

Tune collecting and musical taxonomies in eighteenth-century English tunebooks

Alice Little 

Faculty of Music, University of Oxford,
Oxford, UK

Correspondence

Alice Little.

Email: alice.little@music.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

Music collecting in the late eighteenth century was as much an intellectual practice as a practical one, therefore, the organization of tunes in manuscript tunebooks gives us insight into the worldviews of tunebook compilers. This article introduces some of the literature on tune collecting and categorization, and describes attempts by music historians in the twentieth century to categorize tunebooks. It shows that considering the categorization of tunes only as a practical matter ignores the intellectual function of categorization. It argues that to understand manuscript tunebooks better these sources should be approached as the product of collecting activity and not just as a by-product of music making. An expanded methodological approach, incorporating the history of collecting, biographical methods, and material culture studies, can provide insight into how tunebook compilers used their collections to order their worlds.

KEYWORDS

collecting, collection, English, John Malchair, national music, tunebook, tunes

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2024 The Authors. Literature Compass published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

1 | INTRODUCTION

From the eighteenth century to the 20th it was common for musicians, whether playing by themselves, socially, or at country dances, to collect tunes in pocket-sized manuscripts known today as tunebooks. Tunebooks were created by all kinds of people: adults and children, male and female, educated and uneducated, rural and urban, rich and poor. It was normal for upper-class children learning a musical instrument to record their exercises in tunebooks; equally, rural fiddlers who signed their names with an 'X' kept tunebooks into which they copied the latest tunes (Dellow, 2018; Goodman, 2020). The variety of tunebooks and creators makes tunebooks an unusual source and, as a result, scholars have used them to support a range of theories, often focusing on categorizing the tunebooks in terms of their use rather than looking critically at the contents as variegated collections. For most of these historians the aim has been to categorize the tunebooks rather than the tunes within them, the contents serving only as clues to help deduce the function of the tunebook and perhaps thereby to reveal something of the musician, for example, to show that they played for dancing or were a member of a local militia band. I contend that if we move beyond the practical and see music collecting as an intellectual practice we gain insight into how tunebook compilers used their collections to order their worlds.

Music collecting in late eighteenth-century England was as much an intellectual practice as a practical one: musicians did not only write down and play these tunes, but selected, edited, and ordered the tunes they collected. The process of collecting and categorizing helped people to classify, understand, and define the music they played, whether that was to organise it by function (for song, dance, or performance), rhythm (waltzes, reels, jigs), or nation—that is, to categorize music according to commonly recognised characteristics of Scottish, Irish, Welsh, English, or 'foreign' music. As such, tunebooks can give us insight into how these people defined the musical 'other' and how they fashioned their own identities.

This article begins by describing tunebooks and defining them as collections, and showing how the function of a tunebook affected the organization of the tunes within it. I detail how historians have viewed these sources and attempted to define and categorize tunebooks at the object level, looking closely at the tunebooks of John Malchair (1730–1812) as an example. I then turn to taxonomies of tunes within tunebooks, using Malchair's tunebooks as a case study for how these have been misunderstood and reinterpreted subsequently, and advocating for the use of different methodological approaches—namely using the lenses of biography, material culture, and the history of collecting—to help us understand tunebooks in the round.

2 | CATEGORIZING TUNEBOOKS

Tunebooks are pocket-sized books, usually in landscape orientation and bound in leather—in the nineteenth century they often featured marbled covers. Most were working notebooks into which musicians jotted tunes as they heard them, or where they copied tunes from printed or manuscript books they borrowed. The practical nature of tunebooks is evident from the wear and tear on the manuscripts, and even printed tunebooks were intended to be carried around: James Johnson remarked in his introduction to *The Scots Musical Museum* (1771) that previous collections 'have been printed in such large unportable sizes, that they could by no means answer the purpose of being pocket-companions; which is no small incumbrance, especially to the admirers of social Music' (Johnson, 1787, p. iii).

