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According to the editors of a collected volume, first published in 1999, historically-informed performance was ‘a modernist phenomenon … and, as an intellectual concept, perhaps – exhausted.’¹ In stating this, they had in mind the critique levelled against it by critics in the 1980s, such as Richard Taruskin. Taruskin thought that most historically informed performances promoted an adherence to the letter of the score that differed little from the literalism of ‘mainstream’ classical music performance (and was therefore ‘modernist’), and took a critical view of its attempts to adopt historical performance styles, which he thought was simply a ‘veneer’. Since that time, however, research on historical performance practice has maintained a presence, and looks to have a future. The suggestion made by the editors in the 1999 volume that the discipline of historically-informed performance was ‘exhausted’ – both as an ‘intellectual concept’, and simply because all the available evidence has already been adequately sifted –² has not been borne out, at least among the diverse academic and performing community that continues to pursue research in, and related to, this area.

The purpose and aims of historically-informed performance and research have undoubtedly developed in several significant ways beyond the situation that was described by Taruskin. It not only concerns itself with all historical periods, but has also taken on questions of broader significance, such as the place of performance history within an understanding of music history as a whole. It has also increasingly recognised the complexity of questions relating to historical performance. Relevant source materials include not only contemporary instruction manuals and such like, but also the musical sources themselves as documents of the working lives of musicians of the past – as well as those documenting the social contexts, and functions, of music in different times and places. It is, indeed, an enterprise that invigorates traditional historical musical research, and has the potential to bring important fresh perspectives on seemingly well-known composers and repertoire. The present availability of a wide range of primary source materials via the internet also has the potential to open up this area of enquiry to anyone with an interest in the topic.

As argued by Alberto Sanna in this EMP, common conceptions of how to approach the performance of a core seventeenth-century repertoire, namely the instrumental music of Arcangelo Corelli (1653–1713), deserves closer scrutiny. He points out a continued tendency to apply conventions associated with eighteenth-century performance practice, which acts as a kind of one-size-fits-all ‘Baroque’ performance style. The nomenclature on the title page of Corelli’s Op. 5 Sonate a violino e violone o cimbalo has been noted and discussed before (for instance by David Watkin in ‘Corelli’s op. 5 sonatas: “violino e violone o cimbalo”?’, Early Music, 24/3 (1996), 645–63). Sanna takes the matter a step further by drawing attention to the way Corelli’s collection belongs to the repertoire of seventeenth-century Italian duos, in which parts for instruments whose function was to provide harmonic support (harpsichord, theorbo), were usually provided separate from the string bass. However, there remains a reluctance to take on board the conclusion that Corelli intended this music for violin and violoncello duo, or for violin and harpsichord as a second option (the term violone was used to indicate an 8-foot string bass instrument tuned to C-G-d-a). Provocatively, we could attribute this to the way the discipline is structured, since professionally lives continue to thrive on specialism in ‘Baroque’ music, and all that entails from the point of view of marketing, and how music is taught in universities.

In our second article, Graham Pont contributes to the under-researched area of keyboard arrangements of Handel’s music, examining the case of an aria that was particularly popular. The existence of several contemporary arrangements of ‘Dimmi, cara’ from Scipio (1726) is testimony to Charles Burney’s claim, later in the century, that it was ‘long in favour throughout the [British] nation’. A handful of arrangements of other arias from Handel’s operas have been attributed with some confidence to the composer (since they are found in sources connected to the composer), but it is impossible to test, beyond the use of stylistic evidence, whether others could stem from Handel as well. A number of

² Ibid.: ‘it proved impossible to find an author who could feel that there was something useful that could be said beyond a summary of conclusions and arguments current in the 1980s’.
Handel’s contemporaries in London were associated with the practice of arranging his Italian opera arias, alongside those from other operas produced in London at the time, and were far more prolific in producing them. Nevertheless, Pont observes distinguishing qualities in one of the ‘Dimmi, cara’ arrangements, suggesting that it could stem from Handel. Another question he considers is where the arrangements were performed and who performed them. It is frequently assumed that they were intended for essentially private, domestic performance, and served as mementos, or as ‘remembrances’, of the arias as they were heard in the theatre. The often strikingly virtuosic qualities of the arrangements suggest they may preserve the spirit, if not note-for-note transcriptions, of theatrical performances – thus they are a potentially significant source of information on performance practice. By the same token, however, Pont suggests that the genre’s virtuoso features, which matched the flamboyance and dimensions of some contemporary concerted music, could imply that some examples may have been deemed suitable for performance in a ‘salon’ context, if not in public concerts.

In our third article, Peter Holman turns to examine critically the received view that Jean-Baptiste Lully died of a self-inflicted wound to the foot as a result of conducting his Te Deum with a staff. Holman exposes how the early eighteenth-century account of this incident has been misinterpreted in several ways. The standard interpretation is fundamentally flawed when viewed in the context of what is known about musical direction in France in Lully’s lifetime and after. The source materials relating to this topic are fascinating, whetting the appetite for Holman’s forthcoming book on the subject of musical direction in Georgian Britain.

This issue is rounded-off by two reports on conferences that took place in 2014: John Briggs writes on the ‘Roots of Revival’ conference at the Horniman Museum, which took place in March, while Adrian Powney writes on the wide-ranging conference that marked the 250th anniversary of Rameau’s death, which took place in Oxford in September.

The sad news of the death of Christopher Hogwood on 24 September 2014, who has been the National Early Music Association’s President since 2000, will have come as a shock to many readers. I had the fortunate opportunity of working for Professor Hogwood while assisting him on several occasions in the preparation of the Purcell Society’s forthcoming keyboard volume. I also benefited from his generosity and kind hospitality when I was permitted access to his considerable library of music manuscripts and early prints as part of my PhD research on English keyboard music. Hogwood was an inspiring figure who championed historically informed performance as an enterprise that puts the music centre stage. His aim was to reveal the original contexts in which the music of the past was created and performed, thereby facilitating greater appreciation and understanding on the part of today’s performers and listeners. His performances, as well as his scholarly achievements, were exemplary in putting forth such a philosophy, which will surely remain a model and continuing inspiration to many for years to come.

