Pray’rs,
Will to the Lord ascend, and move
His Pity, and regain his Love.

Although it is tempting to assume that Jennens wanted to remove the now bizarre pairing “pious Orgies”, this is unlikely to be the case: in his day it would not have raised an eyebrow. His changes are more likely to be for two reasons. First, he wished to avoid the repetition of the words “pious” and “decent”. Second, the word “decent” is not only weak but sounds as if the sorrows and prayers are insincere: “contrite” and “fervent” are much more appropriate.

---

1 GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 173.
2 GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 vv. 174-186 (violin I, violin II, viola, oboe I, oboe II, bassoon I, organ, soprano I, soprano II, alto I, tenor I, bass I, and bass II), 243-4 (‘cello I and ‘cello II/double bass), 247-8 (trumpet I and trumpet II), and 353 (timpani); US-We M2.1.H2 v. 12 (alto II); US-Wc: M2.1.H2 v. 14 (tenor II); US-Cu: MS 437 v. 23 (bassoon II); and GB-Lbl: RM 18.b.5 (trumpet III).
3 This includes the oratorio’s best-known mistake: Handel’s “eclips’d” for Morell’s “yclep’d”.
4 GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1571; this is probably the printed edition that was sold as lot 229 in the 1918 Sotheby’s sale (the Walsh print described in lot 228 is bound with one of *Alexander Balus*). That this printed edition contained annotations in Jennens’s hand was noticed by Donald Burrows, and I am very grateful to have been informed of this discovery by both Colin Coleman and Donald Burrows.
Jennens’s second alteration to the text of the oratorio was in the air ‘Father of Heav’n’, in which Handel set the following:

Jennens altered the third and fourth lines:

Jennens’s revision removes Morell’s double dose of tautology: in addition to the fact that the use of the word “solemnize” is redundant when used in connection with a religious feast (since the point of a feast is that a particular event or person is commemorated), Morell’s lines raise the question of how one could “solemnize” a religious feast if not with “holy Rites”.

Jennens’s intolerance of writing that was not up to his high standards can be witnessed in all three of these alterations. Furthermore, the fact that the two texts that he chose to alter are the ones which relate most directly to religion reflects his respect for Scripture: any verbal illustration of events related in the Bible (or the Apocrypha, in this case) ought not to be sullied by a poor choice of words.

Filiation

Aylesford score (v. 173)

Over 150 variants prove that the Aylesford score was not copied or derived from the performing score. These include fourteen variants of pitch (exx. 1-14),5 two of rhythm (exx. 15-16), one relating to the continuation of a figure (ex. 17), two of underlay (exx. 18-19), four of note-length (exx. 20-23), two errors related to aspects of the autograph score (exx. 24-5), and various markings.6 A large number of corrections have been made to the Aylesford score; as they were not made by Jennens, they are not considered in this chapter.

---

5 Music examples are given in Appendix 12.
6 These include Handel’s dates of composition, which S2 copied from the autograph score into the Aylesford score.
Vocal part-books

Soprano I part-book (Israelitish Woman; v. 181)

The soprano I part-book must have been copied from the Aylesford score: the two manuscripts share two errors of pitch (exx. 26-7), a variant of note-length (ex. 28), the omission of a trill (ex. 29), and a variant relating to spacing.7

Soprano II part-book (Israelitish Man; v. 182)

The airs in the soprano II part-book seem to have been copied from the Aylesford score: the part-book shares with that score an error of pitch (ex. 30) and lacks an accidental that is partially obscured there (ex. 31).8

S2’s practice in copying duets seems to have been inconsistent. As vocal part-books always give both vocal lines of a duet, the second vocal part-book can be copied either from the first vocal part-book or from a score. In the first soprano duet the soprano I and II part-books share an error of pitch that is not present in any other part-book (ex. 32), which suggests that S2 copied the soprano II part-book from the soprano I part-book at this point. However, by the end of Act II he had altered his approach. In ‘Oh never’ (HG158), which begins with a soprano duet, he must have copied the soprano II part-book from the Aylesford score, because when the chorus enters (HG162/1/1) he stopped copying the basso continuo line in the soprano I part-book but continued it unnecessarily for eight bars in the soprano II part-book; furthermore, the soprano II part-book contains the Aylesford score’s calamitous error in b. 93 of the same number (ex. 33).9 In the final duet the soprano II part-book does not contain the soprano I part-book’s variants of pitch and note-length (exx. 34-5), so S1 must have stopped using the soprano I part-book as his source by that point.

Presumably the soprano II part-book was copied from the Aylesford score in choruses: it was not copied from the autograph or performing scores (see exx. 26 and 28), and a variant of underlay could not have arisen if the soprano I part-book had been his source (ex. 36). However, a quirk of notation in the final chorus might suggest that S2 had altered his approach by that point (ex. 37).

---

7 In b. 12 of the recitative ‘Well may your Sorrowes’ (HG13/4/4), S2 wrote tied minimis on the same note (rather than a semibreve) in the basso continuo line: this is likely to have been caused by the change of page halfway through the same bar in the Aylesford score. (The autograph and performing scores both have a semibreve at that point.)
8 Although this error is also present in the ‘cello I part-book, this cannot have been S2’s source for the soprano II part-book as it does not contain the vocal lines of airs.
9 It is possible that S2 changed his source even earlier. In b. 13 of the duet ‘Come, ever-smiling Liberty’ (HG54/3/3), he originally copied all but the first note a third too high in the soprano II part-book; as the vocal line of this part-book is written in G2 clef, this error is much more likely to have occurred if his source was written in C1 clef (i.e. the Aylesford score) than if it was written in G2 clef (i.e. the soprano I part-book).
Finally, it seems likely that S2 referred to the soprano I part-book when writing titles and cues in the soprano II part-book: not only are both part-books two of a small number of sources to give the first word of the title as “Judas Maccabaeus” (as opposed to the “Judah” in the autograph score and most of the Aylesford sources), but both part-books are the only part-books to give a bar-count for the solo section of ‘Sound an Alarm’. (The alto I part-book, for example, gives “Judah / Recit& aria // Siegue subito” followed by a change of page.)

Alto I part-book (Israelitish Messenger; v. 183)

Although the evidence is slim, it is likely that the alto I part-book was copied from the Aylesford score: the two manuscripts share two errors of pitch (exx. 38-9) and an error of spelling.\(^\text{10}\)


The alto II part-book contains only choruses. S2 must have copied it from the alto I part-book as the two part-books share an error of pitch (ex. 40) and an error of notation (ex. 41). A variant involving spacing and an accidental suggests that S2 copied the alto I part-book first (ex. 42).

Tenor I part-book (Judas; v. 184)

The tenor I part-book shares with the Aylesford score four errors of pitch (exx. 43-6), one variant of note-length (ex. 47), a variant involving clefs (ex. 48), and a variant relating to underlay (ex. 49).


Like the alto II part-book, the tenor II part-book contains only choruses. That it cannot have been copied from any source other than the tenor I part-book is proven beyond a doubt by three errors of pitch (exx. 50-52), a variant relating to spacing,\(^\text{11}\) and a cue.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{10}\) In the recitative ‘From Capharsalama’ (HG184/1/3), S2 wrote “impetous” (instead of “impetuous”) in the Aylesford score; the missing “u” was added into the score later but not before the spelling mistake was transferred to the alto I part-book. Presumably this was an error on S2’s part rather than his normal spelling of the word as he spelled it correctly in the organ part-book, which, as is shown below, was copied from the autograph score.
Bass I part-book (Simon; v. 185)

The bass I part-book appears to have been copied from the Aylesford score: both manuscripts share an error of pitch (ex. 53) and a variant of note-length (ex. 54).

Bass II part-book (Eupolemus; v. 186)

The bass II part-book shares with the bass I part-book and the Aylesford score the two errors in the chorus ‘Mourn’ that were just given (exx. 53-4). Although it could have been copied from either source in choruses, three variants indicate that the bass I part-book is the more likely source: two variants involving flats (exx. 55-6), and a dynamic marking. The only variants that reveal the filiation of the bass II part-book in movements other than choruses both appear in the recitative ‘Peace to my Countrymen’; both suggest that S2’s source was the Aylesford score. The first is an error of pitch (ex. 57), and the second is a variant of spelling in the recitative ‘Peace to my Countrymen’.

The filiation of the Aylesford score and vocal part-books is therefore as follows:

---

11 In the tenor II part-book, S2 wrote a bar-line halfway through b. 20 of the chorus ‘For Sion Lamentation make’ before realising his error and scratching it out; this was probably a result of copying from the tenor I part-book, which – unlike any of the scores – has a change of line at this point.
12 Both tenor part-books refer to the duet ‘From this dread Scene’ as an air.
13 The bass I and II part-books lack the piano marking that is present in Aylesford score in b. 22 of the chorus ‘Mourn’ (HG10/1/1).
14 Although S2 had written “League” in the organ part-book (which is how Handel spelled it), he wrote “Leage” in the Aylesford score and the bass II part-book (HG203/3/2).
Instrumental part-books

Violin I part-book (v. 174)

Several compelling variants – five of pitch (exxx. 58-62) and two of rhythm (exxx. 63-4) – indicate that the violin I part-book was copied from the Aylesford score.

Violin II part-book (v. 175)

The violin II part-book was presumably copied from the Aylesford score in numbers in which it has its own part: evidence includes five variants of pitch (exxx. 65-8 and 61), and one of rhythm (exxx. 69).

In numbers in which the violins play in unison, the violin II part-book appears to have been copied from the violin I part-book: they share a variant of note-length (exxx. 70), the omission of articulation (exxx. 71), and three variants relating to dynamic markings.\footnote{In b. 65 of the air ‘The Lord worketh Wonders’ (HG135/4/1), all scores have a forte marking whereas neither part-book does; in b. 10 of the air ‘With pious Hearts’ (HG148/6/3), there is a piano marking in the violin part-books but not in any of the other early scores; and in b. 67 of the air ‘Come, ever smiling Liberty’ (HG50/4/1), both violin part-books have a piano marking that is not shared by the early scores.}

The most interesting of the violin variants occurs in b. 4 of the air ‘Pious Orgies’. Handel wrote the opening ritornello and first five bars of the vocal line as follows:\footnote{The music is given here in the key in which Handel first composed it, and in which it appears in the Aylesford score.}
The dotted rhythm in the violins in b. 4\(^1\) foreshadows the dotted rhythm that is a feature of the vocal line; it provides a lighter and more dynamic release from the repetition in b. 3; and in offering some unexpected variation it is also a typical example of the flexibility and improvisational nature of Handel’s musical style. However, after S2 copied this passage into the Aylesford score, he seems to have decided that Handel did not intend b. 4\(^1\) to be dotted: he scratched out the dots so that the rhythm in matched that in bb. 1 and 2.\(^{17}\)

It is this reading that appears in the violin part-books. S2’s conscious decision to straighten out the rhythm in b. 4\(^1\) (resulting in a repetition of the first half of b. 2\(^4\)) reveals a lack of sensitivity to Handel’s style: in the opening ritornello, b. 4\(^1\) is in effect a decoration of the figure in bb. 1\(^3\) and 2\(^4\), and the first half of b. 4\(^4\) can again be seen as a further decoration. Another example of this variation is the fact that the violins’ echoes of the vocal line in bb. 5-9 are exact only in the second and third phrases: the dotted rhythm in the violins at the end of b. 8 subverts our expectation.

**Viola part-book (v. 176)**

Five variants prove that the viola part-book was copied from the Aylesford score: one of pitch (ex. 72), one of rhythm (ex. 73), the omission of a tie (ex. 74), an error involving an accidental (ex. 75), and an error caused by a change of page (ex. 76). Finally, there are two errors of pitch that the viola part-book once shared with the Aylesford score, but that have since been altered in that score (exx. 77-8). The second of these is most interesting because of the way it was corrected in the Aylesford score: the new note fits with the harmony but is not

\(^{17}\) It must have been S2 who was responsible for the scratching out in the score because he wrote the two violin part-books with the new, undotted rhythm.
the note written by Handel. This is interesting partly because it suggests that whoever entered the later corrections into the Aylesford score was basing his decisions on the surrounding music rather than on a particular source; it is also interesting in the way that it might relate to an oboe II variant in the same bar (see below, ex. 82).

In the air ‘No unhallow’d Desire’, in which Handel wrote only the basso continuo line with an instruction for the violins to double at the octave, S2 has the viola playing at the same pitch as the violins except for when it extends to an f’; for this note, he simply wrote the note alone an octave lower. Although the viola plays at the same octave as the violins, S2 must have copied it from the basso continuo line, as it does not share the violin part-books’ variants in that air (ex. 70).

**Oboe/flute I part-book (v. 177)**

The oboe/flute I part-book (henceforth referred to as the “oboe part-book”) seems to have been copied from the Aylesford score, although the evidence – an error of pitch (ex. 79) and a variant of notation[^18] – is slim.

**Oboe/flute II part-book (v. 178)**

Since the oboe/flute II part-book (henceforth referred to as the “oboe part-book”) shares a variant of pitch with the oboe I part-book and the Aylesford score (ex. 79), it is not surprising that there is further evidence in the form of two errors of pitch (exx. 80-81) which demonstrate that it was copied from the Aylesford score in those numbers in which it has its own part. The oboe II part-book contains a third error of pitch that was originally present in the Aylesford score but altered later (ex. 82). This error is particularly interesting because it could relate to a viola variant discussed previously (ex. 78). The two errors of pitch occur simultaneously on lines that would otherwise be almost identical. When considered alone, S2’s oboe II and viola notes appear consonant, as they are a third apart; however, this third is dissonant with the rest of the orchestra. In the autograph score the oboe’s note is clear but the viola’s is not. One possible explanation is that, when copying the Aylesford score, S2 copied the viola line before he copied the oboe line; when he came to copy the oboe line he realised that it was similar to the viola line but would clash with it, and altered the oboe line instead of referring to his source to see if he was making an error. However, the fact that he also wrote a

[^18]: In b. 77 of the chorus ‘Hear us’ (HG79/2/2), Handel wrote a dotted minim in the autograph score. As the Aylesford score has a change of page halfway through the bar, it is written there as a minim tied to a crotchet. Although the oboe I part-book does not have a change of line or page in this bar, S2 wrote the note as a minim tied to a crotchet.
seemingly unrelated error of pitch in the violin II line (he wrote n. 3 as an f") might suggest that he simply lost concentration at this point in copying.

An error of rhythm suggests that the oboe II part-book was copied from the oboe I part-book when the oboes play in unison (ex. 83).

'Cello I part-book (v. 243)

Evidence that the ’cello I part-book must have been copied from the Aylesford score includes errors of pitch (exx. 27, 30-31, 44, and 84), an error involving clefs (ex. 85), and two variants relating to spacing.19

'Cello II/double bass part-book (v. 244)

The ’cello II/double bass part-book (henceforth referred to simply as the “’cello II part-book”) is unlike the ’cello I part-book in that it is treated as a tutti instrument in most of the airs and duets. The most obvious approach for S2 to have taken would have been to copy the ’cello II part-book from the ’cello I part-book in numbers in which they were to play the same music (i.e. instrumental movements, accompanied recitatives, and choruses), and to have copied it from the Aylesford score for those numbers for which he would need to see the vocal part in order to know when ’cello II and double bass should play (i.e. airs and duets). However, the variants reveal that the filiation is not quite so simple.

There is plenty of evidence to show that S2 initially used the ’cello I part-book as his source for instrumental movements, choruses, and accompanied recitatives: the two part-books omit an accidental in the second chorus (ex. 86); both contain an error of rhythm and verbal text in the first accompanied recitative (ex. 87); and both include a bizarre error of pitch in the final bar of the chorus ‘Lead on’ (ex. 88).

It is more surprising to find evidence that S2 also copied the first few solo numbers of the oratorio from the ’cello I part-book. The first variant is a variant of note-length in the duet ‘From this dread Scene’ (ex. 89). S2 was able to copy from the ’cello I part-book in this duet because he did not need to be able to see the vocal line in order to extract the ’cello II/double

---

19 The first of these is in b. 10 of the accompanied recitative ‘I feel the Deity within’ (HG34/2/3). The autograph and performing scores give the basso continuo note as a semibreve, but the Aylesford score has a change of line halfway through the bar, causing the semibreves to be written there as tied minims. Although the ’cello I part-book does not have a change of line or page in this bar, the note is written as tied minims. The second relates to bb. 11-18 of the air and chorus ‘Arm, arm ye brave’ (HG35/2/4–35/3/3). In the ’cello I part-book, S2 skipped from the end of b. 11 to the beginning of b. 16 before realising his error and scratching it out. (It is still visible.) This mistake is most likely to have occurred if he was copying from a source which had a change of line or page both after b. 11 and before b. 16; while this is not the case with either the autograph or performing score, it is for the Aylesford score, which has a change of line after b. 11, and a change of page before b. 16.
bass part: between the opening and closing ritornelli there is no occasion on which neither soprano sings for more than a crotchet, so because S2 treated 'cello II and double bass as tutti instruments they play only in the opening and closing ritornelli.\textsuperscript{20} There are no revealing variants for 'Pious Orgies', which is the first air of the oratorio and the second solo number; however, as 'cello II and the double bass play throughout the air, S2 would not have needed to see a score in order to copy the part-book. The next solo number ('Arm, arm ye brave', which ends with a chorus, and in which 'cello II and the double bass play throughout) contains three variants which indicate that the 'cello II part-book was copied from the 'cello I part-book throughout this number. One variant relates to clefs (ex. 90), whereas the other two are more complicated copying errors: the extra rests in both 'cello part-books at b. 119 was probably caused by S2’s mistaking the C3 clef as a crotchet rest when extracting the 'cello I part-book from the Aylesford score, and then copying this blindly into the 'cello II part-book (ex. 91); the second error relates to spacing.\textsuperscript{21} Unfortunately there are no further revealing variants for the solo numbers of the rest of Part I or the beginning of Part II; however, S2 would have to have used a source which contained the vocal parts because 'cello II and the double bass are treated as tutti instruments in the solo numbers following 'Arm, arm ye brave'. The reason that 'cello II and the double bass are not treated as tutti instruments in the first two airs must be that, in the Aylesford sources at least, both airs are sung by Simon, who is a bass: 'cello II and the double bass play throughout all of his airs except for the air section of 'Rejoice, O Judah'.\textsuperscript{22}

By the middle of Act II (i.e. from the air and chorus 'Ah! wretched Israel' onwards), S2 must have changed his approach: he began copying the 'cello II part-book from the autograph score. Because every copy of any work is ultimately derived from the autograph score, this is proved not by a single, indubitable variant, but instead by a number of variants that make sense only if S2’s source were the autograph score. The 'cello I part-book cannot have been his source for the second half of the oratorio, as that part-book contains four errors

\textsuperscript{20} The only duet of the oratorio in which 'cello II and the double bass play during the singing is the duet setting of 'Come, ever smiling Liberty'. It is unclear why they do not enter, with the bassoon, for the final ritornello; perhaps it has something to do with the fact that this duet is in effect a reinforced version of the air of the same words, and that it completes the segment of the oratorio devoted to liberty.

\textsuperscript{21} This error was probably caused by the fact that bb. 33 and 37 of the air 'Arm, arm ye brave' (HG36/2/5 and 36/3/2) begin the same way: when S2 copied the 'cello II part-book he originally continued b. 37 as if it were b. 33 (he then realised his error and then corrected it); it is most likely that he made this error through looking at the 'cello I part-book because b. 33 is directly above b. 36 in that part-book.

\textsuperscript{22} It is probable that S2 treated 'cello II and double bass as a tutti instrument in this section because he had marked it for Eupolemus instead of Simon. Although the text is clearly marked for Simon in the wordbook, the autograph score does not name a character. S2’s confusion could have arisen from the fact that Eupolemus had recently been assigned a recitative, or that Reinhold sang both bass parts at the first performances. Perhaps S2 had, at an earlier stage, made a mental note that 'cello II and the double bass should play throughout all Simon’s airs (thinking that all of the bass airs were Simon’s), so when he was under the impression that 'Rejoice, o Judah' was for Eupolemus, he treated 'cello II and the double bass as tutti instruments. This is how they are treated in every other air of the oratorio except for Judas’s 'No unhallow’d Desire', which is probably the exception to the rule for the reason that all instruments play in octaves.
of pitch (exx. 92-5) that are not present in the ‘cello II part-book. Three more variants in which the ‘cello I part-book differs from the ‘cello II/double bass part-book not only strengthen that evidence but also prove that the Aylesford score cannot have been S2’s source either: these involve an error of pitch (ex. 44), an extra note (ex. 96), and a slur (ex. 97). Among the Aylesford sources, the only other possible source for the second half of the ‘cello II part-book is the organ part-book; however, four errors of pitch that are present only in that part-book show that it cannot have been S2’s source either (exx. 98-101). Of the two remaining possible sources for the second half of the ‘cello II part-book, three variants show that S2’s source was the autograph score and not the performing score (exx. 102-4). This filiation could be strengthened by the fact that the ‘cello II part-book has been altered at b. 93 of the air and chorus ‘Never’ (ex. 33); presumably S2 initially made the same error that he had made when he copied the chorus into the Aylesford score, but noticed – and corrected – his mistake as he copied this part-book.

As already stated, S2 would have had to copy the airs that follow ‘Arm, arm ye Brave’ from a source containing the vocal lines. As he had copied most of the part-books (including the ‘cello I part-book) from the Aylesford score, it is unclear why he did not use that score. Perhaps S2 was late in completing the copying so the score was already in Jennens’s possession.

Bassoon I part-book (v. 179)

A bassoon part-book is similar to a ‘cello II/double bass part-book in two ways: both are written to be played from by tutti instruments in most airs and duets, and throughout choruses. However, copying one from the other would not be a good idea because the bassoon does not always play the basso continuo line: in bass airs it might double the vocal line, and in choruses it might have its own part. Judas Maccabaeus contains examples of both: the bassoon doubles the vocal line in the air section of ‘Arm, arm ye brave’ (HG35-6) and has its own part in the chorus ‘For Sion Lamentation make’ (HG18); in addition it sometimes swaps between the basso continuo line and a vocal line, for example in the chorus ‘O Father’ (HG3), in which it occasionally doubles the tenor.

