



D. M. ARNOLD

Victoria Bonomi

DENIS MIDGLEY ARNOLD

1926-1986

DENIS MIDGLEY ARNOLD was born in Sheffield on 15 December 1926. He was proud of having been born there and of being a Yorkshireman, and, influenced no doubt by his early years, he always felt at home in cities. His immediate family showed little interest in music. When it became clear, in his mid-teens, that he might well pursue a career in music, his father at first disapproved: he was sales director of a small special steel firm (i.e. one that manufactured small, intricate objects such as watch springs), who hoped that Denis would study foreign languages and then enter the firm and use them to further its cause on the international business scene. There was, however, one older member of his family in Yorkshire who made a decided impact in local musical circles. This was his great-uncle Samuel Midgley, who received an entry in the fourth edition of *Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (London, 1940), and whose name had not disappeared even from *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (1980), as a glance at the article on Bradford reveals. He was for many years prominent in the musical life of Bradford, especially as an organizer of concerts; he published a number of articles and pamphlets on musical subjects, and Novello brought out his *My 70 Years' Musical Memories (1860-1930)* (London, n.d.). He clearly was a forceful man whose passion for bringing music to the local citizens may find an echo in Arnold's own desire, and ability, to communicate his enthusiasm for music.

After attending the local primary school, Denis went to High Storrs Grammar School for Boys, which, academically, was strongest in the sciences. He had piano lessons from the age of six, but the teaching he received, while technically sound, was unimaginative, and he was not yet gripped by music. Indeed, on moving to his grammar school he did not study music, and he gave up piano lessons. But this lack of interest was to be dispelled by one particular event. Since the school was some distance from the centre of the city, Denis, unlike so many schoolchildren at the

time, was not evacuated even when Sheffield was bombed in 1940, and he began attending concerts given by visiting orchestras at Sheffield City Hall. The crucial event was a programme of Beethoven and Wagner in May 1942 conducted by Leslie Heward, conductor of the City of Birmingham Orchestra and a remarkable musician whose reputation would no doubt be higher now had he not died in 1943 aged only 45. Denis was bowled over by the performance of Beethoven's Seventh Symphony. From now on, music became, in his own words, a 'total obsession'. He resumed piano lessons, but again he had an uninspiring teacher. He went to the concerts now given regularly at Sheffield by the Hallé Orchestra, whose permanent conductor from 1943 was John Barbirolli. He quickly developed the great love of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century music that (notwithstanding his research interests) meant so much to him. He obtained good School Certificate results. In the sixth form he studied English, German, and Music, and in the Higher School Certificate examinations in 1944 he obtained a distinction in Music.

By now he had met Frank Shera, a native of Sheffield who had returned as Professor of Music at the university in 1928 and who invited Arnold and others to his home for the performance of chamber music. Shera, now 62, was a key figure in Sheffield music, served as Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Public Orator at the university and published four short books on musical subjects; he was an important early influence on Arnold, and a lasting one. Even though Arnold's school had strong links with Cambridge University, he did not sit Cambridge entrance examinations but went to Sheffield University to read for a general arts degree; his subjects were Music, English, and Philosophy. The entire syllabus in the small music department was taught by Shera himself. Although Arnold found him 'not really a good teacher' and a 'terrible lecturer', he had an inspirational personality and was a good practical musician, who conducted the university orchestra. During his student years Arnold at last found a fine piano teacher, Lily Foxon, who not only was good at inculcating technique but also understood the emotional aspects of music. He made such excellent progress that he played concertos with the university orchestra. He also started a madrigal group and occasionally took them to perform outside Sheffield as well. He graduated BA in 1947 and, after a year specializing in Music, B.Mus. in 1948, when he was also awarded the Royal College of Music diploma in piano performance. A

fellow student was Elsie Dawrant, who became his fiancée and whom he was to marry in 1951.

Arnold now joined the Royal Air Force and became an education officer. He hated the service discipline, and the resistance of many airmen to education further dispirited him. As an antidote he registered as an MA candidate at Sheffield University and, as a result of his enthusiasm for madrigals, and also for Tudor church music, embarked on a study of one of the greatest composers in these fields, Thomas Weelkes. He looked back with some incredulity at the extraordinarily amateurish way ('Heath Robinson', he called it) in which it was compiled, much of it during free afternoons in the RAF. He did, however, receive valuable advice from Hans Redlich, whose doctoral dissertation had been on Monteverdi's madrigals and whom he met through his fiancée—she was now teaching music in Coventry, which was one of the many places Redlich visited during this busy period of his life as an extra-mural lecturer. In 1950 Arnold was awarded the MA for his dissertation *Thomas Weelkes and the English Tradition*. He was now convinced that his career should lie in the sphere of academic music. He had hardly touched the piano during two years in the RAF; he had decided, moreover, that he lacked the temperament to be a successful professional pianist. He applied in vain for university posts, but Wilfrid Mellers engaged him to give some lectures for the Department of Extra-Mural Studies of Birmingham University. Nor did Sheffield University have scholarships that would enable him to study abroad or read for a Ph.D. at Sheffield or elsewhere in Britain; in any case the writing of a Ph.D. thesis on a musical subject was an almost unknown occupation in Britain at that time (though this situation would soon radically change).