Andrew Woolley
Edinburgh, December 2014
andrewwoolley@sapo.pt
Corelli’s Op. 5 and the Baroque Paradigm

Alberto Sanna

The second half of the twentieth century witnessed the rise of so-called ‘Baroque music’ to a prominence similar to that enjoyed by later repertoires. This intriguing socio-cultural phenomenon resulted from a conflation of scholarly and performing endeavours. The music academy and the music industry were often mutually supportive, making it possible for such forgotten masters of the past as Claudio Monteverdi or Antonio Vivaldi – to name only the most striking examples – to find a place in the Pantheon of great composers alongside their illustrious colleagues J.S. Bach and Handel. Endowing them with the full set of academic paraphernalia would not in itself have led to their consecration: complete editions with massive critical apparatuses, regular international conferences, updated biographical studies and monographs of the most fashionable types, while they are each a sine qua non, do not guarantee renewed interest and success. In addition to these, a promotional strategy was in place that worked on several different levels beyond the academy, attracting both amateurs and professionals. Through the recording industry, and concert promotion, the highest intellectual efforts were coupled with regular performances, whether live or recorded.¹

It all started with Curt Sachs’s adoption of the term ‘Baroque’ to describe the music of the Catholic Reformation, which had been used earlier to describe Catholic Reformation art. Then Egon Wellesz located the beginning of the Baroque feeling in the artistic ideals arising in the 1520s, out of the discoveries, experiences and economic developments of the preceding years. Earlier, Robert Haas used the term in connection with the whole period 1600–1750, which constituted the subject matter of his monograph. A number of influential émigré musicologists in the U.S.A. – Hugo Leichtentritt, Paul Henry Lang, Willi Apel – followed suit. But it was in the aftermath of World War II that the most crucial events occurred. In 1946 the American Institute of Musicology published, under the joint editorship of Armen Carapetyan and Leo Schrade, the first issue of a periodical entitled Journal of Renaissance and Baroque Music (a year later re-christened as Musica Disciplina). The following year, the New York publishing house W.W. Norton produced what was to become the reference work par excellence on the musical Baroque, Manfred Bukofzer’s Music in the Baroque Era. In 1948, the leading record company, Deutsche Grammophon, launched its early-music label Archiv Produktion, in whose catalogue German and Italian Baroque music featured prominently, while European and North-American conservatoires opened special departments and devised specific curricula for the study of Baroque instruments.²

Research on music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries gained further momentum in the 1970s. The editors of the authoritative New Oxford History of Music allotted to the years 1630–1750 twice as much attention as to any other period of music history, amounting to the entirety of volumes 5 and 6. In prefacing these publications, Sir Jack Westrup felt no need of apology for a choice of periodization that underscored the importance of an epoch ‘from which’ – in his own words – ‘so much that is memorable has become a necessary part of our existence today’.³ Early-music journals began to devote increasing attention to Baroque topics, while several studies of repertoires, musicians and institutions of that time appeared. Finally, academic presses closed the gap in textbook
production. Claude Palisca’s work had followed Bukofzer’s by twenty-one years, and was followed in turn by Anderson’s by twenty-six years. Now, since the turn of the present century, no fewer than four single-authored, and two multi-authored surveys, have been published in English.⁴

In this essay I argue that, throughout the process I have sketched, the musical Baroque has risen to the status of a ‘paradigm’ in historically informed performance, affecting the interpretation of such popular compositions as Arcangelo Corelli’s *Sonate a violino e violone o cimbalo*, Op. 5 (Rome, 1700). Indeed, the tension existing between the ‘paradigm’ and the ideals of historically informed performance seems particularly clear in the case of the modern reception of this music. And yet the problem passed by, largely unacknowledged, in the literature and performances that emerged around the recent tercentenary of Corelli’s death in 2013. Before turning to this case study, however, it may be useful to outline briefly some of the issues arising from periodization in music history generally, and the intellectual context of its use.

By ‘paradigm’ I mean precisely what Thomas Kuhn meant in his celebrated 1962 study of scientific revolutions: a *disciplinary matrix* to which a group of members of a scientific community or sub-community commits itself, and from which specific traditions of scholarly activity and textual interpretation spring. According to Kuhn, the features of a paradigm are fourfold. First, its achievements are sufficiently unprecedented to attract an enduring group of adherents away from competing modes of thought and behaviour. Second, although rigorously determined, it is still sufficiently open-ended to leave all sorts of problems for the redefined group of practitioners to resolve. Third, it is not coextensive with the ‘rules’ that govern a discipline (‘established viewpoints’ such as the commitment to using period instruments, for example): whereas rules derive from paradigms, paradigms can guide research even in the absence of rules; and whereas explicit rules are usually common to a very broad scientific group, paradigms need not be. Fourth, it engenders effective research irrespective of the amount of awareness for the paradigm among the scholarly community. While it is true that some scientific enterprises incline towards self-analysis, the inextricable mixture of theory, methods and standards acquired in learning a paradigm is more consequential for the development of a research field than the rationalisation of its underlying premises, rules and protocols.⁵

When considered from such a theoretical perspective, the term ‘Baroque’ is not a harmless ‘catch-all’ for an area of musicological research and research-based performance. Rather, it is a powerful concept that denotes several things at once: a) a period of music history extending throughout the whole of the seventeenth, and part of the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, characterised by stylistic as well as ideological consistency; b) a musical-cultural phenomenon, first occurring in a few urban centres of the Italian peninsula, and subsequently investing other regions of the West; c) a variety of musical works, composers, institutions and ideas, unified by a number of exemplary specimens; d) a regulative notion of historical knowledge that steers a middle course between a metaphysical essence and a linguistic label. In sum, the term ‘Baroque music’ is not a mere shorthand for late-sixteenth-cum-seventeenth-cum early-eighteenth-century music: it shapes, in fundamental ways, the historical understanding of European musical cultures.