23 There is only one variant in this section of the oratorio in which the ‘cello II/double bass part-book disagrees with the autograph score: between bb. 39 and 40 of the air ‘With pious Hearts’ (HG149/4/2-3) there is a tie in the autograph score that is not present in the ‘cello II/double bass or organ part-books. However as the organ part-book is without a doubt copied from the autograph score, S2 had clearly omitted the tie once: there is no reason why he might not have done so a second time. This is far more likely than the possibility that in this single air the ‘cello II/double bass part-book was copied from the organ part-book.
Although there are many airs and duets in which S2 could have copied one part-book from the other, it is clear for a number of reasons that his usual practice for this oratorio was to extract the bassoon part and the 'cello II/double bass part independently. There are a number of occasions on which the 'cello II and the double bass play but the bassoon does not;\textsuperscript{24} clearly the 'cello II part-book could not have been copied from the bassoon part-book in these sections of the oratorio. That this is the case is strengthened by the fact that the bassoon part-book contains a bizarre error that is not present in the 'cello II part-book (ex. 105). Although it would have saved S2 time to have copied one part-book from the other in airs and duets in which they were both treated as tutti instruments, it is clear that he did not. When copying the two part-books, S2 followed the same general principle regarding when tutti instruments should play in airs and duets (i.e. that they should not overlap with the singer but still retain sensible phrases). If one follows this principle there is most of the time only one choice for when a tutti instrument should begin to play or drop out; however, there are some occasions on which the location of the beginning or end of a phrase could be interpreted in more than one way. Luckily for anyone seeking to establish filiation, S2 was inconsistent: sometimes the 'cello II part-book includes slightly more notes than the bassoon part-book (exx. 106-7), and sometimes the bassoon part-book includes slightly more notes than the 'cello II part-book (exx. 108-11).

There must have been a good reason for S2's not copying one part-book from the other when possible, because he could have saved considerable time and energy had he done so.\textsuperscript{25} The two most likely reasons are either that whichever he copied first was unavailable as a source when he came to copy the second, or that he recognised the risks involved in this approach.

S2's source for the choruses and instrumental movements in the bassoon I part-book cannot have been either 'cello part-book, not only because the bassoon I part-book differs from both on two occasions (exx. 90-91), but also because in most choruses and instrumental movements S2 would have needed to use a score. First, the bassoon (as mentioned above) sometimes has its own part. Second, the bassoon does not always play at the same time as the 'cello II and double bass. For example, in the air and chorus ‘Oh! never bow we down’, 'cello

\textsuperscript{24} These include the air sections of ‘Ah wretched Israel’, ‘Sound an Alarm’, and ‘Rejoice o Judah’ in addition to: the air ‘Tis Liberty’, in which the bassoon is marked \textit{tacet} but 'cello II and the double bass are treated as tutti instruments; the duet ‘Come, ever smiling Liberty’, in which 'cello II and the double bass play throughout but the bassoon enters only for the closing ritornello; and the air ‘With pious Hearts’, in which the bassoon plays only the opening ritornello but 'cello II and the double bass play throughout, with appropriate dynamics. It is interesting to note that in all of these sections, the oboes are silent. S2 would have known this only if he had been looking at a score. Finally, whereas the 'cello II/double bass part-book plays throughout all of the airs given to Simon in the Aylesford sources, the bassoon part-book does not play in the air ‘With pious Hearts’.

\textsuperscript{25} This is particularly striking for S2: see for example his copying of the trumpet II part-books in the final chorus of this oratorio (below).
II and double bass are treated as tutti instruments in the air section so play the first two notes of b. 88, whereas the bassoon enters at the same time as the chorus (ex. 112). (S2 could not have used the organ part-book, as it does not include vocal parts in choruses and is written as if the chorus begins on n. 1 of b. 88 (as in the 'cello I and 'cello II part-books).) Third, there is some correlation between when the oboes and trumpets play and when the bassoon plays. In the chorus section of 'Sing unto God', S2 has the bassoon enter two notes later than the 'cello II part-book, presumably so that it enters with the trumpets (ex. 113). Finally, on two occasions in the chorus 'To our great God', the bassoon plays in unison with the bass, whereas both 'cello part-books take the basso continuo line (exx. 114-15); as the organ part-book does not include vocal lines, S2 must have been copying from a score.

Although this might suggest that the bassoon I part-book, like most of the other part-books, was copied entirely from the Aylesford score, this was clearly not the case. S2 must have begun copying the bassoon I part-book from a 'cello part-book: it shares with the 'cello part-books a reading in b. 78 of the duet ‘From this dread Scene’ (ex. 89). An interesting variant in the air section of ‘Arm, arm ye Brave’ might suggest why S2 did not copy from a 'cello part-book for long: at b. 20 (HG35/3/5), Handel marked in the autograph score that the bassoon should temporarily double the soloist (Simon, a bass);\(^{26}\) when S2 copied bb. 20-23 into the bassoon part-book, he initially copied the basso continuo line; he must then have realised his error, as he scratched this out and replaced it with the vocal line.\(^{27}\) By just a few bars later he had changed his approach, as the bassoon I part-book does not share the 'cello part-books’ variants in b. 27 and b. 119 of the same number (exx. 90-91). The bassoon I part-book differs from the 'cello part-books elsewhere after this number (see, for example, exx. 92-5 for evidence that it was not copied from the 'cello I part-book, and ex. 96 for evidence that it was not copied from the 'cello II part-book).\(^{28}\)

As has already been noted, S2 would have had to extract the bassoon part in choruses from a score. Three variants indicate that his source for the bassoon I part-book after b. 23 of the ‘Arm, arm ye Brave’ was the Aylesford score, and not the autograph or performing score (exx. 33, 84, and 105).

It seems likely that S2 copied the bassoon I part-book before he copied the 'cello II part-book as the Aylesford score was available as a source for the former but not for the latter. (Since the score was for Jennens’s use only it is likely that any loss of access to it would be

\(^{26}\) This instruction is also present in the performing and Aylesford scores.

\(^{27}\) This suggests that he had a score as well as a 'cello part-book in front of him.

\(^{28}\) If evidence is required that the bassoon I part-book was not copied from the organ part-book, exx. 33 and 90-91 may be consulted.
Therefore the source for the beginning of the bassoon I part-book is likely to have been the 'cello I part-book, not the 'cello II and double bass part-book.

**Bassoon II part-book (US-Cu: MS 437 v. 23)**

S2 must have copied the bassoon II part-book from the bassoon I part-book: the two part-books are the only sources to contain three errors of pitch (exx. 116-18), one variant of note-length (ex. 119), and a cue (ex. 120); and the bassoon II part-book shares with the bassoon I part-book every other variant given so far (including exx. 90 and 105-15).

**Trumpet I, II, and III part-books (vv. 247-8 and GB-Lbl: RM 18. b. 5)**

Only one compelling variant indicates that the trumpet I part-book was copied from the Aylesford score: this is an error of pitch (ex. 121). There are, however, five errors of pitch that indicate that the Aylesford score was the source for the trumpet II part-book (exx. 122-6). The trumpet III part-book offers only one variant to show that it was copied from the Aylesford score (ex. 127).

Since the three trumpet part-books never share the same music it is no surprise that they are not directly related to each other. However, it seems that S2 copied them in close succession: they are three of only a very few part-books to give the title of the oratorio as “Judas Maccabaeus” (generally, S2 followed Handel’s “Judah”).

The most interesting feature of these part-books is the fact that the trumpet II part-book shares two variants with the oboe II part-book in the chorus ‘Rejoice, o Judah’; in both cases both part-books give the notes which oboe I and trumpet I should have been playing instead of their own notes (exx. 128-9). As both instruments play in unison throughout this chorus, it would have made sense for S2 to copy one from the other. Which he copied first is revealed by a slip in the oboe II part-book: in b. 58 (the bar in which oboe II and trumpet II enter), S2 originally copied the oboe I/trumpet I entry (which is two bars earlier); he then scratched this out, and it is possible that he altered the number of bars’ rest so that oboe II would enter at the correct time. S2 could only have made this error if he was copying from a score. Therefore in this chorus the trumpet II part-book must have been copied from the oboe II part-book. For S2 to change sources for only 28 bars demonstrates how keen he was to avoid extracting a part from a score twice. In this case, the Aylesford score has three lines written on one stave (trumpet I/oboe I, trumpet II/oboe II, and trumpet III), which can make it
quite tricky to read. S2’s copying the trumpet II part-book from the oboe II part-book in this section saved him both time and effort and might have ensured fewer mistakes had he extracted the oboe II part-book accurately; unfortunately it did the opposite by perpetuating his errors.

**Timpani part-book (v. 353)**

Two variants suggest that the timpani part-book was copied from the Aylesford score: the omission of a note (ex. 130), and the notation of the final note of the oratorio.29

**Organ part-book (v. 180)**

There can be no doubt that – unlike the other Aylesford part-books – the organ part-book was not copied from the Aylesford score: there are over thirty readings that it does not share with any of the other Aylesford manuscripts. Many of these involve errors of pitch in the Aylesford score which were transferred to all relevant part-books except the organ part-book (see, for example, exx. 43 and 131-2); some involve figurations (in most cases the figuring is omitted in the Aylesford score but is present in the autograph and performing scores and in the organ part-book); others relate to the absence or presence of markings such as ties and pauses (for example the autograph score and the organ part-book are the only sources to omit a pause at the end of the overture); and some involve variants of verbal text.30

Three variants prove that the source of the organ part-book must have been the autograph score, and not the performing score: a variant relating to Handel’s alteration of two notes in the recitative ‘Peace to my Countrymen’ (ex. 57), and an

---

29 This is written as a breve in the autograph and performing scores, but as tied semibreves in the Aylesford score. In every other part-book, S2 wrote the note as a breve even though he was copying from the Aylesford score, but in the timpani part-book he wrote tied semi-breves; it seems unlikely that he would have been copying the timpani part-book from anything other than the Aylesford score, given that he made the conscious decision to write the tied semibreves of the Aylesford score as a breve in every other part-book.

30 Examples include the fact that S2 wrote Handel’s “Powers” (instead of “Pow’rs”) in the duet ‘From this dread Scene’ (HG14) on all but one occurrence of the word in the organ part-book but wrote “Pow’rs” in the other Aylesford sources; b. 8 of the accompanied recitative ‘See, see yon Flames’, in which the autograph score, performing score, and organ part-book read “hath”, whereas the other Aylesford sources read “has” (HG177/2/4); b. 17 of the recitative ‘From Capharsalama’, in which the autograph score, performing score, and organ part-book read “defied”, whereas the other Aylesford sources read “defy’d” (HG184/5/2); and S2’s marking, in the organ part-book, of the end of the first part, the beginning of the second part, and the end of the second part in Italian (as Handel had in the autograph score) as opposed to his writing in English on almost every occasion in the other part-books. (The exceptions are the oboe II part-book, in which S2 wrote “Fine of ye first part”; the oboe I part-book in which he wrote “Fine of the 2d Part”; and the soprano I part-book, in which he wrote “Fine della Parte seconda”.

31 In bb. 63 and 65 of the air ‘The Lord worketh Wonders’ (HG135/3/3 and 135/4/1), Handel accidentally wrote “fearfull of Praise” instead of “fearfull in Praise”: the performing score, the Aylesford score, and the bass I part-book contain the correct word, but the organ part-book does not. It is impossible to know whether S2’s writing the correct words at this point in the Aylesford score was a conscious decision: since he had already written the correct words five times before bb. 63 and 65, he might not even have noticed Handel’s mistake.
error of pitch that seems likely to have been caused by an ambiguity in the autograph score (ex. 133).

The following sequence of events is therefore most likely: S2 copied the Aylesford score; he then copied the vocal, oboe, trumpet, timpani, violin, viola, 'cello I, and bassoon part-books;\textsuperscript{32} he began copying the 'cello II part-book from the 'cello I part-book; and he then copied the rest of the 'cello II part-book from the autograph score, presumably because by that point he had lost access to the Aylesford score.\textsuperscript{33} As the organ part-book was not the source for any other part-book, it is unclear whether S2 copied the organ part-book from the autograph score because he copied it first (when the Aylesford score did not exist), or because he copied it last (when he no longer had access to the Aylesford score).

Therefore the filiation of the Aylesford score and instrumental part-books is as follows:

\textbf{Timing of the Aylesford sources}

Although the Aylesford sources reflect the oratorio’s early, pre-performance state, the fact that they were copied from the autograph score makes it difficult to date them with any certainty: the picture would be much clearer if S2 had copied them from the performing score, which was where all of the alterations Handel made for later performances were entered. The

\textsuperscript{32} It is impossible to know in what order these were copied except that the oboe II part-book must have been copied before the trumpet part-book, and the 'cello I part-book must have been copied before the bassoon I part-book.

\textsuperscript{33} It is impossible to know whether S2 had already lost access to the Aylesford score when he began copying the 'cello II/double bass part-book or whether he lost it when he got to the middle of Act II (i.e. when he began copying from the autograph score) because there are no variants which suggest the source of the solo numbers in the end of Act I and the beginning of Act II.
only helpful alteration is Handel’s rewriting of ‘O lovely Peace’ as a duet (rather than an air).
The fact that the duet version was inserted into the performing score but was copied as an
integral part of the Aylesford sources proves that these were copied after Smith had copied
the performing score.

The fact that Jennens annotated his Walsh print of the oratorio but left his manuscript
copies unmarked could help with dating the latter copies. The Walsh print in question was
first advertised in the *London Evening Post* on 28-30 April 1747.\(^{34}\) It does not seem
unreasonable to assume that Jennens would have studied and annotated the first copy he had
of the oratorio, which would suggest that he did not possess the Aylesford manuscripts of
*Judas Maccabaeus* until at least a month after the work’s first performance.

**Content of the Aylesford sources**

That the Aylesford manuscripts all give ‘O lovely Peace’ as both an air and a duet
could reflect Handel’s initial indecision over which he preferred.\(^{35}\) However, since Handel’s
later insertions to *Judas Maccabaeus* were all borrowed from other works (and so a volume of
‘Songs in the Oratorio of *Judas Maccabaeus*’ was unnecessary),\(^ {36}\) it could also be the case
that this simply reflects Jennens’s wish to own everything that Handel had written. This is
supported by the fact that the Aylesford score includes the same fourteen bars of the
incomplete March incarnation of the air ‘Pious Orgies’ which remain in the autograph score.\(^ {37}\)

S2’s policy appears to have been to copy what was there rather than to follow
transposition instructions; it is unclear whether this is simply for speed or accuracy, or
because Jennens wanted Handel’s first thoughts. Although on other occasions S2 had
managed to match a recitative ending to the key in which he copied the air that follows (see
*Joseph*), he was rather less clever in *Judas Maccabaeus*: he copied Handel’s revised, B minor

---


\(^{35}\) Although S2 made it clear in most copies that the two numbers were alternatives (by writing “The same Song turn’d into a
Duetto” or similar), he occasionally made it seem as if both were to be performed (presumably in error, for example his
“Siegue a 2” in the soprano II part-book).

\(^{36}\) Although the version of ‘O Liberty’ performed in *Judas Maccabaeus* was slightly different to that performed in the
*Occasional Oratorio* (see Merlin Channon, ‘Handel’s Early Performances of ‘Judas Maccabaeus’: Some New Evidence and
Interpretations’, *ML*, 77/4 (1996), pp. 499-526, at pp. 517-8), Jennens – or S2 – might not have realised this and assumed that
he would already have the air in his copy of that oratorio.

\(^{37}\) The part-books do not contain this, presumably because it was incomplete and therefore unsuitable for performance.
Although the gatherings of the Aylesford score are almost consistently regular, there is a disruption at this point. The
incomplete March has not been inserted; the most likely explanation for the disruption in the gatherings at this point is that
when S2 got to the March and saw that it was incomplete, he was unsure whether to include it so continued copying by
writing the chorus ‘Mourn’ on a new gathering while waiting to hear from Jennens. (The two other disruptions in the
gatherings of the Aylesford score are between pp. 125 and 137 (around the chorus ‘Lead on’), and to p. 381 or 383 (the solo
section of the chorus ‘Sing unto God’).
ending to the recitative ‘Not vain’ (HG24/5-6) intended to lead into a G major, soprano ‘Pious Orgies’) but followed it with the original E♭ major, bass setting of ‘Pious Orgies’ (HG22).

On one occasion, the Aylesford sources give a better reading than the performing score. Handel deleted seven bars in the air ‘Call forth’; in the bar that follows (b. 29), he changed his mind regarding which notes the violins and basso continuo should play, leaving the autograph score unclear at that point. S2’s choices of notes are better than Smith’s, and ought to be considered in a critical edition of the oratorio (ex. 134).
9 Alexander Balus

Handel composed *Alexander Balus* between 1 June and 4 July 1747, and it was first performed on 23 March 1748; the libretto was written by Thomas Morell. Almost all of Handel’s and Morell’s pre-performance revisions were made before Smith copied the performing score. Jennens owned one manuscript score (copied by S1),\(^1\) a set of manuscript part-books (also copied by S1),\(^2\) and two Walsh prints\(^3\) of this work.

Only one amendment in the manuscripts is attributable to Jennens; as expected, this is a correction of verbal text. When setting the words “thy sland’rous Tongue” in the air ‘Hatefull Man’, Handel wrote a long melisma on the syllable “slan-”; by the time that he came to write the second part of the word (b. 62, HG109/2/4), he ended the word incorrectly, so that Jonathan sings “thy slander Tongue”. This error found its way into the Aylesford score but was corrected there by Jennens:

![MS 130 Hd4 v. 27, p. 238.](Image)

Filiation

The filiation of the Aylesford score and part-books is complicated; in order to understand it, it is convenient to divide the variants into groups. These are not types of variants (e.g. variants of melody or rhythm) but simply groups, whose constituent elements could derive from any parameter of music. In the interest of clarity, I shall present a general outline of the filiation in stages, then explain and give examples of the different groups of variants before giving the variants for each manuscript.

---

\(^1\) GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4, v. 27; lot 240 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale.

\(^2\) GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4, vv. 174-186 (violin I, violin II, viola, oboe I, oboe II, bassoon, ’cello, soprano I, soprano II, alto, tenor, bass I, and bass II) and 247-8 (trumpet I, trumpet II), and 351-3 (horn I, horn II, and timpani).

\(^3\) Now lost; one was sold as part of lot 251 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale, bound in half calf, the other as part of lot 228; the latter was bound, with Walsh’s print of *Judas Maccabaeus*, in half Russia (Sotheby, Wilkinson & Hodge, *Catalogue of Valuable Books and Manuscripts*, 13-16 May 1918, p. 33).
It is clear that the Aylesford score derives – and was probably copied directly – from the performing score: the Aylesford score contains many variants that were introduced by Smith when he copied the performing score. It is the origin of these variants that leads me to refer to them from now on as belonging to Group I.

![Diagram of score derivation]

Although the part-books contain the Group I variants, they cannot have been copied directly from the performing score (or indeed from the Ayleford score), since part-books that cannot be more than siblings (e.g. vocal and instrumental part-books\(^4\)) share readings that are not present in the performing or Aylesford scores. The only explanation for these variants is that the part-books were copied from an intermediate score: a score that was derived from the performing score (and so contains the Group I variants), and whose scribe introduced new variants (henceforth referred to as “Group II variants”). This explanation naturally prompted a consideration of all extant scores of Alexander Balus: could any of them be the intermediate source? Only one of them seemed to be a possible candidate:\(^5\) this score is now in Princeton, and is henceforth referred to by its location.\(^6\) The Princeton score was copied by S5, and contains the Group II variants; however, it cannot be the intermediate score because it includes many variants that are not present in the part-books (“Group III variants”). As the intermediate score cannot be identified, it is referred to as “X1”. It is worth noting that X1

---

\(^4\) Vocal part-books contain the vocal line of choruses, the vocal and basso continuo lines of airs, and the two vocal lines and the basso continuo line of duets. In recitatives they contain the vocal and basso continuo lines for the sections of the recitative sung only by the character whose part-book it is (e.g. the soprano I part-book contains only Cleopatra’s music in a recitative between Cleopatra and Aspasia). Instrumental part-books contain only the appropriate instrumental line in all numbers except for accompanied recitatives, where the vocal line is also given. The ’cello part-book is the exception as it contains the vocal line for all recitatives. Therefore an example of part-books that cannot be more than siblings is the violin I part-book and the soprano I part-book, as neither contains the necessary music to be the source for the other; they could, however, share a variant if that variant were in Cleopatra’s line in an accompanied recitative. Similarly a variant in the basso continuo line of an air could be shared by the soprano I and ’cello part-books, even though those part-books could not be more than siblings.

\(^5\) The Barrett Lennard score (GB-Cfm: MU MS 790) was not a possible candidate, having been copied in the nineteenth century (Donald Burrows, ‘The Barrett Lennard Collection’, in Terence Best (ed.), Handel Collections and their History (Oxford, 1993), pp. 108-36, at p. 132). An inspection of the Shaftesbury score (GB-Lfo: acc. no. 588) revealed that it cannot have been S1’s source either.

cannot have been copied from the Aylesford score because there are many occasions on which the part-books contain correct readings where the Aylesford score has an error. Therefore the filiation of the part-books appears – at least initially – to be as follows:

![Stemma Diagram]

However, this cannot be the end of the story. While the vocal part-books share many Group II variants with the instrumental part-books, there is an identifiable sub-group of variants that are found in the instrumental part-books but not in the vocal part-books. Moreover, precisely this sub-group of variants is found also in the Princeton score; and it is usually the case that the vocal part-books contain the correct reading whereas the instrumental part-books and the Princeton score contain errors. The only explanation for these variants is that there were two intermediate scores (X1 and X2), and therefore that the Group II variants can be divided into two subgroups – Group IIa and Group IIb – as shown on the following stemma:
A Group IIa variant is therefore a variant that was introduced by the copyist of X1. Such a variant can only be said to derive from X1 (rather than X2) if it appears in a vocal part-book, either in the vocal line itself or in the basso continuo line: if a variant introduced by the copyist of X1 were in an instrumental line other than the basso continuo line (e.g. violin I), it would – in the absence of X1 – be indistinguishable from a Group IIb variant (a variant introduced by the copyist of X2). An example of a Group IIa variant that appears in the basso continuo line is the omission of one bar and the repetition of another in the air and chorus ‘Great God’ (ex. 109).\footnote{Examples for this chapter appear in Appendix 13.} This error must have been introduced by the copyist of X1 because it appears in the tenor part-book; it must have been present in X2 because it appears in the 'cello and bassoon part-books; and it also appears in the Princeton score. When a Group IIa variant relates to a vocal line, the presence of the variant in the Princeton score is crucial because the variant will often not appear in any instrumental part-book. (The exception is the appearance of the variant in a recitative: in semplice recitatives the vocal line is given in the 'cello part-book, and in accompanied recitatives the vocal line appears in the violin I, violin II, viola, and 'cello part-books.) An example of such a variant is an error of pitch in the air and chorus ‘Ye Servants’ (ex. 86): although this variant does not appear in any instrumental part-book, it must have been introduced by the copyist of X1 (and not by S1 when he copied the alto part-book) because it appears in the Princeton score. (If the error were S1’s, we would not find it in the
Princeton score.) Group IIA variants are listed because they prove the existence of at least one intermediate score (X1).

