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Editorial

The task of meditation is not to seek enlightenment but to realise that you already have it ... this Zen axiom has a passing resemblance to the situation with Rawsthorne’s Third Symphony. Many commentators have bemoaned the fact that the work still awaited its London premiere. This in spite of a now twenty-four year-old announcement in The Sprat to the effect that such a performance had taken place at the end of 1993. But even that was not the first ... see p. 47 of this issue. Full marks to the BBC for its two studio performances, even though its enthusiasm for twentieth-century British music has recently been in decline – in the face of which we are grateful to our German friends for performing long stretches of it, not only live but repeatedly (see facing and subsequent pages).

New CD: still on the topic of premieres, from Manchester we have a new disc containing first recordings of Rawsthorne’s 1932 String Quartet and his recently rediscovered Chamber Cantata, as well as of Peter Dickinson’s arrangement of Practical Cats for reciter and piano. Divine Art dda 25169.

Alan’s and Isabel’s books: please read p.48 of this issue and the list that follows it. We are disposing of the books that were in Sudbury Cottage, Rawsthorne’s home in Essex, and offering the chance to Creel readers to own some.

Cello time: this year we make a feature of Rawsthorne’s works for cello – mainly the inspiration of Nigel Bonham-Carter, who supplied most of the press cuttings reproduced here. Had I been two years quicker in implementing his plan we should have hit the fiftieth anniversary of the premiere of the Concerto. As it is, we are lucky to have the seventieth anniversary of the Sonata to fall back on – that is the reason, rather than hubris, for placing my own article first in the running order. Many thanks to John France for altering his original plan in order to give us a really thorough survey of the reception history of the Concerto, and to Heather Roberts, efficient and friendly archivist at the RNCM, for making access to the manuscript materials so pleasant and trouble-free. We are honoured to be allowed to reprint, by kind permission of Mrs Rhiannon Hoddinott, two of the three articles that Professor Alun Hoddinott wrote about Rawsthorne’s concertos in general and the Cello Concerto in particular. ‘Rawsthorne’s Concertos’ is a stand-alone item beginning on p. 15, while Professor Hoddinott’s extensive review of the premiere of the concerto is embedded in John France’s article, on pp. 38–40. Thanks too to Dr Simon Wright for providing details of the materials for the Concerto held in the OUP hire library.

A farewell: this will be my last issue of the The Creel, which for eight years has been a valued part of my life. My willing task now is to express warm thanks to all those who have contributed material – some of them on frequent occasions. For an impartial list, I refer you to the contents pages of this and the previous seven issues. If I single out anyone at all it must be the unassuming Michael Smith, who has been steadfastly willing and reliable at all levels of activity from design consultant to mail clerk, and an unfailing source of calm reassurance.

Martin Thacker
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It is hard in a small format and in greyscale to convey the drama of the programme book – not to mention the production itself – of Rebecca’s Shadow, last year’s new venture by the ballet company of the state of Vorpommern in northeastern Germany.

Ideas were taken both from Daphne du Maurier’s novel and from Alfred Hitchcock’s classic film starring Laurence Olivier as Maxim de Winter. In the ballet version, it is made clear that de Winter had killed Rebecca, whereas Hollywood etiquette had obliged Hitchcock to state that she had died in an accident.

The first Act – danced to the whole of Bax’s Third Symphony and the last movement of the Fourth (we have not heard whether any cuts were made) – deals with the meeting and honeymoon of de Winter and ‘the second Mrs de Winter’ (the heroine is only ‘I’ and ‘me’ in the book, and so has no name) followed by the various events on their arrival at Manderley, his Cornish estate.

The second Act deals with the psychological background, and was danced to Rawsthorne’s Elegiac Rhapsody and Concertante Pastorale and the first movement of the Violin Concerto No. 1.
A Platinum Anniversary: the Cello Sonata

Martin Thacker

The Sonata was first performed on 21 January 1949 by its dedicatees Anthony Pini and Wilfrid Parry, and that year is sometimes given as its date of origin – on the published score and part, for example. But it is more usually thought of as a 1948 work – indeed, the piece is unlikely to have been composed, copied, and learned in three weeks – and this is our pretext for celebrating its seventy-anniversary birthday and giving a cello slant to this year’s Criel.

Unlike the Concerto (see John France’s reception history, pp. 29–44) the Sonata has always had a place in the sun. It has been commercially recorded at least five times and still frequently crops up on concert programmes. The reasons are clear: it is concise with a clear argument and plenty of passion; it is grateful to play and economical to programme, especially when a grant can often be obtained from the Rawsthorne Trust.

A considerable body of commentary is available in various sources, but what follows is from a more basic perspective. Diploma and A-level questions on harmony and counterpoint require almost entirely pre-twentieth-century knowledge and skill – pre-nineteenth-century would do. What would happen if one were (heaven forfend) faced with an examination requirement to ‘continue the following fragment in the style of Rawsthorne, to make a total of sixteen bars’? There is no complete answer here; just thoughts in the general direction of beginning to examine his procedures, exemplified here in a middle-period work. Sadly, familiarity with tenor clef, and alertness to enharmonics, are essential!

Tonality

Rawsthorne did not use key signatures. Anticipating the chorus of ‘what, never?’ I must qualify; never in his mature work; although he used them in juvenilia and student works up to and including the 1932 String Quartet. And should there be a further chorus of ‘so what?’ I would add that in this respect he was decidedly more radical than his leading contemporaries. Walton used key signatures in the Violin and Viola concertos (though not in the earlier First Symphony); Tippett had them in many major works up to and including the run of his mature works; it was undertaken in his role as broadcasting staff arranger.

In the face of this absence of a clue, misleading though it might have been, at the beginning of each stave, the observer has to work out what the keynote is at any given point. The Cello Sonata exhibits various tonal centres, some of which are:

C major/minor

We begin not with the first tonal centre in the piece but with the overall centre, which is C – though only just. The Allegro appassionato of the first movement begins in C and insists on the note C at the half-way point and at the end. ‘In C’ implies some clear preference for the diatonic notes of the C-major scale, but this is not much in evidence – though there are some glimmers in Example 1:

![Example 1: Cello Sonata, movement 1, bars 46–50](image)

Only the third note (♯F) and the C♭ in the last chord are not part of the normal scales of C major or C harmonic minor (mixing the two is one of Rawsthorne’s predilections); he even gives us a cadence in C major (bars 3–4), albeit an inverted one. This is perhaps just enough to establish C as the tonality at this point; but it soon moves away into something like G minor and continues to mutate rapidly. The main way that the tonality is established is retrospectively, after the action, by emphasising the tonic until it sinks in. At the end of the whole movement it is just octave Cs that are repeated. Earlier, at the end of the exposition, we have what is shown in Example 2. Here we might note that the emphasised chords in the piano left hand are a verticalisation of the notes that the cello plays sequentially. In a piece from an earlier era the notes in question would have been C–E–G. But here we realise that in the world of diatonicised chromaticism the tonic chord doesn’t have to be of one set formation; any chord with C as its root will do. h C the root of C–Db–E, or (if you want to take in all
the right-hand notes) of C–D♭–E–F–G♯–A? Yes, according to most theory the major third C–E takes precedence, and its lower note is the root.

Other places where C makes itself felt are the opening of the second movement, with its combination of a C major triad and an augmented triad on C, and the end of the whole work, where bitonal clouds suddenly part and a serene C-major triad is left to shine out. Again, this is a kind of retrospective establishing of the tonality: it is as though he were saying: ‘there you are, that’s what I meant all along’. Rawsthorne doesn’t ban triads; but in his works they derive their value from their scarcity, and they frequently appear at the ends of movements. What a pity that the published cello/piano score contains an engraver’s error leading up to this point: the fourth bar of the last line contains a treble clef in the left hand that should not be there. Luckily the printed reading is so unlikely that the intended one becomes clear.

**D minor**

Triads also occur at particularly dramatic points: in the slow introduction to the Sonata, at letter ‘A’, there is a first inversion B-flat major chord at the climax of an increase in both tempo and dynamics (Example 3) after which the music dies away ready for the following allegro movement. This work unambiguously begins in D minor: it could happily have had a signature of one flat. And this is not the only instance: near the beginning of the development section of the first movement, at letter ‘E’, there is another 8-bar patch of figuration drawn only from the D-minor harmonic scale; and in the final movement, during a 16-bar preparation for the recapitulation of the march theme, there is yet another instance of 8 bars containing only the notes of the D-minor harmonic scale (Example 4).

**G-sharp major/minor**

But we are getting ahead of ourselves. Back to the middle movement, which begins with a long augmented triad on C, where the G♯ (in the guise of A♭) first falls to G as if in a resolution. However, the tenor part then moves to A♭ while the G is still held in the top part. Rawsthorne famously likes augmented chords, but often they are not pure; either (as here) sounding the perfect fifth along with the augmented one, or adding a seventh, or both. Perhaps the A♭ (♭VI of C) here is a link between the C of the first movement and the G-sharp major/minor of the long and sad tune which begins after a reminiscence of the work’s slow introduction. The tune on the cello begins in bar 2 of the second line of Example 5, after a bar and a half of the augmented chord of G-sharp, again with the perfect fifth sounding against the augmented one, widely spread on the piano. This chord does duty as the tonic chord, as did the secundal one in Example 2. The previous line shows the piano in G-sharp minor, ending on a sort of 6/4, the bass D♯ of which falls to the G♯ at the beginning of the second line, in quite a conventional way.

Here we see how a key signature of five sharps (for the minor key: there is no signature for such an outlandish major) would have saved most of the accidentals present at this point. We should have just needed F double-sharp and B♯. But the composer had long since decided that signatures would encourage
unjustified preconceptions in the minds of performers and commentators.