Determined on further study, Arnold decided to apply for a foreign-government scholarship. He narrowed his choice to scholarships to the Netherlands and Italy, the sources of the two principal foreign influences on English music of the Elizabethan period. He won an Italian-government scholarship and went to Bologna to study Italian music of the same period. If Heward's conducting of Beethoven impelled him towards music in general, the overwhelming impact of Italy on his northern temperament permanently established the orientation of his work as a musicologist. He knew no Italian but gradually learnt it, after a fashion—as he said, he never ceased to 'mangle' it. Italy became his second home (in due course literally): his love of it, especially

Venice and the Veneto, remained with him to the end as a fundamental aspect of his existence.

In 1951 Arnold, recently married, returned abruptly from Italy in order to be interviewed for a job at the Queen's University, Belfast, and he was appointed to it. This was a lectureship in Music in the Department of Adult Education, but he also worked for the Department of Music; his commitment to the latter—like the Sheffield department a small one—took up little more than two mornings a week. In his much more intensive work in adult education he would leave home in the late afternoon several days a week, often travelling long distances to lecture on a wide range of music. Just as his first visit to Italy confirmed the thrust of his research, this work with adults confirmed his lifelong stance, as an educator (and indeed simply as a music-lover), as that of a 'generalist': he described himself as a 'GP of music, not a grand surgeon'; and the need to hold the interest of adults attending lectures voluntarily in their spare time sharpened his natural skills as a communicator and reinforced his preference for simple, direct language. His busy evenings notwithstanding, his university duties at Belfast were not demanding: several mornings and most afternoons were free not only for preparing classes but also for his own research. This he pursued avidly. Every summer he went on long study trips to Italy. His two sons, Christopher and Anthony, were born during these years, but he did not allow them to cramp his research: he took the whole family with him, and they camped within reach of the libraries and archives where he needed to work (he was relieved that his sons were not put off either Italy or music). He followed up his research during those free hours in Belfast. The results manifested themselves at first in two main ways: in a series of authoritative articles that made his name as a musicologist, and then in editions of music.

With notable exceptions like Edward J. Dent and the late Gerald Abraham—whom Arnold particularly admired as man and scholar—British musical scholars had tended to concentrate on British subjects, and this remained true of many of those of Arnold's generation who set out to lay the foundations of modern British musicology. Many of them were spurred by the Cambridge lecturer Thurston Dart (whose interests were by no means confined to British music) and by the long-overdue founding, in 1951 on the occasion of the Festival of Britain, of a 'national collection of British music', *Musica Britannica*, comparable with German *Denkmäler* and other national series established many

years before; many British scholars have contributed to this series, though Arnold, with his predominantly Italian interests, was not among them. Much of the best work on Italian late Renaissance and early Baroque music—areas of the utmost importance in cultural history—had been done by German-speaking scholars, and the work of three of them gave an impetus to the further study of this music in Britain around 1950: Hans Redlich, who, as we have seen, lived here and was known to Arnold and who was best known for his work on Monteverdi; Leo Schrade, whose *Monteverdi: Creator of Modern Music* was published here in 1951; and Alfred Einstein, whose long-awaited three-volume *The Italian Madrigal* (Princeton, 1949) proved a landmark of musical scholarship. Moreover, Manfred F. Bukofzer's immediately influential *Music in the Baroque Era* was first published here in 1948. For an impressionable young Italophile such as Arnold these were indeed heady days.

Arnold focused his energies on Venetian music, studying that of Giovanni Gabrieli and Monteverdi in particular and providing a context for it by investigating the circumstances of its performance and studying the lives and works of hitherto neglected composers in the orbit of the two great masters: it was initially in large measure due to him that the music of men such as Giovanni Croce and Alessandro Grandi emerged as worthy of further exploration. Like his MA thesis, Arnold's work on Italian music highlighted his primary interest in vocal music. He was passionately devoted to the human singing voice and, as a scholar at any rate, was less interested in instruments and instrumental music: the vast majority of his published writings are on vocal music, and he edited no instrumental music at all. No wonder that he was so devoted to Gabrieli and Monteverdi: they composed much of the greatest vocal music of their age, and no independent instrumental music by the latter is known. In the 1950s alone, Arnold published eighteen articles in journals, a degree of production that he kept up in various ways in his remaining three decades. In all this industry he had the invaluable help of his wife, Elsie, as fellow researcher, transcriber of music, checker of footnote references, compiler of lists, typist and proof-reader: he made no secret of his dislike of proof-reading and the other humdrum tasks that are an inevitable part of scholarship. He and Elsie formed a most enviable partnership, and, in his later years especially, she emerged as joint author.