A Group IIb variant is a variant that was introduced by the copyist of X2. However, such a variant can only be said to derive from X2 (rather than X1) if it appears in a vocal part-book, either in the vocal line itself or in the basso continuo line: if a variant introduced by the copyist of X2 were in an instrumental line other than the basso continuo line (e.g. violin I), it would – in the absence of X1 and X2 – be indistinguishable from a Group IIA variant (a variant introduced by the copyist of X2). One example of a Group IIb variant is an error of pitch shared by the 'cello part-book and the Princeton score in the duet ‘Hail’; this error is not present in the autograph, performing, or Aylesford scores, or in the soprano I or alto part-books (ex. 37). Again, the presence of this error in the Princeton score proves that it cannot have been introduced by S1 as he copied the ‘cello part-book: for it to be independently present in the ‘cello part-book and in the Princeton score, there must have been an intermediate source (X2) from which both copyists (in the ‘cello part-book and the Princeton score) independently derived the error.\footnote{In the music examples for Group II variants, the Princeton score is listed second, after the part-books, for precisely this reason: to signify the fact that, although they share a variant, the score is not the source for the part-book. (My usual practice is to list the scores first, followed by the part-books.)} Group IIb variants are listed because they prove the existence of a second intermediate score (X2).

Variants that relate to instrumental lines that do not appear in any vocal part-books (i.e. the basso continuo line of a chorus, or any other instrumental line) but that appear only in the instrumental part-books and the Princeton score must belong to Group II, but are impossible to classify more precisely. One example is a variant of rhythm in the violin I, violin II, and viola lines of the air ‘Tost from Thought to Thought’ (ex. 149): this must have been introduced by the copyist of either X1 or X2, but it is impossible to know which without seeing those scores. Such variants are listed because they confirm the existence of at least one intermediate score.

A Group III variant is one that appears only in the Princeton score, for example an error of pitch in the recitative ‘Congratulation to our Father’s Friend’ (ex. 70). Group III variants are crucial to the filiation of the Aylesford manuscripts because they confirm that the Princeton score cannot be one of the intermediate scores that are necessary for all of the variants to make sense. The fact that the Princeton score contains Group I, II, and III variants confirms the existence of both X1 and X2.

As the instrumental part-books never contain vocal lines in airs, duets, or choruses, variants in the vocal lines of these movements are present only in the relevant vocal part-book and the scores. Therefore, in the many cases in which the Princeton score contains a variant in
a vocal line that is not present in any vocal part-book, it is impossible to say whether such a variant belongs to Group IIb or Group III. An example of such a variant is an error of pitch in the vocal line of the air ‘Hark, hark’ that is present only in the Princeton score (ex. 50): this error could have been introduced by the copyist of X2, by S5 when he copied the Princeton score, or even by the copyist of a score that lies between X2 and the Princeton score on the stemma. Despite this, these variants are worth listing: whether the variant first appeared in X2 or in the Princeton score, it reveals something about the filiation of the sources, confirming either the existence of X2, or that the Princeton score cannot have been the source of any of the Aylesford manuscripts.

Following the form of other chapters, and to avoid confusion, the variants that prove this filiation are given according to the manuscript in which they occur. Selecting the music examples for any chapter involves whittling down a large number of variants so as to create a balance between three concerns: only those variants that are compelling should be presented; there should be enough evidence to confirm my conclusions about the stemma; and there should not be so many examples that (a) the case is overstated, and (b) the reader will be overwhelmed. The complicated filiation of Jennens’s copies of Alexander Balus resulted in there being an extraordinary number of variants; although I present only a fraction of them in Appendix 13, there remain about twice as many examples than is usual. This is because my proposed stemma not only is much more complicated than any other stemma in the dissertation, but also contains two missing scores: a larger number of examples than is usual is necessary to ensure that each part-book under consideration can be seen to fit into and support such a hypothesis.

**Aylesford score (v. 27)**

The Aylesford score was certainly derived from, and probably copied directly from, the performing score, as it contains a large number of Group I variants. These variants come in many forms, including general copying errors made by Smith (exx. 1-5), corrections to omissions in the autograph score (exx. 6-7), variants involving pitch (exx. 8-16), rhythm (exx. 17-24), note-length (ex. 25-6), verbal text, spelling, ties (exx. 27-8), clefs (ex. 29), figurings.

---

9 In some of these variants the autograph score is wrong; in others, it is the performing score that contains the error. In some variants, both readings could work; and in others, the readings alter the meaning. It is beyond the scope of this footnote to analyse them, or indeed to note what readings are given in the part-books and in the Princeton score (these details are given in the sections on the relevant part-books). In b. 19 of the recitative ‘Thus far, ye glorious Partners of the War’ (HG15/5/1), the autograph score reads “and Gifts, yet more than Gifts”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “then”; in b. 6 of the recitative ‘Check not the pleasing Accents of thy Tongue (HG63/5/1), the autograph score reads “the **Honours** of the
(ex. 30), slurs (ex. 31), and the placing of an adagio (ex. 32), among a host of others not listed here.\footnote{In bb. 15-16 of the recitative ‘Thus far, ye glorious Partners of the War’ (HG15/4/1-2), the autograph score reads “Alert”, whereas the performing, Aylesford, and Princeton scores, and the tenor and ‘cello part-books read “Alart”. (The Aylesford score has been corrected, but it is not possible to tell by whom.)}

Vocal part-books

Variants for the vocal part-books are given in the following order: Group I, Group IIa, Group IIb, Group IIb or III, Group III, and variants that confirm that the vocal part-book cannot have been copied from the Aylesford score. Variants that confirm that the vocal part-book cannot have been copied from the ‘cello part-book are not generally given: not only would this be a highly impractical approach for a copyist to take, but the confirmation has already been provided by the IIb variants.

S1 did not title his vocal part-books according to voice type, but according to character; for the sake of simplicity they are referred to here by voice type, which is how most of them are bound.

Soprano I part-book (Cleopatra; v. 181)

Five Group I variants that have already been given (exx. 5, 16, 29, 30, and 32) prove that the soprano I part-book must derive from the performing score.\footnote{One of the many variants I have not used is the fact that the autograph score does not contain instructions for shortening the B section of the air ‘Love, Glory, Ambition’ to the final version that is given in the performing score and that is present in the Aylesford and Princeton scores and the relevant part-books (HG132). This is because it is possible that the autograph score once contained instructions, written in pencil, that are now invisible: unfortunately some of the pencil markings in other autograph scores that are referred to by Burrows and Ronish are no longer visible. (These pencil markings would be on f. 64v if they ever existed.)} The soprano I part-book contains only one Group IIa variant: a trill (ex. 33).

There are far more variants that belong to Group IIb and therefore that confirm the existence of X2: ten relating to pitch and/or accidentals (exx. 34-43), two involving rhythm

\footnote{The soprano I part-book also contains a Group I variant of verbal text that has already been mentioned: in b. 6 of the recitative ‘How blissful State’ (HG66/5/3), the autograph score reads “\textit{when} equal Love”, whereas the performing, Aylesford, and Princeton scores, and the soprano I and ‘cello part-books read “but”.

well-fought Field”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “Honour”; in b. 6 of the recitative ‘How blissful State’ (HG66/5/3), the autograph score reads “\textit{when} equal Love”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “but”; in b. 18 of the recitative ‘Why hangs this heavy Gloom’ (HG73/6/2), the autograph score reads “it were not equal Price for such a Gem”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “to”; in b. 47 of the air ‘Love, Glory, Ambition’ (HG132/1/3), the autograph score reads “these disconsolate \textit{Tears}”, which was originally written in the performing score, but was altered in pencil to “Fears”, which is the reading given in the Aylesford score; in b. 13 of the chorus ‘Mistaken Queen!’ (HG168/1/1), the bass line in the autograph score reads “Queens”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “Queen”; and in b. 2 of the recitative ‘Yes, he was false’ (HG192/1/2), the autograph score reads “and \textit{ev’n} conspir’d”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “hath”.

well-fought Field”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “Honour”; in b. 6 of the recitative ‘How blissful State’ (HG66/5/3), the autograph score reads “\textit{when} equal Love”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “but”; in b. 18 of the recitative ‘Why hangs this heavy Gloom’ (HG73/6/2), the autograph score reads “it were not equal Price for such a Gem”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “to”; in b. 47 of the air ‘Love, Glory, Ambition’ (HG132/1/3), the autograph score reads “these disconsolate \textit{Tears}”, which was originally written in the performing score, but was altered in pencil to “Fears”, which is the reading given in the Aylesford score; in b. 13 of the chorus ‘Mistaken Queen!’ (HG168/1/1), the bass line in the autograph score reads “Queens”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “Queen”; and in b. 2 of the recitative ‘Yes, he was false’ (HG192/1/2), the autograph score reads “and \textit{ev’n} conspir’d”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “hath”.

well-fought Field”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “Honour”; in b. 6 of the recitative ‘How blissful State’ (HG66/5/3), the autograph score reads “\textit{when} equal Love”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “but”; in b. 18 of the recitative ‘Why hangs this heavy Gloom’ (HG73/6/2), the autograph score reads “it were not equal Price for such a Gem”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “to”; in b. 47 of the air ‘Love, Glory, Ambition’ (HG132/1/3), the autograph score reads “these disconsolate \textit{Tears}”, which was originally written in the performing score, but was altered in pencil to “Fears”, which is the reading given in the Aylesford score; in b. 13 of the chorus ‘Mistaken Queen!’ (HG168/1/1), the bass line in the autograph score reads “Queens”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “Queen”; and in b. 2 of the recitative ‘Yes, he was false’ (HG192/1/2), the autograph score reads “and \textit{ev’n} conspir’d”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores read “hath”.}
(exx. 44-5), one involving a tie (ex. 46), one involving pauses, and one involving tempo markings. On four occasions, the scribe of X2 seems to have corrected errors or ironed out inconsistencies that were introduced either as part of the Group I variants or as a result of an ambiguity in the performing score: a spelling, two variants of pitch (exx. 47-8), and a rhythm (ex. 49).

Variants that could belong either to Group IIb or to Group III include variants of pitch (exx. 50-56), rhythm (exx. 57-8), note-length (ex. 59), ornamentation (in all cases the Princeton score has more ornamentation: see, for example, exx. 60-65), underlay (exx. 66-8), and verbal text. Two such variants are corrections of errors that presumably arose from the performing score and were therefore present in X1 but corrected in X2 or later: in b. 31 of the air ‘Subtle Love’, the performing score might appear to read “fix thee dart”, which is the reading given in the soprano I part-book, instead of “fix the dart”, which is given in the other sources (ex. 69); and in b. 176 of the air ‘Tost from Thought to Thought’ (HG127/1/6), the spelling “ghest” is present only in the performing score and in the soprano I part-book.

Only two Group III variants relate to the soprano I line: an error of pitch (ex. 70), and the omission of a tie (ex. 71).

Finally, three variants of pitch (exx. 72-4), three involving verbal text, one involving a trill (ex. 75), one involving ties and slurs (ex. 76), and one involving accents (ex. 77) prove that the soprano I part-book cannot have been copied from the Aylesford score.

Therefore the soprano I part-book must have been copied from a score (X1) that had been copied from the performing score.

13 The autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores, and the soprano I part-book do not contain pauses on the final note of the air ‘Convey me to some peacefull Shore’ (HG205), whereas the Princeton score and the violin I, violin II, viola, and cello part-books do.
14 After initially marking the duet ‘Hail’ (HG148) as Andante, Handel decided upon Allegro. This was copied into the performing score, and from there found its way into the Aylesford score and the soprano I and alto part-books. The scribe of X2 must have omitted it, however: the Princeton score and the violin I, violin II, and viola part-books do not have a tempo marking, and the ‘cello and bassoon part-books are marked Andante. (It is likely that S1 decided that the duet ought to be marked Andante when he copied the ‘cello part-book, and then either copied this into the bassoon part-book or remembered his decision when copying it.)
15 In the final bar of the recitative ‘Ah! whence these dire Forebodings of the Mind?’ (HG119), Handel spelled the first word correctly: “check”. When Smith copied the performing score he wrote “Cheks”, and it is this spelling that is found in the Aylesford score and in the soprano I part-book; however, the Princeton score and the ‘cello part-book contain the correct spelling.
16 In bb. 25-6 of the chorus ‘Hymen, fair Urania’s Son’ (HG157/2/1-2), the autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores, and the soprano I and II part-books give the correct text “crown the Day”, whereas the Princeton score gives “crowne the Night”. (This error occurs only in the soprano line of that score: the bass line has the correct word, three staves lower. The error probably occurred because the text at this point in the chorus reads “crown the Day and bless the Night”). Similarly, the Princeton score is the only source in question to read “Strange Reverse to human Fate” in bb. 35-6 of the air ‘Strange Reverse’ (HG180/3/1-2): the correct text is “Strange Reverse of human Fate”.
17 If scribes were consistent, one would expect S1 to have written “ghost” at this point in the Aylesford score; however, S1’s spelling appears to have been very flexible.
18 In listing Group III variants I distinguish between a line and a part-book because in a Group III variant, the new reading is not present in the part-book under consideration.
19 In the recitative ‘Ah! whence these dire Forebodings of the Mind?’, the Aylesford score is the only source to give “Foreboding” (HG119/1/1-2); it is the only source in which Cleopatra and Alexander sing “Love” instead of “Law” in b. 48 of the duet ‘Hail’ (HG150/3/4); and it is the only source in which Cleopatra sings “wrapt in endless Shades of Night” instead of “wrapt in Shades of endless Night” in bb. 27-8 of the air ‘O take me from this hatefull Light’ (HG200/2/1-2).
Soprano II part-book (Aspasia; v. 182)

As Aspasia has a much smaller part than Cleopatra, the soprano II part-book contains far fewer variants than the soprano I part-book. It contains only five of the Group I variants already given (exx. 5, 13, 19, 25, and a variant of text\textsuperscript{20}), and only one variant that can be said with certainty to belong to Group IIa. Handel wrote the tempo indication for the air ‘Strange Reverse of human Fate’ as follows in the autograph score:

\[ \text{\textcopyright British Library Board (RM 20. d. 3, f. 93r)} \]

The dotted line beneath the word “ordinario” indicates that he wished to reinstate the word after having deleted it. While the performing and Aylesford scores both read “A tempo ordinario, Allegro ma non troppo”, the soprano II, violin I, violin II, viola, oboe I, oboe II, ’cello, and bassoon part-books and the Princeton score all read only “Allegro ma non troppo”:

presumably the scribe of X1 omitted “a tempo ordinario”.

Only four variants that definitely belong to Group IIb relate to the soprano II part-book: the first has already been given (ex. 49), the second is a correction to an error introduced by Smith in the performing score,\textsuperscript{21} the third is an elision of syllables in order to clarify Handel’s underlay,\textsuperscript{22} and the fourth relates to tempo.\textsuperscript{23} Of the variants that could belong either to Group IIb or to Group III, the soprano II part-book contains seven that have already been given (exx. 53-6, 62, and 67-8), in addition to four others: an ornament (ex. 78), an alternative note (ex. 79), a variant of pitch (ex. 80), and a correction, in line with the autograph score, to an error of pitch made by Smith in the performing score (ex. 81). Further

\textsuperscript{20} In b. 6 of the recitative ‘Check not the pleasing Accents of thy Tongue’ (HG63/5/1), the autograph score reads “the Honours of the well-fought Field”, whereas the performing and Aylesford scores and the soprano II and ’cello part-books read “Honour” (The Princeton score reads ‘Honours’, which is a correction that belongs to Group III, whether or not it relates to the autograph score.)

\textsuperscript{21} In the recitative ‘Check not the pleasing Accents of thy Tongue’ (HG63), Handel wrote “‘Tis a Reward, beside the Honours of the well fought Field”, which is how it appears in the wordbook. Smith wrote “besides”, which appears in the Aylesford score and the soprano II part-book, but not in the ’cello part-book and the Princeton score, which give “beside”: presumably the copyist of X2 made the alteration.

\textsuperscript{22} Handel set the words “the approaching” to three notes in the final bar of the recitative ‘Give to the Winds’ (HG130); this was copied into the performing score and from there made its way into the Aylesford score and the soprano II part-book. It seems that the copyist of X2 decided to improve Handel’s underlay: the ’cello part-book and the Princeton score both read “th’ approaching”. It is extremely interesting to note that when Smith prepared the insertion into Part II of the performing score of Alexander’s Part III air ‘Pow’rfull Guardians’ (replacing the air ‘Love, Glory, Ambition’) for the planned 1751 revival, he wrote “th’ approaching” when he recopied ‘Give to the Winds’, which retained its place in Part II but which he recopied for ease of reading. (This insertion is now ff. 37-9, with “th’ approaching” appearing on f. 37r; Clausen refers to this insertion as “E8” (Händels Direktionspartituren, pp. 101-2).)

\textsuperscript{23} The autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores and the soprano II part-book do not give a tempo indication for the air ‘So shall the sweet attractive Smile’ (HG64). It seems that the copyist of X2 decided it ought to be marked Allegro, as that is what appears in the violin I, violin II, ’cello, and bassoon part-books, and in the Princeton score.
confirmation that the soprano II part-book was not copied from the Aylesford score includes a variant of pitch that has already been given (ex. 74) and a spelling.\(^{24}\)

Only one Group III variant relates to the soprano II line, and that variant is somewhat complicated: it can also be described as a Group I variant, since Smith made an error of pitch in the performing score that was transferred to the Aylesford score and to the soprano II, 'cello, and bassoon part-books, but was then corrected when copied into the Princeton score (ex. 82). It is impossible to know whether this correction was made on the basis of the autograph score.

S1 is too careful a scribe to have made mistakes that would have provided evidence regarding the source of the soprano II part-book in choruses: the only variants that suggest that it was copied from the soprano I part-book in choruses relate to slurs, which are not reliable variants. For this reason all that can be said is that the soprano II part-book was copied either mostly (i.e. in solo numbers) or entirely from a score (X1) that had been copied from the performing score.

**Alto part-book (Alexander; v. 183)**

Although Alexander’s music is written in C1 clef in the autograph, performing, and Princeton scores, S1 copied his music in C3 clef (see also the alto part-book of *Joshua*, where he did the same). The alto part-book must derive from the performing score, as it contains four Group I variants already given (exx. 5 and 11, and two variants of verbal text\(^{25}\)). Four variants of pitch (exx. 83-6), one of underlay (ex. 87), and one involving an alternative note (ex. 88) belong to Group IIa and therefore prove the existence of at least one intermediate score in the stemma. Evidence that there must have been two intermediate scores, and that the alto part-book must have been copied from the first, include two Group IIb variants already given (ex. 37 and the tempo marking of the duet ‘Hail’ (see fn. 14)), in addition to one of pitch (ex. 89), three of rhythm (exx. 90-92), one of note-length (ex. 93), and one relating to verbal text.\(^{26}\)

\(^{24}\) In b. 23 of the recitative ‘Treach’ry, o King’ (HG174/2/3), the Aylesford score is the only source under consideration in which “Demetrius” is spelled “Demetrious”.

\(^{25}\) In b. 18 of the recitative ‘Why hangs this heavy Gloom’ (HG73/6/2), the autograph score reads “it were not equal Price for such a Gem”, whereas the performing, Aylesford, and Princeton scores and the alto and ‘cello part-books read “to”; and in b. 47 of the air ‘Love, Glory, Ambition’ (HG132/1/3), the autograph score reads “these disconsolate Tears”, which was originally written in the performing score, but was altered in pencil to “Fears”, the reading given in the Aylesford and Princeton scores and in the alto part-book.

\(^{26}\) In the recitative ‘Be it my chief Ambition there to rise’ (HG38), Alexander (correctly) continues “where for these Obligations true Desert may speak me grateful” in the autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores, and in the alto part-book; in the Princeton score and in the ‘cello part-book, however, he states “where for those Obligations”.
Of those variants that could belong to Group IIb or Group III, three have already been given (exx. 59, 65, and 66); there are also two of pitch (exx. 94-5), two of rhythm (exx. 96-7), two of note-length (exx. 98-9), one of underlay (ex. 100), and nine of ornamentation (including three given here: exx. 101-3). The only alto variants that can be said with certainty to belong to Group III are two variants of pitch (exx. 104-5) and one of spelling. Further evidence that it was not copied from the Aylesford score includes two variants already given (exx. 72-3), a variant of pitch (ex. 106), one of note-length (ex. 107), and three of verbal text. A consideration of all these variants leads to the conclusion that S1’s source for the alto part-book was a score – now lost – that was copied from the performing score: X1.

The only puzzle regarding the alto part-book is two apparently incompatible variants of verbal text in the B section of the air ‘Heroes may Boast’ (HG78). The text of the B sections is:

Fly swift, on borrow’d Wings of Love,
Ye tardy-footed Minutes, fly;
And bring the Sentence to remove
This frantic Torture, Live or Die.

On the first two statements of “Fly swift” (ex. 108), S1 wrote “Fly fly” in the Aylesford score. On the first occasion, the alto part-book reads “Fly swift” like the other sources; but only four bars later, on the second occasion, the alto part-book reads “fly, fly”, which might suggest that S1 was copying from the Aylesford score. The most likely explanation is simply that S1 had “fly fly” in his mind. However, as the second occurrence of “Fly swift” is closer to the “fly” that ends the second line of text than it is to the third occurrence of “Fly swift”, it is possible that S1 thought that Handel meant the last note of b. 136 and the first note of b. 137 to be a repetition of the final word of the second line, rather than a second occurrence of the first two words of the B section.  