Here, too, we see Rawsthorne’s use of mixed major and minor tonality. We go from the minor mode at the end of line 1 of Example 5 to mixed mode (the piano has B♭ but at first the cello has B). The E♮ (which perhaps might have been spelled D double-sharp) is part of the minor scale but does duty in providing the top note of the augmented triad on the keynote.

And now that we have begun to say something about Rawsthorne’s chords, it might be useful to continue along the line of the tune we have begun to discuss. Assuming that Rawsthorne isn’t just ‘smearing his notes at random like bird-lime on telegraph wires’, to paraphrase Hindemith, can it be that his genius is able to take apparently unrelated notes and combine them in ways that sound exactly right – which they certainly do; if you play a wrong note you can tell at once. Or is it possible to analyse his procedures to the extent that we might be able to reproduce them? How about that last chord in Example 5: the bottom note remains as G♯ from the previous bar, though this isn’t really a pedal; if he had wanted to he would have changed it, as can be seen from the similar situation in bars 3 and 4 of Example 6. It might be more significant that the top two notes remain the same (C♮ being the same note as B♯), and that all the others except G♯ move up a semitone. We can either view this chord as an augmented triad on E that somehow incorporates an A, or carry out the time-honoured procedure of looking for a perfect fifth, which we find between the A and the E. So we call A the theoretical root of this chord; we are looking at a chord of A with major seventh (in the bass) and minor third. A stands in a Neapolitan relationship with the keynote, G♯.

What next? Example 6 shows the rest of the tune up to the V of its eventual cadence on C♯. In bar 1 of this example, the piano part plunges into flats, but the chords can be read as A-sharp minor and F-sharp major (with a seventh in the bass); II and bVII of G-sharp. Bar 2 of Example 6 has an arpeggiated A ma-

jor (Neapolitan of G-sharp) with minor ninth, followed by first inversion G minor with a major seventh. This is bVI of the B major (relative major of G-sharp minor) augmented chord which takes up the third bar of the example. The fourth bar also has only one chord: C-sharp with both perfect and augmented fifths and a minor ninth, but no third. The top two notes of this chord, D and A, perhaps inspire the first chord in the next bar, bar 5 in the example, whose root is unquestionably D (Neapolitan of C-sharp), in the presence of a major seventh. The second half of the bar is a major third on B♭, which we prefer to call A♯, II of G-sharp; and then in bar 6 we are back to the augmented chord of G-sharp major, though the cello melody insists on the minor third. This figuration consists of exactly the same notes as those in the penultimate bar of Example 5, but at twice the speed; and the second chord in this bar is a slight alteration of the chord in the final bar of that example.

The tune whose harmony we have described so laboriously uses all the notes of the twelve-note chromatic scale … except E. But music theory does not recognise elevenatonic scales! If we try to fit the tune into the octatonic system (used in the Piano Sonatina from the same period) we find that the last two bars of Example 5 and the first three (plus one note) of Example 6 do indeed stick to the transposition that contains C♯ D♯ E F G A B C ([C♯]). Quite a good run – but the harmony does not conform, and to cover the whole tune we have to
change the transposition of the octatonic scale somewhat freely and frequently.

The first bar of the last line of Example 6 is where the tune terminates when it is recapitulated at the end of this movement, after the scherzando interlude. Rawsthorne uses an almost identical bar to this one, altered to cadence with bare fifths on G-sharp, where he straightway prefigures the beginning of the last movement:

![Example 7, Cello Sonata, movement 2, bars 70–74](image)

but a semitone too high. No problem – he cheekily changes the succeeding notes, with no preparation, to ...

G major

The last movement begins with a march in the key that will become the dominant of the eventual close of the work on C. This is one of Rawsthorne’s sonorous movements: full of ceremonial-sounding chords and rhythmic vigour, it begins in a way that would make a stirring concluding organ voluntary, though it would soon become impossible to accommodate the virtuoso cello figuration, and we are in the presence not of Noel Rawsthorne but of Alan, who did not hold the organ in high regard.

We have already said something about the middle section of this march (see Example 4) after which a brief recapitulation leads to the closing Adagio. But the main section is akin to the final movement of the Piano Sonatina. There, he features the whole-tone scale; here the Lydian mode looks possible at the start, though what is really going on is continual feints at modulation. But in both these final movements the straightforward major scale, having been strenuously avoided in what went before, is now de rigueur. And is that a common chord of A in bar 3 of the piano part, Example 8? Well, yes, but the cello sounds a dissonant B♮ against it, and in the next bar we are back to augmented triad on D plus major seventh.

![Example 8: Cello Sonata, movement 3, bars 37–40](image)

In summary, the main tonalities are: D, C, G-sharp, G, C. Not unusual, apart perhaps from the beginning in another key from the main one, and the choice of G-sharp instead of A-flat.

I am still not ready to produce any pastiche Rawsthorne! No significant loss, when so many fine examples of the real thing are so rarely played.

---

**Rawsthorne’s Concertos**

Alan Hoddinott

The first Welsh composer to achieve international prominence, Alan Hoddinott (1929–2008) was also the first Professor of Music at what is now Cardiff University, and the founder of the Cardiff Festival of Twentieth-Century Music. He commissioned Rawsthorne’s Ballade for Piano in 1967 and the Piano Quintet in 1968, and in 1973 facilitated an LP recording of AR’s piano and chamber works. He was a great friend to Rawsthorne and, as we can see in this issue, a powerful advocate for the Cello Concerto, writing, in all, three articles on the work. This one is reprinted from The Listener of 31 March 1966. His Tempo review of the premiere of the Concerto can be seen on pp. 38–40. Both appear by kind permission of Mrs Rhiannon Hoddinott.

Alan Rawsthorne’s recently completed Cello Concerto is his eighth work for solo instrument(s) and orchestra, the others being concertos for clarinet, oboe, violin (two), piano (two) and the Concertante Pastorale for flute, horn and strings. In addition, two other works are given the title of concerto – Concerto for Strings and Concerto for Ten Instruments.

This obvious delight in concerto form is comparatively rare among British composers of Rawsthorne’s generation, and for him this preference is not spasmodic or isolated. The concertos span most of Rawsthorne’s creative life and, indeed, the major concertos come at crucial times in his technical development and evolution.

The composer’s thirty-odd years of composition may be divided conveniently into three phases (early works apart) – 1937–45; 1945–56; 1956–66. In 1937 comes the Concerto for Clarinet and Strings and in 1942 the first of the piano concertos; 1947 sees the completion of concertos for oboe and violin, and 1951 the Piano Concerto No. 2. The Second Violin Concerto was written in 1956, the Concertante Pastorale the following year, and now, after a longer-than-usual gap, comes the cello work. This (necessarily) detailed list shows that each of the three phases opens with a concerto and reaches its highest point with a further concerto – this is not to say that the concertos are Rawsthorne’s best works, but that they do represent specific points on an emerging pattern. Moreover, the concerto that marks the opening of each phase quite clearly initiates new explorations of the composer’s musical idiom.

The Clarinet Concerto, perhaps, has less of this characteristic than the others – it is an unequivocal revealing of the basic patterns of Rawsthorne’s creative language: originality of idiom; mastery of formal procedures and, perhaps most pertinent to concerto writing, an instinctively imaginative conception of textures allied to a sure balancing of solo and tutti.

Violin Concerto No. 1 is one of the composer’s largest-scale works and foreshadows a period of intense exploration of the possibilities of symphonic
constructions and developments as distinct from the variation-type structures so often used in the previous phase.

Curiously, the third phase also begins with a violin concerto (No. 2) but this time the work opens up new developments of the fabric of the musical language, especially in the region of harmonic procedures, where the bitonal aspects of Rawsthorne’s idiom are given major prominence.

The First Piano Concerto lays many claims to being considered the finest of Rawsthorne’s early works. It is one of the most accomplished and attractive of modern piano concertos. All the various aspects of the composer’s first creative phase are sharply crystallised – glittering and inventive textures; integrated thematic unity; formal conciseness, clarity and brevity and the fascinating aural attraction that is an inevitable characteristic of these early pieces.

Rawsthorne’s second phase (again coincidentally) curves up to the Piano Concerto No. 2. Vastly different from its predecessor, this ebullient, extroverted work successfully and authoritatively coalesces a powerful and large-scale symphonic structure with direct tunefulness and thematic simplicity, a mixture that exerts the strongest appeal on differing levels.

In the new Cello Concerto many of the different and varied strands of Rawsthorne’s musical character revealed over the years are drawn together and fused into an expansiveness that shows yet another facet of a profound and complex creative imagination. For example, the wider possibilities of language noted in the Second Violin Concerto and explored in succeeding works are blended most happily with earlier procedures, giving the impression of a familiarity that springs many surprises. Or, again, there is the merging in yet another kind of structure of Rawsthorne’s two most-used forms, sonata and variation.

The concerto takes about twenty-eight minutes in performance and is in three large-scale movements, thematically related and, as is usual with Rawsthorne, unified cyclically through the consistent use of basic cellular ideas.

Intervallic relationship has always played an integral part in Rawsthorne’s technical methods and all three movements of the concerto are tightly knit by the permeating use of major seconds and perfect fourths. Both intervals are used horizontally and vertically, the second in particular giving the melodic line its smooth lyrical aspect. The fourth is perhaps the dominating interval, its use in chord formations being especially prominent.

A third basic idea which is accorded much significance in the overall structure is a specific chord, first exposed in bar 15 and used thereafter with varying degrees of importance. For example, the central section of the slow movement is an extensional development of the proliferation of certain features of the chord. The formation of the chord is basically the first inversion of a seventh (major third, two minor thirds) in bitonal relationships with either simple chord structures or more complex varieties (using second and fourth interval formations).