The use of the term ‘Baroque’ can be compared to other traditional labels given to style periods. Yet there are important differences to note between the way scholars have adopted these terms and the way they have used the term ‘Baroque’ in recent years. In the past decades a lively musicological debate has led to a more contextualised understanding of both ‘Renaissance’ and ‘Classical’; by comparison, discussion of the validity, or otherwise, of the term ‘Baroque’ has been limited, while its use remains widespread.

Reinhard Strohm has documented how the idea that ‘European music experienced a “Renaissance” comparable to that of literature and the other arts ... originated as a by-product of humanist reflections on the arts in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries’.⁶ However, its anchorage in musical repertoires is far more dubious. As the same scholar argues
elsewhere, the Renaissance is best interpreted as 'a consciously created socio-cultural environment, not a style characteristic of music'. Strictly speaking, the concept of a 'musical' renaissance 'is not needed to explain a development of the musical art; in fact it falls far short of explaining it. It can be used to describe, on the other hand, what happened to the musical art in places such as Italy and Spain in the later fifteenth century'. In this way, the musical techniques and the processes of development they undergo within a given socio-cultural context are kept distinct from one another without any loss of explanatory force.7

Recent research on Classical music emphasises much the same points. In a study of Haydn’s instrumental works, James Webster questions the validity of 'the traditional concept of “Classical style”' as a historiographical and critical tool. Not only does he show that the notion 'is anachronistic, inherently ambiguous, and shot through with conservative aesthetic-ideological baggage', but also that 'as a period designation, it denies both the strong continuity of late eighteenth-century music with earlier musical cultures of the century ..., and its (very different) continuity with that of the nineteenth century'.8 This scholar proposes, for the music of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven, the term ‘First Viennese Modernism’. This is admittedly clumsy but entails several advantages – as Webster discusses at length in a subsequent article –9 not least of which is the fact that it leaves room for the historically-founded term ‘galant’ (not usually capitalised) to denote the majority of music composed in Europe between c.1720 and c.1780. The label ‘galant’ now occurs with some regularity in musicological writings, although not without caveats. David Sheldon for instance has concluded a series of investigations into the eighteenth-century meanings of the word ‘galant’, and its use in musical discourse, by remarking that ‘the designation of galant style … oversimplifies, and therefore distorts, a very complex situation’.10 The catchy titles of some academic books, for which editors rather than authors may be responsible, ought not to mislead us into thinking otherwise. For there is little doubt that ‘galant’ as a music-critical expression is currently understood not as a set of technical features but rather, in the words of Robert Gjerdingen, ‘as a code of conduct, as an eighteenth-century courtly ideal (adaptable to city life), and as a carefully taught set of musical behaviors’.11 ‘This shared code of conduct’ may encompass diverse musical genres and styles.

Conversely, musicologists have hardly recognised the problems with the term ‘Baroque’. The only exceptions known to me are John Müller's aesthetic critique of 1954 – which, however, has had very little resonance within the discipline – and Tim Carter's somewhat perfunctory surveys of the concept published in 2005 and 2006.12 Between them, there is a remarkable gap of half a century. Typical of conventional understanding at the present is Palisca’s statement that ‘the two centuries between roughly 1540 and 1730 can legitimately be considered an artistic era united by a common ideal, and, if one must find a word for it, “Baroque” is defensible as designation’ – which one can still read in the updated online version of The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians.13 This is not the place to conduct an in-depth investigation and critique of both the uses and abuses of the term. Nevertheless, the following discussion may help to shed light on some of the issues for performance and scholarship that the baroque paradigm inevitably brings with it.

A context for Op. 5

To understand how a scientific paradigm can point scholarship in particular directions at the expense of other, more nuanced ways of thinking, let us consider two publications occasioned by the tercentenary of the death of Arcangelo Corelli: the Bärenreiter Urtext edition by the late Christopher Hogwood and Ryan Mark of the Sonate a violino e violone o cimbalo, Op. 5 (retitled Sonatas for Violin and Basso continuo); and the Linn recording by The Avison Ensemble of the same set of works (renamed Violin Sonatas).14

In its practical slant, the Bärenreiter edition of Corelli’s Op. 5 complements the version prepared by Cristina Urchuegüía and Martin Zimmerman for the Corelli Complete Edition.15 This Urtext publication comes in two pairs of volumes, each pair covering sonatas nos. 1–6 (Volume 1) and nos. 7–12 (Volume 2). In the first pair of volumes the sonatas are laid
out as two superimposed treble-and-bass staves: the upper system has the 1700 version for ‘Violino’ and ‘Violone o Cimbalo’, while the lower system has a figured-bass realisation by Antonio Tonelli (1686–1765).\textsuperscript{16} The second pair of volumes comprises three partbooks: one for ‘Violino’, one for ‘Violone o Cimbalo’ (actually a score identical in appearance to the upper system in the first pair of volumes) and one containing several ‘decorated versions’ of the violin part dating from the entire course of the eighteenth century. The editors’ avowed aim is ‘to offer the historically-aware musician a selection of contemporary performing solutions in practical format’ to two main problems: 1) violin ornamentation and 2) continuo realisation.\textsuperscript{17} As to the former, Hogwood and Mark ‘provide the encouragement and models needed’ by modern players to adopt a style of ornamentation that ‘proved acceptable to (some) 18th-century tastes’; as to the latter, they encourage experimentation with ‘the Italian “rich” style [of accompaniment], with full-voiced chords in both hands’ as exemplified by Tonelli and (some) other eighteenth-century theorists.\textsuperscript{18}