---

27 In b. 7 of the recitative ‘My Jonathan’ (HG50/3/2), Handel spelled “Tyranny” correctly; Smith wrote “Tyrany”, which found its way into the alto and ‘cello part-books; the Princeton score, however, gives the correct spelling. (That the Aylesford score gives “Tiranny” does not necessarily call this variant into question: it is possible that S1 was unsure of the spelling so spelled it his way when copying the score, but followed the spelling given in his source when copying the part-book.)

28 The first has already been given (see fn. 19 “Love”/”Law”). The second concerns the air ‘Fury with red sparkling Eyes’ (HG174): the first two times these words are stated, S1 wrote “Eye” in the Aylesford score; but when he copied the alto part-book he wrote “Eyes”, presumably because his source (X1), like all other sources, gave the correct reading. The third concerns the recitative ‘Treach’ry, o King’: in b. 24 (HG174/3/1), the Aylesford score reads “Horror! Confusion! Call all Forces round”, whereas the other sources in question give the correct word (“my”).

29 That Handel originally wrote “O fly” at both points is interesting but irrelevant to this chapter.
Tenor part-book (Jonathan; v. 184)

Five of the Group I variants already given prove that the tenor part-book derives from the performing score (exx. 5, 20, 21, 23, 24, and fn. 10). The tenor part-book’s relationship to X1 is shown by a wealth of convincing Group IIa variants: the omission of a bar (ex. 109), six variants of pitch, including the omission of an accidental (exx. 110-15), two of rhythm (exx. 116-17), three of note-length (exx. 118-20), and several more including the omission of a tie (ex. 121) and variants of verbal text and spelling.\(^{30}\) Although there are no variants that can be categorised as Group IIb, four variants of pitch (exx. 122-5) could belong to either Group IIb or III; and two variants of pitch (exx. 126-7) and three errors of verbal text\(^{31}\) belong to Group III.

There are several tenor variants that belong to more than one group: variants in which one would expect the Princeton score to share a variant that was introduced earlier in the stemma, but when it instead gives either a third reading, or the correct (original) reading. In the latter case it is usually impossible to determine whether the appearance of the correct reading in the Princeton score was the result of a coincidence, or whether it was the result of a conscious decision by a copyist (see, for example, ex. 128); and if it was a decision, whether the copyist came up with the reading himself, or whether he consulted another source. The only Group III correction of an earlier error that is very likely to be the copyist’s conscious solution to a problem has already been given (ex. 20).

As there are no Group IIb variants for the tenor part-book, evidence needs to be provided that it was not copied from the ‘cello part-book. The tenor part-book provides such evidence: it contains the stage direction “To Aspasia” that is not present in the ‘cello part-book (b. 17 of the recitative ‘Treach’ry, O King’ (HG174/1/0). Two variants of pitch (exx. 129-30) confirm that the tenor part-book was not copied from the Aylesford score.

\(^{30}\) One of these is a wrong word introduced by the copyist of X1: in b. 28 of the air ‘Hatefull Man’ (HH107/3/2), the tenor part-book and the Princeton score read “throws in vain his poison’d Dart” instead of “the”, which is found elsewhere. Two more concern spelling: in bb. 9-10 of the recitative ‘Treach’ry, O King’ (HG173/43-4), the autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores read “garrison’d”, whereas the tenor and ‘cello part-books and the Princeton score read “garison’d”; and in b. 8 of the recitative ‘Mysterious are thy Ways, O Providence’ (HG206/2/4), the autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores read “laid low in Dust”, whereas the tenor and ‘cello part-books and the Princeton score read “lay’d”. Not all Group IIa variants of verbal text are errors, however: two are corrections of previous errors. The first, Handel’s melisma on what should have been “sland’rous” in the air ‘Hatefull Man’ (b. 62, HG109/2/4), was described in the second paragraph of this chapter. “[T]hly slander Tongue” was copied into the performing score, but was presumably corrected by the copyist of X1, since the tenor part-book and the Princeton score both give the correct word. (It was Jennens who corrected the error in the Aylesford score.) The second correction made by the copyist of X1 is a correction to an error made by Smith in the performing score: in b. 19 of the recitative ‘Thus far, ye glorious Partners’ (HG15/5/1), Smith’s error was to write “then” instead of “than” in the phrase “Gifts, yet more than Gifts”; this Group I error was transferred into the Aylesford score but presumably corrected by the copyist of X1, since the correct reading is present in the tenor and ‘cello part-books and in the Princeton score.

\(^{31}\) Of the sources under consideration, the Princeton score is the only one to contain the following errors of verbal text: “yet ever save” instead of “safe” in b. 9 of the recitative ‘There is no greatness in Mortality’ (HG105/6/2); “they are not Gods” instead of “no” in b. 6 of the recitative ‘May he return’ (HG182/2/3); and “of Providence” instead of “O” in b. 2 of the recitative ‘Mysterious are thy Ways, O Providence’ (HG206/1/2).
The tenor part-book is involved in two puzzling variants. The first seems to suggest that it was copied from the Aylesford score (ex. 131); the more likely reason for this variant is that S1, having observed that this musical figure was normally set to “Allelujah” throughout the chorus, assumed the underlay in his sources to be incorrect and altered it to coincide with the rest of the chorus. In the second variant, the tenor part-book’s reading appears to be related to an incorrect reading in the Princeton score, but the 'cello part-book is correct (ex. 132). Although this variant appears to invalidate my stemma, the readings given in the tenor part-book, the 'cello part-book, and the Princeton score could all have arisen from a particular kind of error in X1. It is certainly not impossible that in X1 b. 2 falls at the end of a system, and that the copyist, assuming that the note was to be the same on the next system, wrote a tie (ex. 132a). This could easily account for the tenor part-book’s error. The readings in the 'cello part-book and in the Princeton score can be accounted for if X2 contained the same reading as the tenor part-book: S1, copying the 'cello part-book from X2 could have spotted the odd reading and removed the slur, whereas by the time the variant reached the Group III stage, the slur had been made into a tie by altering the pitch of one of the notes. While this seems fanciful, it is certainly possible: there is no reason to assume that S1 would make the same decision regarding an odd reading every time he encountered it, especially if the first time he encountered the odd reading was a long time before the second. Indeed, a large number of variants show that he often reacted differently at different times. Furthermore, there are examples of scribes reacting in different ways to exactly this type of error in copies of other oratorios (exx. 132b, 132c, and 132d), as well as an image of this type of error in action in the Princeton score of Belshazzar32 (ex. 132e). Although a few of the tenor part-book’s variants are rather odd, the majority of them indicate that it was copied from X1.

Bass I part-book (Ptolomee; v. 185)

Although the bass I part-book contains only three Group I variants (ex. 5 and two variants of verbal text33), it contains a number of Group IIa variants including one of pitch (ex. 133), one of rhythm (ex. 134), two of note-length (exx. 135-6), one of underlay (ex. 137), and a trill (ex. 138); it also contains a Group IIa omission of an accidental added by Smith (ex. 139). The bass I part-book contains only one Group IIb variant (ex. 140), only one variant

---

32 James S. Hall collection of George Frideric Handel ((C0640), no. 18), Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.

33 In b. 13 of the chorus ‘Mistaken Queen!’ (HG168/1/1), the bass line in the autograph score reads “Queens”, whereas the performing, Aylesford, and Princeton scores and the bass I part-book read “Queen”; and in b. 2 of the recitative ‘Yes, he was false’ (HG192/1/2), the autograph score reads “and ev’n conspir’d”, whereas the performing, Aylesford, and Princeton scores and the bass I and 'cello part-books read “hath”.
that is either Group IIb or III (ex. 67), and only two that belong to Group III: a variant of pitch (ex. 141) and the omission of a tie that was added by Smith in the performing score (ex. 142).

Three variants – one of underlay (ex. 143), one of note-length (ex. 144), and one involving clefs (ex. 145) – confirm that the bass I part-book was not copied from the Aylesford score. Although a variant of verbal text appears to indicate the opposite, it is likely that this reading – which is shared by the Aylesford score and the bass I part-book – is the result of S1’s editing.\(^{34}\)

The only explanation for the bass I part-book’s variants is that it was copied from X1.

**Bass II part-book (Sycophant Courtier and Messengers; v. 186)**

Although one might expect the bass II part-book to contain choruses, it contains only the recitatives for three small characters: the Sycophant Courtier (‘Stay, my dread Sovereign’ (HG104)), the first Messenger (‘Ungratefull Tidings’ (HG197)), and the second Messenger (‘Forgive, O Queen’ (HG202)). These three recitatives include three Group IIa variants (ex. 146 and a variant of verbal text\(^{35}\)), one Group III variant,\(^{36}\) and two variants – one of pitch (ex. 147) and one of spelling\(^{37}\) – that confirm that it was not copied from the Aylesford score: it must have been copied from X1.

Strictly speaking, the section of this part-book that contains the recitative ‘Ungratefull Tidings’ ought to be referred to as the “tenor II part-book” because the first Messenger, who sings this recitative, is notated in C4 clef here and in the scores. It is included here because it is bound, with the music of the other two characters, with the bass II part-book to *Judas Maccabaeus*: to refer to it as a tenor II part-book would be misleading in that it would imply that there is a separate part-book. It is worth noting that the part of the Angel in *Joshua*, which is written in C4 clef, is also bound in this volume: perhaps the decision was made that it would be neater to include the small parts from *Joshua* and *Alexander Balus* in the bass II volume of *Judas Maccabaeus* which would be equally small had S2 not also copied the

\(^{34}\) When Handel composed the chorus ‘Ye happy Nations’ (HG41), one of the phrases he set was “boldly triumph”, when this was changed to “loudly triumph”, Handel updated some (but not all) of the occurrences of the phrase in the autograph score. As a result, the performing score sometimes gives “boldly”, and sometimes gives “loudly”. In b. 47 (HG46/1/4), the autograph, performing, and Princeton scores all read “boldly”, whereas the Aylesford score and the bass I part-book read “loudly”. Presumably S1 realised that “loudly” was the correct word so adjusted the text accordingly.

\(^{35}\) In b. 9 of the recitative ‘Ungratefull Tidings’ (HG197/3/1), the bass II and ‘cello part-books, and the Princeton score read “and Destruction on their City pow’rd” instead of “pour’d”, which is given in the autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores.

\(^{36}\) In b. 13 of the recitative ‘Forgive, O Queen’ (HG202/5/4), the Princeton score reads “hath breath’d his last”, whereas all other sources – including the bass II part-book – read “Soul”.

\(^{37}\) In bb. 6-7 of the recitative ‘Ungratefull Tidings’ (HG197/2/2-3), the Aylesford score reads “Ozotus” instead of the correct “Azotus” that is given in the autograph, performing, and Princeton scores, and in the bass II and ‘cello part-books.
choruses) than to have a four-page tenor II volume containing the Angel (Joshua) and the first Messenger (Alexander Balus).

**Instrumental part-books**

There are several variants that relate to more than one line and that are present in multiple part-books that cannot be more than “siblings”. They are listed here in order to avoid listing them more than once: those variants that belong to either Group IIa or Group IIb include three of rhythm (exx. 148-50), one involving ties (ex. 151), two involving trills (exx. 152-3), and one that involves instrumentation, a trill, and a reading (ex. 154); those variants that belong to Group III include one of rhythm (ex. 155), one of note-length (ex. 156), one involving a tie (ex. 157), and one involving trills (ex. 158).

Individual variants for the instrumental part-books are given in the following order: Group I, Group IIa, Group IIb, Group IIa or IIb, Group III, variants that confirm that the instrumental part-book cannot have been copied from the Aylesford score, and variants relating to whether one instrumental part-book was copied from another.

**Violin I part-book (v. 174)**

The violin I part-book contains five Group I variants that have already been given (exx. 9, 14, 17, 18, and 31), the Group IIa tempo marking of the air ‘Strange Reverse’ detailed in the section on the soprano II part-book, and four Group IIb variants that have already been listed (exx. 38, 43, 47, and 48).

Among the many violin I variants that belong to either Group IIa or Group IIb are six already listed (exx. 149-54), twelve of pitch (exx. 159-70), six of rhythm (exx. 171-76), two of note-length (exx. 177-8), the omission of a note (ex. 179), two involving ties (exx. 180-81), a wealth of variants of ornamentation, fifteen of which I list (exx. 182-95), and the correction of a Group I error of rhythm (ex. 196).

The Group III variants that relate to the violin I line include three already listed (exx. 155, 156, and 158), in addition to six of pitch (exx. 197-202), eight of rhythm (exx. 203-210), one involving a tie (ex. 211), and five of ornamentation (exx. 212-16): the violin I part-book cannot have been copied from the Princeton score.
There are a number of variants which confirm that the violin I part-book was not copied from the Aylesford score, including two already listed (exx. 180-81), one of rhythm (ex. 217), one of ornamentation (ex. 218), and one involving a tie (ex. 219).

The violin I part-book must therefore have been copied from X2: a lost score (X2) that was itself copied from a lost score (X1) that was copied from the performing score.

**Violin II part-book (v. 175)**

The violin II part-book contains six Group I variants that have already been given (exx. 2, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18), the Group IIa tempo marking of the air ‘Strange Reverse’ detailed in the section on the soprano II part-book, and four Group IIb variants that have already been listed (exx. 38, 43, 47, and 48).

Violin II variants that belong to either Group IIa or Group IIb include six already given (exx. 149-54), one variant of pitch and rhythm (ex. 220), eleven of pitch (exx. 221-31), five of rhythm (exx. 232-6), two involving ties (ex. 237-8), and two involving ornamentation (exx. 239-40).

In addition to three Group III variants already mentioned (exx. 155, 156, and 158), the violin II line is involved in a number of others including six of pitch (exx. 241-46) and one involving a tie (ex. 247). Two variants of pitch (exx. 248-9) confirm that S1’s source was not the Aylesford score.

In the absence of X1 and X2, it is impossible to say with certainty whether S1 copied the violin II part-book from the violin I part-book when the violins play in unison. However, evidence that he could have done so includes four variants of pitch (exx. 250-53), one of rhythm (ex. 254), a trill (ex. 255), a tie (ex. 256), and the fact that the violin I and II part-books are the only sources among those in question to have a pause on the final bar of the air ‘Oh what resistless Charms’ (HG54).

The violin II part-book contains two slightly puzzling variants. The first was probably the result of the violin II line being left blank in X1 or X2, leading to different readings in the part-book and in the Princeton score (ex. 257), and the other is probably the result of various scribes adding and omitting various elements of the music (ex. 258). When Smith copied the performing score, he omitted Handel’s flat but added a tie, which was then transferred to the Aylesford score. Presumably the violin II part-book and the Princeton score contain the flat because the copyist of X1 or X2 reinstated it; and presumably the violin II part-book lacks the
tie that is present in the Princeton score either because S1 omitted it or because the copyist of
X1 or X2 omitted it and S5 then reinstated it when he copied the Princeton score.

Therefore S1 must have copied the violin II part-book either entirely from X2, or from
X2 when it has its own part and from the violin I part-book when it does not.

**Oboe/flute I part-book (v. 177)**

The oboe/flute I part-book (referred to here as the “oboe I part-book”) contains one
Group I variant already given (ex. 3), and the Group IIa tempo marking of the air ‘Strange
Reverse’ detailed in the section on the soprano II part-book.

As oboes often play with the violins, most of the oboe variants have already been
listed. The oboe I variants that belong to Group IIa or IIb include fifteen that have already
been given (exx. 148, 151-2, 169, 171-2, 178, 183, 185-7, 190-91, and 196), along with one of
pitch (ex. 259), one of rhythm (ex. 260), and one that relates to whether they should be
playing (ex. 261). Group III variants (which prove that the oboe I part-book was not copied
from the Princeton score) include nine that have already been given (exx. 155-6, 158, 197,
201, 203, 205-6, and 212) in addition to four of pitch (exx. 262-5) and two of rhythm (exx.
266-7). A variant involving a tie is further proof that the oboe I part-book was not copied
from the Aylesford score (ex. 268).

In the absence of X1 and X2, it is difficult to determine the oboe I part-book’s
immediate source in numbers in which it plays in unison with one or both violin lines. It is
unlikely that S1 would have used the violin I part-book as his source in airs since – as the
oboes are treated as tutti instruments – he would have to have known when the singer was
singing in order to establish when the oboes should play. This is supported not only by the
fact that the oboe part-books do not contain two errors of pitch present in the violin part-
books in the air ‘Oh what resistless Charms’ (exx. 252-3), but also by two occasions on which
S1 has the oboes play less than the violins when there is no indication in the violin part-books
to do so. In the first, the oboe part-books do not play a passage that begins when Alexander is
singing (beginning b. 60 (HG52/16)); as the violin part-books are not marked *piano* at this
point, S1 could not have known to keep the oboes silent if he were looking only at a violin
part-book. Second, S1 cut the final note of another phrase short in the oboe part-books and not
in the violin part-books so that the oboes did not overlap with the entry of the voice (ex. 269).
Therefore S1 appears to have copied the oboe I part-book entirely from X2.
There is only one anomalous oboe I variant, which at first glance appears to suggest that – as the oboe I part-book does not contain a Group I error of rhythm – S1 was momentarily copying from the autograph score (ex. 270); a far more likely explanation is that S1 corrected the error consciously or otherwise.

As usual, the contents of the oboe part-books do not quite match those of the surviving scores: the violin I part-book contains the oboe solos at the beginning of the air ‘Fair Virtue’, at which point the oboe I part-book has only rests (HG38-9); and the air ‘O Sword’ (HG193) is marked *tacet* in the oboe part-books even though the B section contains an oboe line.

**Oboe/flute II part-book (v. 178)**

The oboe/flute II part-book (referred to as the “oboe II part-book”) contains two Group I variants (exx. 1-2) and the Group IIa tempo marking of the air ‘Strange Reverse’ detailed in the section on the soprano II part-book. Of the variants that belong to Group IIa or IIb it contains sixteen that have already been given (exx. 49, 148, 151-2, 169, 172, 178, 186-7, 190-91, 196, 221, 229-30, and 234) in addition to six of pitch (exx. 271-76) and one of rhythm (ex. 277). The Group III variants involving the oboe II part-book include six already given (exx. 155-6, 197, 205-6, and 246) along with one variant of pitch and rhythm (ex. 278) and two of pitch (exx. 279-80).

In the absence of X1 and X2 it is difficult to determine S1’s immediate source in numbers in which the oboe II part-book does not have its own line. Two variants of pitch in the second part of the Overture could indicate that S1 was copying from the violin II part-book in that movement, as the Princeton score gives the correct reading (exx. 281-2); however, the two readings could be Group II variants (originating in X1 or X2) that were corrected at some point later (whenever the Group III variants were produced). A variant involving a trill in the chorus ‘Hymen, fair Urania’s Son’ (another number in which oboe II doubles violin II), could indicate that S1 was not copying from the violin II part-book at this point (ex. 240), but the variant could have arisen for several reasons that are impossible to confirm without seeing X1 and X2.  

In the air ‘Thrice happy’ (HG20), Handel indicated that oboe II should double violin II until b. 178, when it should double the violin/oboe I line. This instruction was copied into the

---

38 Possible reasons include the possibility that the two lines were written separately in S1’s source; that the placing of the trill was ambiguous in S1’s source, leading him to make different decisions when copying the two part-books; or that the trill was clearly on the penultimate note in S1’s source but he made an editorial decision to move it when he copied the oboe II part-book.
performing score, and was followed by S1 when he copied the oboe II part-book. It is likely that he used X2 as his source rather than any part-book: a variant involving a tie in b. 138 (ex. 151) suggests that he was not copying from the violin II part-book in the first part of the air, and a variant involving a trill in b. 178 (ex. 283) suggests that he was not copying from the oboe I part-book at the end of the air.

It seems likely that S1 copied the oboe II part-book from the oboe I part-book in airs in which the oboes play in unison with the violins but are treated as tutti instruments: in addition to the variants mentioned in the oboe I section (exx. 252-53, which show that the oboe II part-book cannot have been copied from either violin part-book, and ex. 269, which suggests that it was copied from the oboe I part-book), this is indicated by the omission of a trill (ex. 255), the fact that neither oboe part-book contains the pause that is present in the violin part-books on the final note of ‘Oh what resistless Charms’ (HG54), and the fact that the oboe part-books are the only instrumental part-books to omit the tempo marking for the air ‘So shall the sweet attractive Smile’ (HG64).³⁹ A consideration of all the evidence leads to the conclusion that when S1 copied the oboe II part-book he used two sources: the oboe I part-book when the oboes play in unison, and X2 when they do not.

When Handel indicated that oboes should double a violin line, he did not always remember that certain notes were impossible for his oboists to play. This happens only once in *Alexander Balus*; it seems likely that the adjustment to the violin II line that appears in the oboe II part-book at that point was the work of S1, since otherwise any indication that might have appeared in X1 or X2 might be expected to have been transferred to the Princeton score (ex. 284).

**Viola part-book (v. 176)**

Five of the Group I variants that have previously been listed relate to the viola part-book (exx. 2, 4, 10, 25, and 26); it also contains the Group IIa variant relating to the tempo marking of the air ‘Strange Reverse’, and four Group IIb variants already given (exx. 38, 43, 47, and 48). Viola variants that belong either to Group IIa or to Group IIb include two already given (exx. 149 and 154), thirteen of pitch (exx. 285-97), three of rhythm (exx. 298-300), two ties (exx. 301-2), the omission of notes (ex. 303), and a Group II correction of a Group I error of pitch (ex. 304). The Group III variants are only slightly less abundant, including one

³⁹ This tempo marking was probably the invention of the copyist of X1 (see fn. 23); the omission of it in the oboe part-books was probably the result of an oversight by S1, and is more likely to have occurred when he copied the oboe I part-book and transferred it from there into the oboe II part-book.
already given (ex. 157), an alteration of the viola line so that it conforms with the other instrumental lines (ex. 305), eleven variants of pitch (exx. 306-16), one of note-length (ex. 317), and a tie (ex. 318). More evidence that it cannot have been copied from the Aylesford score includes one variant already given (ex. 304) in addition to two of pitch (exx. 319-20). All of these variants combined indicate that S1’s source for the viola part-book was X2.