Francis Collinson and David Johnson have written at length about Scottish tunebooks, defining the form and use of these books, although these authors differ as to the primary purposes and contents of tunebooks. Francis Collinson describes tunebook keeping as an established practice for Scottish fiddlers from the start of the eighteenth century and highlights the practical nature of tunebooks for musicians at all levels of experience (Collinson, 1966, pp. 266–267). David Johnson, rather than focusing on their purposes for collecting tunes, writes disparagingly about *who* was using them, describing tunebooks as the vanity projects of amateur musicians, into

which they wrote out their own (“correct”) versions of famous tunes—where a more successful musician would have written his own compositions and had them published in print (D. Johnson, 2005, p. 8).

I think of tunebooks as collections, with varying degrees of consciousness on the part of the compiler, bearing in mind Alec Hyatt King's 1961 warning that, ‘We cannot call a man a collector just because he may amass the music of his own country and his own day for performance either by himself or by others.’—

For a man to be estimated a true collector, we surely require evidence of something wider and deeper, something which denotes a breadth of outlook, a certain spirit of curiosity and a quest for knowledge of the musical past.

(King, 1963, p. 7)

King's definition is particularly pertinent to tunebooks, as so many were compiled for personal use, for ‘performance either by himself or by others’, leaving doubt as to whether they were deliberately compiled as collections or simply left behind by musicians, the by-product of a musical life. But a close reading of these sources easily reveals varying degrees of selecting, editing, curation, and organisation—evidence of a ‘spirit of curiosity’—indicating that many tunebooks were indeed products of conscious collecting activity (Little, 2018).

Almost all manuscript tunebooks were created for personal use by their compilers (as opposed to being scribal copies or drafts for publication, which though they exist are the minority in the 18th and 19th centuries), but within this ‘personal’ category, there are a variety of different specific uses for tunebooks. For example, a tunebook might be used to help a musician learn an instrument, be played from for a paid performance, or used for purely theoretical purposes to better understand different forms or styles of music. It is tempting to try and categorize tunebooks according to these functions, either by looking at the compiler (where known) or at the tunes contained. Francis Collinson, Samuel Bayard, and Celia Pendlebury have all attempted to divide manuscript music books along the lines of personal/domestic/home, professional/dancing master, and military band use. But these classifications are made on the basis of a static view of the tunebooks' contents as we see them today, and fail to take account of these manuscripts as dynamic and diachronic objects over years—even decades or centuries—of use, potentially by more than one person.

There are three primary ways in which tunebooks might jump, straddle, or transcend categories over time. First, tunebooks, particularly those manuscripts with spare pages for adding further tunes, were passed between musicians of different kinds over generations who will have used them for different purposes; second, individual musicians had multi-faceted careers and might collect and play different sorts of things at different times in their lives; third, tunes themselves are flexible, so a tune created for one circumstance (e.g. a song melody, or marching tune) could be transferred to other uses (such as instrumental performance, or for dancing). Even while trying to draw firm lines between these sources Pendlebury notes that of the tunebooks she studied, more tunes are common to more than one manuscript than unique to any individual tunebook, meaning it would be impossible to divide tunebooks into categories based on content alone (Pendlebury, 2015, pp. 64–65).

The difficulty of defining the purpose of a tunebook is compounded when a tunebook has changed hands. A good example of this is the James Lishman manuscript, later owned by Thomas Browne. James Lishman (1777–1849) was a dancing master who taught in Kendal and Windermere in the first half of the nineteenth century. It makes sense that Lishman's tunebook (ALMS11 at the Armit Library, Cumbria) contained country dance repertoire popular around 1800; it was presumably created by him to use when teaching dancing. Acquired by Thomas Browne (c.1810–1890/1) of Troutbeck around 1850, five modern tunes were added in Browne's hand, and the book was presumably used for domestic music making (on the basis that Browne was a landowner and not known to perform publicly). Thomas Browne owned, used, and added to other tunebooks including one from John Cook (ALMS12) which was begun in the 1770s and at that time contained only psalm tunes, then owned by J. Wilson of Keswick, and finally passed to Thomas Browne, who added fiddle tunes to the book in the 1830s (Partington, n.d.-a). On the basis of its contents, therefore, this tunebook might be categorized as for professional use, domestic use, or

religious use. Regardless, what is not in doubt is that the tunes in this book were collected, and that by looking at how the tunebook was put together and at the lives of its compilers we can make better use of this source than we can by seeking to categorize it definitively as being for one purpose or another.