The opening movement, Allegro lirico, is a set of very freely constructed variations, that both decorate the initial thematic material (in which a gently swaying tune, a fanfare-like pattern of fourths and characteristically resolving upward arpeggio may be noted) and develop it symphonically. Towards the end of the movement a brief cadenza emphasises the underlying tonality of C (incidentally one of Rawsthorne’s favourite key centres) although the end of the movement is quiet and tonally obscure.

The second movement, Mesto, falls into a ternary shape, the final paragraph being so abbreviated (again a favourite Rawsthorne device) that it almost assumes the character of an epilogue or coda. Thematic material is very beautiful indeed, tinged by a characteristic melancholy and dominated by the richness of the harmonic texture, the fourth interval relationships softened by the addition of thirds. The first section is notable for the profusion of its melodic ideas, while the central episode with its proliferating arabesques and decorative passages floating above and through purple-coloured, multi-formed chords suggests a kaleidoscopic nocturnal evocation.

The finale, Allegro, opens rather unusually with a long tutti, closely resembling, thematically, the opening of the concerto. There is throughout, in fact, a considerable amount of tutti music, balanced, naturally, by some brilliant and effective solo writing. The entire movement, with the exception of a more lyrical and reflective episode, bowls along in Rawsthorne’s most vital, genial, and invigorating manner. The buoyancy and good humour of the thematic ideas and developments allied with compellingly propulsive rhythmic patterns and an uninhibited C major tonality make this finale the perfect foil for the more introspective mood of the previous two movements.

The concerto certainly ranks among Rawsthorne’s finest works. Yet it indicates that the composer is still quietly exploring further possibilities inherent in his idiom and is moving deeper into his unique and profound creative imagination.
The Cello Concerto Revisited

Nigel Bonham-Carter

By way of setting the scene, I will begin with a couple of quotations, both extracted from newspaper reviews of the first performances of two other late Rawsthorne works:

There is something elliptical and evasive about Alan Rawsthorne’s best music.¹

[His] initials are clear in the subtle understatement characterising all three succinct movements.²

These observations, appearing at or near the beginning of the two reviews, may be considered perhaps as representative of what had by then become (or hardened into) the standard critical ‘take’ on Rawsthorne’s overall body of work. All these adjectives – ‘elliptical’, ‘evasive’, ‘subtle’, plus one key noun, ‘understatement’ – might begin to suggest as a corollary music lacking in broad appeal and/or emotional power. To me any such suggestion would altogether miss the mark; on the contrary the language used seems to me (and indeed I think, at bottom, to the reviewers themselves) to define an expressive character of an altogether personal kind. It should be added that both these reviews go on to be fundamentally positive in tone, even the first of them, the final sentence of which begins: ‘Yet behind its bare and ungesturing style there lurks a distinct and individual mood of disenchanted romanticism ... ’ That last phrase strikes me as a particularly apt introduction to the Cello Concerto, and I am possibly not alone in regarding its slow movement as one of the two most profound that he ever wrote (the other being the slow movement, marked Alla Sarabanda, of the Third Symphony). That view is to some extent corroborated in the two newspaper reviews of the concerto (by Colin Mason and ‘Anon’, possibly William Mann) reproduced in full on pp. 33 and 36 of this issue, which I have picked on as the hooks upon which to hang my own impressions of the concerto and which I will come to later. What follows is a personal take mainly in the light of which I have picked on as the hooks upon which to hang my own impressions of the concerto and which I will come to later. What follows is a personal take mainly in the light of what (these and others) have said about it. Sometimes this has been a rather dim and flickering light, sometimes by contrast harsh and glaring.

It is worth emphasising too, perhaps, that this is in some sense an ‘outsider’s view’, i.e. that of a music-lover, which according to a review culled from a back number of Tempo is ‘a description which implies no academic background or training’ and as such entirely appropriate in my case. Before I embark on that, however, there are one or two rather more objective aspects which should be gone into, before even a subjective judgement can be reached.

The critics at large

As John France’s comprehensive ‘reception history’, starting on p. 29 of this issue, makes only too plain, the critical fraternity was for the most part not enthusiastic about the Cello Concerto on its first outing, and some of them, in the vernacular phrase, had no hesitation in putting the boot in – with, by definition, little restraint. No way to treat a senior composer of acknowledged distinction. Fortunately the balance was to some extent redressed by two much more carefully considered articles from the pen of Alun Hoddinott. The first of these was explicitly a preview of the concerto, published in The Listener a few days before the broadcast of its premiere in April 1966;³ the second a detailed review of the premiere appearing in Tempo later in the summer.⁴ Naturally, for these media Hoddinott was not burdened by the need to meet unforgiving newspaper deadlines.

It is relevant to state that as a personal friend and longstanding admirer of Rawsthorne, Hoddinott clearly had access to the score in writing both pieces, indeed he says as much in his Tempo review, and I detect no special pleading on his part in either of them. They accordingly present a more balanced and reflective view of the concerto’s merits than the inevitably hasty and, I think it is not unfair to say, ephemeral judgements of the premiere by the newspaper critics, something moreover which Hoddinott as a composer himself was uniquely well qualified to provide. Happily, by kind permission of Mrs Rhiannon Hoddinott, we have been able to reprint both articles in full (The Listener on pp. 15–17 and Tempo on pp. 38–40), so readers can make up their own minds about them.

The first performance – and subsequent revision

The premiere (given a live broadcast) took place on 6 April 1966, the second performance at a Prom on 25 August (a Thursday), also broadcast of course, later in the same year with the same soloist, Christopher Bunting, but with Norman Del Mar replacing Sir Malcolm Sargent as conductor. Between these two dates Rawsthorne carried out a quite extensive revision to the score, making a substantial cut in the last movement. This may have been (at least in part) a response to the adverse criticisms of the premiere detailed in John France’s article. A little strangely perhaps, not one of the later reviewers appears to have noticed or been aware of the revisions, though these may well have been partly responsible for the gradually improving tone of later reviews (even in relation to the second performance) as charted by John France. However, the less than satisfactory performance at the premiere is also relevant in this context. Hoddinott in his Tempo review refers in passing to ‘obviously ill-balanced dynamics and equally obvious under-rehearsal’. One might in any case have guessed, had not John McCabe also remarked, that Sargent ‘was clearly out of sympathy with the work’, which was not ‘his kind of music’. Inevitably this got the Concerto off to a bad start, and Rawsthorne was ‘extremely disappointed by the relatively poor reception accorded his Cello Concerto’.⁵

Gerard Schurmann

Many of The Creel’s readers will be aware of Gerard’s importance in Rawsthorne’s life, as revealed in his three articles, biographical rather than analytical, published in the journal, as well as in Dimitri Kennaway’s article ‘Alan Raw-
The concerto was actually among the earliest pieces of Rawsthorne which I ever taped off the BBC Third (the Prom performance), so I have known it for over fifty years and have never been troubled by any such criticism, while my response to it remains as strong and sympathetic as ever. As to Anon’s (or Mann’s) review, also on balance positive, I find it notable for the way in which its second paragraph plunges, with reference to the central Mesto, into a torrent of adjectives (three plus ‘brooding’ used as a noun in a single sentence!) all of which, while risking overkill, perhaps to the extent of defeating its own ends, seem to me apt, but I remain happy with my single adjectival choice of ‘profound’. Writing about the work of another composer of Rawsthorne’s generation, the philosopher Sir Isaiah Berlin explored the notion of depth in a mini-essay which is much too long to paraphrase here; but I will quote one full and one part sentence from it, and leave it at that: ‘The notion of depth is hard to analyse ... there are no doubt kinds and degrees of it, and ordinary prose, intended to be understood, has not so far proved a good medium for explaining what is meant by it.’

Violence – an affinity with Francis Bacon?

This is the last aspect of the concerto that I wish to touch on and a more tendentious one – so I should make it plain immediately that I am not seeking to imply any influence, either direct or indirect, of the art of Francis Bacon upon the music of Alan Rawsthorne. Rather, it is a question – literally a question – of some degree of artistic affinity between them.

The origin of this suggestion as far as I am concerned lies in an initial comment made by McCabe, who attended the Third Symphony’s Cheltenham premiere, immediately before his musical analysis of that work: ‘There are moments when the outbursts of raw emotional intensity bring Rawsthorne nearer than in any other composition to the art of Francis Bacon.’

Rawsthorne had come to know Bacon personally through his second wife Isabel, her portrait having been painted by Bacon on several occasions. Schurmann too had already met Bacon independently, and they became close friends. Schurmann was in frequent contact with him when both he and his first wife Vivien and Bacon too were living in Henley-on-Thames during the early fifties; Bacon also did a portrait of Schurmann, with which Gerard himself says that ‘he was very pleased’. [Some readers may have seen it in the background of the photograph used on the front cover of the Chandos LP, since reissued on CD, of the Six Studies of Francis Bacon.]

No doubt Rawsthorne had a view on Bacon’s art, but what it was we are not at this late date likely to discover. However, the word ‘violence’ appears quite early on in Colin Mason’s concerto review, with reference to ‘the outbursts...
towards the end [of the slow movement], and maybe the link which McCabe detects between their respective artistic outputs is no more than a personal reaction on his part to the violence, often implicit, sometimes explicit, as revealed in Bacon’s paintings and Rawsthorne’s music – in the latter’s case the Third Symphony in particular and to my mind parts of the Cello Concerto as well. Perhaps he was expressing his frustration at the unfair critical treatment of his later works, though, as hardly needs saying, the sources of his inspiration would have gone far deeper than mere pique. Rawsthorne memorably stigmatised critics, in a BBC interview given in 1962, as ‘sort of the Christian Diors of the profession, and they are very anxious that one should be right up to the minute – I think they frequently seem to treat music rather as though it were a new waistline.’ This of course was a year or two before either work was written (and disparagement of critics was something Rawsthorne shares with many another composer). The joke is a good one, though the surface flippancy may mask a degree of bitterness on his part. Or maybe it was the angst of advancing years combined with gradually failing health which prompted artistic release. We shall never know, any more than the composer would have known himself, I would suppose, other than subliminally, but this at least can be stated, I hope without fear of contradiction: at no time in his career did Rawsthorne shy away (entirely of course in his own terms) from emotional engagement in his music, nor reveal the least sign of hedging his emotional bets. Both the Third Symphony and the Cello Concerto strongly attest to his absolute refusal to do so.