As it happens, the Linn recording of Op. 5 gives its own solutions to those very problems. Violinist Pavlo Beznosiuk embellishes his part lavishly in all slow and some fast movements, while his colleagues – cellist Richard Tunnicliffe, harpsichordist Roger Hamilton (also doubling as organist) and archlutenist Paula Chateauneuf (also doubling as guitarist) – provide a type of accompaniment as varied as unobtrusive. As Hogwood and Mark also do in passing, the author of the accompanying booklet, Simon Fleming, acknowledges that ‘although many have referred to these as “solo” sonatas, the title-page indicates that they were intended as unaccompanied duos for violin and violone with the option of substituting the latter with a harpsichord’. But then he goes on to write that ‘there was considerable flexibility in how these sonatas could be performed’, thus justifying the practice of realising the bass part with a variety of instruments, as well as that of improvising the violin ornamentation ‘on the spot’.

These publications have much in common. First, they are the work of prominent figures in the field of historically informed performance. Second, they focus on a body of instrumental compositions that plays a conspicuous part in our appreciation of Italian Baroque music as a whole. Third, they offer a rather conventional picture of the works as far as issues of genre and instrumentation are concerned – one made current in various educational settings and popularised by the music industry for commercial reasons. According to this view, the Op. 5 sonatas are pieces for a solo violin accompanied by a thorough-bass which can be realised extemporaneously by as few as two instruments (cello and harpsichord) and as many as seven (cello, double bass, harpsichord, organ, archlute, theorbo, guitar), though not all playing always at the same time. Thus, notwithstanding their scholarly and artistic achievements, the two Corelli publications are offered to the general public in a commercial dress which – alas – says more about mid eighteenth- than late seventeenth-century violin playing. Both the critical commentaries and the editions themselves leave unanswered two fundamental historical questions: To what musical genre do Corelli’s Op. 5 sonatas belong? And what was the most common type of instrumentation for that genre in the second half of the seventeenth century?

There was a greater variety of musical genres with a single violin part (or other soprano instrument) than the ubiquitous title ‘violin sonata’ postulated by the Baroque paradigm would suggest. In addition, between the late sixteenth and the early eighteenth centuries, the violin was used in combination with a wide range of other soprano as well as tenor and bass instruments. Some of these genres went out of fashion before Corelli began to publish in the 1680s. Nevertheless, remnants of them can be found in contemporaneous manuscripts of violin music, which present a more varied picture of the repertoire than do the printed sources on their own.

The late seventeenth-century sonata has a number of features in common with its earlier seventeenth-century forbears. It is notable, for instance, that the piece types and idioms within earlier collections (which, in the first half of the century, were not always arranged into performing units) remained in use. Table 1 lists in alphabetical order some of
the most characteristic violin pieces found in prints and manuscripts produced in central and northern Italy during Corelli's lifetime, many of which had a long history. Some pieces were related in varying degrees to dancing (e.g. the *brando*); some others were sets of variations (*partite*) upon either well-known tunes (e.g. the *bergamasca*) or standard bass or harmonic progressions (e.g. the *passacaglio*); still others were named after some pervasive technical device (e.g. the *spiritoso*). After mid-century, the sinfonia and the sonata replaced the canzona as the most popular genres of instrumental music. In his first five publications, Corelli refrained from using any term other than ‘sonata’ for a single work. Instead, what he and other composers did was to incorporate some of the older piece types and idioms into the longer multi-movement works typical of his time, albeit often without retaining their original names. The *tromba* that opens the Op. 5 collection is an example of such a practice, where the result is quite refined.

Seventeenth-century musicians also made current distinct sub-genres of the sonata: the *sonata da chiesa*, the *sonata da camera* and the *sonata da ballo*. Within any given publication, composers and publishers could take quite a strict approach to the matter when they wanted to – whether for aesthetic or marketing reasons. However, as the century advanced, many musicians increasingly favoured a multi-purpose type of instrumental composition that, although primarily destined for private recreation, could also serve as functional music for a variety of public and semi-public occasions – for example as an introduction to a religious ceremony. Corelli’s Opp. 1, 3 and 5 had a functional purpose, as did the sinfonias of his Roman colleagues Lelio Colista, Carlo Mannelli and Alessandro Stradella: all were instrumental pieces *toucourt*, being serious yet varied enough in content to be suitable for numerous uses. Works so crafted fulfilled the compositional ambitions of their authors as well as the political exigencies of their dedicatees.19

For the greater part of the seventeenth century, the majority of sonatas were written in one to four parts. Italian musicians called them *sola, duo, trio or quarto*; in prints, these terms were abbreviated as *a1, a2, a3* and *a4*. Solos were typically scored for either a soprano (S) or a bass instrument (B); duos for either two sopranos (SS) or a soprano and a bass (SB); trios for two sopranos and a bass (SSB) or exceptionally three sopranos (SSS); quartos for the standard vocal combination (SATB).20 Contrary to paradigmatic beliefs, the thorough-bass was by no means compulsory. In the church genres, it was common to write an additional thorough-bass part for the organ, either for acoustic reasons, or due to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Dances</th>
<th>Genres</th>
<th>Variations</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>Allemanda</td>
<td>Aria</td>
<td>Barabano</td>
<td>Canone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affettuoso</td>
<td>Balletto</td>
<td>Canzona</td>
<td>Bergamasca</td>
<td>Finale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>Ballo</td>
<td>Capriccio</td>
<td>Ciaccona</td>
<td>Introdutione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave</td>
<td>Bore</td>
<td>Fantasia</td>
<td>Passacaglio</td>
<td>RitorNELLO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>Brando</td>
<td>Fuga</td>
<td>Passamezzo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lento</td>
<td>Canario</td>
<td>Partita</td>
<td>Ruggiero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posato</td>
<td>Corrente</td>
<td>Rercare</td>
<td>Variatione</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestissimo</td>
<td>FurLana</td>
<td>Sinfonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presto</td>
<td>Gagliarda</td>
<td>Toccata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritoso</td>
<td>Gavotta</td>
<td>Tromba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veloce</td>
<td>Giga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivace</td>
<td>Sarabanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivace</td>
<td>Zoppa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Piece types and idioms in late seventeenth-century instrumental music from Italy
instrument’s symbolic associations. Dance music, on the other hand, especially of the functional type, usually dispensed with the thorough-bass altogether. Ordinarily scored for soprano and bass only, it was often published with *ad libitum* parts for a second soprano instrument and, sometimes, alto- and tenor-range parts as well. Much instructional material for the violin was also ‘unaccompanied’, in the sense that there was no thorough-bass part. The Este Library in Modena preserves a number of books containing numerous didactic pieces for violin, without thorough-bass, by Giuseppe Colombi and the two Vitalis, Giovanni Battista and Tomaso Antonio.