A further problem with categorizing tunebooks is the vagueness of the term 'domestic'. Celia Pendlebury uses this term to mean tunebooks used for personal music making at home. Similarly, I used the term above to mean 'amateur', where no income was sought from the tunes recorded, through teaching, performance or other means. However, the limitations of this category are easily demonstrated by use of an example: the third tunebook of John Malchair (Malchair, [c.1784-a](#)). Malchair's tunebook is categorized as 'domestic' by Pendlebury presumably because it was a working tunebook, with tunes collected from a range of sources and added in the order in which he came across them. But even if Malchair only collected tunes as a hobby (as he himself described in the introduction to his fourth tunebook (Malchair, [1795-b](#))), he was a professional musician, employed as leader of the Oxford Music Room band from 1760 to 92. Furthermore, Malchair appears to have explored the idea of publishing some of his collection and copied out many of the tunes into his fourth tunebook, completed in 1795, where he organized them into national categories and added an introduction about the tunes and his collecting of them.¹ While Malchair's own project went no further in the end than his handwritten manuscript, Malchair lent his tunebooks to his colleague, Oxford Professor of Music William Crotch (1775–1847) who, in 1807, published over 120 tunes from Malchair's collection in *Specimens of Various Styles of Music*. It is impossible to know if publication was in Malchair's mind as early as the 1780s when he was noting down tunes as he heard them, but once we know the history of Malchair's tunebooks, their creator, and what they were used for later, I suggest that classifying Malchair's third tunebook as 'domestic' is not instructive. It seems that while the compilers of tunebooks ordered their worlds through their collections, twentieth- and twenty-first-century scholars have sought to understand their own worlds by reinterpreting earlier schemes of categorization.

It might be possible to achieve a taxonomy of tunebooks as these authors have attempted, but more work remains to be done to determine which features it would make most sense to use as categories. If the contents of tunebooks are too overlapping, the creators' intentions too difficult to determine, a tunebook's use over time too changeable, and their various uses (where these can even be determined) too complicated, perhaps approaching tunebooks from other directions would provide a way in. For example, a material culture approach would take into account a tunebook's material features and the process of its construction, alongside contextual information such as the cost and availability of paper, and where the tunes were copied from or learned. A good example of this approach is Glenda Goodman's study of Sally Brown's music collection (Goodman, [2020](#)), which sets out how the global trade network, including the slave trade, supplied Sally Brown and other consumers with music-book materials in late eighteenth-century America.

Another methodological approach might be to view tunebooks in the context of the history of collecting, rather than only the history of music. This would more easily allow us to categorize unusual items such as the tunebook of James Gairdyn (National Library of Scotland MS 3298, c.1700–50). Gairdyn's tunebook contains a large number of 2–4 bar incipits, seemingly intended to prompt Gairdyn with the opening pitches of tunes he already knew. Rather than trying to work out the contexts in which these tunes might have been used, we can regard this tunebook as his collection, or more precisely a catalogue of his collection—an index to the tunes collected and stored in Gairdyn's head.

A third approach, as exemplified by Malchair's tunebooks, would be to recognise that tunebooks, like their compilers, have their own biographies. They are often put together over many years, travelling with a musician from their parents' homes to their adult lives, through various fields of interest and/or professions. Karen McAulay ([2013](#)) has written about how Scottish women's collecting habits were affected by changes in their lives, for example, Margaret Maclean-Clephane's frequent travels to Italy after her marriage to Lord Compton led her to expand her collecting from Gaelic Hebridean songs into European art music (McAulay, [2013](#), p. 176). If we take a biographical approach when looking at Malchair's tunebooks we are forced to see them on their own terms, in the context of Malchair's life and times. It no longer matters whether Malchair compiled his tunebooks during work or

leisure hours, instead his third tunebook is confirmed to be the last of a sequence of working tunebooks begun when he first moved to Oxford in 1760, compiled over decades in chronological order, a tune added every time he came across something he liked; meanwhile, his fourth tunebook can be recognised as a textbook intended to organize, categorize, describe and compare the Scottish, Welsh, and Irish tunes in his collection (Wollenberg, in Harrison, 1998, p. 43; Little, 2018, p. 41).