Examination of the source materials

In summer 2018, Martin Thacker made two visits to the Rawsthorne Archive at the Royal Northern College of Music in order to examine the available manuscript materials for the Cello Concerto. He writes:

A typing error crept into The Creel’s early survey of the manuscripts in the Rawsthorne Archive, making it look as if the substantial cut had occurred in ‘II’, i.e. the slow movement, whereas it was definitely in the last movement. John McCabe reports 83 bars cut, corresponding to The Creel’s 11 pages and 4 bars; rehearsal figures 66–72 inclusive (The Creel refers to another cut on p. 138 but this is only deletion of a single bar accidentally written twice). The cut occurs between 5'06'' and 5'07'' in the Baillie / Lloyd-Jones / RSNO recording, after – or, really, during – the fugal development based on a short phrase from the scherzando middle section. It is apt to seem rather sudden once you know it is there, for the final appearance of the fugue subject is not even allowed its last note before we are whisked away, by a sudden violin tremolando, backed by wind and siderdrum, and a ‘wake up’ horn/harp motif, into the next section. The context was originally different; it might not be true to say that the fugue was more fully worked out, but it was certainly more prolonged – the subject continued to appear frequently – before a much more gradual onset of the tremolando, first of all in the violas, led to the horn/harp motif (also prefigured) and a change of mood.

Such, at least, is the evidence of the autograph full score in OUP binding, now housed at the RNCM (AR/1/081a). Although Rawsthorne worked entirely in pencil, there is no sign of any recomposition or alteration – just a very clean deletion by crossing through the area concerned. The conductor’s score in the hire material available from OUP is a facsimile of this pencil score made with the ‘dyeline’ process originally developed for reproduction of technical drawings but widely used in music publishing during the Rawsthorne/Tippet/Britten era. I am indebted to Dr Simon Wright for the information that this copy has the cut marked in the same way, and that the rehearsal figures have been updated to reflect the new situation (old 73 became new 66, and so on – this has not been done in the autograph itself). A paperclip in the hire department score assists the jump over the cut pages. The score is labelled ‘c. 1/6/66. M. Sargent use only’, and signed by Sargent on the flyleaf: ‘c.’ is not ‘copyright’ or ‘circa’; perhaps it means ‘corrected’. The implication is that this is the score used at the premiere, altered in time for the second performance. Possibly the original intention was that Sargent would conduct on that occasion as well.

Also at the RNCM is a short score (AR/1/081b) showing the solo part with the accompaniment on two staves (see the reproductions on pp. 24–7). This is Rawsthorne’s composing score, and thus earlier in time than the full score. It was used as the engraver’s exemplar for the published cello and piano reduction of the work: ‘casting up’ is evident throughout. This score duly shows the 83-bar cut referred to above, but more surprisingly it reveals that a further 30 bars had been cut at an earlier stage, never having reached the full score or the hire material. Furthermore, in this document the 16 bars following the cut, still extant in the work as it now stands, are shown as a pasteover covering something else – at this stage we don’t know what. In summary: the full score may show an almost arbitrary cut, but it is evident from the short score that Rawsthorne had thought about this area of the work for a long time, and had already recomposed it even before the premiere.

In conclusion

As I mentioned earlier, the Cello Concerto was among the earliest of Rawsthorne’s works with which I was able to become properly acquainted through
The Cello Concerto: p.9 of the short score (RNCM AR/1/081b). This is Rawsthorne's continuous draft of the complete work; using pencil allowed him to make it clean enough to double as the exemplar for the printed cello/piano reduction. See, above the top system, the engraver's 'casting up' marking '16/1'. Nearby, Rawsthorne indicates a cut to rehearsal figure 73 (which thus became 66). The fugue subject – up a minor seventh, down a perfect fourth, and so on – has by the top of this page acquired a triplet of crotchets instead of its original crotchet and two quavers. It appears in stretto, first between the two top parts of the accompaniment, beginning in the alto at bar 2, and then between the tenor and bass, from 66 at the beginning of the cut section. The subject appears again 3 bars before 70, at the bottom of the page.
The Cello Concerto: p. 11 of the short score (RNCM AR/1/081b). The music up to 73 on this page survived to appear in the orchestral score and to be performed for the first and only time under Sargent. The tied chords in the lowest stave of the first and second systems were implemented as a tremolando on the violas – a much gentler way of approaching the violin tremolando and horn/harp motif that now come straight after the cut. But after 73 a further 30 bars formerly existed but were excised before the full score was made. The ‘V.S.’ (turn quickly) at this point would only make sense if the previous material had remained uncut when it was written. Four bars after 73 we see the last wistful appearance of the fugue subject in the top part (B♭–A♭–E♭–F) and at the end of the next system the introduction sotto voce of the subsequent horn motif (B♭–C–E♭–F). The first 16 bars (next page – not illustrated) after the combined 113-bar cut are on a pasteover covering something else – this too was inserted before the full score was made.
my own recording, and to which my response, even on first encounter, was immediate. I should like once again, and for the last time, to cite Gerard Schurmann, who at the very end of the first of his biographical pieces in The Creel wrote the following:

To have known him, and to know his music well, is a privilege that I continue to treasure with affection as one of my most enduring possessions.19

Amen to that, though of course I cannot claim that my knowledge of the music, if set beside his, will be at anything more than a relatively superficial level. What I can fairly say, I think, is that from the very outset I have sensed, however dimly at first and later on over the years more strongly in the rest of his catalogue, in the well-chosen words (which I cannot improve upon) of his other great advocate Alun Hoddinott: ‘another facet of a profound and complex creative imagination’.20
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19 Schurmann, ‘Recollections of a Long Friendship’, p. 120.
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The Reception of Alan Rawsthorne’s Cello Concerto (1966)

John France

Genesis

On 18 February 1965, the Daily Telegraph announced that the Royal Philharmonic Society committee of management was to receive a sum of £2,550 (about £48k at 2018 values) from the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. It was the Society’s intention to use this money to commission several new works from established composers over the following three years. The first commission had been accepted by Alan Rawsthorne for a cello concerto.

The year 1965 was reasonably productive for Rawsthorne. Although the only major work produced during this time was the Cello Concerto, there were several others: ‘The Oxen’ for chorus was first heard during December 1965; this was the composer’s contribution to Oxford University Press’s popular anthology Carols of Today, published in that year. This volume featured seventeen numbers by modern composers, including Peter Racine Fricker, Richard Rodney Bennett, Alun Hoddinott and Peter Maxwell Davies. In the same year, Rawsthorne’s Tankas of the Four Seasons was premiered at the Cheltenham Festival. This was a setting of Catalan love poems by Carles Riba for tenor solo and chamber ensemble (oboe, clarinet, bassoon, violin and cello). To my knowledge this work awaits its debut recording. Another important work that has languished is the incidental music for the BBC’s 1965 dramatisation of Charles Dickens’s A Tale of Two Cities. Dressler notes that there are some 24 minutes of music, composed for chamber orchestra, 2 it may be that the extreme sectionalisation of this score has prevented a ‘suite’ being created. The final work from 1965 was a setting of Louis MacNeice’s poem ‘The Streets of Laredo’ for solo voice and guitar.

The following year, 1966, was much less productive, with only a single work completed: The God in the Cave, a cantata for SATB chorus and orchestra on a text by the communist poet Randall Swingler. The work was commissioned by the Edinburgh University Madrigal Society for their centenary celebration. It
was premiered on 8 February 1967. The text is a collection of poems inspired by the caves at Lascaux in France, which ‘deals with primitive caveman and the psychological urge to create cave art, as a metaphor for the relationship between man and nature’.

The Programme note
For reference, I include the programme note provided by the composer for the Cello Concerto (this was not, however, the one used for the premiere):

Although the first movement of this concerto falls into seven sections based on one theme, it should be heard as a continuous piece rather than as a set of variations in a formal sense. In the first of these sections the soloist states the theme; the last is in the nature of a recapitulation. After the theme has been heard, the cor anglais introduces a more melancholy mood (meno mosso) which presently gives way to a return to the original tempo, where the cello starts to play lively figurations of the melody. These passages work up to introduce the fourth section, with a powerful tutti. The cello enters and continues the strenuous character of this with bravura passages. The fifth section reverts to a more meditative mood, and the cello enters to play a little duet with the cor anglais. The music works up to a climax, and the sixth section is a vehement paragraph for orchestra only. After a short cadenza the cello settles down to play a series of quiet arpeggios, over which the oboe starts to recapitulate the theme, and the piece ends very quietly.

The material of the slow movement consists of an orchestral introduction leading to a very sad melody played by the soloist, and a second idea which forms a middle section. This takes the form of a very free, rhapsodic kind of melodic line against a background of sustained chords by the orchestra. There follows some development of the first subject and, after a large orchestral climax and a short cadenza, a brief reference is made to the second subject by the clarinet. A much-abbreviated recapitulation concludes the movement.

The last movement starts with a reference to the theme of the first, and spends some time, during its course, in working these allusions together with the new material which is more properly its own. It has a scherzando idea for a middle section, of which a short phrase serves as a subject for fugal development. In a fairly lengthy coda two of the themes are heard in combination with a fresh one, and the concerto finishes with a bravura climax.