In one or two of his early articles Arnold pursued, for the last

time in print, his enthusiasm for English madrigals—for instance in ‘Croce and the English Madrigal’¹—but he generally concentrated on aspects of Italian music and its context. The more substantial articles attracted the attention of other scholars, whether for their summing-up of knowledge or for breaking new ground; into the first category falls, for instance, his first address to the Royal Musical Association, in 1956, ‘Ceremonial Music in Venice at the Time of the Gabrielis’;² into the latter, ‘Music at the Scuola di San Rocco’,³ an article that demonstrated his enthusiasm for sifting through the Venetian archives: he was rarely more contented as a scholar than when working his way, with Elsie, through this rich resource of his favourite city. His enthusiasm for Monteverdi begins to appear in an article such as ‘“Seconda Pratica”: a Background to Monteverdi’s Madrigals’,⁴ which also illustrates his growing knowledge, stemming from countless transcriptions from the original prints, of the music of lesser composers who appeared to influence Monteverdi. These early articles contain some of his finest work. He also contributed four articles to the fifth edition of *Grove’s Dictionary* (1954) and, more important, began in 1952 a long association with the major German encyclopaedia, *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (*MGG*), which appeared in instalments over many years and of which he often expressed his admiration. He wrote nearly 50 articles for it, most of them on composers, among them Andrea and Giovanni Gabrieli, Croce and Grandi.

Arnold’s love of transcribing music gave rise to the second way in which he came to prominence. In 1957 he produced the first volume of the complete edition of the works of Giovanni Gabrieli that Armen Carapetyan had invited him to edit for the American Institute of Musicology, and he produced five more volumes over the next seventeen years.⁵ They contain most of Gabrieli’s vocal works and offer the opportunity to study an outstanding corpus of music, some of it for exceptionally large forces, in a spacious, well-prepared edition. That he did not continue with the edition was partly because he could not summon up sufficient enthusiasm for the instrumental music; he asked to be released from the

¹ *Music & Letters*, xxxv (1954), 309–19.

² *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, lxxxii (1955–6), 47–59.

³ *Music & Letters*, xl (1959), 229–41.

⁴ *Ibid.*, xxxviii (1957), 341–52.

⁵ *Giovanni Gabrieli: Opera omnia* (Corpus mensurabilis musicae, series 12, vols. i–vi, [Rome], 1957–74).

edition, and after some delay Richard Charteris has been commissioned to complete the edition in six further volumes: the first two of these bear a memorial dedication to Arnold. Another reason for Arnold's withdrawal was surely his preference, over expensive library editions, for cheap, practical editions from which people could perform. From 1962 he produced a regular flow of such editions which have done much to make the music he loved more widely known. They included editions for Eulenburg miniature scores of music by Monteverdi, Purcell, and Verdi, and he produced for Oxford University Press three sets of ten madrigals by major, but not widely appreciated composers—respectively Luca Marenzio (1966), Andrea Gabrieli (1970), and Orlando di Lasso (1977), as well as a set of ten Venetian motets. Nevertheless he did revise two volumes (xv–xvi) of Gian Francesco Malipiero's complete edition of Monteverdi (they appeared in 1967–8) and towards the end of his life contributed to the complete edition of Vivaldi's music currently being produced under the auspices of the Istituto Italiano Antonio Vivaldi; but unlike the Giovanni Gabrieli edition, these are not simply library editions.

That Arnold produced so many performing editions is surely all of a piece with his own relentless activity as a performer, especially as a conductor; much of this was of a local nature and little known to the wider scholarly world. A glance through the programmes of the weekly chamber concerts at Queen's University, Belfast, for example, shows that Arnold appeared regularly as conductor, director or keyboard player, often of music connected with his research. He held the firm belief that musical scholarship and performance are indivisible, and in his later posts he continued to put this belief into practice, both within the universities he served—often more prominently than hitherto by virtue of holding a chair of music—and in the cities where they were situated, as, for example, conductor of the Bach Choirs of Hull and Nottingham and in the festivals at Beverley and Nottingham. His infectious enthusiasm encouraged many amateurs to take part in his choral and orchestral concerts, at which he conducted a wide range of music, not only standard works but also lesser known works by composers on whom he focused his research. He and Elsie would often have groups of staff and students round to their home for madrigal-singing and other informal music-making. Their hospitality on these and on other, purely social occasions was legendary, and many of his former students doubtless look back on them with pleasure and perhaps

recall their initial surprise that one bearing the title 'professor' could be so informal and gregarious.

In 1960 Arnold was promoted to Reader, but he was beginning to feel that he had been in Belfast long enough, and in 1964, accepting a slight demotion, he moved to the University of Hull as a Senior Lecturer in Music. Again, he flourished in a small department, and he had four very enjoyable years there, active, as at Belfast, as performer as well as teacher. During these years he also had spells as visiting professor at Berkeley (1966) and as *docente* at the Accademia Musicale Chigiana, Siena. As well as the editions referred to above, the flow of articles in learned journals, and essays in collaborative volumes, continued unabated through the 1960s and indeed up to the end of his life. He began to investigate music in Venice later than that of the period around 1600—the first signs of a decisive shift in his interests that occurred late in his life; 'Orphans and Ladies: the Venetian Conservatoires (1680–1790)' and 'Orchestras in Eighteenth-Century Venice'⁶ provide two examples of this development. But a dozen articles from the 1960s show his continued devotion to Monteverdi, which was particularly in evidence around the quatercentenary of the composer's birth in 1967. His services were much in demand then with the editors of publications both serious and more popular—the latter bearing witness to Monteverdi's growing accessibility, to which Arnold had himself contributed much. It was inevitable that his work on Monteverdi would crystallize in a life-and-works study, which duly appeared in 1963: the volume in the 'Master Musicians' series (published by J. M. Dent), which continues in print as a standard work. It is on a modest scale, judicious, written in lively prose, well tailored to a general readership and very good at charting Monteverdi's music against its background in Mantua and Venice and, by relating it to that of the composer's lesser predecessors, rightly undermining Schrade's claims, summed up in the subtitle of his above-mentioned book, for Monteverdi as revolutionary. This latter approach is especially beneficial in the two excellent chapters on the madrigals. There are also many good points in the chapters on the dramatic music and on the church music, including eight particularly valuable pages on the *Vespers*, always a favourite with Arnold. Three earlier books on Monteverdi had appeared in English—the first, by Henry Prunières, as long ago