3 | COLLECTING AND CATEGORIZING TUNES

If we view all tunebooks as the product of collecting activity, it requires us to give attention to the tunes collected, how they are organized, and what we can find out about how and why these tunes were collected. That English tunes and tunebooks have not previously been considered through the lens of collecting is revealed by the fact that, despite much interest eighteenth-century tunebooks, the majority of authors writing about music collecting do not consider collecting of everyday vernacular music to have begun before the nineteenth century. Jan Ling, writing about Europe as a whole, attributes the late Victorian folksong revival to the influence of composer-collectors such as Bartok in continental Europe and Vaughan Williams in England (Ling, 1997, p. 2). Similarly, Neil Grobman dates the emergence of 'modern standards of integrity' in collecting old songs no earlier than the 1820s, with William Motherwell in *Minstrelsy Ancient and Modern* (1827) recording songs 'almost exactly as he had heard them from folk-singers' (Grobman, 1975, p. 30). Grobman places the origins of collecting earlier than most, but he still downplays the existence of lyric and music collectors in the 18th and also the seventeenth century.

For those works that address tune collecting and categorization, the majority of the available literature is concerned with Scottish collecting, for example, the work of Karen McAulay on Scottish song collecting and subscription lists (McAulay, 2013, 2022), and Evelyn Stell's work on Scottish tunebooks of the seventeenth century (Stell, 1999, p. 11). Tune collecting in England is a more popular topic in works about the first folk revival in the late nineteenth-century—see for example, the work of Ian Russell and David Atkinson (2004), E. David Gregory (2006), and Mark Freeman (2005)—but there is little work that looks at English collecting prior to 1900, or on English tune collecting (as opposed to song collecting) at all.

One consequence of the dominance of the first folk revival is the tendency to see eighteenth-century English collecting activity as 'folksong collecting', an endeavour well understood by the late Victorian era but of which there was not yet a concept in, say, the 1760s, when John Malchair began collecting tunes. Even though the term 'folksong' was coined as early as 1773 (by Gottfried Herder in his *Essay on Ossian*), the country dance music collected by Malchair and others in their tunebooks was not considered 'folk' music until at least a century later, when it began to be collected alongside song. We need to approach collectors from the starting point of the world in which they lived: in both his conceptualization of the material and his collecting practices, Malchair was more in line with antiquarians of the preceding century than the folksong collectors of the Victorian period. Malchair referred to his collection as one of 'old tunes', while his friend and Oxford Professor of Music William Crotch referred to it as one of 'national music'. In contrast to the early folksong collectors, who prioritised collecting 'from the mouths of the people', Malchair's collection relied heavily on the printed books and an old manuscript borrowed from an acquaintance, and was only supplemented (around 20 tunes out of 500) with experiential acquisitions such as tunes collected from people he knew and musicians he heard in the street.

William Crotch's label, 'national music', provides another lens through which we might analyse eighteenth-century tunebooks. But, once again, studies of 'national music', 'country dance tunes' or 'Scotch airs', among other labels, rarely focus on the act of collecting or the ways in which collectors categorized the tunes they found. For example, writing about eighteenth-century publisher Allan Ramsay, Matthew Gelbart describes Ramsay's work as 'selecting' music to publish, but does not seem to consider what Ramsay's sources might have been or the criteria for selection. Instead, Gelbart simply states that in Scotland 'songs and music were copiously abundant', and that the musical culture of the early eighteenth century was entirely based upon manuscript and oral transmission

(Gelbart, 2012, pp. 82–83). James Porter similarly observed the ‘fad’ for Scots tunes and ‘fascination for all things Celtic’ in England in this period, without commenting on how this music and other forms of cultural expression were recorded or collected (Porter, 1989, p. xx). Such works provide no details of provenance or methods, and no indication of what might be considered musically usual or unusual for the eighteenth century.