Performance and review
The premiere was given on 6 April 1966 at the Royal Festival Hall. The New Philharmonia Orchestra, led by Hugh Bean, was conducted by Sir Malcolm Sargent. The cello soloist was Christopher Bunting. The concert began with Delius’s North Country Sketches (1913–14) and Rawsthorne’s concerto followed. After the interval there was a single work: the Symphony No. 1 (1932–5) by Walton. The concert was broadcast on the BBC Home Service.

Radio Times (31 March 1966) had carried an introduction to the Cello Concerto written by Alun Hoddinott. He opens his remarks by reminding the reader that Rawsthorne is ‘one of the few English composers consistently attracted to the writing of concertos in any large number ...’ The present concertante work (in 1966) was his eighth in the genre. Hoddinott included the Concertante Pastorale for flute, horn and orchestra, but not the Concerto for Ten Instruments nor the Concerto for String Orchestra in this tally. In the following years only one more example was composed: the Concerto for Two Pianos (1968).

Hoddinott considered that the Cello Concerto ‘... is likely to be not only a landmark in his own music, but also a significant and valuable addition to a still rather meagre repertoire’. Hoddinott believed that it was ‘distinguished by many immediately discernible characteristics: a masterful and subtly organised overall structure that is cyclic in conception; inventive and creatively imagined textures; and the uniquely original personal language that retains the vitality to explore, and still surprise’. Overall, Hoddinott thought that the work was sympathetic to the soloist and successfully balanced lyricism (most of the work) with contrasting bravura passages.

It is of considerable interest to note the progress of criticism of Rawsthorne’s Cello Concerto, which has largely swung from an adverse impression in the immediate aftermath of the premiere to acceptance of the work as one of the composer’s masterpieces. A paradigm for understanding some of the relatively negative reviews of the premiere is given by John McCabe. Yet all was not praise. Greenfield wondered whether the ‘very intention of writing “important music” [for the Philharmonic Society] has crabbed Rawsthorne’s inspiration, for the quality of invention is markedly less individual than one expects from this composer’. He felt that although ‘on paper’ the music
appeared to contain 'good melodic lines' the reality was that 'in performance [it] is curiously unmemorable'. The slow movement is described as 'lumpish, with its heavy double stopping, and even the main subject for the march finale was recognisable not so much as a distinctive theme as by its obvious rhythm'. Interestingly Greenfield blames the lack of success of this work largely on the composer, whilst commending 'the excellent expressive playing of the soloist'. He would modify his impression of the work in his appraisal of the Promenade performance later in the year, although without altering his preference for melodies and distinctive themes; see below, pp. 36–7, Guardian, 26 August 1966.

The Financial Times (7 April 1966) review by David Cairns stands out from other early reactions by reason of its almost entirely positive tone. Cairns recognised that the work was 'an attractive and characteristic addition to the cello's limited concerto repertoire ... He considered, in common with many but not all other reviewers, that 'a cellist more powerful in tone and attack' was required. However, the concerto should be 'prized' for its 'delicate, profound, austere lyricism ... especially in its slow movement'. Cairns considers that this is 'one of the most masterly and searchingly beautiful things Rawsthorne has done'. A poetic description of the opening of the first movement states that it 'is pure enchantment – an exquisite cool pattern of interlacing woodwind phrases subtly preparing for the soloist's entry with the gently sinuous main theme whose characteristic sigh and fall runs clearly through the entire work'. Finally, Cairns finds that it is the middle movement that 'carries the listener with it without reservation'. Nothing is more moving in this work than, after a grave and grand climax in the first half of the movement, a 'pathetic passage ... in which the soloist stammers and stutters, as if struggling to break free into fresh flights of lyrical expansion but can only repeat with quiet resignation the sighing figure of the work's main theme'. This is the 'essence of Rawsthorne's deep, stoical melancholy'.

Colin Mason provided a major critique of the premiere in the pages of the Daily Telegraph (7 April 1966). Under the headline 'Imaginative Scoring of New Cello Concerto' he noted that the work was 'designed on a larger scale than Rawsthorne had generally worked to'. Interestingly, he suggests that the concerto has some 'extra-musical dramatic content, equally unusual in [his] music'. Mason refers to a pertinent example of this in the slow movement, 'where the violence of the outbursts towards the end is not immediately self-explanatory in purely musical terms'. What this 'drama' may have been is unfortunately not discussed in any subsequent studies or reviews.

Much as he appreciated the scoring of the concerto, especially the chamber music 'feel' in the opening pages, Mason suggested that the problem with the work was that when Rawsthorne wished to seek 'dynamic contrast [he] falls into too easy a routine of letting the orchestra off the rein between the soloist's entries'. This had the effect of creating a work 'on two planes' which rarely met – lightly accompanied soloist and full orchestral tuttis. Finally, Colin Mason remarked on the 'elusive, shadowy quality that has always been characteristic
of Rawsthorne’s music’. Soloist Christopher Bunting was ‘sensitive, animated and precise … [he] seemed to realise the character and meet the demands of the work to perfection’.

The Times review (7 April 1966), possibly by William Mann, echoes Colin Mason’s comments about balance. He writes that many composers have ‘found [that] the cello is not an instrument which readily balances against a symphony orchestra’. He feels that although ‘the musical argument … is generously shared among soloist, woodwind, occasionally horns and strings, there are many points at which its tenor [i.e. train of thought] becomes lost simply because the solo line is submerged’. Bunting’s shortcomings are raised: ‘a more incisive soloist … have projected it more strongly?’ The critic decides that it is the composer’s fault. There was little to ‘really arrest the attention’ with all the ‘thematic ideas [being] small, sometimes no more than a statement of a particular interval and a brief embellishment of it … ’ The reviewer thought that the ‘more persuasive’ slow movement ‘reached its appointed end somewhat before its actual one’. The finale, beginning with a nod to the vibrancy of Rawsthorne’s Street Corner overture (1944) soon became ‘less playful, more rarefied, and ultimately less interesting’. The bottom line is that ‘there was nothing compelling in [Rawsthorne’s] actual invention’.

Desmond Shawe-Taylor (Sunday Times, 10 April 1966) claimed that he liked Alan Rawsthorne’s music ‘in general’, with a concern that his earlier concertos for piano and for violin have been ‘unaccountably neglected’. A preliminary inspection of the score ‘had promised a lucid structure and cool, airy textures’. Despite being satisfied with the ‘lovely opening of the first movement and the end of the second’, he found that much of the work ‘sounded grey and ineffective in a way so uncharacteristic of its composer that he [Shawe-Taylor] was ‘tempted to reserve judgement’. He wondered whether it was ‘the fault of the scoring, of the soloist (a sensitive, not very strong player), of inadequate rehearsal time, or of Sir Malcolm’s indifference to the niceties of balance’. He does not offer an opinion on the identity of the main issue, but apprehends that ‘what we heard cannot have been quite what the composer intended’. Shawe-Taylor felt that the opening movement required ‘more substantial themes to fill out its longish argument’. Positively, the middle movement contained ‘some affecting and eloquent writing for the soloist’ and the finale re-presented material from the earlier movements, looked at ‘with brisk, extrovert eyes’. Finally, however, Shawe-Taylor wrote that ‘… unless the performance was at fault [there is] a decided want of conviction and vitality in the whole’. Based on these comments he can foresee ‘no very brilliant future for [Rawsthorne’s] concertos’.

Largely positive towards the soloist was the anonymous editorial in The Strad (May 1966). Here the reviewer felt, in common with Greenfield and Mason, that Christopher Bunting was ‘accomplished and dedicated: his beauty of tone and impeccable of intonation were apparent throughout …’ On the other hand, the concerto was ‘a disappointment’. The writer found, like Greenfield, that although the work was ‘extremely well written for the cello’, ‘the thematic material seemed rather slight and its treatment gave a general effect of monotony’. Like Mason, the critic notes the ‘strident orchestral tuttis’, which may have been created to break this dullness, but ‘create an impression of hysteria rather than a culmination of power derived from the underlying spirit of the music’.

Musical Times (May 1966) gave the concerto short shrift. Stanley Sadie wrote that the new work ‘has some distinguished ideas, carefully and tastefully laid out, and music of quiet poetic eloquence in the central slow movement. It seemed, at a first hearing, to be well argued. What it lacked was anything which caught and held the interest — perhaps with more vivid solo playing, that really cut through the orchestral textures, it might prove arresting; but I rather doubt it.’

G. M., writing in Musical Opinion (June 1966) was less than impressed by the new work. He wrote that it ‘proved something of a disappointment as, in spite of some skilful, and, at times, poetic writing, the concerto is of a rambling nature and never gets anywhere in particular’. Extensive revisions by Rawsthorne after the first performance may have been in response to criticism of this nature; see also Alan Blyth’s review quoted next. One of the issues, for G. M., was the cyclic nature of the work, with themes reappearing in the three movements. None of these are ‘[especially memorable’. As to the actual performance, G. M. damned with faint praise: ‘Christopher Bunting played the solo part with sympathy, but his tone was scarcely sufficiently large to get through the thick orchestral score.’

The now-lamented Music and Musicians (June 1966) reminded the reader that Rawsthorne’s Cello Concerto had ‘collected a crop of regretfully unfavourable notices in the newspapers’. Alan Blyth chose to add another. He wonders whether the critics had been ‘expecting a different kind of work’? The problems were twofold. The new work ‘seemed both rambling and thick textured’. This was strange, as Rawsthorne’s reputation ‘rests on the cogency of his structures and the facility of his orchestration’. Graciously, Blyth wonders if it was a ‘fault’ in the ‘reticent’ playing by Bunting. If the ‘themes had been more positively delineated, and the internal balance better maintained, we should have been hailing a worthy successor to the Piano and Violin Concertos’. Blyth concludes his comments by suggesting that an ‘open mind’ be kept until several more performances and performers have ‘either confirmed [the] initial impression of dullness or proved a thoughtful composer and master craftsman to have been well justified in the latest extension of his personal and compelling style’.