One interesting aspect of the Aylesford viola part-book is the way in which the viola is treated in the two airs of the oratorio in which it plays only briefly. In the first, ‘Fury with red sparkling Eyes’ (HG174), Handel wrote a viola line only in the B section. In the second, ‘Strange Reverse of human Fate’ (HG179), the viola does not play at all: Handel wrote only parts for violins and oboes, and when in bb. 37-40 and 52-55 the upper instruments divide into three parts he intended the oboes to take the highest line, the first violins to take the middle line, and the second violins to take the lowest line. Despite this being the case in the performing and Aylesford scores, the Aylesford part-books divide the lines between violin I, violin II, and viola, thus introducing the viola to a movement in which it was never intended to play (see ex. 154). In the Aylesford viola part-book, rather than remaining silent for most of the two airs in question, the viola is treated as a temporary addition to the continuo ensemble. In both cases, when the viola does not have its own part it plays the bassoon line an octave higher.\(^{40}\) The octave displacement results in the viola playing higher than the violins on occasion; however, since it plays only in the tutti sections, it is never higher than the voice. It is interesting to note that S1 appears to have regarded f" to be too high for the viola: he lowered one note by an octave in b. 8 of ‘Fury with red sparkling Eyes’ (HG174/6/3) so that the viola would not have to play an f"#, and he made a similar adjustment in the chorus ‘O Calumny’ (ex. 321).

‘Cello part-book (v. 180)

As S1 included all recitatives in the ‘cello part-book, it contains a large number of variants, many of which have already been given: thirteen from Group I (exx. 5-7, 13, 20, 23-5, 27-9, 82, and 142), fifteen from Group IIa (exx. 33, 87, 109-10, 112-14, 116, 118, 121, 146, fn. 30 (spellings of “garrison’d” and “laid”), fn. 35, the tempo marking of the air ‘Strange Reverse’, and ex. 323), and twenty-one from Group IIb (exx. 34-48, 89-93, and 140). Of the variants that belong either to Group IIa or to Group IIb, it includes the omission of one bar

\(^{40}\) One might then assume that the viola part in these instances was taken from the bassoon part-book. There is no evidence for or against this.
and the repetition of another (ex. 322), three variants of pitch (exx. 323-5), and two of rhythm (exx. 326-7). The Group III variants include ten already given (exx. 70-71, 82, 105, 126-7, 141-2, 157, and fn. 31), one of pitch (ex. 328), and one involving the omission of a note (ex. 329). Further evidence that the ’cello part-book was not copied from the Aylesford score includes ten already given (exx. 87, 106, 129-30, 145, 147, fn. 24, fn. 37, and two variants of verbal text41) in addition to two of pitch (exx. 330-31) and one involving a tie (ex. 332). It must therefore have been copied from X2.

Bassoon part-book (v. 179)

The bassoon part-book has far fewer variants than the ’cello part-book because it is treated as a tutti instrument in airs and does not play in recitatives. As it usually plays in unison with the ’cello, most of its variants have already been given: five in Group I (exx. 5, 7, 25, 27, and 82), three in Group IIa (exx. 109, 116, and the tempo marking of the air ‘Strange Reverse’), four in Group IIb (exx. 39, 44-5, and 89), three in Group IIa or IIb (exx. 322, 326, and 327), and four in Group III (exx. 82, 126, 328, and 329). Both of the variants that concern only the bassoon part-book relate to which line it plays in the air ‘Thrice happy’ (HG20), in which it sometimes has its own line, sometimes doubles the basso continuo line, and sometimes doubles the vocal line. The first belongs to Group IIa or IIb: the bassoon has rests in the autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores, but plays with the vocal line in the bassoon part-book and in the Princeton score (ex. 333). The second is a Group III variant that also proves that the bassoon part-book was not copied from the Aylesford score (ex. 334); this is confirmed by four variants already given (exx. 77, 145, 331, and 332).

As S1 treats the bassoon as a tutti instrument, he could not have copied the bassoon part-book from the ’cello part-book in airs as he would have needed to see the vocal line. He could, however, have used the ’cello part-book as his source in choruses, although in the absence of X1 and X2 it is impossible to state with certainty that a reading which appears only in the ’cello and bassoon part-books is not a Group II error that had been corrected by the time that the Princeton score was copied. That caveat notwithstanding, it seems likely that the ’cello part-book was indeed his source as some of the readings in question are errors that are more likely to have been made in a part-book than in a score. These include two of pitch (exx. 335-6), two of rhythm (exx. 337-8), one of note-length (ex. 339), and one involving the

---

41 The ’cello part-book does not contain the Aylesford score’s incorrect readings described above: “foreboding” (fn. 19) and “all” (fn. 28).
omission of two bars (ex. 340). It is interesting to note that the bassoon part-book shares an Andante marking with the ’cello part-book in the duet ‘Hail’ (HG148), in which S1 treats the bassoon as a tutti instrument and so cannot have been copying from the ’cello part-book (see fn. 14).

**Trumpet I part-book (v. 247)**

The trumpet I part-book contains eight variants which indicate that it was copied from X2: one of pitch in Group I (ex. 8); two of pitch (exx. 341-2) and two of rhythm (exx. 343-4) in Group IIa or IIb; and one of rhythm (ex. 345), one involving a tie (ex. 346), and one involving a trill (ex. 158) in Group III.

**Trumpet II part-book (v. 248)**

The trumpet II part-book contains only three variants: one of rhythm in Group I (ex. 22), one of pitch in Group IIa or IIb (ex. 342), and one of rhythm that could show that it is related to the horn II part-book, or that could be a Group IIa or IIb error that was corrected at the Group III stage (ex. 347). Despite the paucity of variants it is likely that S1’s source for (at least part of) this part-book was X2.

**Horn I part-book (v. 351)**

The horn I part-book is presumably also derived from X2 as it shares seven variants with the trumpet I part-book: one in Group I (ex. 8), three in Group IIa or IIb (exx. 341-2 and 344), and three in Group III (exx. 158, 345, and 346). It also contains a variant of pitch which shows that it cannot have been copied from the Aylesford score (ex. 348).

**Horn II part-book (v. 352)**

The horn II part-book shares the three variants present in the trumpet II part-book (exx. 22, 342, and 347), in addition to a Group IIa or IIb variant of pitch (ex. 349). Based on
the evidence of the other part-books, it seems likely that S1’s source for this part-book was X2.

**Timpani part-book (v. 353)**

There is only one reliable variant for the timpani part-book: a variant of pitch that belongs to Group III (ex. 350); this proves that the Princeton score was not S1’s source.

****

There is no doubt that a study of all the surviving eighteenth-century sources of *Alexander Balus* would shed more light on the filiation; unfortunately that is well beyond the scope of this dissertation, which aims to discover S1’s immediate sources. The Shaftesbury score, for example, suggests that the situation is even more complicated than it already appears to be: a brief inspection of it reveals that it not only contains but also lacks variants belonging to most categories – to Group IIa, Group IIb, Group IIa or IIb, and Group III. It must be related to the performing score, to X1, to X2, and to the Princeton score, but quite how is a matter for the editor of the Halle edition of this oratorio.

**Timing and order of copying**

As the Aylesford manuscripts do not contain any of the revisions made for the planned revival in 1751, the Aylesford score and X1 must have been copied before these revisions were entered into the performing score. Indeed, it seems probable that they had already been copied by 1748, because they contain a few errors that are unlikely to have gone unnoticed – and uncorrected – during the period of the first rehearsals and performances and that have indeed been corrected in the performing score. Of the variants that can be relied upon, the most calamitous is Smith’s error in the closing bars of the chorus ‘O Calumny’, in which he added an extra bar in the vocal lines and the basso continuo but did not do the same in the violin and viola lines (ex. 5). It would be impossible for this error to go unnoticed, and it must have become apparent the first time it was rehearsed: unsurprisingly, it has been scratched out in the performing score and corrected, presumably immediately. The second example is an error in pitch in the tenor line of the air and chorus ‘Great God’ (ex. 351). This error remains
in the Aylesford score and tenor part-book but was corrected in the performing score, most likely when it was first discovered. Unfortunately, the variants offer no clues as to when X2 and the part-books were copied, nor to whether the Aylesford score was copied before or after the part-books.\footnote{The fact the vocal part-books and the instrumental part-books were copied from different scores suggests that S1 copied the sets in stages. Although it is tempting to imagine that – because X1 lies earlier in the stemma than X2 – the vocal part-books might have been copied earlier than the instrumental part-books, there is no evidence to support this conjecture.}
10  Joshua

Jennens owned one manuscript score,¹ one set of part-books,² and a Walsh print³ of Joshua. The manuscript copies were all copied by S1, and Jennens seems not to have had any input in their creation: he never owned a red-morocco score of Joshua, and there is no evidence to suggest that he ever amended the oratorio. Therefore all that remains to discuss in this chapter is the filiation of his score and part-books. As only Part II of the performing score survives,⁴ this chapter deals only with variants from Part II.

Filiation

Score (v. 166)

A wealth of compelling variants demonstrates that S1 must have copied the Aylesford score from the performing score (or from something derived from it). These variants include twelve of pitch (exx. 1-12),⁵ two of rhythm (exx. 13-14), one involving accidentals (ex. 15), one of note-length (ex. 16), one involving underlay (ex. 17), three relating to spelling,⁶ three relating to verbal text,⁷ a tie (ex. 18), one relating to a scene heading,⁸ and many more – not listed – relating to dynamics and slurs. This filiation is confirmed beyond doubt by the fact

¹ GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 166 (lot 262 in the 1918 Sotheby’s sale). The three-volume score of Joshua in lot 262 (now GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4, vv. 167-9) was not owned by Jennens.
² GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 vv. 174-8 (violin I, violin II, viola, oboe I, and oboe II), 180-181 (‘cello and soprano), 183-6 (alto, tenor I, bass, and tenor II (bound with bass II part-books)), 247-8 (trumpet I and trumpet II), and 353 (timpani).
³ Lot 251 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale.
⁴ D-Hs: M A/10:27a.
⁵ Music examples are given in Appendix 14.
⁶ First, in the recitative ‘The Walls are levell’d’ (HG 96/3/4), Handel wrote “Bulworks”, but the performing and Aylesford scores and the ‘cello and bass part-books give “Bullworks”. Second, in the opening bars of the chorus ‘How soon’ (HG114), Handel wrote the correct words “our Glory’s lost”; in bb. 5-6 in the soprano line Smith wrote “our Glory” is lost”; and at every appearance of those words except for b. 11 in the soprano, S1 wrote “our Glory” is lost” in the Aylesford score. Third, in b. 22 of the recitative ‘Sure, I’m deceiv’d!’ (HG137/3/3) Handel spelled the name of the King of Jerusalem Adonizedek as “Adonozedeck”; although Smith initially spelled it the same in the performing score, it was then altered to “Adonozedeck”, which is the spelling that is present in the Aylesford score and in the ‘cello and bass part-books.
⁷ The first occurs in b. 23 of the accompanied recitative and chorus ‘Oh! thou bright Orb’ (HG147/2/3), where Smith originally wrote “rapid Nations” instead of “rapid Motion” (presumably because the next line contains the word “Nations”). The final letter was removed, and the first two letters were altered so that the performing score now gives the correct words. The Aylesford score gives “Nation”; presumably it was copied from the performing score before it was altered there. The most likely reason that the Aylesford score reads “Nation” and not “Nations” is that Smith crossed out the final letter as he copied, but the more serious mistake (his wrong word) was not noticed or corrected until later. The second occurs in bb. 28 and 33 of the air ‘Nations, who, in future Story’ (HG140/2/2 and 140/3/4). Handel made an error in the text here: he wrote “Friendship is the Road of Fame” rather than “Friendship is the Road to Fame”. This error was originally copied into the performing score, but it has been corrected there. The correct reading is given in the Aylesford score and the alto part-book, presumably because they were copied from the performing score. (However, since Handel had written the correct text elsewhere in the air it is possible that S1 corrected the error himself.) Only one variant relates to a change of word. In b. 2 of the recitative ‘Brethren and Friends’ (HG141), the autograph score gives the original text: “what Joy this Scene imparts”; in the performing score, this was altered to “what Joy this Day imparts”. The Aylesford score and the ‘cello and tenor I part-books give the later version, which is present only in the performing score.
⁸ The Aylesford score, like the performing score, lacks the scene heading “The Passover” that is present in the autograph score above the recitative ‘Let all the Seed’ (HG105).
that five of Smith’s copying errors in the performing score were transferred to the Aylesford score (exx. 19-23).

**Instrumental part-books**

**Violin I part-book (v. 174)**

It is extremely likely that S1 copied the violin I part-book from the performing score. He cannot have copied it from the autograph score, as it shares with the performing score three variants already given (exx. 8, 19, and 20) in addition to two variants involving dynamics (exx. 24-5) and one of articulation (ex. 26); furthermore, two errors of pitch (exx. 27-8), one variant of note-length (ex. 29), and further evidence including dynamics (ex. 30), trills (exx. 31-2), slurs (ex. 33), and a tempo marking⁹ prove that he did not copy it from the Aylesford score. The conclusion that S1’s source was probably the performing score is not only the result of a process of elimination: it is supported by three variants. Two relate to dynamics (exx. 34-5), and the third relates to spacing.¹⁰

**Violin II part-book (v. 175)**

Evidence that S1 did not copy the violin II part-book from the autograph score includes seven variants that have already been given (exx. 6, 8, 19-20, and 24-6) in addition to a suggest variant involving a trill (ex. 36); and seven variants – four already given (exx. 30-33), an error of pitch (ex. 37), a tie (ex. 38), and a trill (ex. 39) – prove that he was not copying from the Aylesford score. Only two variants suggest positively that the performing score might have been S1’s source; these have already been cited (exx. 34-5).

It is unclear whether S1 copied from the violin I part-book in numbers in which the violins play in unison, as the only suggestive evidence could be a reflection of S1’s practice regarding the writing of dynamics in instrumental part-books (exx. 40-41).

The violin II and viola part-books’ readings in bb. 16-17 of the accompanied recitative ‘Oh! thou bright Orb’ are at first glance odd (ex. 42). However, they are the results of

---

⁹ Although S1 omitted the tempo marking for the chorus ‘Almighty Ruler’ when he copied the Aylesford score, it appears in the violin I part-book.

¹⁰ S1 omitted the first half of b. 4 of the air ‘Nations, who, in future Story’ (HG138/1/4) in the violin part-book; he would be far more likely to make this mistake if he were copying from the performing score (which has a change of line halfway through this bar), than if he were copying from the autograph or Aylesford scores (which do not).
adjustments made by S1 to allow the violin and viola parts to be played by three people.\footnote{Unfortunately it is impossible to tell whether this was at Jennens’s request.} Handel had marked the viola line at this point to be played by violin III and viola. As violin I and II play in unison in b. 16, S1 simply gave violin II the higher part when the viola line splits; in the second half of b. 17, in which Handel had written four different notes, S1 omitted one; and in b. 18 he omitted another. When S1 copied the part-books for Belshazzar, he called the violin II part-book “violin II et III”; why he did not do the same for Joshua is not clear.

Viola part-book (v. 176)

Evidence for the filiation of the viola part-book is slim, but probably S1 was, again, copying from the performing score. Unfortunately the only variant that the viola part-book shares with the performing score alone involves slurs, which are subject to the whim of a copyist (ex. 43); however, two variants – one involving a tie (ex. 18) and one involving an cautionary accidental (ex. 44) – suggest that it was not copied from the autograph score, and there is strong evidence that it was not copied from the Aylesford score (ex. 45). This filiation appears at first glance to be contradicted by the fact that the performing score contains one sharp that is not shared by the Aylesford score or viola part-book; however, the sharp in question was not always present in the performing score (ex. 46).

‘Cello part-book (v. 180)

Presumably the ’cello part-book was also copied from the performing score: it cannot have been copied from the autograph score, as it shares eight compelling variants with the performing score and other Aylesford sources (exx. 12, 14, 19, and 21, the spellings “Bullworks” and “Adonozedock” (see fn. 6), the reading “what Joy this Day imparts” (see fn. 7)) and an error of pitch (ex. 47); and it cannot have been copied from the Aylesford score, as it does not share two variants – one of rhythm and one of note-length – that are present there (exx. 48-9).

The ’cello part-book shares with the bass part-book an interesting variant which casts light on the workings of a copyist’s mind. In the recitative ‘Joshua, the Men dispatch’d’, Handel set the word “Pride” to two quavers. Although this is how it appears in the performing and Aylesford scores, S1 wrote it as a crotchet when he copied the bass and ’cello part-books (ex. 50). Since there is no intermediate source in which Jennens could have made this...
correction, it must be S1’s own. The copyist did not, however, make the same correction in the score.

Bassoon part-book

There is no bassoon part-book for Joshua: Jennens had the part-books of Joshua bound with those of Judas Maccabaeus and Alexander Balus, and the bassoon volume contains part-books only for these two oratorios. The soprano II volume also contains part-books only for Judas Maccabaeus and Alexander Balus. This must be because there is not a second solo soprano part in Joshua; although the sopranos divide in the Part III chorus ‘See, the conqu’ring Hero comes’, S1 wrote both parts in one part-book. It seems most likely, therefore, that S1 never copied a bassoon part-book for Joshua.

Trumpet/horn I part-book (v. 247)

Although S1 titled this part-book only “Tromba Prima”, it also contains the horn I part. When the two instruments have different music, S1 did not write two different staves: he wrote a single stave that sometimes contained the trumpet I line, and sometimes the horn I line. Four variants in the March show that the trumpet/horn I part-book cannot have been copied from the Aylesford score (exx. 51-4); since the other part-books were copied from the performing score, it is likely that this was too.

Trumpet/horn II part-book (v. 248)

Again, although S1 titled this part-book only “Tromba Seconda”, it also contains the horn II part; when the two instruments have different music, S1 adopted the same practice as in the trumpet/horn I part-book. Three variants of pitch reveal that the trumpet/horn II part-book, like the trumpet/horn I part-book, cannot have been copied from the Aylesford score (exx. 55-7); again, it is therefore likely that S1’s source was the performing score.
Timpani part-book (v. 353)

That the timpani part-book is derived from the performing score is all that can be said with confidence: it shares with the Aylesford score two errors that Smith made in the performing score (exx. 1 and 22).

Bizarrely, S1 omitted the accompanied recitative and chorus ‘Oh! thou bright Orb’ from the timpani part-book. Smith (presumably accidentally) omitted much of the timpani part of that number from the performing score: it disappears after the first note of b. 36. The Aylesford score has a second note in this bar, but thereafter it too has no music for the timpani in Part II (ex. 58). It is unclear why the whole chorus is missing from the timpani part-book.

Oboe/flute I part-book (v. 177)

Convincing evidence that the oboe/flute I part-book (henceforth referred to as the “oboe I part-book”) was not copied from the autograph score has already been given (exx. 2, 5, 15, and 16); it cannot have been copied from the Aylesford score either, as it does not contain three errors of pitch (exx. 27-8 and 59), three trills (exx. 31-2), a dotted rhythm (ex. 60), or an accidental (ex. 61) that are present in that score. It seems likely that the oboe I part-book was copied from the performing score (see ex. 60).

S1 could not have copied the oboe I part-book from the violin I part-book in those numbers in which the oboes play the same as the violins: not only do the oboes not always play throughout these numbers, but the oboe I part-book contains the whole of b. 4 in the air ‘Nations, who, in future Story’ (see fn. 10), whereas the violin I part-book lacks the first half of the bar. As usual, it is not obvious why numbers that Handel had indicated as being for violins only are given in the oboe part-books; in such numbers S1 treated the oboes as tutti instruments.

Oboe/flute II part-book (v. 178)

Convincing evidence that the oboe/flute II part-book (henceforth referred to as the “oboe II part-book”) was not copied from the autograph score has already been given (exx. 4, 5, and 11), as has evidence that it was not copied from the Aylesford score (exx. 31-2, and 60). It seems likely that the oboe I part-book was copied from the performing score (see ex. 60).
It is unclear whether S1 used the oboe I part-book as his source in numbers in which the oboes both double violin I as tutti instruments. He might have used it at least as a template: although the oboes have separate parts in the chorus ‘Almighty Ruler’ (HG105), both lack the Andante marking that is present in the autograph and performing scores, and in most other part-books.\footnote{This seems more likely than the other possibility: that S1 was copying from the Aylesford score at this point.}

The filiation of the Aylesford score and instrumental part-books is therefore as follows:

\[\text{Autograph score} \rightarrow \text{Performing score} \rightarrow \text{Aylesford score}\]

\[\text{Oboe I} \rightarrow \text{Violin I} \quad \text{Oboe II} \rightarrow \text{Violin II} \quad \text{Timpani} \rightarrow \text{Viola} \quad \text{Trumpet I} \rightarrow \text{‘Cello} \quad \text{Trumpet II} \]

\[\text{Vocal part-books}\]

**Soprano part-book (Achsah; v. 181)**

S1 must have copied the soprano part-book from the performing score: variants involving accidentals (ex. 15), underlay (ex. 17), verbal text (exx. 62-3), articulation (ex. 64), and rhythm (ex. 65) show that it was not copied from the autograph score; and three errors of pitch (exx. 66-8), one of verbal text (ex. 69), and a tempo marking\footnote{The soprano part-book shares with the other vocal part-books the Andante marking for the chorus ‘Almighty Ruler’ (HG105) that is present in the autograph and performing scores but not in the Aylesford score.} indicate that it was not copied from the Aylesford score. There is no compelling positive proof that the soprano part-book was copied from the performing score, although a variant involving articulation may be taken as evidence (ex. 70).
Alto part-book (Othniel; v. 183)

S1 titled this part-book “Part of Othniel” and wrote his music in C3, even though it is written in C1 in the autograph, performing, and Aylesford scores. (See the alto part-book of Alexander Balus, where he did the same.)

Again it is likely that the alto part-book was copied from the performing score: three errors of pitch (exx. 3, 47, and 71), a variant of verbal text (ex. 62), a copying error (ex. 21), and a variant of text (see the second variant in fn. 7) prove that it was not copied from the autograph score, and an error of pitch (ex. 72), a wrong word,\(^\text{14}\) and a variant of verbal text (ex. 69) prove that it was not copied from the Aylesford score. Positive evidence that the alto part-book was indeed copied from the performing score is suggested by a peculiar sharp in the part-book, which could be the result of ambiguity in the performing score (ex. 73).