By regarding tunebooks as products of collecting activity, and using material evidence alongside biographical information, it is possible to gain a deeper understanding of these sources and to see more clearly why particular tunes were included—which in turn might tell us more about the compilers and their lives. The manuscript tunebook of Cumbrian High Sheriff Humphrey Senhouse (1705–1770), D/Sen 12 Box 239-1 at the Cumbria Archive Centre, contains exactly 100 tunes written down in 1746–7 by Senhouse's son, also Humphrey (1731–1814, Member of Parliament for Cockermouth from 1786, and for Cumberland 1790–96).² Humphrey junior noted his sources for these tunes, including the names Ed Stanley, Trevor Corry, Al Home, Henry Mathewman, and John Casson. Rather than being names associated with printed tunebooks (such as Playford or Aird, whose names function as a shorthand for their collections), each was a member of the local aristocracy or gentry, and personally known to the Senhouse family (Partington, n.d.-b). Combining this biographical information with material evidence from the tunebook (e.g. his note ‘First Part over again’ on p. 50) suggests that his collection was used for practical purposes, allowing him to play tunes with particular friends, with the attribution allowing him to identify at a glance which tunes each person already knew.

This brings us to the categorization of tunes within a tunebook, and what the differing processes and means of organization might reveal of the interests and intentions of the compiler. There are two main ways tunebooks are compiled: first, in chronological order, where tunes are added ad hoc one after the other as a compiler comes across them, whether into sections or simply from start to finish. Second, where a collection of tunes has been copied up later and divided into sections as part of that process. John Malchair's two tunebooks, described above, demonstrate each of these systems: his third volume was the last in a sequence of tunebooks he added to in chronological order with no other organisational scheme imposed other than a handful of tunes added separately at the back; his fourth tunebook, ‘The Arrangement’, included tunes from his existing collection ‘arranged’ (organized) into the categories ‘Scotch Tunes’, ‘Welsh Tunes’ and ‘Irish Tunes’.

It is unusual to see working tunebooks split into sections, other than where a separate set of repertoire has been included at the back, often with the book turned upside down for that purpose. In tunebooks I have seen from earlier in the eighteenth century, any material at the back was either added by a second individual or was lesson material such as fingering charts or exercises. In the later eighteenth century and into the nineteenth century it became common to include religious music at the back of a tunebook: psalms or hymns that the musician would play in a different context to the music at the front.³

Whether a tunebook is a working tunebook or a neat copy, there are three common methods of imposing structure on the contents. First, while the material might have been initially collected in an ad hoc fashion, an organizational scheme could be imposed later by individually labelling each tune, as in the case of the Senhouse tunebook described above, where tunes were labelled according to the friend they came from. Second, an order could be imposed by means of an index or contents page at the front or back. Regardless of the heading used, indexes and contents lists appear equally in page number order and alphabetical order by tune title. An example of alphabetical indexing is provided by a second Senhouse tunebook, D-Sen 12, box 239-2, dated 1792, which also belonged to Humphrey Senhouse junior. In this manuscript the tunes appear in the tunebook with no labels other than the tune titles, and are listed in the index in alphabetical order. Categorization by first-letter may not shed any light on how Senhouse viewed the tunes, but it reveals that these tunes were referred to on an individual basis, such that a basic finding aid was needed.

Third, where a collection has been copied up and the tunes grouped, the physical structure of the book can reveal something of the process. For example, in Malchair's fourth tunebook blank pages were left at the end of each section in case he wanted to add further tunes later, showing that while he was essentially copying up an existing collection he did not predetermine which tunes would be included, and in fact appears to have still been

collecting new tunes at the same time, sometimes copying several tunes in a row from printed collections when he gained access to these books. Once the sections were full, extra tunes were also added onto empty staves—sometimes interrupting a sequence of tunes copied from a printed collection—in order to ensure they were placed in the correct section. In other places, pages were added to accommodate additional tunes or to provide introductory information about the collection and the sources from which it was drawn.⁴

There are also manuscripts that combine two or more of the above processes. The 1768 manuscript of James Gillespie (MS 808 at the National Library of Scotland), which appears to be a neat copy rather than a working tunebook, judging by its large portrait format, features both grouped contents and an alphabetical index. In a contents page at the front the tunes are listed in alphabetical order; within the manuscript the tunes are grouped in sections by form: *Airs and March[es]*, *Scotch Tunes*, *Minuets*, and *Hornpipes, Jiggs and Reels*.