In describing the process of composing music in several parts, contemporary theorists distinguished between the need to write a ‘singing bass’ (*basso cantante*) and the option of including a ‘thorough-bass’ (*basso continuo*). Sometime between 1677 and 1694, the Ferrarese musician Bartolomeo Bismantova explained: ‘Would one wish to write the thorough-bass, one shall do it after having done the composition and form it from the bass voice’. His Bolognese colleague, Lorenzo Penna, was of the same opinion: ‘When one wishes to put in the compositions the thorough-bass for the organ, or spinet, etc. this is done after having done the whole composition, forming it always from the lowest voice of that composition’. Hence, the terms ‘singing bass’ and ‘thorough-bass’ were used to refer to two musical entities, both low-ranged and sharing some musical material, and yet distinct enough conceptually and aurally to warrant names that distinguished them from one another. Their compositional relationship, moreover, was straightforward: the thorough-bass was always derived from the singing bass not vice versa. Corelli’s *oeuvre* itself provides the best evidence for such a widespread practice, for the composer dispensed altogether with the thorough-bass in his Opp. 2, 4 and 5 sonatas.

The ideal instrument for the overexposed role of the ‘singing bass’ was considered to be either a violone/cello or an archlute. Not only is this apparent from the title-pages and introductory notes of many publications, but it is also corroborated by the substantial amount of other evidence gathered by musicologists. Whilst by no means excluded from such a function on occasion, harpsichords, spinets and positive organs were, on the whole, not considered flexible enough to play singing basses, to the extent that some outstanding practitioners of the time – Bernardo Pasquini, Francesco Gasparini, Alessandro Scarlatti – felt obliged to provide sets of written instructions for anyone wishing to perform from the bass part at the keyboard with the required taste.

Tables 2 and 3 give lists of single-authored volumes of solos for a soprano instrument and thorough-bass (*a1*), and of duos for a soprano and a bass instrument, with or without thorough-bass (*a2*), published in central and northern Italy before Corelli’s Op. 5. The tables exclude volumes containing pieces with multiple scorings, and those with *ad libitum* scorings. They also do no attempt to distinguish between those collections concentrating on particular sub-genres, namely those made up primarily of lighter dances, and those that are more abstract and serious (see discussion of the two types within the *a2* repertoire below).

The solos are fewer in number than the duos: nine collections of solos by eight different composers were published over a period of seventy years against fourteen collections of duos by twelve different composers over less than three decades. Technological as well as sociological circumstances offer an explanation for this fact. First, as is well known, the printing process with moveable types was ill-suited to rendering such elements of solo violin music as double stops, chords and elaborate bowings; and Italian music publishers lagged behind their northern-European competitors in adopting the more reliable technique of copper engraving. Second, professional violinists had little interest in offering their virtuoso compositions in printed form, when they actually made their living by performing them live in exclusive settings for powerful patrons. Giovanni Antonio Leoni said as much in the dedication of his solo sonatas to Cardinal Pallotta: ‘And I would like to think they may reasonably hope to deserve in some parts the favour of such a worthy and noble protection. For I have composed many of them to this purpose and played them in the said
church of the Santa Casa in the presence of Your Eminence, who, to my singular fortune, has graciously condescended to listen to and enjoy them several times.\textsuperscript{27} In the subsequent preface, Leoni also hinted at the rivalries between professionals and the danger of ‘live plagiarism’ as possible motives for releasing solo sonatas: ‘I have satisfied partly the said professors of music by publishing in printed form some other sonatas I composed lately, so that through them the experts may acknowledge the first inventor and author of the style which nowadays the inquisitive young professors of this instrument are capable of imitating so well.'\textsuperscript{28} In what must have been quite a competitive environment, even for an established virtuoso, publishing could be a means of asserting the authorship of a specific style of composition or performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Opus</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gabriello Puliti</td>
<td>Fantasia, scherzi, et capricci da sonarsi in forma di canzone, con un violino solo o vero cornetto</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>1624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Uccellini</td>
<td>Delle sonate over canzoni da farsi à violino solo, &amp; basso continuo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>1649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Antonio Leoni</td>
<td>Sonate di violino a voce sola</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Berardi</td>
<td>Sinfonie a violino solo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlo Mannelli</td>
<td>Primo libro di sinfonie à violino solo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietro degli Antoni</td>
<td>Sonate a violino solo con il basso continuo per l’organ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Buonaventura Viviani</td>
<td>Sinfonie, arie, capricci, alemande, correnti, gighe, introduzioni, sarabande, &amp;c. per violino solo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietro degli Antoni</td>
<td>Sonate a violino solo con il basso continuo per l’organ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Veracini</td>
<td>Sonate da camera a violino solo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Modena</td>
<td>1694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 2nd edition; ii. lost; iii. Also published in Venice as Sonate a violino solo. Capricci armonici, da chiesa, e da camera, à violino solo