⁶ *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, lxxxix (1962–3), 31–47, and *The Galpin Society Journal*, xix (1966), 3–19, respectively.

as 1926—but Arnold's was the first by a native Englishman, which tells us something about the paucity of work by earlier British musicologists on whole tracts of European music. More important, though, the fact that the book is written from an English perspective and is, in Arnold's own words, 'designed specifically for the English general reader'⁷ is one of its great strengths.

Shortly afterwards he and the present writer began planning a composite volume on Monteverdi to commemorate the quatercentenary, and the outcome was *The Monteverdi Companion* (London, 1968). As well as acting as joint editor, he contributed, with me, annotated translations of some of Monteverdi's letters and, on his own, two essays in which he again turned to subjects on which he was at his most authoritative: 'Monteverdi and his Teachers' and 'Monteverdi: Some Colleagues and Pupils'. We produced a new edition, *The New Monteverdi Companion*, in 1985, commissioning several new essays in place of some of those in the 1968 edition and supplanting our selection of Monteverdi's letters by one taken by Denis Stevens from the superior complete edition of the letters that he had meanwhile brought out with the same publisher, Faber. Arnold's two essays were among those retained, and he wrote one of the new ones—a short study of performing practice in Monteverdi. Again with an anniversary in mind, Faber soon commissioned from us a comparable volume which appeared as *The Beethoven Companion* in 1971 (again a year late), for the bicentenary of the composer's birth. For Arnold (as for me) this was a departure from the subjects with which he was associated in the public mind and one that again showed him as a 'generalist'. He contributed to the book not an essay but, collaborating with his wife, 'The View of Posterity: an Anthology', a sequence of annotated extracts ranging from the early nineteenth century to two unlikely bedfellows, Stravinsky and Lenin.

I saw much more of Arnold from his Hull days onwards, and, discussing musicological matters during our work on Monteverdi and contemplating the recent expansion of research by post-graduate students and young lecturers—a situation startlingly different from that obtaining during Arnold's time as an MA student—we decided that a forum was needed at which, in the presence of invited senior figures too, they could read papers arising from their work and discuss ideas and problems of

⁷ *Monteverdi*, p. v.

common interest. Just before Christmas 1967, therefore, we organized at Hull University the first Conference of Research Students in Music; many of the forty-odd attending this exploratory meeting have gone on to do distinguished work and achieve important positions. A second conference followed at my own university, Birmingham, in 1968, and it was gratifying to Arnold, as to me, that from these tentative beginnings such conferences have continued ever since, at many different venues, as a valuable fixture in the musicological calendar in this country, and are now promoted by the Royal Musical Association.

In 1965 Arnold initiated another significant strand in his writings on music: a sequence—not planned as such—of five short books on late Renaissance Italian composers, spanning twenty years. At the expense of tidy chronology, it seems to me appropriate to consider these books together. They are: *Marenzio* (1965) and *Giovanni Gabrieli* (1974) in the series 'Oxford Studies of Composers'; and *Monteverdi's Madrigals* (1967), *Monteverdi's Church Music* (1982) and *Gesualdo* (1984) in the series of BBC (now Ariel) Music Guides. Three are rounded studies of leading composers of the period, concentrating on their music. Two of the composers, Marenzio and Gesualdo, are most distinguished for their madrigals; Gabrieli was also a madrigalist but is of widest appeal in his spectacular ceremonial music for St Mark's, Venice. The other two, more specialized, books are studies of two of the three types of music cultivated by the greatest composer of the age. Except for Gesualdo, these subjects are prominent among those to which Arnold devoted the greater part of his career as a musicologist. The challenge in writing these books was to address a large audience of music-lovers and convey to them, enthusiastically, straightforwardly and in largely non-technical language, the essence of the achievements of four fascinating composers, synthesizing the work of other scholars, drawing on his own research and responding personally to the music. The composers are all passionate and emotional ones: all were exclusively, or primarily, composers of vocal music, much of it secular; all wrote some of the most arresting and innovatory music of their age.