What conclusions can we draw by looking at the categorization of tunes within a tunebook, and the ways in which a compiler has chosen to create or preserve a structure? Headings, corrections, labels and marginalia communicate how the compiler or users of a tunebook conceived of its contents, and additional textual evidence such as marginal numbers or musical errors allows us to work out which printed books the tunes might have been copied from and therefore to learn which sources the compiler had access to. Looking at Malchair's tunebooks in this way reveals how conscious his categorization of tunes was: where a tune might appear to have been fitted onto an empty stave, the fact that he did this despite there still being spare pages elsewhere in the manuscript suggests his placement of it in a particular section was deliberate.

If categorization of tunes indicates a conscious collector, it remains unclear why other scholars have not brought these two activities together. The connection seems particularly relevant to collections of 'national music', and this topic will be my focus for the remainder of this article. In *The Invention of Folk Music and Art Music*, Matthew Gelbart describes how during the eighteenth century the notion of categorizing music by function was replaced by categorization by geographical origin, which is still the most common form of categorization today. He writes, 'the earliest catalyst for the extended classification by origins was nationalism', where 'nationalism' is understood to have been a cultural rather than a political phenomenon until the 1790s (Gelbart, 2007, p. 24). Other work on this subject places this shift much later: Frank Howes assumes nationalism to have been the primary motivator for collecting: he writes 'Although folk-song collections were made in Scotland and Ireland in the eighteenth century, there was no nationalism in English musical life till the end of the nineteenth century' (Howes, 1969, pp. 89–91). Here, Howes regards 'nationalism' in a nineteenth-century political sense, rather than considering the cultural manifestations of national thought in Britain prior to this, as described by Linda Colley (2009), Christine Gerrard (1994), Suzanne Aspdén (1997), and Howard Weinbrot (2013).

I do not suggest that every tunebook grew out of a desire to define or express national identity but collections of tunes can reveal national divisions in repertoire. In the eighteenth century, following the Acts of Union between Scotland and England, and given the recurrence of war with France, many tunes were composed or published as a consequence of national feelings; how this repertoire was collected and organized can tell us how this was perceived by individuals. Furthermore, tunebooks tend to reflect the repertoire that was known and played in a restricted area, namely where the compiler lived, therefore tunebooks can reveal regional and national divisions in repertoire, with tunes given titles or labels such as 'Scotch' or 'Irish' depending on the claimed origins of the tune (composer's nationality, or geographical origins) or the perceived musical style. This brings us back to John Malchair's tunebooks, which make a useful case study because his tunebooks represent a very conscious attempt to collect and categorize music along national lines. As described above, Malchair's fourth tunebook, which he titled 'The Arrangement', included tunes from his existing collection organized under three headings: 'Scotch Tunes', 'Welsh Tunes' and 'Irish Tunes'.

Malchair's collecting of 'national music' and his concern to categorize into national 'classes' were not motivated by national feeling in the same way as Gelbart has described for Allan Ramsay in Scotland. This is perhaps because Malchair was not Scottish (he was German, born in Cologne) and not in Scotland (he lived in England from the age of 24). Instead, Malchair displays Porter's 'fascination for all things Celtic' and King's 'spirit of curiosity and a quest

for knowledge of the musical past'. Malchair's collection of 'national music', which today consists of two extant tunebooks containing around 500 distinct tunes, was the product of an age where ideas of the nation and national character were constantly being discussed, and were believed to correspond to behaviours, mores and 'essences', as considered contemporaneously by David Hume in his 1748 essay on national characters, and discussed in the modern literature by Colin Kidd and Joep Leerssen respectively (Kidd, 1999; Leerssen, 2006). Malchair's understanding of his own taxonomy for the tunes he collected was not based simply on where a tune originated (as Gelbart would have it), but was intended also to indicate the music's style (Little, 2020). His categorization also takes into account place of use, so that he might include the same tune in two sections, an apparent contradiction easily explained, as also observed by Steve Roud for folksong (Roud, 2017, p. 81).