**Table 2. Solos for a soprano instrument printed in Italy before Corelli’s Op. 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Opus</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maurizio Cazzati</td>
<td>Sonate a due istromenti cioè violino, e violone</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Maria Bononcini</td>
<td>Arie, correnti, sarabande, gighe, &amp; alemande a violino, e violone, over spinetta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietro degli Antoni</td>
<td>Balletti, correnti, &amp; arie diverse à violino, e violone per camera, &amp; anco per suonar nella spinetta, &amp; altri instrumenti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Battista degli Antoni</td>
<td>Balletti e correnti gighe, e sarabande da’ camera à violino, e claricembalo; à violoncello</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Bononcini</td>
<td>Sinfonie a due strumenti violino, e violoncello, col basso continuo per l’organ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giuseppe Torelli</td>
<td>Concertino per camera a violino, e violoncello</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvatore Mazzella</td>
<td>Balleti, correnti, gighe, sarabande, gavotte, brunde, e gagliarde ... a due, violino, e viola, e cimbalo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Maria Ruggieri</td>
<td>Bizzarrrie armoniche esposte in dieci suonate da camera a due, cioè violino, e lento a turba col suo basso per il violone, à spinetta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>1689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Battista degli Antoni</td>
<td>Ricercate à violino, e violoncello, à claricembalo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Battista degli Antoni</td>
<td>Balletti à violino, e violoncello, à claricembalo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartolomeo Girolamo Laurenti</td>
<td>Suonate per camera à violino e violoncello</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attilio Ottavio Ariosti</td>
<td>Divertimenti da camera a violino, e violoncello</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Veracini</td>
<td>Sonate da camera a due, violino, e violone, à arciuleto, col basso per il cimbalo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Modena</td>
<td>1696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomaso Pegolotti</td>
<td>Trattenimenti armonici da camera a violino solo e violoncello</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modena</td>
<td>1698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. Duos for a soprano and a bass instrument printed in Italy before Corelli’s Op. 5**
Issues such as those raised by Leoni were of no consequence for composers of the lighter instrumental genres – balletti, correnti, arie, divertimenti, trattenimenti and the like – that featured so prominently amongst the collections of duos for a soprano and a bass instrument without thorough-bass. **By and large this was unpretentious music of the diversional sort:** it frequently marked the debut of an author on the local scene, and was normally dedicated to a member of the local nobility whose needs for entertainment it served so well. A far more serious affair were those duo sonatas, sinfonias and canzonas for a soprano and a bass instrument, with or without thorough-bass, which required of a composer contrapuntal skills and formal ingenuity that went beyond the capabilities needed to produce a collection of simple dances. Within these latter genres, compositional options were less standardised, and the outcomes themselves quite varied – at least until the first part (the first six sonatas) of Corelli’s Op. 5 set a standard that was sufficiently high to stir up emulation from various Italian, and other European quarters.

There was, of course, some cross-fertilisation between genres, especially in the context of a large set of complete works. Indeed, the title-page of the second part of Corelli’s op. 5 – *Preludii allemande correnti gighe sarabande gavotte e follia* – appears to be suspiciously similar in wording to those from volumes published, for example, by Giovanni Maria Bononcini in Bologna, or by Salvatore Mazzella in Rome (see Table 3). Some of the content is equally light-hearted (e.g. the gavottas in the sonatas no. 9, 10 and 11, which were to provide eighteenth-century virtuosos with the basis for sets of dazzling variations) but some is clearly not. The *Follia*, for instance, is just as good a piece of ensemble music as any fugue in the first part of Op. 5, though it may have originated as a solo work of the type that closes Carlo Ambrogio Lonati’s manuscript of solo sonatas copied in 1701. It was relatively easy for a composer to turn a duo into a solo by substituting a singing bass for a thorough-bass, even though that entailed a certain amount of rewriting and some rethinking, too. The same feat could be accomplished in performance, although the sound ideals of the solo and of the duo sonata were rather incommensurable. Then as now, the instrumentalists would have had to alter the sonority of the piece, upsetting the balance between the soprano and the bass parts by ornamenting the former and harmonising the latter.

To sum up, a study of late seventeenth-century sources and documents yields the following observations concerning the nature of Corelli’s Op. 5: 1) the sonatas are duos for string instruments, a soprano (violin) and a bass (violone/cello), similar yet distinct from the duo sonatas for two soprano instruments which, though popular with Venetian, Bolognese and Modenese composers, were not with Corelli; 2) a few individual movements notwithstanding, the sonatas belong to the rarer, but more learned, sub-genre of the instrumental duo; 3) with still fewer exceptions, the bass part is a singing bass for the violone/cello (or alternatively for the archlute), not a thorough-bass for the harpsichord, organ or theorbo similar to that included by Corelli in his Opp. 1 and 3 trio sonatas for two soprano instruments (violins) and a bass (violone or archlute) instrument. Finally, to clear the ground from possible misgivings, I should like to add that the argument expounded above is concerned with the historiographical tools, not the creative means, one may choose to bring to bear on the interpretation of Corelli’s Op. 5 and collections like it. It is an argument about musicology, not about musicianship.