These are surely the prime reasons why the task of writing them so appealed to Arnold—it would have been surprising had he produced comparable monographs on, say, Palestrina (a less overtly passionate composer) or Frescobaldi (primarily a composer of instrumental music). The particular orientation of his task is significant too: the need to address the educated layman

will have appealed to the teacher who remained true to the ideals of adult education that he embraced in his first post and who continually enabled people to get to know music as a living experience, whether as performers or listeners. These are motifs that will inevitably recur in any account of Arnold the successful popularizer of music which is not always inherently 'popular', the man who could judge so well the level at which to communicate with non-specialists—and specialists, for there is much in these books that should appeal to them too. There may, it is true, be slips from time to time, but on the whole the books are rooted in sound scholarship. As an example of Arnold's writing in this vein, here he is communicating the delights of a notably erotic madrigal by Monteverdi. Having mentioned a madrigal in which 'pictorialism keeps the eroticism in decent bounds', he continues:

which is more than can be said of 'Si ch'io vorrei morire'. The poet again works out the double meaning of the word 'death'. 'I wish to die', he begins, 'now I feel the lovely mouth of my beloved'. He enlarges on the kisses. First he is content with a love-bite—and indeed no wonder, for 'In this sweetness of her breast I am extinguished'. He hurries to the climax, tasting the lips, in a conventional kiss, then biting voluptuously again—and then he 'dies'. In itself it is not a distinguished poem; but Monteverdi is ready to seek out its potentialities. The wish to die is repeated three times in a meaningful descent. The mouth of the beloved arouses him again. He bites with a delicious dissonance; as it is about to resolve, the discord bites again, and again, and yet again. But the rising phrase is extinguished in conventionally falling suspensions until the cadence settles in the bottom register of the voices. He calls for haste in a canon, so hasty that there is but a single crotchet between the parts. [Now follows a music example.] She playfully resists. He tries once more, using three voices so that two of them continually push the third up and up. She shows less resistance this time (using three voices instead of five, as before), but now nothing can hold him back. The canon resumes in the sopranos, the bass pleads, 'Ah mouth, ah kisses, ah tongue'. He conquers—and 'dies' with the very first descending phrase. The composer who can do this understands love; and these shepherds are no idealized rustics. They are very human.⁸

This is very typical of Arnold's 'popularizing' manner: witness the enthusiasm for, and endorsement of, Monteverdi's delineation of human love; the crisp (if not quite impeccable) style, with its short sentences; the avoidance of pretentiousness and of all but the most necessary technical language.

⁸ *Monteverdi Madrigals*, p. 36.

The same approach informed Arnold's many talks on BBC Radio 3. One danger attending it is the need, or temptation, to fall back on rather too easy generalizations; another is the possible negating of historical insights or strict historical truth by the desire to reinforce a message by producing parallels (sometimes rather homely) with the more familiar. Arnold did not always avoid these, but the virtues of this work are far more important. To quote the words that another scholar used when reviewing Arnold's last book, these five books display his 'boundless enthusiasm for music and musicology and remarkable talent for concise and vigorous expression'.⁹ Arnold was also greatly in demand as a reviewer, not only in scholarly journals but also for *The Listener*, where for a period he provided reviews (sometimes controversial) of music broadcast by the BBC during the preceding week, and for *The Gramophone*, to which for many years he contributed lively reviews of gramophone records of music from his main fields of research. Like many other scholars he also provided *The Listener* with several short articles on music that was about to be broadcast by the BBC.

In 1969 Arnold was appointed to the chair of music at the University of Nottingham, where he succeeded Ivor Keys, another man with the natural ability to communicate, especially as performer and lecturer. As Keys had been, Arnold immediately became prominent in both university and city music. A notable initiative in his department was his establishment of a one-year MA course in the editing and interpretation of Baroque music, exemplifying both his desire to unite scholarship and performance and his concern to broaden the range of postgraduate students to include mature students, perhaps from abroad, and those who had failed to obtain grants for more than one year of study. The Arnolds were conveniently placed to foster both musical and social life by their decision to rent a house on the campus. Helped by the proceeds from the sale of their house in Hull, they bought two small houses elsewhere. One was at Curbar in the Derbyshire Peak District (near where Denis grew up), convenient for weekends and other short breaks; the other was in north-east Italy, in the Venetan village of Pieve di Soligo. In 1974 they exchanged the latter for a new house, with a vineyard and a spectacular view, in the same area at Farrò di Follina. Arnold spent every summer vacation for the last sixteen

⁹ Howard E. Smither, review of Denis and Elsie Arnold, *The Oratorio in Venice*, in *Music & Letters*, lxviii (1987), 369.

years of his life at his Italian home, and several other vacations, and periods of study leave, too. Although he travelled around Italy a good deal and also visited Austria—mainly to attend conferences and to do research—and took time off on car journeys between England and Italy, notably in Munich, he never took holidays anywhere else. It is clear that the lover of cities also needed the peace of the country, in familiar surroundings.

Arnold's essays and periodical articles in the last sixteen years of his life—there are nearly thirty of them (one written jointly with his wife)—show an increasing diversity, and an intensification of the tendency noted above to concentrate more on Venetian music in the eighteenth century. More of them were commissioned rather than being unsolicited (like most of his earlier articles): naturally, the more prominent he became the more he was in demand to contribute to *Festschriften* and to deliver papers at conferences whose proceedings were later published. After 1979 hardly any of these articles were on subjects from the period around 1600. Alessandro Stradella, Vivaldi, Baldassare Galuppi, Pasquale Anfossi: it is works by these later composers that now form the basis of his output, alongside broader surveys of Venetian solo motets or of music in a typical Venetian conservatory. The volume in which one of his articles on an earlier subject appeared—*Andrea Gabrieli e il suo tempo* (Florence, 1987)—was dedicated by the editor, Francesco Degrada, to Arnold's memory. The *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, cxiii/2 (1988), is similarly dedicated.