That Malchair sometimes included the same tune in two sections led to a misunderstanding of his tunebooks in the decades after his death in 1812. In 1856 music publisher and collector William Chappell borrowed Malchair's fourth tunebook 'The Arrangement' and called it a 'map of absurdities'. His contemporary John Muir Wood commented in pencil on the tune 'Roast Beef' in disbelief, 'Placed here among Irish Tunes!!'(Chappell, 1856; Malchair, n. d.-a, p. 71, in the handwriting of John Muir Wood.) The notion of categorizing music by geographical origins that seemed so natural to Chappell and Muir Wood in the 1850s was not yet the default in the late eighteenth century when Malchair was 'arranging' his collection. I have shown elsewhere how Malchair's categorization might be interpreted in a way that makes sense of both his own labels and also these near-contemporary comments, by interpreting top-level and additional labels as geographical origins and musical style respectively—although Malchair's categorization of 'Roast Beef' as Irish remains to be explained (Little, 2020).

4 | CONCLUSION

Tunebooks are useful sources for telling us about their compilers and how they viewed and categorized the world around them. While attempts to categorize tunebooks by function or user remain unsatisfactory, a more successful attempt might be made if these sources were approached through the lens of the history of collecting. Tunebooks should be viewed as products of collecting activity, with varying amounts of consciousness and thought going into their assembly and the organization of the contents within. Through a close reading of the sources, and by bringing in approaches borrowed from the history of collecting, biography, and material culture studies, it is possible to draw deeper conclusions about the lives and worldviews of the musicians who created and used these manuscripts, and to more fully understand what these manuscripts can tell us about the societies in which they were produced.

ORCID

Alice Little  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1950-2815>

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Images and a transcription of this material are provided in in Alice Little, 'The Tunebooks of J. B. Malchair, Oxford, c.1760–1812' (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2018), Appendices 1a and 1b.
- ² The shelf mark for this tunebook is D/Sen 12 Box 239_1, the Archive Centre's full catalogue reference is: D/Sen Senhouse family of Netherhall, Maryport – 1259–1958, 12 Printed and pictorial Boxes, Box 239 Music, [item] 1.
- ³ The most well-known reference to tunebooks separating dance and religious music is found in Thomas Hardy's *Under the Greenwood Tree*, where in the Preface to the 1896 edition Hardy writes: 'Their music in those days was all in their own manuscript, copied in the evenings after work, and their music-books were home-bound. It was customary to inscribe a few jigs, reels, horn-pipes, and ballads in the same book, by beginning it at the other end, the insertions being continued from front and back till sacred and secular met together in the middle, often with bizarre effect[.]' Thomas Hardy, *Under the Greenwood Tree* (London: Penguin Books Ltd, 2004), p. 162.
- ⁴ The removal and addition of pages is also seen in scribal or compiler-made neat copies where there is no organisational structure, in these cases it is most likely because an error was made, and a page was replaced to ensure the book remained neat.