Promenade performance

The next performance of the concerto was at a Promenade Concert on Thursday, 25 August 1966. The concert included Schubert’s Symphony No. 5, Richard Strauss’s Oboe Concerto and Beethoven’s Symphony No. 7. On this occasion, Christopher Bunting was once again accompanied by the New Philharmonia
Orchestra, this time conducted by Norman Del Mar. Heinz Holliger was the soloist in the Strauss concerto.

Andrew Porter, writing for the Financial Times (26 August 1966), remained unimpressed by this work. He believed 'it left little mark' at the premiere and 'little last night'. He considered that the music 'lacks character' with each movement beginning 'more promisingly than it continues'. It seemed that interesting ideas were initially presented, but 'when argument, development, working-out begin, one's interest flags'. He accepts that the work has consistency: 'The discourse has been pondered, the paragraphs have been shaped. The logic is impeccable, and the appropriate cross-references are made.' But the result 'seemed dull'. Porter did propose, as had many after the premiere, that 'a more forceful soloist than Christopher Bunting ... might have quickened the attention': 'his playing lacked personality'. The reason for this was his tendency to present a musical idea 'in a modest, almost apologetic way' resulting in a disinclination 'to seize the lead'.

The Times (26 August 1966) critic, possibly William Mann, was particularly struck on this occasion by the middle movement. He considered that it was 'deeply felt and vividly expressed'. Furthermore, this 'is deeply troubled, sometimes even haunted music, particularly suited to the cello's capacity for dark brooding, and scored for the orchestra with many a chilling touch of fantasy'. Here he responded similarly to Colin Mason after the first performance, who had wondered whether some extra-musical dramatic content was behind this movement. Once again, the problem of the tutti emerged. He sensed that the 'tension accumulated in the tutti seemed rather too often dissipated when it was the cello's turn to be heard ... ' It seemed a problem of balance. The concluding remark completes the tone of this analysis: 'Mr Bunting was ... too much the sensitive chamber musician, too little the flaming soloist, though it was playing finely interwoven with the orchestral texture.'

Edward Greenfield (Guardian, 26 August 1966) gave a short but important review of the Promenade Concert. Greenfield declared that he had come 'close to drawing a blank' with the work at its premiere. The issue was with Rawsthorne's inhibition at 'writing sharply memorable tunes' of any great length. In the Cello Concerto this reserve 'seemed to have grown worse with vaguely lyrical flutterings taking the place of real melodies'. It does seem strange that Greenfield even expected melodies and tunes from a work written at this period. His experience at this concert was that the second hearing had made clear 'how cogently argued the work is'. He now regarded the opening movement as 'a most satisfying combination of sonata form, rondo and variation form'. One wonders whether this new appreciation is partly the result of having had time to absorb Alun Hoddinott's arguments in his various writings about the concerto, and/or the programme note for the Promenade Concert performance (which may have been Rawsthorne's own, quoted above). Greenfield seems to have become reconciled to the 'two powerful tutti' in this first movement, so condemned by other critics. He concludes by reporting that Christopher Bunting played the solo part 'radiantly', and admitting that his attention had been 'riveted in a way I had not found at the first performance'.

The Cello Concerto was panned by Peter Brown in Music and Musicians (November 1966). Under the headline 'Lifeless Rawsthorne' he wrote that despite Norman Del Mar's best efforts, Christopher Bunting had been 'unable to breathe much life into Alan Rawsthorne's Cello Concerto'. He did concede that it has 'some nice moments' especially in the latter part of the slow movement, and in the final bars of the opening 'Allegro lirico', nevertheless, 'taken as a whole the work failed to convince one of either a high level of inspiration or individuality'. Brown was, by the way, the first commentator to make explicit the disparity between the 'jocular finale' and 'the earlier restrained movements'.

The score and piano reduction of the concerto were published in 1970 by Oxford University Press. Reviewing the score in Musical Times (October 1973) Stephen Srawley wrote that:

Alan Rawsthorne in his Cello Concerto is more sparing with his orchestration than has been the symphonic tendency this century. The first movement, described by the composer as continuous variations, at no point reaches a major climax: that is reserved for the sad and rhapsodic slow movement. The last movement cannot claim quite the originality of the first two. Rawsthorne even has to resort to a fugue, yet another example of 'when the fount of inspiration dries up, write a fugue'.

Analysis
The concerto is fortunate in having generated several studies of varying analytical depth. The earliest is a pre-concert introduction by Alun Hoddinott published in The Listener (31 March 1966). This article (see pp. 15–17 of this issue) also briefly discusses the seven previous concertos including the Clarinet Concerto.
and the Violin Concerto No. 2. Hoddinott is the first commentator to note the merging of the traditional sonata form with variations in the first movement of the Cello Concerto. His analysis was based on his notes for the programme of the premiere. He closes his discussion by stating that: 'The concerto certainly ranks among Rawsthorne’s finest works. Yet it indicates that the composer is still quietly exploring further possibilities, inherent in his idiom and is moving deeper into his unique and profound creative imagination.'

Following up on his articles in Radio Times and The Listener and the programme note for the first performance, Hoddinott provided an important review of the Cello Concerto and its premiere for Tempo magazine (Summer 1966):

Rawsthorne’s music falls into three clear periods (early works apart), the first establishing a highly individual and original musical language, the second showing a masterly exploring of large-scale symphonic forms, while the third (and present) is primarily concerned with the renewing and broadening of some elements of the language. Obviously, some aspects of the differing periods overlap but there is a consistency that shows distinct patterns of development.

One is a predilection for concerto writing and it is no exaggeration to say that in this genre Rawsthorne has few equals amongst English composers. Moreover, the concertos come at crucial times in Rawsthorne’s evolution and in themselves form a subsidiary pattern. The Clarinet Concerto initiates the first period, which reaches its climax with the First Piano Concerto. Similarly the second period begins with the First Violin Concerto and rises to a climax with the Second Piano Concerto. The latest period opens with the Second Violin Concerto and has arrived at the recent Cello Concerto. Another pattern of interest is the preceding of the ‘climactic’ concertos by a large-scale orchestral work. Thus the First Piano Concerto follows the Symphonic Studies, the Second Piano Concerto the First Symphony, and the Cello Concerto the Third Symphony.

It is patently not possible to say with exactitude whether or not the Cello Concerto fits into the established pattern and is the climax of this present phase - in any case, ‘climax’ is superfluous in the light of, for example, the Violin Sonata of 1958 or the Quintet for Wind and Piano of 1963. By its nature, however, the new concerto does suggest that it follows the precedent of the earlier works.

One extremely interesting aspect of the concerto is the quite masterly ease and flexibility with which Rawsthorne has merged the familiar and the newer elements of the language – a process that begins with the Second Violin Concerto and has fluctuated with successive pieces. The harmonic fabric is wide-ranging, blending a basically tonal (C major) structure with freely chromatic chord formations. In his earlier music, Rawsthorne maintains a euphonious texture by using chords built primarily of thirds, fifths and sevenths, a newer note being introduced in the third period by the use of chords made up of seconds, fourths and sevenths resulting in a harder, more dissonant sound. Both types of chord formation are used [in the Cello Concerto], resulting in a smooth flow of tension and relaxation.

The integrated use of chord formation in the total structure is perhaps more pronounced in the Cello Concerto than in previous works, and a chord first heard in bar 15 of the first movement is used as a pivotal point for expansion and development. This chord is the first inversion of a minor seventh (with a major third) coloured with bitonal additions that either sharpen the dissonance or make for an opaque sound. It is not the only chord formation thus used, but it is the most important, as the second (slow) movement shows - almost the entire middle section of the movement derives from the proliferations and exploring of the possibilities inherent in the chord.

Bitonal elements have formed the basis of many of Rawsthorne’s later works, but here they are kept in the background and used mainly for chord formation and harmonic colour. Thematically, the concerto contains some of Rawsthorne’s most distinguished invention, the slow movement being especially memorable. The composer’s cello writing, orchestrally and in chamber music, has always been marked by its lyrical and passionate intensity. One has only to think of the cello line in the First Piano Concerto or the Clarinet Quartet, or indeed the only other work for solo cello, the Sonata of 1949, to realise this. From the serenely beautiful opening, through the nocturnal prolixity of the ‘Mesto’ to the virtuoso demands of the finale, the solo writing shows (as always with Rawsthorne) the instinctive feeling for the essential character of the instrument.

Rawsthorne’s rhythmic patterns, here as always, are direct, clear and entertaining – the finale even contains an echo of the finale of the Second Piano Concerto. The metrical implications of some sections of the slow movement do, however, seem to indicate a new point of departure in their freedom, and sometimes static quality.

One feature of the concerto that did not always make its impact (and especially so in the finale) was the beautifully balanced and colourful texture. This is possibly one of the most difficult problems to manage.
in the cello concerto medium and due to obviously ill-balanced dynamics and equally obvious under-rehearsal, Rawsthorne’s solution of this particular problem was sometimes difficult to assess and must be left to a further hearing, although a reading of the score shows no miscalculation in this respect.

The structures of the three movements are basically the same as those evolved by Rawsthorne in his second period. Nevertheless there are subtle refinements, such as the interlocking of the free variations of the first movement, the finely balanced ternary form of the second, and the sharply divided sections of the finale (although here again, the obscurity of the performance of the finale must have puzzled many listeners with regard to the structure). Rawsthorne’s favourite method of thematic integration is total in this work and every note fits into a primary conception and its derivations.

Hoddinott’s penultimate paragraph expresses the hope that a further hearing will reveal Rawsthorne’s ‘beautifully balanced and colourful texture’, obscured in the unsatisfactory premiere. Indeed, it was not until the recording of 2000 (see below) that these issues were finally resolved.