Work began in 1970 on *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, which, until it was published ten years later (in twenty volumes), absorbed the energies of a great many musical scholars both in Britain and overseas, as contributors, editors, or advisers. Arnold had never been thought of, or thought of himself, primarily as an editor—indeed he prided himself on being a writer, a 'doer'—and he was not among the roll of forty scholars, most of them British, appointed to the executive committee and advisory board in order to guide and edit this enterprise. He was, however, quickly enrolled as a writer, and he contributed articles on more than forty subjects (a few of them those on which he had written for *MGG*); prominent among them are his well-judged essays on the lives and works of Andrea and Giovanni Gabrieli and Monteverdi (with work-lists by his wife) and his short histories of the Mass from 1600 to 1900 and of music in Venice. He contributed to three other encyclopaedias too.

Arnold did undertake one major editorial task. At about the same time as the initiation of *The New Grove* at Macmillan, Oxford University Press decided that the time had come to prepare a new edition of one of their most successful publications, *The Oxford Companion to Music*. Written, amazingly, by one man, the indefatigable Percy A. Scholes, this one-volume encyclopaedia first appeared in 1938 and went through nine further editions, the last one (revised by John Owen Ward) in 1970, twelve years after Scholes's death. Arnold was appointed editor of what came to be called *The New Oxford Companion to Music*, which eventually appeared in 1983 in two large volumes; it was thus twice as large as its predecessor. It may also be mentioned here that from 1976 to 1980 Arnold was joint editor, with an Oxford colleague, Edward Olleson, of the quarterly musicological journal *Music & Letters*. From what was said above (see p. 395), it may seem surprising that Arnold accepted these positions. However (to confine discussion to the *Companion*), he was concerned not with the minutiae of editing—the province of a sub-editorial staff—but with planning and with commissioning articles from the most appropriate authors and reading them when they came in; even here, a good deal of the work was done by two assistant editors, and Arnold's role might be summed up as that of general editor. He clearly thought hard about the contents of the *Companion*. It would have been unthinkable, for instance, for such a publication not to reflect a view of world music very different from the parochial vision of Scholes's day. As Arnold says in his preface, the original *Companion* 'was written largely for the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant, for this was Scholes's world'. But by the time Arnold came to plan his work 'the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant' consensus had completely broken. The ease of travel and the mixture of peoples from all over the world in Britain had seen to that. Hence a dictionary could no longer be exclusively White or Anglo-Saxon.¹⁰ Thus, in addition to, for instance, the traditional coverage of Western composers, musical forms and techniques, there are numerous articles on jazz, popular music, and non-European traditions; and early music and the twentieth century in general come into their own too.

Arnold, moreover, led from the front and decided to write many articles himself—one of his most regular tasks all through the 1970s. He wrote not only on such expected subjects as the

¹⁰ *The New Oxford Companion to Music*, p. [v].

Gabrielis and Monteverdi, as well as on, for instance, Palestrina, Purcell, and various English madrigalists, but also on such major figures as Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Brahms, and Bruckner, and many of their lesser contemporaries: in short, on a very large number of composers from the sixteenth century to the nineteenth. He also wrote many of the articles on subjects other than composers.

No encyclopaedia will be perfect, of course, and there are indeed mistakes in the *Companion*, as well as oddities of selection and faults of proportion, whether concerning the respective lengths of articles or of bibliographies. And it must be said—to stick to a single group of articles—that those by Arnold himself on composers are rather variable in quality. The orientation of such articles throughout the dictionary is biographical, and such comment on the music as there is, is absorbed into the narrative; this is often well handled—in the case of Monteverdi, for instance—occasionally less well, as with Bruckner (the short article on whom is rounded off with rather a thin paragraph on his music). On the whole, however, the *Companion* is a useful compilation that succeeds in its aims and offers a tremendous amount of accurate, up-to-date and well-presented information.

In the midst of all this writing, in 1975, Arnold was offered the Heather Professorship of Music at Oxford in succession to Joseph Kerman. As a quintessentially 'Redbrick' northerner he at first doubted whether he would adapt to an environment entirely foreign to him, but he decided to accept the offer, and he still occupied the chair at his death. As he later reported, many features of Oxford academic life appealed to him: he found that people could 'do their own thing'; that hierarchies appeared 'free and easy'; that undergraduates were not in awe of their teachers (he likened the typical relationship to the one he had enjoyed with Shera at Sheffield); that there was an immense amount of congenial music-making. As a teacher at Oxford he was particularly active as the supervisor of postgraduate students, far more of whom he taught than in his previous posts. He stressed to his postgraduate students that they should never get too bogged down in minutiae—even while concentrating on the trees, they should never lose sight of the wood; he wanted them to start writing their dissertations early on, meet other scholars and try and write for publication as soon as possible (he welcomed the opportunities that writing for *The New Grove* gave to young scholars). From what has been said above, none of this will be surprising. I do not think he can be said to have founded a

'school' of young scholars—something that in any case has hardly occurred in musicology in this country—but several of his former postgraduate students have spoken enthusiastically to me of his inspiring, indeed in the best sense exhausting, supervisions.