**Beyond the Baroque**

Discussing the meanings of ‘big words’, such as ‘Baroque’, the art historian Bernard Heyl once remarked that they ‘cannot be abolished with impunity’. Actually they can, for without them the entire apparatus goes up in smoke. One of the fathers of cultural studies, the great Dutch scholar Johan Huizinga, warned us many years ago that ‘one should constantly be prepared to abandon a term as soon as it seems to have lost its validity in the light of the nature of the individual details themselves’. We need only consider the recent achievements of Bach scholarship, or the insights produced by research on early opera, to realise that historical
explanation can dispense altogether with such terms as ‘Renaissance’, ‘Baroque’ and ‘Classical’. The problem is that terms such as these all too soon turn into concepts and, as such, go on to enjoy a life of their own. As Huizinga puts it: ‘A vague, indeterminate historical concept takes form, with all sorts of heterogeneous notions loosely associated in it. The whole can only be grasped and expressed by applying a striking metaphor to it. The vaster the complexes the historian wishes to fathom, the greater the danger of hypostatizations.’ In time, such a concept ‘becomes an intellectual force and begins to dominate over our minds, which are only too willing to serve the new, consoling gods. And like every force, the concept expands, conquering territory at the cost of other concepts. The hollower the concept and the weaker the term in which it is expressed, the more that expansion of force bears the character of an inflation’. The picture loses focus, our thinking rigidifies, and a paradigm emerges.

Paradigms such as the ‘Baroque’ entail a reductive way of thinking that does not do justice to the plurality and the individuality of musical cultures, which appear superficially homogenous at first sight because of their historical remoteness. Although the acquisition of a paradigm is a sign of maturity in the development of any given scientific field, research can surely do without paradigms. And if this is most obvious in the case of specialised enquiries, it is less so in the case of broader analyses of specific musical cultures. Indeed, with the notable exceptions of Lorenzo Bianconi’s and Tim Carter’s circumscribed surveys of music in northern Italy at the dawn of the seventeenth century, no attempt has thus far been made to account for musical developments in western Europe between the late sixteenth and the early eighteenth centuries in other than paradigmatic terms. Some may think that these shortcomings are intrinsic to textbooks – or that, in fact, textbooks do not even constitute ‘proper’ scholarship. And yet, leading musicologists have devoted substantial efforts to writing textbooks for the benefit of generations of music students, performers and analysts. More decisively, specialists of both earlier and later times have shown that it is indeed possible to survey an entire musical culture in non-paradigmatic terms. The examples that come readily to mind are Strohm’s treatment of the ‘long fifteenth century’ and Daniel Heartz’s study of the ‘short eighteenth century’. These authors succeed in conveying a sense of distinct traditions of musical composition and performance occurring at one and the same time – sometimes in dialogue with, sometimes in conflict with, sometimes in total indifference to, one another. To put it differently, these authors demonstrate how continuity and change are both possible at any specific historical juncture – if one is willing to take on a type of historical narrative that replaces the standard chronological-geographical pattern with more fluid and flexible systems.

It may only be a coincidence that this valuable work comes from fields in which a thorough revision of such notions as ‘Renaissance’ and ‘Classical’ music has long since taken place. Else, it may be the case that, as a disciplinary matrix for historically informed performance, the ‘Baroque’ paradigm, too, has served its purpose: that the time is ripe to abandon it and to start looking for more refined hermeneutic tools with which to engage the musics and the cultures of our past.


1 Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 50th anniversary edn (Chicago, 2012).


9 Claude Palisca, ‘Baroque’, Oxford Music Online (http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com). Whilst symptomatic of a latent conflict, the adoption of a different term or the adaptation of an old one do not in themselves alter the essence of a paradigm. Whether called ‘baroque’ or, as has become fashionable, ‘seventeenth-century music’, the object musicologists refer to is clearly the same as the one for which Hugo Riemann devised the expression ‘Age of the Thorough-Bass’ (Das Generalbass-Zeitalter) and Guido Adler ‘Third Style Period’ (Dritte Stilperiode). See Hugo Riemann, Kleines Handbuch der Musikgeschichte mit Periodisierung nach Stilprinzipien und Formen (Leipzig, 1908); Guido Adler (ed.), Handbuch der Musikgeschichte (Frankfurt am Main, 1924). For the persistent use of Riemann’s expression, see for example the chapter entitled ‘Le temps de la basse continue’ in Jacques Chailley (ed.), Précis de musicologie, new edn (Paris, 1984).
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Lorenzo Penna, *Li primi albori musicali per li principianti della musica figurata*, 4th edn (Bologna, 1684), 139: ‘Quando nelle composizioni si vuole porre il basso continuo per l’organo, è spinetta, &c. questo si fa dopo haver fatta tutta la composizione, formandolo sempre con la parte più bassa di essa composizione ...’.


Leoni, *Sonate*, unnumbered p. 4: ‘Mà non hò potuto però affatto oppormi alle violenze fattiemi da i sudetti professori di musica, mi è convenuto sodisfarli in parte con pubblicare per mezzo della stampa alcune altre sonate ultimamente da mè composte, acciò per mezzo di esse si riconosca da gl’intendenti il primo inventore, & autore dello stile, che i curisosi giovani professori di questo istromento han saputo hoggidì si felicemente imitare.’


For a different view, see Niels Martin Jensen, ‘When is a solo sonata not a solo sonata? Corelli’s Op. V considered in the light of the genre’s tradition’, *Arangolo Corelli fra mito e realtà storica. Nuove prospettive d’indagine musicologica e interdisciplinare nel 350° anniversario della nascita: atti del convegno internazionale di studi, FiesiGnano 11–14 settembre 2003*, ed. Gregory Barnett, Antonella D’Ovidio and Stefano La Via (Florence, 2007), vol. 1, 211–230. If authentic, the so-called ‘Assisi’ sonatas recently recorded by Enrico Gatti and the Ensemble Aurora (GCD 921209, 2014) may well be deemed Corelli’s contribution to the lighter sub-genre of the duo sonata for a soprano and a bass instrument without thorough-bass.
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'A Favourite SONG in the Opera of SCIPIO':
Handel’s own arrangement of ‘Dimmi, cara’ for
the harpsichord?