For several years The Strad magazine carried a series of essays about ‘Contemporary Cello Concerti’. These included studies of works by Frank Bridge, Donald Tovey, Havergal Brian and Kenneth Leighton. In the May 1973 edition of the magazine, S. S. Dale wrote about Rawsthorne’s Cello Concerto. Much of the article was background; setting the composer and his work in general into context. This includes reference to his (and other composers’) film scores. A brief biographical section ensues, followed by a stylistic analysis of his earlier works. Dale felt that two major influences were to be found in his music: Hindemith and Walton. The overall tone of Rawsthorne’s music was ‘pleasantly astringent, yet it never shocks’.

Turning to the Cello Concerto, Dale reminds the reader that Rawsthorne had studied the cello under the German-born, Manchester-residing cellist Carl Fuchs (1865–1951). Fuchs was best known as the cellist in the Brodsky Quartet and as the principal cellist in the Hallé Orchestra during Hans Richter’s tenure as chief conductor. Dale notes that ‘a casual glance at the score is quite sufficient to show us that [Rawsthorne] understood the nature of string writing and string playing’. The concerto is ‘hallmarked with [Rawsthorne’s] fingerprints, and as chief conductor. Dale notes that ‘a casual glance at the score is quite sufficient to show us that [Rawsthorne] understood the nature of string writing and string playing’. The concerto is ‘hallmarked with [Rawsthorne’s] fingerprints, and as chief conductor. Dale notes that ‘a casual glance at the score is quite sufficient to show us that [Rawsthorne] understood the nature of string writing and string playing’. The concerto is ‘hallmarked with [Rawsthorne’s] fingerprints, and as chief conductor. Dale notes that ‘a casual glance at the score is quite sufficient to show us that [Rawsthorne] understood the nature of string writing and string playing’.

A brief biographical section ensues, followed by a stylistic analysis of his earlier works. Dale felt that two major influences were to be found in his music: Hindemith and Walton. The overall tone of Rawsthorne’s music was ‘pleasantly astringent, yet it never shocks’.

Turning to the Cello Concerto, Dale reminds the reader that Rawsthorne had studied the cello under the German-born, Manchester-residing cellist Carl Fuchs (1865–1951). Fuchs was best known as the cellist in the Brodsky Quartet and as the principal cellist in the Hallé Orchestra during Hans Richter’s tenure as chief conductor. Dale notes that ‘a casual glance at the score is quite sufficient to show us that [Rawsthorne] understood the nature of string writing and string playing’. The concerto is ‘hallmarked with [Rawsthorne’s] fingerprints, and as chief conductor. Dale notes that ‘a casual glance at the score is quite sufficient to show us that [Rawsthorne] understood the nature of string writing and string playing’.

After a descriptive analysis of the concerto, which largely follows the concert programme notes, Dale gives his opinion that this is ‘one of the most playable of modern concerti for violoncello and orchestra. The composer … obviously knew the potentialities of the instrument and utilised them with a certainty that would have earned a tribute from [his] old cello master …’

Writing in 1986, Sebastian Forbes presented an analytical study of most of Rawsthorne’s orchestral music, including the concertos. He began his study of the Cello Concerto by insisting that this work ‘matches the two violin concertos in breadth of conception and in idiomatic writing for the solo instrument’. He maintains that it is basically a lyrical work, with a ‘skilful structure’ and ‘powerful climaxes’. One key feature of this concerto is that the three movements ‘take their time to unfold and reveal their story’…

Forbes presents a short analysis with several musical examples. In conclusion he suggests that ‘the concerto as a whole bears a family resemblance to the Third Symphony which he feels is probably Rawsthorne’s finest work of this period. Both works are characterised by ‘free, almost improvisatory’ melodic movement and a rich harmonic palette.

The most recent analysis is presented in John McCabe’s (1999) study of the composer. This is a largely descriptive discussion supported by three musical examples. Of importance is the view that the opening movement, subtitled ‘Quasi variazioni’ presents a ‘subtle version of variation technique’. McCabe feels that this movement sounds like an ‘exceptionally well-integrated sonata form’ and he reminds the readers that the composer himself had warned that ‘it should be heard as a continuous piece rather than as a set of variations in the formal sense’. In fact, it is so close to sonata form that the last variation can be regarded as the recapitulation.

Another feature of the opening movement that impressed McCabe was the ‘curious mixture of the openly diatonic (somewhat akin to [Rawsthorne’s] Pastoral Symphony) … and the extremes of dissonance’ first heard in the Third Symphony and ‘with almost equal ferocity in two substantial orchestral sections here’. McCabe considers that Rawsthorne is here less concerned ‘with motivic and other development’, having presented material that is ‘more rhapsodic in style’.

Much criticism of this concerto has been the disparity between the musings of the soloist and the orchestral outbursts. Yet McCabe contextualises this: The climaxes … seem less an eruption of subterranean turbulence than a sudden outpouring by way of contrast.’ This enables the composer to provide variety in a movement of this length’, McCabe considers that the ‘free variation’ used by Rawsthorne largely parallels the ‘ebb and flow of intensity’ of a more traditional sonata form.

The move from the stillness of the ending of the first movement to the middle ‘Mesto’ is ‘equally rhapsodic in feeling, but far more concentrated in thought’. McCabe cites David Cairns’ review (Financial Times, 7 April 1966; quoted above), which concludes by suggesting that this movement ‘is the essence of Rawsthorne’s deep, stoical melancholy’.

John McCabe describes the ‘extraordinary blatant assumption of cheerfulness’ of the opening of the finale. It comes as a complete contrast to the ‘darkening purple’ of the slow movement. He thinks that the ‘buoyancy and good
humour of the thematic ideas and developments, allied with the compellingly propulsive rhythmic patterns and an uninhibited C major tonality make this finale the perfect foil for the preceding two ‘introspective’ movements. The formal structure may appear to be a rondo, but McCabe feels that it is ‘another kind of variation movement, more elusively derived’ from the concerto’s principal theme.

One of the characteristic features of this concerto is the wide range of cello writing that the composer utilises. McCabe suggests that despite Rawsthorne being ‘well suited to the more melancholy and yearning tones’ of the cello, he is able ‘to write admirably apt scherzando passages, light and airy in character …’

Interestingly, in John McCabe’s ‘highly personal’ list of Rawsthorne’s music that he considers of the highest quality, he does not include the Cello Concerto, although he does suggest that it may well be included by ‘other commentators’. The omission does not make any less relevant the general comment that Rawsthorne had ‘a voice unlike any other, speaking not at the top of his voice, but quietly, persuasively, with intensity – a precious musical resource we must not ignore’. This final thought is the perfect précis of Rawsthorne’s Cello Concerto.

**Recordings**

It is remarkable that there is only a single commercial recording of the Rawsthorne Cello Concerto. This compares to a current (March 2018, ArkivMusic.com) tally of eighty-four performances (some may be repackages) of Elgar’s Cello Concerto. In 2000 Naxos released a CD of Rawsthorne orchestral works played by the Royal Scottish National Orchestra conducted by David Lloyd-Jones. Works include the pre-war Symphonic Studies (1938), the lyrical Oboe Concerto dating from 1947 and the Cello Concerto. The cello soloist is Alexander Baillie.

Andrew Clements (Guardian, 1 December 2000) noticed that there was a ‘quiet Alan Rawsthorne revival’ under way. He remarked on the considerable number of chamber and orchestral works now available on various record labels, especially Naxos. Clements considered the Cello Concerto was the ‘finest thing’ on this present disc. This is a big claim, bearing in mind the coupling with the Symphonic Studies. Clements deemed the concerto to be a ‘good example of [Rawsthorne’s] mature style, with its lucid orchestration and the vaguely neo-classical cut of its themes’.

Andrew Achenbach, reviewing the CD for The Gramophone (February 2001), welcomed the first recording of the Cello Concerto. He regards it as a ‘major achievement’ which can ‘rank beside Rawsthorne’s superb Third Symphony and Third String Quartet … in its unremitting concentration and nobility of expression’. Achenbach points out the dichotomy between the ‘lyrical’ opening movement and the ‘dark introspection with outbursts of real anguish’ in the middle ‘Mesto’. All is largely resolved in the ‘energetic, even rumbustious finale’. The review concludes with Achenbach’s opinion that this is a ‘substantial, deeply felt utterance’ with the soloist Alexander Baillie giving ‘a stunningly idiomatic rendering; Lloyd-Jones and the RSNO offer big-hearted, confident support’.

Paul Conway (MusicWeb International, 1 February 2001) is equally absorbed. He suggests that there is ‘much to impress in this sombre and eloquent work, nowhere more so than in the beginning and ending of the central ‘Mesto’ as the solo cello tries in vain to climb out of the rich, dark textures which mire it’. He notes that ‘The mood of the finale is uncertain (an initial breeziness is soon snuffed out by memories of the solemnity of the preceding movements). There are compensations in the brief but emotionally charged cadenza and the grand, towering conclusion.’

Rob Barnett (MusicWeb International, 1 March 2001) also welcomes this CD. He writes:

The Cello Concerto ... is not an easy winner and its rewards will only yield to repeated listenings. It is given an atmospheric interpretation and the typically lucid recording brings out its cellular character. This is not a work of directly lyrical expression nor of dramatic defiance. Another intriguing British cello concerto continuing the same line as the Walton, the Bax and the Moeran – none of them totally successful – all of them with sustaining interest. Rawsthorne is well served by Baillie and the orchestra.

Nine years after the release of this CD, Roger Hecht gave a useful summary of the Cello Concerto in his extensive overview of British orchestral music for the American Record Guide (January/February 2010). He writes '[Rawsthorne’s] Cello Concerto is a major work. It is serious, but there is a great deal of expressive variety. It sounds atonal but never forbiddingly so. The orchestra is active and often brassy. The cello ranges from brooding to angry, its lines almost vocal sometimes. A lot of things go on in this piece, and they’re always interesting.’