REFERENCES

- Aspden, S. (1997). Ballads and Britons: Imagined community and the continuity of 'English' opera. *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 122(1), 24–51. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrma/122.1.24>
- Chappell, W. (1856). *William Chappell to William husk (tucked inside 'the arrangement', RCM MS 2091)*. Royal College of Music.
- Colley, L. (2009). *Britons: Forging the nation, 1707–1837 (rev. Ed.)*. Yale University Press.
- Collinson, F. (1966). *The traditional and national music of Scotland*.
- Dellow, R. (2018). *Vernacular instrumental manuscript sources 1860–1875. Paradigmatic of popular culture or folk tradition?* [PhD thesis]. University of Sheffield.
- Freeman, M. (2005). Folklore collection and social investigation in late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century England. *Folklore*, 116(1), 51–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0015587052000337716>
- Gelbart, M. (2007). *The invention of folk music and art music: Emerging categories from Ossian to Wagner*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gelbart, M. (2012). Allan Ramsay, the idea of 'scottish music' and the beginnings of 'national music' in Europe. *Eighteenth-Century Music*, 9(1), 81–108. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1478570611000352>
- Gerrard, C. (1994). *The patriot opposition to Walpole: Politics, poetry, and national myth* (pp. 1725–1742). Clarendon.
- Goodman, G. (2020). Bound together: The intimacies of music-book collecting in the early American republic. *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 145(1), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1017/rma.2020.9>
- Gregory, E. D. (2006). *Victorian songhunters: The recovery and editing of English vernacular ballads and folk lyrics* (pp. 1820–1883). Scarecrow.
- Grobman, N. R. (1975). David Hume and the earliest scientific methodology for collecting balladry. *Western Folklore*, 34(1), 16–31. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1498750>
- Harrison, C. (1998). *John Malchair of Oxford: Artist and musician*. Ashmolean Museum.
- Herder, J. G. (1773). *Auszug aus einem Brifwechsel über Ossian und die Lieder alter Völker*.
- Howes, F. (1969). *Folk music of Britain—and beyond*. Methuen.
- Johnson, D. (2005). *Scottish fiddle music in the 18th century: A music collection and historical study* (3rd ed.). Mercat Press.
- Johnson, J. (1787). The Scots musical museum: Humbly dedicated to the catch club, instituted at edin. June 1771 (vol. 1). Sold and subscriptions taken in, by & for the publisher. In N. Stewart, R. Bremner, C. Sutherland, & R. Ross Edinr (Eds.), *All the music sellers in London*.
- Kidd, C. (1999). *British identities before nationalism: Ethnicity and nationhood in the Atlantic world, 1600–1800*. Cambridge University Press.
- King, A. H. (1963). *Some British collectors of music, c. 1600–1960*. Cambridge University Press.
- Leerssen, J. (2006). *National thought in Europe: A cultural history*. Amsterdam University Press.
- Ling, J. (1997). *A history of European folk music*. University of Rochester Press.
- Little, A. (2018). *The tunebooks of J. B. Malchair. 1760–1812* [DPhil thesis]. University of Oxford.
- Little, A. (2020). For the sake of difference: John Malchair's categorizations of tunes, 1760–95. *Folk Music Journal*, 11(5), 52–66.
- Malchair, J. (1795b). *The Arrangement, Being an Extract of the Welsh, Irish, and Scotch Tunes contain'd in the foregoing Vols, & placed in separate classes* (GB-Lcm MS 2091). Royal College of Music.
- Malchair, J. (1784a). Vol. 3d: *The third collection of tunes* (QM 3619). Vaughan Williams Memorial Library.
- McAulay, K. (2013). *Our ancient national airs: Scottish song collecting from the enlightenment to the romantic era*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- McAulay, K. (2022). Strathspeys, reels, and instrumental airs: A national product. In S. Fleming & M. Perkins (Eds.), *Music by subscription: Composers and their networks in the British music-publishing trade* (pp. 1676–1820). Routledge.
- Partington, C. (n.d.-a). Browne info. Retrieved from <http://www.cpartington.plus.com/Links/Browne/Browne%20Info.html>
- Partington, C. (n.d.-b). Senhouse info. Retrieved from <http://www.cpartington.plus.com/Links/Senhouse/Senhouse%20Info.html>
- Pendlebury, C. (2015). *Jigs, reels and Hornpipes: A history of "traditional" dance tunes of Britain and Ireland*. University of Sheffield.
- Porter, J. (1989). *The traditional music of Britain and Ireland*. Garland.
- Roud, S. (2017). *Folk song in England*. Faber and Faber.
- Russell, I., & Atkinson, D. (2004). *Folk song: Tradition, revival, and re-creation*. The Elphinstone Institute. University of Aberdeen.
- Stell, E. F. (1999). *Sources of scottish instrumental music 1603–1707* [PhD thesis]. University of Glasgow.
- Weinbrot, H. D. (2013). *Literature, religion, and the evolution of culture, 1660–1780*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Alice Little is a Research Fellow in the Music Faculty at the University of Oxford. Her research focuses on collectors and collections of music and musical instruments. She has previously written about the songs collected by Percy Manning and Thomas Carter in the late nineteenth century, and the tunebooks of eighteenth-century violinist John Malchair. She is responsible for the Baines Project at the Bate Collection of Musical Instruments, researching the collection of twentieth-century organologist Anthony Baines. Her most recent book was a biographical catalogue of the Anthony Baines Archive (2021).

How to cite this article: Little, A. (2024). Tune collecting and musical taxonomies in eighteenth-century English tunebooks. *Literature Compass*, e12760. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lic3.12760>