Tenor I part-book (Joshua; v. 184)

The tenor I part-book was certainly not copied from the autograph score: it shares with the performing and Aylesford scores an error of pitch (ex. 10), a bizarre figuring (ex. 23), the reading “what Joy this Day imparts” (see the last sentence of fn. 7), and a variant of verbal text (ex. 62). A tempo marking (see fn. 13), a wrong word (fn. 14), and a variant of underlay (ex. 69) suggest that it was not copied from the Aylesford score, as does the fact that, although the Aylesford score is the only score not to indicate that the tenor line at b. 47 of the chorus ‘Glory to God’ (HG84/1/3) is a solo, the tenor I part-book is marked “solo” at that point. However, three variants seem to suggest the opposite. The first is S1’s omission of a figuring in the Aylesford score and in the tenor I part-book (ex. 74); this can easily be explained either as a coincidence, or as S1’s deciding that the figuring was unnecessary. The second relates to underlay (ex. 75), and could again be an oversight on S1’s part. The third, a variant of pitch (ex. 76) is more puzzling; perhaps S1 momentarily changed his source from the performing score to the Aylesford score.

Tenor II part-book (Angel; v. 186)

The only music in the tenor II part-book is the Angel’s recitative and accompanied recitative in Part I. It was probably also copied from the performing score; it was certainly not

\(^{14}\) The alto and tenor I part-books also give the correct word (“listning”) at b. 19 of the accompanied recitative and chorus ‘Oh! thou bright Orb’ (HG147/1/3), unlike the Aylesford score, which gives “listing”.


copied from the Aylesford score, which has an error of pitch that is not present in the part-book (ex. 77).

**Bass part-book (Caleb; v. 185)**

Unfortunately there are no variants unique to the performing score and the bass part-book. However, the performing score was probably S1’s source: three variants of pitch (exx. 7, 9, and 12), one of rhythm (ex. 13), one variant of verbal text (ex. 62), and two variants of spelling (see fn. 6) prove that he did not use the autograph score; and a tempo marking (see fn. 13), one variants of verbal text (ex. 69), a spelling,\(^ {15} \) and a slur (ex. 78) suggest that he did not use the Aylesford score.

The filiation of the vocal part-books is therefore as follows:

\[
\text{Autograph score} \downarrow \\
\text{Performing score} \quad \text{Soprano} \\
\text{Bass} \text{ Tenor II} \text{ Alto} \text{ Tenor I}
\]

**Parts I and III**

It would be extremely unlikely for the filiation of Part II to differ from that of Parts I and III. Although the volumes of the performing score containing these Parts are lost, the variants suggest that the filiation is indeed the same: there are 35 occasions on which the Aylesford score gives an incorrect reading but the part-books do not, and 34 occasions on which the Aylesford score and part-books all contain readings that cannot have originated in the autograph score. These variants make sense only if S1 copied all the Aylesford manuscripts from a score that had been copied from the autograph score; as the performing score was his source for Part II, it is highly unlikely that this intermediate score was anything

\(^{15}\) In b. 2 of the recitative ‘Thus far our Cause’ (HG145/2/2), the bass part-book, like the autograph and performing scores, reads “favour’d”, whereas the Aylesford score reads “favor’d”.
but the performing score. Therefore the Aylesford manuscripts of *Joshua* could be used in conjunction with other sources to reconstruct the contents of the two lost volumes of the performing score:¹⁶ as the Aylesford score and part-books are only siblings, any reading given in both the score and the part-books must also be present in the performing score.

**Timing**

The paper characteristics of the Aylesford copies and the fact that some of the errors that are present in all of the Aylesford sources are fairly catastrophic suggest that S1 copied these manuscripts from the performing score at a very early stage – possibly before the first rehearsals. This, combined with the fact that the Walsh print of *Joshua* does not contain choruses or recitatives, means that the Aylesford manuscripts – with their potential to reconstruct the missing Parts of the performing score – would be useful sources in a modern critical edition of the oratorio.

---

¹⁶ The Shaftesbury score of *Joshua* (GB-Lfom: acc. no. 582) is another source that could be used in this way, as it too was derived from the performing score. It cannot, however, have been the source for the Aylesford copies.
11 Solomon, Susanna, Theodora, and Jephtha

For none of these four late oratorios did Jennens have part-books copied. All four have been published in reliable editions by the HHA, so only brief comments are needed here.

**Solomon**

Jennens owned a manuscript score of *Solomon* in three volumes, copied by S6,¹ and a Walsh print.² According to Hans Dieter Clausen, S6 copied Jennens’s manuscript score from the performing score.³ Jennens made a few corrections to the verbal text of the score; these mostly involve spelling.

**Susanna**

Jennens owned a manuscript score of *Susanna*,⁴ copied by S5, and a Walsh print.⁵ According to Bernard Rose, S5 copied Jennens’s score from the performing score.⁶

**Theodora**

Jennens owned a manuscript score of *Theodora*,⁷ copied by Smith, and a Walsh print.⁸ Colin Timms has shown that Smith copied Jennens’s manuscript score from the autograph score at the same time as he copied the performing score; he notes that “Comparison of the sources leads to the conclusion that some parts of [the Aylesford score] were copied after [the performing score], and others before, and that Smith worked on both manuscripts simultaneously. Neither of them can be seen as earlier than the other. Both are closely related to [the autograph score], and since [the performing score] must have been completed before the first performance, the same is probably true of [the Aylesford score].”⁹

Jennens’s amendments to this score relate mostly to the verbal text; none is particularly interesting, and most involve spelling.

---

¹ Part I is now in the British Library (RM 18. b. 15), and Parts II and III are in the Manchester Central Library (MS 130 Hd4 vv. 310-11). The latter two parts are listed twice in the Sotheby’s catalogue: in lots 244 and 258; Part I is not listed at all.
² Lot 236 of the Sotheby’s sale.
³ Hans Dieter Clausen (ed.), *Solomon* (Kassel, 2014), ii, p. 495.
⁴ GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 vv. 315 (Part I) and 316 (Parts II-III); lot 240 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale.
⁵ This was bound with his printed edition of *Solomon* (lot 236 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale, see fn. 2).
⁷ GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 349; lot 240 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale.
⁸ Lot 238 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale.
Jephtha

Jennens owned one manuscript score of *Jephtha*, copied by Smith, and two printed editions. Kenneth Nott states that Smith copied Jennens’s manuscript score from the performing score, probably in 1752. Jennens’s amendments to the verbal text in this manuscript are typical: most involve the correction of spelling, and one amendment relates to the sense of a repeated text.

---

10 GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 150; lot 240 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale.
11 A Walsh print (lot 227 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale), and a Randall & Abell print (lot 248 of the 1918 Sotheby’s sale).
12 Kenneth Nott (ed.), *Jephtha* (Kassel, 2009), p. 311. Nott’s dating of this manuscript is based on both the watermark and the contents.
13 These include changing “Powr” to “pour” and “unheaded” to “unheeded” in the air ‘Pour forth no more unheeded Pray’rs’ (HHA11). Nott notes that “Powr” is the spelling found in both the autograph and performing scores (*Jephtha*, p. 315).
14 In Iphis’s first line of the B section of the duet ‘These Labours past’ (bb. 139–44, HG56/2/1-5 / HHA/54), Jennens’s score originally gave the words “when gath’ring Fruit from Conquest’s Tree, we deck the Feast of Love, we deck the Feast of Love, we deck of Love”; Jennens altered the final two words to “the Feast”, thus making sense of the line.
The previous chapters have revealed that a variety of approaches were taken in copying Jennens’s manuscripts of Handel’s sacred oratorios from Saul to Jephtha. They were copied by different scribes: S1, S2, S5, S6, and Smith; they were copied from different sources: from autograph scores, from performing scores, from other scores which were presumably in the possession of Smith at the time, and from scores within Jennens’s collection, many of which are now lost; and when part-books were copied, they were not always copied from the score that they were made to accompany.

Although this may appear chaotic at first glance, it is possible to discern patterns in what the scribes did or did not copy. S1 and S2 tended to copy part-books: the sacred oratorios for which Jennens did not own part-books were copied by S5, S6, and Smith. Moreover, although S1 and S2 both copied part-books, they did not copy them in the same way. S1 never copied keyboard part-books, whereas S2 usually did;¹ S1 never copied 'cello II part-books, whereas S2 usually did;² S1 never copied bassoon II part-books, whereas S2 usually did;³ S1 included semplice recitatives in his 'cello part-books, whereas S2 did not;⁴ and S1 always wrote soprano, alto, and tenor lines in C1, C3, and C4 clefs respectively, whereas S2, when copying part-books, wrote the soprano, alto, and tenor lines in G2 clef.⁵ These patterns are striking in three ways. The first relates to the exceptions: among his oratorio sets, S2’s copies of L’Allegro, Saul, and Samson are the only ones that contain only a single 'cello part-book; his copies of L’Allegro are different from his other oratorio copies in two respects: in the lack of keyboard part-book, and in the clefs used in the score; and his copies of Saul and Samson are the same as each other yet different from his other oratorio sets in their lack of bassoon II part-books. The second striking element of the patterns is the almost complete lack of overlap in the practices of S1 and S2. Finally, S2’s use of G2 clefs, rather than C clefs, for the vocal lines in his part-books is interesting; although one would expect professional musicians to have been able to read C clefs, it seems that amateur musicians were not expected to, which is presumably why G2 clefs are so common in the vocal lines of Walsh prints. S2’s copies therefore seem to fit the needs of their owner better

¹ The exception to this among the oratorios is L’Allegro; the only operas for which S2 did not copy keyboard part-books are Atalanta and Deidamia. This will be considered below.
² The exceptions to this are L’Allegro, Saul, and Samson.
³ The exceptions to this are the Saul and Samson sets, for which single bassoon part-books contain both bassoon parts.
⁴ This may account for the fact that S1’s 'cello part-books tend to be oblong in format (the exceptions are his 'cello part-books for Israel in Egypt and Belshazzar), whereas S2’s are upright.
⁵ Although S2 normally used C1, C3, and C4 clefs when copying soprano, alto, and tenor lines in scores, he used G2 clefs in his score of L’Allegro, and a mixture in his score of Alexander’s Feast.
than S1’s did: it is certainly possible that S2 used these clefs at the request of Jennens; it could follow, then, that the other ways in which S2’s copies differed from S1’s had also been requested by Jennens; and hence that S1 simply adopted the usual practice of the Smith scriptorium in preparing part-books, and adapted it to what he assumed to be the needs of Jennens.

Why then did S1 and S2 take such different approaches to copying for Jennens? It is difficult to imagine that they would not have taken a united approach if they were working together: their differences in approach make much more sense if one of them took over from the other. But if that happened, why is it not the case that the earlier oratorios were copied by one of them, and the later oratorios by another? The situation begins to make sense only when two factors are taken into account: the paper characteristics of the manuscripts, and Jennens’s Handel collection as a whole. Incorporating these factors would have been impossible without the research of a number of scholars, principally Donald Burrows, who was extremely generous in showing me his work on the physical characteristics and copyists of the Jennens manuscripts held in the Manchester Central Library. This chapter is built upon that research. Other work by Burrows has been indispensable in writing this chapter: his work on the paper characteristics of the autograph scores (in collaboration with Martha J. Ronish), and on the rastra measurements of the performing scores, which I have used in conjunction with Hans Dieter Clausen’s work on those scores. I also draw upon John Roberts’s research on the Aylesford collection, which has been an important source of information throughout this dissertation.

Using Burrows’s research on the paper characteristics, Roberts traces the development of the Aylesford collection, writing that “It was probably around 1728 that Jennens began collecting Handel manuscripts”, and continuing: “At first his aims as a collector seem to have been relatively modest. […] He was always a faithful buyer of the published editions […], and many of the early manuscripts of opera excerpts copied for him were obviously designed to fill gaps in the printed scores or compensate for their other deficiencies, not to replace them”. Roberts goes on to describe how “sometime in the early to mid-1740s Jennens decided to embark on a far more ambitious project: a sort of complete edition of Handel’s music, for the most part necessarily in manuscript form”. He also notes that,
whereas Jennens’s oratorio sets tend to include everything that is necessary for performance, the opera sets lack the overtures, most of the *semplice* recitatives, and part-books for singers.\textsuperscript{14} Roberts ends his narrative by noting that it appears that Jennens’s collection was never finished: there are no part-books for *Semele* or for any of the oratorios after *Solomon*; and many of the sets do not contain keyboard part-books.\textsuperscript{15} In writing this account of the development of Jennens’s collection, Roberts lacked crucial information: he was not aware that the bulk of the copying – that which took place in the 1740s – was not carried out only by S2. Adding S1, S5, S6, and Smith into the picture clarifies the events of the 1740s, not least since it becomes clear that most of the oratorio sets lack keyboard parts not because S2 never completed them, but because it was not S1’s practice to copy them. Most revealing is the fact that there is barely any overlap between the physical characteristics of the copies made by S1 and S2.\textsuperscript{16} It is clear that one took over from the other.

The aim of this chapter is to flesh out Roberts’s narrative by incorporating new information, thereby gaining a deeper understanding of the development of Jennens’s collection. Achieving this involves piecing together a multi-dimensional jigsaw puzzle, in which the evidence I use is of various types: the physical characteristics of the manuscripts, as identified by Burrows; the scribes who copied them (also identified by Burrows); the physical characteristics of the autograph and performing scores;\textsuperscript{17} the dates of composition and performance of Handel’s oratorios; and the evidence that I have gathered during the course of the previous chapters, which relates to letters, to Jennens’s amendments to his copies, and to the filiation and contents of a number of the manuscripts.

What follows does not take into account the whole collection: such a comprehensive study would be beyond the scope of this dissertation, not only because I have looked in detail at only a relatively small portion of Jennens’s huge collection, but also because I have details of the physical characteristics only of those Jennens manuscripts that are owned by the Manchester Central Library – indeed, not all of those hundreds of manuscripts are taken into consideration. In keeping with the subject of this dissertation, I focus on the copying of the bulk of the collection, which began in the 1740s with S2, and continued with S1; within this, I focus on the oratorios. I initially chose to order this discussion by the watermarks used, and

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 42. Roberts writes that “This distinction probably reflects Jennens’s assumption, reasonable enough in the late 1740s, that while he might someday have occasion to sponsor the performance of a whole oratorio, he would never be called upon to supply more than excerpts from the operas. He would not have needed manuscript parts for the opera overtures because of the comprehensive collections published by Walsh.”

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., pp. 42-3.

\textsuperscript{16} What little overlap there is will be considered below.

\textsuperscript{17} As stated above, I have compiled this information from Burrows and Ronish, *A Catalogue*, Clausen, *Händels Direktionspartituren*, and Burrows, ‘Rastra Types in Handel’s Conducting Scores’.
within that ordering, by the rastra measurements present. However, since the paper types used by the scribes in this period of copying for Jennens tend not to overlap, I have grouped the watermarks by scribes; in cases where the paper types overlap, the significance of this fact is discussed along the way. Although the dates of S2’s copying on particular paper may not coincide exactly with Handel’s and Smith’s use of the same paper in the autograph and performing scores, it seems fair to make two assumptions: first, that the paper within the Aylesford collection follows the same basic chronology as that found in the autograph and performing scores (e.g. that S2’s copies on paper bearing the watermark C80 are likely to have been copied earlier than those he copied on paper bearing the watermark C110); second, that the Aylesford manuscripts are likely to have been copied around the same time as the autograph and performing scores that contain similar papers. Although I discuss the Jennens manuscripts according to watermark, they are considered to share paper characteristics with the autograph and performing scores only if both the watermark and the rastra measurements match. Naturally this usually occurs when the Jennens manuscript in question is oblong in format: the upright instrumental part-books tend not to have exact counterparts in the autograph and performing scores; presumably they shared precise paper characteristics with the part-books that Handel used in performance (now lost). However, manuscripts sharing watermarks but not rastra measurements are still considered as being likely to originate around the same time. Finally, it is of course the case that the watermarks of manuscripts in Jennens’s collection overlap within single manuscripts as well as within sets: some caution has also been exercised in this respect.

S2

As Roberts states, Jennens had begun collecting Handel manuscripts in the late 1720s, but at that point his aims as a collector were far from comprehensive: it was not until the 1740s that he embarked on the “ambitious project” of owning scores and part-books of everything that Handel had written. Although S2 was responsible for copying a few manuscripts for Jennens on paper bearing watermarks associated with the late 1720s and the 1730s, it is clear that his copying for Jennens began in earnest on paper bearing the watermark C80 (Cf).

---

18 For an explanation of the watermarks and rastra measurements referred to, see Burrows and Ronish, *A Catalogue*, pp. xxvii-xxxi, 325, and 329-30.
C80 (Cf)

The watermark C80 occurs in autograph and performing scores dated around 1740-4. It is the earliest watermark that appears in a substantial number of S2’s manuscripts: it was on this paper that he began to copy the bulk of Jennens’s collection.

S2 seems to have begun this task by copying sets of instrumental part-books for the operas. Six of these sets were copied using paper bearing the watermark C80; although the six operas in question would not appear adjacent to each other in a chronological list of Handel’s operas, they were all composed within a six-year period. This could be a coincidence, but it is possible that Jennens had provided S2 with a list of the operas for which he required part-books. S2 copied only two opera scores using paper bearing the watermark C80: Ezio and Tamerlano. C80 also occurs in the harpsichord part-book for Amadigi, together with the watermark C90. The only variation in rastra measurements within the C80 opera part-books relates to the format of the manuscripts.

It is worth noting that by this stage of S2’s copying, Jennens either had begun, or was beginning, his editorial activities relating to the oratorios: in 1740, S1 had copied Score A of L’Allegro; and by 1741, Jennens had borrowed the autograph score of that oratorio and annotated his score of it.  

C90 (Ch)

The watermark C90 occurs in autograph and performing scores dated around 1744-6. It is found in two of S2’s opera scores (Rodelinda and Atalanta), and in most of his opera part-books: in all of the part-books for operas from Tamerlano onwards that S2 had not yet

---

19 It appears in autograph scores dated 1740-43 (Burrows and Ronish, A Catalogue, p. 331), and in performing scores dated 1741-44 (Clausen, Händels Direktionspartituren, p. 250).
20 They are: Admeto (1726), Siroe (1728), Tolomeo (1728), Ezio (1731), Sosarme (1732), Orlando (1732). In most cases, it is clear to which manuscript I am referring because there is only one copy in the collection: these shelf-marks are given in Arthur D. Walker, George Frideric Handel: The Newman Flower Collection: A Catalogue (Manchester, 1972). In the rare cases where there are two copies, I specify the relevant shelf-mark. In copying these operas, S2 was copying works that had been composed many years earlier; the questions of (a) which versions of these works his copies contained, and (b) which sources he used is addressed in Winton Dean and John Merrill Knapp, Handel’s Operas 1704–1726 (Oxford, 1987), in Winton Dean, Handel’s Operas 1726–1741 (Suffolk, 2006), and in the relevant HHA volumes.  
21 The score of Ezio also contains other watermarks including C40 (Cd), and the score of Tamerlano also contains B140; this may suggest that S2 copied these before he copied the part-books.
22 The harpsichord part-books are all oblong, with the rastra measurement @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’; this measurement, in combination with the watermark C80, occurs in the autograph scores of Joseph (GB-Lbl: RM 20. c. 10) and Semele (GB-Lbl: RM 20. f. 7, and RM 20. c. 2, ff. 42-3), and in the performing scores of the same oratorios (D-Hs: M A/1025 (Joseph) and D-Hs: M A/1050 (Semele)). The violin I, violin II, oboe I, oboe II, viola, and ‘cello part-books are upright, with the rastra measurement @ 4 72.5; this combination of watermark and rastra measurement does not appear in any autograph or performing score.
23 See pp. 60-61.
24 It appears in autograph scores dated 1743-7 (Burrows and Ronish, A Catalogue, p. 331), and in performing scores dated c. 1744-6 (Clausen, Händels Direktionspartituren, p. 250).
copied,\textsuperscript{25} in those for \textit{Amadigi} (1715), those for \textit{Muzio Scevola} (1721), and in the violin I and II part-books for \textit{Radamisto} (1720). Again, most of these manuscripts contain the same rastra measurements, depending on their format.\textsuperscript{26}

S2’s C90 manuscripts are not limited to operas: it is at this point that he began to copy other items. Those of relevance to this study are: Score B of \textit{L’Allegro}, the part-books for \textit{L’Allegro}, the part-books for \textit{Saul}, the harpsichord part-book for \textit{Songs in Saul}, the part-books for \textit{Samson}, and the score of \textit{Messiah}. On the whole, these share rastra measurements with the C90 opera part-books.\textsuperscript{27} Given that S2’s copies of \textit{L’Allegro}, \textit{Saul}, and \textit{Samson} differ from his other oratorio copies in their content,\textsuperscript{28} it is not surprising that these are among his earliest copies of non-opera items. It is also interesting to note that S2 made these copies of \textit{L’Allegro}, \textit{Saul}, and \textit{Samson} using scores that Jennens had already annotated (see the chapters on those oratorios).

Although one must always be cautious in using paper characteristics to determine a precise dating for manuscripts, the date of 1744-6 is possible for S2’s copying onto paper bearing this watermark. We know that Jennens had annotated his Score A of \textit{L’Allegro} in 1740,\textsuperscript{29} he is likely to have annotated his red-morocco score of \textit{Samson} by 1743,\textsuperscript{30} and he is

\textsuperscript{25} These are: \textit{Tamerlano} (1724), \textit{Rodelinda} (1725), \textit{Scipione} (1726), \textit{Alessandro} (1726), \textit{Riccardo Primo} (1727), \textit{Lotario} (1729), \textit{Partenope} (1730), \textit{Poro} (1731), \textit{Arianna in Creta} (1733), \textit{Ariodante} (1734), \textit{Alcina} (1735), \textit{Atalanta} (1736), \textit{Giustino} (1736), \textit{Arminio} (1736), \textit{Beronice} (1737), \textit{Faramondo} (1737), \textit{Sera} (1738), \textit{Imeneo} (1740), and \textit{Deidamia} (1740).