**Conclusion**

David Lloyd-Jones, Alexander Baillie and the Royal Scottish National Orchestra have learned the lessons of the 1966 premiere. Here the balance between soloist and orchestra is well judged. The cellist projects his part and allows the thematic development to be clear and satisfying. The orchestral tuttis, although still powerful, are less strident, and the above-noted tendency to ramble is not a characteristic of this recording. The benchmark for all future performances has been set.

**Discography**

Notes
1 Not 'Carlos'.
5 McCabe, Alan Rawsthorne, p. 259.
7 McCabe, Alan Rawsthorne, pp. 259–63.

In Brief
Rare Programme Note: the Elegiac Fragments

Tony Burton writes: ‘The Programme Note feature in the last issue caught my eye. I wondered whether the enclosed, from the first performance of what became the Elegiac Rhapsody, might fill a gap. As a keen sixteen-year-old, I got the composer’s autograph on it.’

[A pity no one checked the spelling of MacNeice’s name in the last line! - ed.]
Second Symphony: recent news

The Southgate Symphony Orchestra provided a rare opportunity to hear a Rawsthorne symphony in concert with their performance of his Second Symphony on 25 November 2017, at Southgate, north London. This was the first time that Andrew Knowles or I had heard a live performance of one of his symphonies. The Rawsthorne work was framed by Rossini’s overture The Italian Girl in Algiers and Berlioz’s Harold in Italy. The conductor, Adrian Brown, introduced each work and had the orchestra play snatches of the Rawsthorne by way of ‘signposts’, for the audience, before reassuring them that this was not ‘difficult’ music!

The orchestra gave a spirited and sympathetic, if not always accurate, performance, not helped by the very cold evening. Soprano Nicola Ilnstowicz was the soloist in the last movement and the performance was well received by the audience, most of whom will not have heard anything by Rawsthorne before. The last movement was reprised, to greater applause.

Tony Pickard

Third Symphony: delayed news

Received wisdom is still that the Third Symphony has never achieved a London performance, in spite of an announcement in The Sprat for New Year 1994 (right) describing a recent studio performance at the BBC Maida Vale studios, ‘before an invited audience’. This should count as a public performance, although it was necessary to apply for tickets in advance. Like The Sprat, the BBC’s advertisement in Tempo magazine announced this as the ‘London premiere’, and, as hoped, it was seemingly broadcast, twice, during summer 1994; although for some reason this is hard to verify from the Genome project <https://genome.ch.bbc.co.uk>.

Had they but known, however …

What Genome does, however, reveal, is that a previous Maida Vale performance, also before an invited audience, apparently broadcast live, had taken place as early as 3 April 1967, when Norman Del Mar conducted the BBCSO. Rawsthorne’s work appeared in the second half, the first having been devoted to Roberto Gerhard’s Concerto for Orchestra. Evidently there must have been a connection with the Lyrita LP recording of the same works with the same conductor and orchestra, issued in 1968.

Nigel Bonham-Carter / Tony Pickard

London Premiere

It is astonishing that the Third Symphony has had to wait almost thirty years for its London première. The first performance was on 8th July 1964 at Cheltenham; the first performance in the Capital was on 7th December 1993, when Lionel Friend conducted a studio performance by the BBC Symphony Orchestra. This will, it is presumed, be broadcast on a date yet to be announced.

Nigel Bonham-Carter / Tony Pickard

East of Southgate: Rawsthorne rehearsing the State Symphony Orchestra of the USSR in his Second Symphony with the soprano V. Ilinanova (who sang in Russian) for a concert on 3 October 1963, in which he also conducted his Concerto for String Orchestra.

West of Maida Vale: Rawsthorne with Maurice Gendron and George Hurst at the Cheltenham Festival concert of 8 July 1964, in which Hurst conducted the BBC Northern Symphony Orchestra in the premiere of Rawsthorne’s Third Symphony and Gendron was the cello soloist in Richard Strauss’s Don Quixote.
Alan’s and Isabel’s Library

Martin Thacker

Composers’ bookshelves are a fascinating study: sometimes the books survive (e.g. Britten) and sometimes there is only a list of books long since dispersed (e.g. J. S. Bach). Now we have our own example: the books and music that remained in Sudbury Cottage when Isabel Rawsthorne died in 1992 were taken to the Royal Northern College of Music. The music has stayed there, but in 2016 it was decided that the books did not really fit into either the library or (with about two exceptions: nos. 132 and 137 on the list below, which we will retain) into the archive. So they were entrusted to my care for listing.

Your chance to own one (or preferably several) of the books from Sudbury Cottage

The decision taken by the Rawsthorne Trustees is that the books are to be sold to raise funds for the aims of the Trust. The books themselves are seldom annotated in any significant way, and they are mostly not in particularly pleasing condition, all too clearly having been kept in a lath-and-plaster cottage in rural Essex for many years. Some have inscriptions by their owners (AR, IR, Constant Lambert, etc.) or from donors, some of whom are well-known; many more display no sign of ownership at all. As long as we have a good list, we do not need to hang on to the items themselves.

If you require any of the items on the list below, they can be sent to you direct, price £3.00 per volume plus postage costs (if you are able to offer a little more per volume we will be grateful – it is in a good cause). Contact me (mthacker@care4free.net) with your requirements in the first instance, and I will ascertain the cost of postage. Cheques (drawn on a UK bank, please) should be made payable to ‘The Rawsthorne Trust’.

Items no longer available

The following items are already no longer available – predictably, they will often be the very ones readers require. We apologise for this – we received a very good offer from a collector specialising in association copies from Constant Lambert’s circle and so we achieved the twin aims of freeing shelf space and raising a substantial sum. In addition, there are the two items mentioned at the end of the first paragraph on this page, which should ideally go back to the archive.

1–27; 46; 56; 60; 61; 62; 66; 70; 73; 96; 100; 105; 107; 132; 135; 137; 147; 151; 163; 167; 175; 180; 181; 182; 193; 194; 197; 202; 203; 204; 212; 214; 217; 218; 219; 221; 229; 234; 235; 238.

I. Peter Warlock items (probably via Constant Lambert) (1–2)

II. Constant Lambert items (3–27)

III. Unless specifically marked, may have belonged to Alan Rawsthorne or to Isabel Rawsthorne, or possibly, if published in 1951 or earlier, to Constant Lambert (28–183)

As a rule of thumb, books on music would be AR’s; books on art or in French would be IR’s. But this leaves many others unallotted. And what of no. 47, on music and in French? My guess is that it belonged to IR.

IV. Art catalogues and other books marked as belonging to Isabel Rawsthorne, and books published after Alan’s death (184–240)

I. Ex Libris Peter Warlock


II. Ex Libris Constant Lambert


11. Gray, Cecil. Gilles de Rais: A Play; by Cecil Gray; with decorations by Michael Ayrton. London: Simkin Marshall, 1941. 72p. [Limited edition of 250 copies; 200 for sale.] TP verso: [printed]: Of these 200 copies this is Number... [Gray’s hand]: ‘out of series For Constant from Cecil.’ Upside down on verso of end flyleaf: List of phone nos. and addresses in biro (IR’s hand).


III. Ex Libris Alan or Isabel Rawsthorne, or Constant Lambert


Flyleaf: 'A Happy Birthday - happy as possible - Love from Jimmy [Jinny?]'.

Flyleaf: 'Alan Rawsthorne'. Half-title: 'Addie - from J. 2nd May 1938'.

52. Busoni, Ferruccio. The Essence of Music; and Other Papers; translated from the German by Rosamond Ley. London: Rockliff, 1957.


Flyleaf: 'Alan, from J. Chew Magna. 1940'.


Flyleaf: 'Alan Rawsthorne. Chew Magna 15.1.41. From J'. [See also no. 136].

Flyleaf: 'Alan Rawsthorne. / from M. May 2nd, 1943'.

Flyleaf: 'Rawsthorne 5/32'.

Compliment slip from publisher inserted at front. Some of the criticism is by Constant Lambert – perhaps his copy.

Inserted: slip from the publisher indicating that this is a review copy.


Flyleaf: For dear Alan for his collection of polyglottal-stopping logopoeics on his 91st birthday (in intergalactic overdrive intersplit along the generated space/time fracture) with unending (elliptical) devotion from Randall, Geraldine, Dan. May 1st/2nd 1996 (or 1967 whichever vintage you prefer). Under this: musical quotation from the Internationale (in red biro).


‘Alan Rawsthorne. Christmas 1921’.


77. Gay, John. The Beggar’s Opera. Written by Mr. Gay. To which is Prefixed the Musick to each Song. [Text of the 1765 edn with modern numbering of scenes]. London: Heinemann, 1921. xviii, 93p.


165. *The Dandies’ Ball; or, High Life in the City*; embellished with sixteen coloured engravings. Manchester: Sherratt and Hughes, 1902. Unpaged.


IV. Ex Libris Isabel Rawsthorne


204.
Flyleaf: ‘For the metallic / voice, / the grasshopper leap, / and the Kunstklatsch / [Delmer’s mark] / 22.7.62.

205.

206.

207.

208.

209.

210.

211.

212.
Flyleaf: ‘for Isabel on her way to Africa with much love Louis. 20.1.61’.

213.

214.
Flyleaf: ‘Xmas 1974 / For Isabel / Best Wishes / Dedwydd’.

215.

216.

217.

218.
Half-title: ‘A Isabel et à Alan Rawsthorne, / leur ami [?] mais / ici bien jeune / Michel Leiris’.

219.
Half title: ‘A Isabel, que je suis si content d’avoir vue l’autre jour à la Tate en vérité comme en effigie. Amicalement, Michel Leiris’.

220.

221.

222.
Flyleaf: ‘Isabel Lambert’.