At Oxford, Arnold threw himself into performance with renewed zeal, at all levels from college to festival. For example, he gave concerts with the Oxford Pro Musica ('the orchestra of the City of Oxford'), including one in London (Heinrich Schütz's *Christmas Story* and Venetian music, Queen Elizabeth Hall, 1981); if there was no suitable platform he invented one ('The Heather Professor's Concerts'); he conducted for the English Bach Festival (Monteverdi's *Vespers*, 1979); and he directed operas and other works for the annual 'Handel at Oxford' summer festival. He also resumed intermittently the tradition associated with the first fifteen years of his predecessor but one, Sir Jack Westrup, whereby the Heather Professor conducted the productions of the Oxford University Opera Club. He made his début in 1977 with a rarity by Verdi, *Giovanna d'Arco*, conducting, according to one distinguished reviewer, 'with sympathetic panache',¹¹ and other works he directed, whether in stage or concert performances, included Monteverdi's *Il ritorno d'Ulisse*, *Muzio Scevola* (one act each by Filippo Amadei, Giovanni Bononcini and Handel) and the 1806 version of Beethoven's *Leonore*.

Of all his achievements at Oxford, Arnold was proudest of the fact that, at a time of financial stringency, it proved possible for the Faculty of Music to move, in 1980, from its cramped premises in Holywell to an attractive, spacious, well-appointed building in St Aldate's made available through the evacuation of Linacre College and extensive refurbishment and development on the site. Arnold played a big part in raising essential funds and persuading influential people to support the ambitious venture. He appropriately concluded an account of the new building with the claim that it met the major provisions for a music department set out by Sir Henry Hadow, Vice-Chancellor of Sheffield University, in 1928, after the chair of music at Sheffield had been set up.¹²

During his Oxford years Arnold took on a number of public duties and received numerous honours. He became chairman of both the music panel of Southern Arts and—at a difficult period in its history—of the Oxford Playhouse, and he was effective and

¹¹ Winton Dean, *The Musical Times*, cxviii (1977), 323.

¹² 'Music Moves at Oxford', *ibid.*, cxxiii (1982), 107–8.

energetic in both positions. Already an Honorary Member of the Royal Academy of Music (1971), he now became, in 1976, a Fellow of the British Academy and an Honorary Foreign Member of the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rome, and in 1977 he was awarded the Premio Internazionale Galileo Galilei dei Rotary Italiani at Pisa University for his services to scholarship on Italian music. In 1978 he was elected to represent Great Britain on the Directorium of the International Musicological Society: he was attending a meeting of it in Budapest when he died. He had become a member of the Council of the Royal Musical Association only in 1974—later than might have been expected, conceivably because he had always worked away from London and was not seen as, to use a cant word, an 'Establishment' figure. By 1978, however, he was elected President, and he served for five years; he had a strong sense of duty, and he told me at this time that if one's peers asked one to assume a major office one had a duty to accept. In 1980 his first two universities, Sheffield and Queen's, Belfast, awarded him the honorary degree of D.Mus., and in 1981 he became an Honorary Fellow of the Royal College of Music. In 1983 he was awarded the CBE. If in conversation he might speak of being 'anti-Establishment', even 'revolutionary' (he was Left-inclined, though essentially non-political), his close friends might detect tongue planted firmly in cheek and knew how much pleasure he derived from his varied honours—a response consistent with his sense of duty.

Three further books by Arnold remain to be considered. In 1979 he published with OUP his largest musicological study, *Giovanni Gabrieli and the Music of the Venetian High Renaissance*, a summing-up of his research into Gabrieli and his background and of his study of Gabrieli's music over half a lifetime, adumbrated in the above-mentioned short study of 1974. He studies Gabrieli's life and works more or less chronologically, turning to a particular type of music as Gabrieli himself took it up, sometimes returning later to a genre in which Gabrieli was prolific or in which his later works were markedly different from his earlier ones. Several works are treated in some detail, with the aid of a generous number of music examples. The book divided the reviewers. According to one, 'There is no doubt that this book, with the mine of information and interpretation it contains, will continue to be the authoritative work on Gabrieli for a long time to come.'¹³ Another, however, felt that 'although this

¹³ John Steele, *Music & Letters*, lxii (1981), 83.

book is a serious and sizable contribution to the study of a very fine and individual composer, it is also far short of being the definitive reassessment that we might have hoped for.¹⁴ Another, in similar vein, felt that the book

offers a good survey of the musical style of Gabrieli and his contemporaries for the general reader. For the scholar, Arnold has provided significant new documentary evidence and a ground plan for future research. He has raised most of the crucial questions about the composer and his music, and if his discussions of these are frustratingly brief, we can hope that he or someone else will build on these foundations, and finally give us the picture of Giovanni Gabrieli that the composer merits.¹⁵

But this reviewer felt bound to point out a number of flaws, for example in the interpretation of both archival entries and the music. The book is generally strong when Arnold presents material from the Venetian archives but sometimes more open to criticism in the discussions of Gabrieli's music (which should perhaps have received one further revision). It can, I believe, nevertheless be said that, whatever its shortcomings, this is the best available book on Gabrieli.