\textsuperscript{26} Almost all of S2’s C90 oblong opera manuscripts – the harpsichord part-books and the \textit{Atalanta} score – were copied on paper containing the rastra measurement @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’. This combination of watermark and rastra measurement appears in a number of autograph scores (including \textit{Semele} (GB-Lbl: RM 20. e. 7), \textit{Hercules} (GB-Lbl: RM 20. e. 8 and GB-Cfm: MU MS 263, f. 79), \textit{Belshazzar} (GB-Lbl: RM 20. d. 10), and \textit{Judas Maccabaeus} (GB-Lbl: RM 20. e. 12)), and in the performing scores of \textit{Hercules} (D-Hs: M A/1021) and \textit{Belshazzar} (D-Hs: M A/1009). S2’s copy of \textit{Rodelinda} has a slightly different rastra measurement: @ 5 90(+) to 90.5, Type ‘A1’; and the harpsichord part-book for \textit{Riccardo Primo} combines the rastra measurements @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’ and @ 5 88.5. The upright part-books mostly contain the rastra measurement @ 4 72.5 to 73, although a few contain the measurement @ 4 70.5 to 71 (these are all the upright part-books for \textit{Arianna in Creta} and segments of the violin I, violin II (GB-Mp: MS 130 H4v. v. 53), viola, and \textit{cello} part-books for \textit{Ariodante}); even fewer contain the measurement @ 4 75.5 (these are the violin I part-book for \textit{Radamisto}, which also contains the watermark C110 (Ci); the timpani part-book for \textit{Rinaldo}, for which the other part-books have the watermark C110 (Ci); and the \textit{Giustino} viola and \textit{cello} part-books, which are mostly @ 4 72.5).

\textsuperscript{27} The rastra measurement @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’, which is present in many of the oblong opera manuscripts, is also present in the harpsichord and vocal part-books for \textit{Samson}, the harpsichord, carillon, and vocal part-books for \textit{Saul}, the harpsichord part-book for \textit{Songs in Saul}, the score of \textit{Messiah}, and Score B of \textit{L’Allegro}. However, Score B of \textit{L’Allegro} also contains the rastra measurement @ 5 88, which also occurs in the vocal part-books for \textit{L’Allegro}. Just as in the upright opera part-books, the measurement @ 4 72.5 to 73 is the most common among the non-opera part-books: it appears in the violin I, violin II, viola, \textit{cello}, bassoon I, and bassoon II part-books for \textit{L’Allegro}, and in the instrumental part-books for \textit{Samson}, for \textit{Saul}, and for \textit{Songs in Saul}. And, again, a few of the part-books contain the measurement @ 4 70.5 to 71 (these are the viola, \textit{cello}, and \textit{oboe} II part-books for \textit{L’Allegro}).

\textsuperscript{28} As described earlier, Score B of \textit{L’Allegro} is the only one of S2’s scores in which he wrote the soprano, alto, and tenor lines in G2 clefs; the set of part-books for \textit{L’Allegro} is the only one of S2’s sets of oratorio part-books that lacks a keyboard part-book; the sets of part-books for \textit{L’Allegro, Saul}, and \textit{Samson} are the only oratorio sets copied by S2 that lack \textit{cello} II part-books; and the sets of part-books for \textit{Saul} and \textit{Samson} are the only sets copied by S2 that have both bassoon parts written in one part-book. Interestingly, among S2’s sets of part-books, \textit{L’Allegro} is unusual but not alone in lacking a keyboard part-book: his sets for \textit{Atalanta} and \textit{Deidamia} also lack them; and many of the upright volumes in these three sets are copied on identical paper (C90 with the rastra measurement @ 4 72.5 to 73).

\textsuperscript{29} See fn. 23.

\textsuperscript{30} Some of his amendments to the verbal text appear in another score dated to that year: the Hunter score (GB-Ckc: Mann MS 400). It was Burrows who first noted that this score contains a few of Jennens’s amendments (Burrows, ‘Something Necessary to the Connection’, p. 3). According to Clausen, its musical text was derived from both the autograph and performing scores, so it is only the verbal text that was derived from something within Jennens’s collection. He speculates that this was a lost wordbook, annotated by Jennens (Clausen (ed.), \textit{Samson}, ii, p. 442).
extremely unlikely to have annotated his red-morocco score of Saul after mid-1744: S2 would certainly have been able to use these annotated scores as sources by 1744. Furthermore, Burrows’s work on the score of Messiah has revealed that S2 must have copied it before Handel’s 1745 revisions to the oratorio were available or even composed: S2 added those revisions to the score at a later date, using paper bearing the watermark Cn.

Among S2’s copies, the watermark C90 overlaps with two later watermarks: C110 (Ci) and Cn. C110 is found, along with C90, in the Rodelinda score, in the Rodrigo harpsichord part-book, and in the Radamisto violin I and II part-books. The watermarks C90 and C110 are also combined in one manuscript that has not yet been mentioned: the violin II part-book for Songs in Joseph. The sets of part-books for Radamisto and Songs in Joseph are similar not only in the watermarks and rastra measurements of their violin part-books but also in the fact that the remaining part-books in the sets have different watermarks: the other Songs in Joseph manuscripts bear the watermark C110, and the other Radamisto part-books bear the watermark Cn. The final overlap between the watermarks C90 and Cn relates to Saul: whereas the part-books bear the watermark C90, the score (GB-Mp: MS 130 Hv4 vv. 269-71) bears the watermark Cn. There is so much overlap between the watermarks C110 and Cn in S2’s copies that the two watermarks are considered together.

C110 (Ci) and Cn

The watermark C110 occurs in autograph and performing scores dated around 1745-7, whereas the watermark Cn occurs only in the performing score of Theodora.

---

31 In the summer of 1744, Jennens was busy writing the libretto of Belshazzar, at which point he was still defining scenes according to the operatic system. He did not decide that the scenes in oratorio libretti should be defined according to the English theatre system until after Handel had begun composing Belshazzar. The scenes in Jennens’s version of Saul are still defined according to the operatic system: see, for example, Jennens’s Part II, scene iii, which begins with a recitative between Saul and Jonathan (‘Hast thou obey’d’ (HGi132)). This recitative heralded a new scene in the oratorio as it was first performed by Handel, because David leaves and Saul enters just before it; it is probably for a similar reason that it heralds a new scene in Jennens’s version of the oratorio, as Saul is not present during the air that precedes it there (Jonathan’s air ‘Author of Peace’ (see p. 11 for an explanation as to why Jonathan is singing this air at this point in Jennens’s version.).
33 The overlap between C90 and C150 (Co) in some of the Alcina part-books is discussed below (see fn. 59).
34 As noted in fn. 26, this score is the only one of the C90 oblong manuscripts to bear the watermark @ 5 90(+) to 90.5, Type ‘A1’.
35 As noted in fn. 26, this part-book shares with most of the C90 oblong manuscripts the watermark @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’. The other part-books for Rodrigo were copied on paper bearing the watermark C110.
36 The Radamisto violin II part-book and the Songs in Saul violin I part-book contain the usual rastra measurements for upright manuscripts bearing the watermark C90: @ 4 72.5 to 73. On the other hand, the Radamisto violin I part-book and the Songs in Saul violin II part-book are relatively unusual among the C90 upright manuscripts, containing the rastra measurement @ 4 75.5; this rastra measurement, however, is common among the C110 upright manuscripts.
37 It appears in autograph scores dated 1745-7 (Burrows and Ronish, A Catalogue, p. 331), and in the 1745 insertions in the performing score of Belshazzar (Clausen, Händels Direktionspartituren, pp. 121-2 and 250).
38 Clausen, Händels Direktionspartituren, p. 250. Regarding the fact that Cn appears only in the performing score of Theodora, Burrows has written, “In view, however, of the terminal dates of the five-stave, 90 mm. rastra (1743-8), it would appear that S2 had access to Cn paper at a somewhat earlier date” (‘The Autographs and Early Copies of Messiah’., fn. 38).
S2’s copying of the opera part-books continued and concluded on paper bearing these two watermarks. Having copied the later operas using paper bearing the watermark C90, all that remained were the earlier operas, most of which contain both C110 and Cn, overlapping slightly with C90.\(^{39}\) S2 also copied more opera scores; again, these contain a mixture of C110 and Cn.\(^{40}\) There is little variation in rastra measurements among these manuscripts, and no correlation between watermark and rastra measurement.\(^{41}\)

It was at this point that S2 copied the score of *Saul* (GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 vv. 269-71), Score B of *Joseph*, the part-books for *Joseph*, the part-books for *Songs in Joseph*, and the score and part-books for *Judas Maccabaeus*;\(^{42}\) he also updated the score of *Messiah* so that it included the 1745 alterations. Again, although one must exercise caution in using paper characteristics to pinpoint an exact dating for manuscripts, it is plausible that S2 was copying onto this paper around 1746-7. *Judas Maccabaeus* is the latest work that S2 copied; given its date of composition, he could not have copied it earlier than late 1746.\(^{43}\) Furthermore, S2 could not have copied Score B and the part-books of *Joseph* much earlier than 1746:

Jennens’s activities in 1744 and his scene divisions in his own version of *Joseph* mean that he

---

39 These are Rodrigo (1707), Agrippina (1709), Rinaldo (1711), Il Pastor Fido (1712), Teseo (1712), Silla (1713), Radamisto (1720), Floridante (1721), Ottone (1722), Flavio (1723), and Giulio Cesare (1724). Of these, only the set of part-books for Agrippina is not mixed, containing only C110. The overlap with C90 has already been mentioned: the harpsichord part-book for Rodrigo and the violin I and II part-books for Radamisto all contain both C90 and C110, and the timpani part-book for Rinaldo is the only part-book in that set to be copied on paper bearing the watermark C90, rather than C110.

40 There is a pattern in the watermarks of the opera scores: as was previously noted, the score of Rodelinda (1725) contains both C90 and C110; the scores of Scipione (1726) and Riccardo Primo (1727) contain only C110; the scores of Tolomeo (1728), Partenope (1730), and Poro (1731) contain both C110 and Cn; and the scores of Lotario (1729), Giustino (1736), Arminio (1736), Faramondo (1737), Serse (1738), and Imeneo (1740) contain only Cn. S2 therefore appears to have copied these scores in chronological order of composition, moving from C90, to C110, to Cn.

41 Among these manuscripts, all that are upright in format contain the measurement @ 4 75.5, regardless of their watermark. The oblong manuscripts contain one of two rastra measurements: @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’, or @ 5 90(+) to 90.5, Type ‘A1’. The rastra measurement @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’ – present with C110 in a few autographs, including a 1745 insertion into the performing score of Hercules (D-Hs: M A/1021), and with C90 in a number of autograph and performing scores listed in fn. 26 – is found in a manuscript bearing the watermarks C90 and C110 (the harpsichord part-book for Rodrigo); in manuscripts bearing only the watermark C110 (the harpsichord part-book for Agrippina and the scores of Riccardo Primo and Scipione); in manuscripts bearing the watermarks C110 and Cn (the harpsichord part-books for Flavio and Partenope, and the scores of Tolomeo, Partenope, and Poro); and in manuscripts bearing only the watermark Cn (the harpsichord part-books for Ottone and Giulio Cesare, and the scores of Lotario, Giustino, Faramondo, and Imeneo). The rastra measurement @ 5 90(+) to 90.5, Type ‘A1’ – present with C110 in the autograph scores of Alexander Balus (GB-Lb: RM 20. d. 3) and Joshua (GB-Lb: RM 20. c. 11) – is similarly found in manuscripts containing different watermarks: in a manuscript bearing the watermarks C90 and C110 (the score of Rodelinda); in a manuscript bearing only the watermark C110 (the harpsichord part-book for Rinaldo); in manuscripts bearing the watermarks C110 and Cn (the harpsichord part-books for Teseo and Silla); and in manuscripts bearing only the watermark Cn (the harpsichord part-books for Il Pastor Fido and Radamisto, and the scores of Arminio and Serse).

42 These manuscripts contain a mixture not only of the watermarks C110 and Cn, but also of the rastra measurements found in the C110 and Cn opera scores and part-books. Within the *Joseph* copies, the upright instrumental part-books are all C110 @ 4 75.5. The oblong *Joseph* manuscripts are all @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’, but with mixed watermarks: Score B and the soprano I part-book are both Cn, the soprano II, tenor I, and tenor II part-books contain both watermarks (C110 and Cn), and the alto, bass, and organ part-books are all C110 @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’. As previously mentioned, the violin I part-book for *Songs in Joseph* contains C90 and C110; however, like the viola and ‘cello part-book in the same set, it is @ 4 75.5. The harpsichord part-book for *Songs in Joseph* shares with the other part-books in the set the watermark C110, but, being oblong, has a different rastra measurement @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’). Within the *Judas Maccabaeus* copies, the upright part-books are all Cn @ 4 75.5; the score and the organ, soprano I, soprano II, and alto part-books are all Cn @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’; the soprano II and bass II part-books share the same rastra measurement, but contain the watermarks Cn and C140; and the tenor I and bass I part-books, which again share the same rastra measurement, are C140. The score of *Saul* (GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 vv. 269-71) is upright, with the watermark and rastra measurement Cn @ 4 75.5.

43 Handel composed *Judas Maccabaeus* in 1746, beginning it on 8 or 9 July and completing Part III on 11 August.
cannot have annotated the red-morocco score of *Joseph* earlier than 1745. Finally, it would have been impossible for S2 to have entered the 1745 alterations to *Messiah* into that score before 1745. It is interesting to note that most of the oratorios that S2 copied for Jennens were copied from scores within Jennens’s collection that their owner had annotated: the only exceptions are *Messiah* (which he copied from the performing score), and *Judas Maccabaeus*.

### S1

Although S1 had previously copied a few items for Jennens, it seems that his copying for this collection began in earnest after S2 had stopped: on the whole, the paper on which S1 copied for Jennens does not overlap with the paper that S2 had used. (The points at which it does overlap are considered below.)

**C120 (Ck), B160 (Bl), C130 (Cl), C140 (Cm), C150 (Co), and C160 (Cp, Cq)**

Most of S1’s copying for Jennens was on paper bearing watermarks later than S2’s. These watermarks have an overall date range of 1746-54 among the autograph and performing scores: C120 appears in 1746; B160 in 1746-8; C130 in 1746-9, C140 in 1748-51, C150 in 1746-50, and C160 in 1749-54. Whereas most of S2’s copying for Jennens is easily divisible according to paper type, S1’s is not: of the thirteen works that S1 copied onto paper bearing the watermarks in question, only five were written on paper bearing only one watermark. The table in Appendix 15 illustrates how these six watermarks are spread across S1’s copies of these thirteen works. There is clearly some pattern in the watermarks: all five of the works written on only one paper type were written on the latest of

---

44 See pp. 126-7 and 131-2.
46 C120 appears in autograph and performing scores dating only from 1746 (Burrows and Ronish, *A Catalogue*, p. 331, and Clausen, *Händels Direktionspartituren*, p. 250).
47 B160 appears in autograph scores dated 1746-7 (Burrows and Ronish, *A Catalogue*, p. 330), and in performing scores dated c. 1746-8 (Clausen, *Händels Direktionspartituren*, p. 249).
48 C130 appears in autograph scores dated 1746-9 (Burrows and Ronish, *A Catalogue*, p. 331), and in performing scores dated c. 1747-8 (Clausen, *Händels Direktionspartituren*, p. 250).
49 C140 appears in autograph scores dated 1748-9 and 1751 (Burrows and Ronish, *A Catalogue*, p. 331), and in performing scores dated c. 1748-50 (Clausen, *Händels Direktionspartituren*, p. 250).
50 C150 appears in autograph scores dated 1749-50 (Burrows and Ronish, *A Catalogue*, p. 331), and in two performing scores, one dated 1746, the other 1750 (Clausen, *Händels Direktionspartituren*, p. 250).
S1’s paper types: C160. It is difficult, however, to perceive much of a pattern in S1’s earlier watermarks, other than to note that much of this copying took place on paper bearing the watermarks C130, C140, and C150. This kind of overlap is not surprising, considering the dates of the autograph and performing scores in which these watermarks occur. The rastra measurements are not much more enlightening, although it is heartening that they confirm the evidence of the watermarks: they confirm that S1 copied the part-books for Belshazzar at a similar time to those for Israel in Egypt and Hercules; they reveal that his copies of Messiah, Joshua, and Esther are closely related, and that those three are related to his copies of Alexander Balus and Deborah; and they reveal how closely related the C160 copies of Deborah are to the copies of the five works that S1 wrote only on paper bearing the watermark C160.

Again, the paper characteristics match the contents of the manuscripts that S1 was copying: some of the variants in the score of Alexander Balus and in the score (GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 66) and part-books of Joshua seem to indicate that S1 may have copied Jennens’s manuscripts before the first rehearsals of those works took place; and the 1751 Additions to Belshazzar have an obvious terminus post quem.

The overlap between S2 and S1

The contents of the manuscripts copied by S2 and S1 suggest that the changeover from S2 to S1 occurred around 1746-8: as was noted above, S2 must have been copying at least until late 1746, probably 1747, because he copied Jennens’s score and part-books for Judas Maccabaeus; and S1 appears to have been copying around late 1747 or early 1748. This is
reflected in the overlaps in the paper types used by the two copyists. In copying the soprano II, tenor, bass I, and bass II part-books for Judas Maccabaeus, S2 used paper bearing the watermark C140 with the rastra measurement @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’, which was used by S1 in some of his copies of Esther, Messiah, and Joshua;

56 this overlap makes sense, given that Judas Maccabaeus is the latest work that S2 copied. Moreover, in copying some of the part-books for Belshazzar, S1 used paper bearing watermarks that are associated with S2 (C90 and C110), but his paper does not share rastra measurements with S2’s copies on paper bearing these watermarks; 57 again, this partial overlap makes sense, given that the rest of S1’s Belshazzar part-books are copied on C120, the earliest watermark that is associated with his copying of so much of Jennens’s collection. 58 Other partial overlaps in paper characteristics between the copies made by S2 and S1 are likely simply to be insignificant reflections of the untidiness of life. 59

56 S1’s copies containing the combination of the watermark C140 and the rastra measurement @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’ are: the soprano I, soprano II, alto I, alto II, tenor I, tenor II, bass I, and 'cello part-books for Esther; the 'cello part-book for Messiah (GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 145), which also contains the watermark C130; and the score (GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 66) and tenor part-book for Joshua. The soprano II and bass II part-books for Judas Maccabaeus also contain the watermark Cn, the usual watermark for the Judas Maccabaeus copies.

57 S1 copied the viola, bassoon, trumpet I, and trumpet II part-books for Belshazzar on paper bearing the watermark C90 (in addition to C120, in the case of the viola and bassoon part-books); but these upright volumes have the rastra measurement @ 2 31, which does not occur in S2’s C90 copies. S1 copied the violin I, violin II, oboe I, oboe II, soprano I, soprano II, alto I, alto II, tenor I, tenor II, and bass part-books for Belshazzar on paper bearing the watermark C110; but these volumes, which are a mixture of upright and oblong quartos, contain the same rastra measurement as his C90 manuscripts – @ 2 31 – which is not present in S2’s copies C110 copies. However, the soprano I part-book for Belshazzar also contains the rastra measurement @ 5 88, which occurs in the organ part-book for Alexander’s Feast (C110, copied by S2); presumably the organ part-book for Alexander’s Feast was one of the last manuscripts that S2 copyed for Jennens.

58 S1 could not have copied the part-books for Belshazzar much earlier than around 1747: between the composition of the oratorio and S1’s copying of the part-books, two tasks had to be completed: the copying of the red-morocco score of the oratorio, and Jennens’s amendments to it.

59 S1 copied a score of Rodrigo using paper bearing the watermarks C30 (Cc) and C80, and a copy of keyboard music bearing the watermark C80; these are both likely to have been one of the few items that S1 copied for Jennens during the first stage in the development of Jennens’s collection. S2 copied a few items that contain some of the watermarks normally associated with S1. B160 appears, along with C80, in S2’s copy of the 'cello part-book for Orlando; C80 is the usual watermark for S2’s part-books for Orlando, and this part-book shares their rastra measurement ( @ 4 72.5), which does not appear in S1’s B160 manuscripts. B160 also appears, along with B140 (Bk), in an S2 volume titled by Jennens as “A Collection of Old Lessons”; however, its rastra measurement – @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’ – does not appear in S1’s B160 manuscripts. C150 is another watermark that is usually associated with S1, but that appears also in a few S2 manuscripts: it appears with the rastra measurement @ 4 72.5 in the viola, 'cello, and oboe I part-books for Alcina, with the rastra measurement @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’ in the harpsichord part-book for Alcina (GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 19; this also contains C90), and with the rastra measurement @ 5 87.5 to 88 in a score of the Concerto Grosso, op. 3, n. 2 (which also contains C20 (Cb)). Both B160 and C150 are found as early as 1748 in the autograph and performing scores (see fn. 47 and 50); their appearance in these S2 manuscripts may mean that their dates could be extended even earlier. Likewise, the appearance of the watermark Cn in S1’s score and violin I, violin II, and viola part-books for the Organ Concerto op. 7, n. 2 is not of any significance, given not only the fact that their rastra measurements ( @ 5 90.5 to 91 for the score, and @ 2 28.5 for the part-books) do not appear in S2’s Cn manuscripts, but also that Cn appears as late as 1750 (in the performing score of Theodora).
The later additions to Jennens’s collection

As observed by Roberts, no part-books were copied for Handel’s works from Solomon onwards. Again, however, Roberts was lacking crucial information: Jennens’s scores of these works were all copied by scribes other than S2 and S1 – Solomon by S6, Susanna by S5, and The Choice of Hercules, Theodora, and Jephtha by Smith. As one would expect, these scores have rather late watermarks.60

The overlap between S1 and S6, S5, and Smith

S1’s copying overlaps with the copying of later works carried out by S6, S5, and Smith in two ways. The first concerns content. Colin Timms has proved that Smith copied the score of Theodora from the autograph score at the same time that he copied the performing score of that work.61 this must, therefore, have taken place between 31 July 1749 (when Handel completed the oratorio) and 16 March 1750 (when he first performed it). It is clear, however, that S1 was still copying around this time, since one of the sets of part-books he copied was the 1751 Additions to Belshazzar. The second way in which S1’s copying overlaps with the copying of later works carried out by S6, S5, and Smith relates to the score of Semele, which was copied jointly by S1 and S5. It is not difficult to imagine why this is the only major work before Solomon for which Jennens did not own part-books: given its subject matter and Jennens’s description of it as a “baudy opera”,62 he cannot have had any expectation of performing it at Gopsall. Presumably he owned a score of it in order to complete his collection of Handel’s music. Unfortunately, its paper characteristics give no indication as to its date of copying.63

60 Theodora is C160, Jephtha is C160, and The Choice of Hercules is a late C-type; and Solomon has the watermark F2a (Clausen (ed.), Solomon, ii, p. 495), which occurs in performing scores dating from 1755 onwards (Clausen, Händels Direktionspartituren, p. 251).
61 Timms (ed.), Theodora, p. xxvi.
63 The collaboration between S1 and S5 is not the only way in which Jennens’s score of Semele appears to straddle stages in the development of his collection: it also contains a mixture of watermarks that not only has a total range of 1728 to 1746 in the autograph and performing scores, but that also overlaps with paper characteristics more commonly found in S2’s copies, many of them early. The score contains a section bearing the watermark C30 (Cc) and the rastra measurement @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’; this watermark is associated with autograph scores dated 1728-40 (Burrows and Ronish, A Catalogue, p. 331), and performing scores dated 1728-39 (Clausen, Händels Direktionspartituren, p. 250); C30 appears in combination with the rastra measurement @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’ in Jennens’s score of Flavio, which was copied by S2. The Semele score also contains the watermark B140 (Bk), again in combination with the rastra measurement @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’. B140 appears in autograph and performing scores dated 1738-41 (Burrows and Ronish, A Catalogue, p. 330, and Clausen, Händels Direktionspartituren, p. 249); this combination also appears in a number of volumes copied by S2, including his scores of Floridante and Orlando. Finally, the Semele score contains the watermark C90 in combination with the rastra measurement @ 5 89.5 to 90, Type ‘A’; this combination appears in autograph and performing scores dated 1743-6, and in many of S2’s copies (see fn. 26). Given the composition date of Semele, it is clear that some of these watermarks cannot be relied upon too heavily in determining when S1 and S5 copied Jennens’s score of it.
The development of Jennens’s collection

It has been known for some time that although Jennens already owned a number of Handel manuscripts by the end of the 1730s, the bulk of his collection was copied after that point. It is now clear that this copying fell into three stages. The first was carried out by S2, who copied a large number of manuscripts that included the opera part-books, some of the opera scores, and some of the oratorio part-books and scores, most of which he copied using scores that Jennens had annotated; this first stage could have begun as early as 1740, and lasted until around 1746-8. At this point, the second stage began: S1 took over from S2, and continued to copy for Jennens until at least 1751. The third stage – in which S6, S5, and Smith copied scores (but not part-books) of Handel’s later works – could have begun as early as 1748. This begs two questions: why did S1 take over from S2? And why did S1 not copy scores and part-books for the works composed after 1748?

One clue as to why S1 took over from S2 may lie in S2’s skills as a copyist. Considering the reliability of Jennens’s part-books as sources for editors of Handel’s works, Donald Burrows has written that “it is not known whether the principal copyist (S2) was closely involved with the preparation of Handel’s partbooks, or whether he was put on to the Aylesford task because he had a fluent hand and was not needed (or was thought untrustworthy) elsewhere”. It is certainly possible that Smith considered S2 to be untrustworthy: in addition to the fact that he sometimes made poor musical decisions, his copies of the oratorios are littered with bizarre spelling mistakes.

---

65 See, for example, p. 176.
While this may not have been so much of a problem in his copies of the operas, it was disastrous in his copies of the oratorios. Not only was the verbal text of the oratorios of paramount importance to Jennens, but he had spent hours correcting spelling and punctuation in his first scores of the oratorios. Presumably he expected that the scores and part-books that were made using his annotated scores would have the text written exactly as he had suggested: in paying S2 to copy these manuscripts, Jennens was paying not only for a multitude of errors to be introduced into his new copies, but also to waste his own time – the time that he had spent correcting the spelling in his first scores of the oratorios, and the time that he now had to spend correcting these copies. The change from S2 to S1 occurred at a period of great change for Jennens: on 16 April 1746, Jacobite hopes suffered a major blow at Culloden; on 28 June the same year, his dear friend Edward Holdsworth died; and on 4 July 1747, his father died, and Jennens inherited Gopsall along with 34 other properties. It is easy to imagine that – if Jennens realised what a mess S2 was making of copying the oratorios at this point – he would not have reacted generously: perhaps he demanded that someone more capable took over the copying, and either forgot to convey his special requests (regarding clefs, etc) to the new copyist, or expected Smith to do so.

There are no real clues to suggest the cause of the change from S1 copying scores and part-books to S6, S5, and Smith copying only scores. Roberts’s suggestion as to why the collection was never completed – that “the irascible Jennens came to a final break with Smith, whom he had once referred to as Handel’s ‘toad-eater’” – is certainly possible. Perhaps it occurred to Jennens that as long as he owned a good copy of a score, he could have part-books copied by someone outside the Smith circle.

Three questions remain regarding the copying of the oratorios under consideration in this dissertation; all three questions relate to the fact that so many of Jennens’s oratorio part-books and scores were copied from his first scores of the works, which – in most cases – were bound in red morocco. First, bearing in mind that there is some chronological order to the copying of S2 and S1, why did S1 copy Israel in Egypt? S2 was able to copy the oratorios in chronological order only because Jennens had already annotated his first scores of them: we know that he was annotating Score A of L’Allegro in late 1740, and that he had annotated his

---

67 The S2 copy that contains the most corrections by Jennens is the harpsichord part-book for Samson. Perhaps it was this that first opened Jennens’s eyes to the mess that S2 was making of the task he had been set.
69 Another possibility is that S2 died or became unable to work.
71 Score A of L’Allegro is not bound in red morocco, but its binding is richer than that of Score B and the part-books: it is bound fully with mottled leather, with gilt tooling.
72 It seems that S2 copied the operas in stages that relate roughly to when they were composed (see fn. 20, 25, and 39); and of the oratorios he copied, he began with L’Allegro, Saul, and Samson, and then continued with Joseph and Judas Maccabaeus.
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score of Samson in 1743. Since it is impossible to determine whether Jennens annotated his red-morocco score of Israel in Egypt, the most likely suggestion that can be made as to why S2 did not also copy the part-books for Israel in Egypt is that Jennens intended to annotate his first score of it, but had not done so before S1 took over S2’s copying.\(^\text{73}\) The second and third questions are interrelated: why did Jennens have his first scores of Joseph and Belshazzar bound in red morocco, given that by 1743 he had already written all over some of them, making them useful only as sources for other scores? and why were new scores of Samson, Belshazzar, and Israel in Egypt not copied to accompany the part-books? It is easier to answer the first question in relation to Belshazzar than it is to answer it in relation to Joseph: probably Jennens would not have anticipated having to make anything more than minimal changes to his red-morocco score of Belshazzar, not only because he was happy with the libretto, but also because there was little he could do to reverse the actions of Handel that he disagreed with (since these mostly involved Handel’s never setting large portions of the libretto). This is likely to be the reason that no Score B of Belshazzar was ever copied: presumably the annotated red-morocco score was a clean enough copy that it could be used in performance. This was certainly not the case for L’Allegro or Saul (for which the first scores did not contain everything that Jennens wished to be performed), or for Joseph (whose red-morocco score would be difficult to use given how much of the oratorio Jennens deleted).\(^\text{74}\)

****

The aim of this dissertation was to gain a deeper understanding of Jennens’s unusual collection. Two questions were foremost in my mind: how and when was the collection assembled? and why are the contents of many of Jennens’s manuscripts so peculiar? A detailed study of a carefully chosen group of compositions enabled both questions to be answered.

The previous section draws together the findings of this research in relation to how, when, and by whom Jennens’s collection was created. However, my examination of the work carried out over a number of years by several copyists has a significance that reaches beyond Jennens’s collection and that has implications for other fields of Handel studies, including the editing of his music. Much about Handel’s scriptorium remains unknown, including the identity of most of the copyists and where the copying took place. One might have assumed

\(^{73}\) Whether he ever did annotate it does not make a difference: he could have annotated it by the time that S1 started copying, or he could have lost interest in annotating it.

\(^{74}\) The red-morocco score of Samson must have had a large number of amendments to it, but these amendments relate mostly to the verbal text. If it were to be used in a performance of Jennens’s version of the oratorio, presumably the most awkward alterations would be the deletions and the relocation of ‘Ye Men of Gaza’ from the beginning of the oratorio to the end of the oratorio (as ‘Ye Men of Israel’). In the absence of this score, it is impossible to determine whether this could have been achieved by moving the gatherings it was on.
that the production of many of Jennens’s manuscript copies would have been a simple process. My research has revealed that this was not the case: there was no uniformity of approach either between copyists or within the work of a single copyist, and moreover it was common practice to use multiple sources when copying a single manuscript.\textsuperscript{75} This complexity strengthens the case for a single location for the scriptorium: it must have contained a large number of manuscripts, as well as desks spacious enough to hold several manuscripts at once. Since it seems unlikely that there would have been enough space in Handel’s house in Brook Street, other sites might be considered, including Smith’s house. Finally, although the identities of S1 and S2 remain unknown, my detailed examination of a large number of their manuscripts has revealed features of their scribal practice as well as their strengths and weaknesses as copyists which must be borne in mind when using their copies: the wide-ranging study that forms the foundation of this dissertation has made it possible to form a clearer idea of the particular ways in which the \textit{modus operandi} of these (and other) copyists affected their transcriptions.

As for the peculiar nature of many of Jennens’s manuscripts – in particular why they contain readings that were clearly never intended by Handel – my study of his collection reveals the answer: Jennens wanted to create his own versions of many of the oratorios. This fact was not previously apparent for the simple reason that most of the scores in which Jennens entered his annotations are now lost, presumably having been bought by someone interested chiefly in their beautiful binding: in the absence of these annotated scores, all that remains is copies of them.

A study of the two oratorios for which Jennens’s first scores survive – \textit{L’Allegro} and \textit{Joseph} – revealed that Jennens made hundreds of amendments to both. These amendments relate to the verbal text and the music of both works, and include the correction of spelling, the addition and correction of punctuation, alterations to underlay, and the addition of performance markings, which in the case of \textit{L’Allegro} he transferred painstakingly from the autograph score. Jennens also altered the content of the works in both of his scores, incorporating the 1741 English-language additions into his score of \textit{L’Allegro}, and altering the form of \textit{Joseph} entirely, with the result that about 20\% of the original text was deleted.

Careful examination of other manuscripts in Jennens’s collection revealed that at least three of the red-morocco scores that are now lost must have undergone similar modification by Jennens: his surviving copies of \textit{Saul}, \textit{Samson}, and \textit{Belshazzar} contain versions of these oratorios for which there can be no other explanation. This solves two of the puzzles mentioned in the introduction: the apparent contradiction between the contents and the paper

\textsuperscript{75} The complexity of the copying process also serves as a warning to editors of Handel’s music.
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characteristics of the surviving score and part-books of Saul, and the presence of the Organ Concerto in D minor (HWV 303) in Jennens’s part-books for Belshazzar. The fact that Jennens had part-books made for his own versions of these oratorios – and therefore that he presumably intended to hold informal performances of them – strengthens the case for one of the two probable motivations behind his well known alterations to the air ‘I know that my Redeemer liveth’ in his score of Messiah: while Jennens probably did attempt to persuade Handel to adopt his changes,\(^{76}\) it seems even more likely – in the light of the nature of his collection – that he intended his favoured version of the air to be sung at Gopsall.\(^{77}\)

The filiation work which supports the discovery that Jennens created his own versions of so many of Handel’s oratorios is gratifying not only because it reveals more about the copying of Handel manuscripts or because it explains some puzzling features of the collection: it also enables us to understand more fully the relationship between Handel and Jennens. The librettist’s alterations to his own copies of Saul shed light on the collaboration between the two men: it appears that it was the composer – and not the librettist – who instigated many of the pre-performance revisions of Saul, although Jennens presumably assisted by writing new text. Furthermore, although it has long been known that Handel occasionally allowed Jennens to write in his autograph scores (his writing can be found in those of Saul and Belshazzar), my research has revealed that Handel was far more generous than had previously been supposed in granting Jennens access to his primary musical materials. Most remarkably, a comparison of Jennens’s first score of L’Allegro with the autograph and performing scores revealed the identity of the “original score” referred to by Jennens in his letter of 29 December 1740 to James Harris:

As soon as I receiv’d your commands (which was on Christmas day) I sent for Rawlins, & gave him the first part of the Allegro in Mr Handel’s original score, which I had borrow’d to correct my own copy. […] I was glad to save my own score, because Dryden’s song, which I lent him, before, was return’d in a dirty condition.\(^{78}\)

“Mr Handel’s original score” was none other than the now-priceless autograph score. Moreover, the contents of the Belshazzar part-books suggest that L’Allegro was not the only work of which Handel allowed Jennens to borrow a primary source: Jennens can only have altered Belshazzar in the way that he did if he had made a close study of the performing score. Whereas a great deal of evidence survives regarding Jennens’s feelings towards Handel, Handel’s attitude towards Jennens is harder to define; the composer’s generosity in this

\(^{76}\) This is the usual assumption, and one that is advanced by Burrows (Handel: Messiah, p. 79).

\(^{77}\) This has been suggested by Smith (The Man Behind Handel’s Messiah, p. 53), for example.

\(^{78}\) Burrows and Dunhill (eds.), Music & Theatre in Handel’s World, p. 110.
respect greatly augments our understanding of his relationship with one of his most important collaborators.

Also interesting are those alterations that contribute to our understanding of Jennens’s beliefs and commitments, and of how he harnessed the power of Handel’s music to further them. Much of his editorial work on the oratorios involved meticulous comparison of sources and the alteration of tiny details, revealing the high esteem in which he held Handel’s works. It is clear, however, that this esteem never overshadowed his dedication to the two pillars of his life: Anglican Christianity and the deposed Stuarts. In the case of the sacred oratorios, Jennens regarded Handel’s music – however wonderful – as a vehicle for the words it carried.

Jennens’s alterations to all of the oratorios under consideration demonstrate his profound respect for their verbal text. His alterations to Hamilton’s libretto of *Samson* and to his Walsh print of *Judas Maccabaeus* reveal a characteristic lack of patience with writing that was not up to his own high standards.\(^79\) However, it was clearly not just librettists who frustrated Jennens: his annotation to a chorus in *Joseph* – “N.B. intolerable nonsense” – and his careful correction of the problem caused by Handel’s word-setting further strengthens our understanding of his feelings towards Handel, whose music he adored but who himself sometimes fell short of Jennens’s expectations.\(^80\) All of Jennens’s many amendments to Handel’s underlay relate to the clarity of the verbal text within the oratorios. His alteration to the text of the chorus in *Joseph* so that it made sense when sung was not the only one of that nature (see pp. 44-5 and 50-52 for similar examples in *L’Allegro*); and he corrected many oddities in Handel’s recitatives, normalising accentuation and rectifying discrepancies between the number of syllables in a word and the number of notes to which Handel set it (see, for example, exx. 74-83 in *Joseph*, and pp. 100-101 for similar amendments in *Samson*).

Furthermore, Jennens’s reversal of some of the pre-performance revisions of *Saul* and his deletions of some sections of Hamilton’s and Miller’s texts may help to define the limit to which Jennens felt it acceptable to alter or add to the Biblical narrative; and the list of oratorios that Jennens used to further his beliefs can be extended, given his removal of anything that distracted from or endangered the defence of Christianity in Hamilton’s *Samson* and Miller’s *Joseph*, two oratorios that feature important types of Christ.

It is clear that the careful study of manuscript sources can still yield information of central importance to Handel studies, granting insights into the production of manuscript copies, into Handel himself, and into the relationship between Handel’s oratorios and the

\(^{79}\) It is interesting that, although he clearly disagreed with Miller on the content of the libretto of *Joseph*, he seems to have been happy with Miller’s writing.

\(^{80}\) Jennens’s well-known comments regarding his disappointment with Handel over *Messiah* do not need to be repeated here; they are printed and discussed by Amanda Babington and Ilias Chrissochoidis (‘Musical References in the Jennens-Holdsworth Correspondence (1729-46)’, *RMARC*, 45/1 (2014), pp. 76-129, at pp. 82 and 114-20).
This dissertation has revealed Jennens’s collection to be a rich source of understanding in all of these respects, even if – as in the case of Saul – the preliminary work was sometimes anything but simple. It was these copies of Saul that first sparked my interest in Jennens’s manuscripts, and which suggested that further study of them was likely to be fruitful. From the beginning of this project, it was clear that an investigation into this unusual collection of Handel’s music would be greatly aided by an understanding of the collection’s architect; however, the degree to which a close study of these manuscripts would shed light on Charles Jennens could not have been anticipated.
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<td>Bass II</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin I</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin II</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola/violin III</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’Cello</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassoon I</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassoon II</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe/flute I</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe/flute II</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>US-Cp: M2. 1. M2. v. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet I</td>
<td>US-Ws: W.b. 527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet II</td>
<td>US-Cu: MS 437 v. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timpani</td>
<td>GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other copies of L’Allegro owned by Jennens

Additions GB-Lbl: RM, 18. c. 11 (ff. 137-65)
Additions GB-Lbl: RM, 19. a. 2 (ff. 52r-53v)

Samson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet I</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet II</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpsichord</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin I</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin II</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’Cello</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe/</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe II</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassoon I and II</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soprano I (Dalila)</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soprano II (Israelite Woman)</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto (Micah)</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenor I (Samson)</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenor II (Philistine)</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tenor III (Israelite) 288
Bass I (Manoa) 289
Bass II (Harapha and Officer) 290
Timpani 353

Joseph and his Brethren

Score A GB-L.fom: acc. no. 1267
Score B GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 151
Violin I 152
Violin II 153
Viola 154
'Cello I 155
Oboe/flute I 156
Oboe/flute II 157
Bassoon I 158
Bassoon II US-Cu: MS 437 v. 23
Soprano I (Asenath) GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 159
Soprano II (Benjamin) 160
Alto I (Joseph) 161
Alto II (Phanor) 162
Tenor I (Simon and Potiphera) 163
Tenor II (Judah) 164
Bass I (Pharaoh) 165
Bass II (Reuben) US-Wc: M2. 1. H2. v. 15
'Cello II GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 244
Trumpet I 247
Trumpet II 248
Organ 249
Timpani 353

'Songs in the Oratorio of Joseph' part-books

Violin I GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 240
Violin II 241
Viola 242
'Cello 243

Belshazzar

Violin I GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 152
Violin II 153
Viola 154
'Cello 155
Oboe I 156
Oboe II 157
Bassoon 158
Soprano I (Nitocris) 159
Soprano II (Cyrus) 160
Alto I (Daniel) 161
Alto II (choruses only) 162
Tenor I (Belshazzar) 163
Tenor II (Arioch) 164
Bass (Gobryas and Messenger) 165
Trumpet I 247
Trumpet II 248
Timpani 353
### Additional Songs in Belshazzar' score and part-books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>GB-Lbl:</th>
<th>GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v.</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timpani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Cello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Judas Maccabaeus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Editions</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v.</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin I</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin II</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe/flute I</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe/flute II</td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassoon I</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassoon II</td>
<td>US-Cu: MS 437 v.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ</td>
<td>GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v.</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soprano I (Israelitish Woman)</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soprano II (Israelitish Man)</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto I (Israelitish Messenger)</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto II (choruses only)</td>
<td>US-Wc: M2. 1. H2. v.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenor I (Judas)</td>
<td>GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v.</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenor II (choruses only)</td>
<td>US-Wc: M2. 1. H2. v.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass I (Simon)</td>
<td>GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v.</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass II (Eupolemus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Cello</td>
<td></td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Cello II/double bass</td>
<td></td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet I</td>
<td></td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet II</td>
<td></td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet III</td>
<td>GB-Lbl: RM 18. b. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timpani</td>
<td>GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v.</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alexander Balus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Editions</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin I</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin II</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe/flute I</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe/flute II</td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassoon</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Cello</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soprano I (Cleopatra)</td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soprano II (Aspasia)</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto (Alexander)</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenor (Jonathan)</td>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass I (Ptolomee)</td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass II (Sycophant Courtier and Messengers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trumpet I 247
Trumpet II 248
Horn I 351
Horn II 352
Timpani 353

Joshua

Score GB-Mp: MS 130 Hd4 v. 166
Violin I 174
Violin II 175
Viola 176
Oboe/flute I 177
Oboe/flute II 178
'Cello 180
Soprano (Achsah) 181
Alto (Othniel) 183
Tenor I (Joshua) 184
Bass (Caleb) 185
Tenor II (Angel) 186
Trumpet/horn I 247
Trumpet/horn II 248
Timpani 353

Other manuscript copies

Belshazzar
James S. Hall Collection of George Frideric Handel, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library, v. 18

Alexander Balus
James S. Hall Collection of George Frideric Handel, Manuscripts Division, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library, v. 17

Joshua
GB-Lfom: acc. no. 588

Walsh prints cited

Samson
Smith 1 GB-Mp: B.R. f530 Hd665 (owned and annotated by Jennens)
GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1520
Smith 1/2 GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1527
Smith 2 GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1521
Smith 4 GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1523
Smith 6 GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1524

Judas Maccabaeus
Smith 1 GB-Lfom: acc. no. 1571 (owned and annotated by Jennens)
Other primary sources cited

Ainsworth, Henry, *Annotations upon the Five Books of Moses, the Booke of the Psalmes, and the Song of Songs, or, Canticles* (London, 1627)

Calvin, John, *Ioannis Calvini Noviodunensis opera omnia* (Amsterdam, 1671)

Grotius, Hugo, *Hugonis Grotii opera omnia theologica* (Basel, 1732)

Henry, Matthew, *An Exposition of all the books of the old and new testament* (3rd edn., London, 1725)

Jennens, Charles, *The Tragedy of King Lear, as Lately Published, Vindicated from the Abuse of the Critical Reviewers; and the Wonderful Genius and Abilities of those Gentlemen for Criticism, set forth, celebrated, and extolled, by the Editor of King Lear* (London, 1772)

Mather, Samuel, *The figures or types of the old Testament, by which Christ and the Heavenly Things of the Gospel were Preached and Shadowed to the People of God of Old. Explain’d and improv’d in sundry Sermons* (2nd edn., London, 1705)

Miller, James, *Are these Things so? The previous Question, from an Englishman in his Grotto, to a great Man at Court* (London, 1740)

  *The great Man’s Answer to Are these Things so? In a Dialogue between His Honour and the Englishman in His Grotto* (London, 1740)


Letters

**Holdsworth to Jennens**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>GB-Lfom: acc. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 March 1736</td>
<td>7640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 April 1736</td>
<td>7626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 November 1736</td>
<td>7636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jennens to Holdsworth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>GB-Lfom: acc. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 July 1736</td>
<td>7629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 February 1742</td>
<td>7672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 January 1743</td>
<td>7681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 February 1743</td>
<td>7683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 March 1743</td>
<td>7685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 September 1743</td>
<td>7687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 September 1744</td>
<td>7692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 February 1746</td>
<td>7707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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