For many years Arnold was not very sympathetic to the music of Bach, but he gradually became drawn to it, especially through having to conduct it: as a conductor of Bach Choirs and other choral groups that normally sang repertory works, he simply could not avoid at least Bach's large-scale masterpieces. Even so, it was something of a surprise when in 1984 he published a book on Bach's life and works, for OUP's 'Past Masters' series. On a scale rather larger than in the five short studies from *Marenzio* to *Gesualdo* but obviously still writing for the intelligent layman, Arnold attempts here the difficult task of tackling a large corpus of music in non-technical language and without music examples. One of his aims was to play down Bach the Protestant composer and choirmaster, though he seems to me to do so less drastically than he may have intended and than the blurb promises; even so, although he writes a good deal about the church cantatas and is very enthusiastic about the Mass in B minor and the Passions, he does do full justice to the instrumental music. As always with Arnold, the book is brisk and readable.

¹⁴ Jeremy Noble, *Early Music History*, i (1981), 352.

¹⁵ Jonathan E. Glixon, *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, xxxiv (1981), 155.

By this time, Arnold had decided that he would no longer concentrate on the period of Italian, especially Venetian, music history dominated by Gabrieli and Monteverdi. Not only did he feel that he had said all he could about it, he was deeply impressed by the fresh work that the American scholar James H. Moore was doing—summed up in, but by no means exhausted by, his two-volume *Vespers at St. Mark's* (Ann Arbor, 1981)—and wished to leave the field to him (in the event Moore was soon to die, tragically young); moreover, Arnold was now intensively developing his own interest in later Venetian music referred to above. This interest is expressed in most extended form in what was to be his last book, the short study *The Oratorio in Venice* (London, 1986), a joint work with his wife Elsie, which was issued as the second in the series 'Royal Musical Association Monographs' established during his time as the Association's president; it was thus at once his last service to the Association and last major contribution to musicology. The survey covers the period from c.1660 to the late eighteenth century and, again, valuably presents a mass of archival material, but, given its prescribed length, it has of necessity less to say about the librettos and music of the many oratorios themselves. As the leading historian of the oratorio has said in a review: 'Valuable as it is, the book is a survey and does not pretend to be more. . . . Future scholars writing specialized studies of the institutions, composers and works treated (or mentioned in the appendix) will surely use this book as an essential point of departure . . .'.¹⁶

In September 1985 Arnold contracted a virus infection in Italy and on his return to Oxford was immediately admitted to hospital, seriously ill. After two months he appeared to have recovered, and he resumed his usual busy life. But his heart had been fatally weakened, and he was to die suddenly—as already mentioned, in Budapest—on 28 April 1986 at the age of 59. He left a number of scholarly projects unfinished or barely begun, among them a projected book, *Music in 17th-Century Europe*, in which for the first time he was to have written on a broad historical scale, attempting to do for late twentieth-century readers what one of his early heroes, Manfred Bukofzer, had done for those of forty years before.

Short in stature, though not slight of figure, Arnold was a forceful man with a 'big' personality, and was unmissable even in a crowd. Though usually dressed rather formally in a suit, plus

¹⁶ Smither, op. cit., p. 371.

bow tie, he was informal and unstuffy and enjoyed subverting the pretensions of the pompous. Some may have found the public man occasionally over-exuberant, yet many of those who encountered him, perhaps more privately, testify to his life-enhancing influence: students spurred to renewed study by a tutorial or a lively lecture; or guests invigorated by an uproarious lunch—after an hour or two spent with him and with Elsie, one simply felt better able to face the tasks ahead, however dreary. He was a showman, totally at home on the lecturer's or conductor's podium. The connection may seem facile, but it is probably no accident that he was so captivated by a city as spectacular as Venice and by the music that Gabrieli and Monteverdi wrote for the occasions when Venice was 'putting on a show' and which, fittingly, featured so prominently in the concert in his memory given in a packed Sheldonian Theatre by the choirs of three Oxford colleges, with instrumentalists, on 30 October 1986.

An account of the public man is not the whole story. Arnold was proudest of being a historian and of finding his way around the Venetian libraries and archives and uncovering so many unknown works and documents—the very antithesis of public activity. As a teacher he above all hoped to produce graduates who loved music, and he may well have helped to do that as much through individual encounters as through lectures. He needed the balance of public and private that his varied life always brought him: the hectic public domain and his enviably happy family circle; the public concert and the private research; the bustle of Oxford and other cities and the remoteness of Farrò di Follina. Everything he did he did with zest and passion, and he brought enlightenment and enjoyment to many through his lectures, teaching, writings, and performances. It was no surprise to hear him say towards the end of his life: 'I haven't had a dull day for years.' The loss of his friendship and effervescent personality has left a gap in the lives of all those who remember him with gratitude and affection.

NIGEL FORTUNE

I am grateful to the following for providing me with help and information in the preparation of this memoir: Richard Charteris, Kathleen Hermolle, Robert Pascall, Jerome and Elizabeth Roche, Jan Smaczny, Michael Talbot, John Whenham and, above all, Elsie Arnold.