Graham Pont

Handel’s twentieth opera, *Publio Cornelio Scipione*, was completed and first produced in London during March 1726. The star-studded cast included the famous castrato, Senesino, in the role of Lucejo (Luceius), a prince of the Celtiberians and lover of the beautiful Berenice, who had been taken prisoner during Scipio’s conquest of New Carthage. In the fourth scene of Act I, Lucejo addresses his love in an exquisite aria, ‘Dimmi, cara’ (HWV 20:10). No contemporary record is known of the public’s response to the first production of the opera, but the historian Charles Burney later recorded that this particular aria ‘was long in favour throughout the nation. The melody is natural, elegant, and pleasing; and… could be sung by every one possessed of an ear and a voice’.

As with many of Handel’s stage successes, ‘Dimmi, cara’ was soon after separately reissued in condensed score with the melody also arranged for the flute. Transposed in this edition from E major to G major, the air might have seemed even more ‘natural, elegant, and pleasing’, since it the mediant tonality at the conclusion of the B section is B minor instead of G sharp minor. ‘Dimmi, cara’ also reappeared around 1730, in an elaborate transcription for the harpsichord, also in the key of G, within Peter Prellleur’s compilation *The modern musick-master* (see Ex. 2).

This remarkable arrangement is sandwiched between two other ‘Favourite Airs’ arranged for the harpsichord. The first, a setting of ‘Vanne, segui’l mio desio’ from Handel’s opera *Floridante* (HWV 14:28), is much simpler in style than ‘Dimmi, cara’, and is probably not by the same person; it adheres mostly to the original melody, adding only a few conventional ornaments. Much the same applies to two other anonymous keyboard arrangements of ‘Dimmi, cara’: one in D major in *The Lady’s Banquet Fourth Book* (London: Walsh [c.1734]), p. 2; the other in A major, in a manuscript in the Gerald Coke Handel Collection, accession no. 1297 (ff. 68v–69v).

The different forms in which the aria arrangements are titled in *The modern musick-master* is noteworthy, suggesting that they might have originated from several sources: those from *Floridante* and Ariosti’s *Vespasian* are called ‘Airs’, but ‘Dimmi, cara’ is called a ‘Song’.

The keyboard version of ‘Dimmi, cara’ in *The modern musick-master* is a sophisticated production, which freely elaborates both the solo passages of the right hand and the instrumental accompaniment in the left – so skillfully that it gives the impression of being an inspired improvisation. In bar 52, the right hand departs from the original melody: instead of transposing the c-sharp of the full score to e, the keyboard version stays at a, the equivalent of f-sharp in the original. Similarly, in bar 67, the low c is again avoided by the harpsichord’s b, the equivalent of g-sharp in the original key. In bars 69–70, the leap of a seventh from e to d (c-sharp to b in the original) is embellished with a dramatic turned shake on the lower note. (These features are not explained by the transposition to G major – conceivably made originally to accommodate a woodwind instrument incapable of playing this low note – since low b/d is retained.)

Such arbitrary changes – which are not followed in the keyboard arrangements found in other sources – resemble the spontaneous effusions of a virtuoso, as do many of the other ornaments added to the solo part, especially the *volata* (or *tirade*) of bar 3. These are the kind of interpolations that might have been introduced by a singer of the first rank – as Senesino was; but the concluding flourishes in demisemiquavers at bars 39 and 72 represent an extempore contribution from his accompanist at the harpsichord. Indeed, while the melody of the right hand mostly represents the *ad libitum* delivery of a fine singer, the left hand reflects the support of a gifted and imaginative accompanist, who confidently supplements the original score with rich harmonies, and occasionally some additional part-writing, sensitively responding to the nuances of the sung poetry. In its representation of both the solo voice and the accompaniment, this transcription conveys throughout an air of noble pathos and proud abandon.

In Handel’s original score, the opening four bars are marked ‘Adagio, e piano’, with the second and fourth filled only with a minim rest surmounted by a fermata. According to the
conventions of the day, this could be interpreted as a call for a cadenza from the singer. The additions to the first and third bars of the transcription suggest that Senesino did improvise here in an impassioned outburst of ‘cara, cara’. But, since the empty bars remain in the keyboard transcription, we cannot tell whether he extended his exclamation to the other two bars, or simply heightened the expressiveness of these dramatic silences with some appropriate gesture or sculpturesque pose.

The accompanist’s interpretative freedom becomes evident in the third bar where the original dot after the crotchet note in the bass is replaced by rests in the transcription – a subtle tronco per grazia to focus attention on the solo part. At bar 9, the accompanist momentarily enriches the bass line with an inner part, perhaps to heighten the emphasis of the imploring ‘non mi dir’. In bar 11, the accompanist follows the singer, ignoring the semiquaver rest specified for the original strings parts; and in bars 12 and 14, additional part-writing is again introduced. Meanwhile, the soloist has added ornaments in all but one bar up to the first double bar-line (bar 19). At bars 12, 14, 18, 21, and elsewhere, the plain trills of the original melody are embellished with turns (which were not necessarily imitated by the accompanying strings).

Bar 13 is the first to be transcribed as originally written, without ornaments; the next to be transcribed thus is bar 22. After this point additional ornamentation continues for the rest of section A, with the exception of bar 29, where even the original orchestral trill is omitted. But the pathos of the words at bar 29 – ‘mà, oh cara’ – is emphasized by fuller chords in the bass part, and similarly at bar 33, at the word ‘lontan’.

As a whole, this arrangement suggests that Senesino’s interpretation of the aria was very free and highly decorated. The arrangement might also preserve an authentic image of Handel’s accompaniment at the harpsichord, especially in the concluding symphony of section A (bars 36–43), given the added inner part in bars 40–42, and the full final chord of bar 43.

Section B depicts the lover’s anguish at the prospect of distant separation. Although its modulation to the mediant key is conventional, the use of G sharp minor is nevertheless striking; a comparable example is the B major aria ‘Rendi l’ sereno al ciglio’ in Susarma (HWV 30:4), whose B section modulates to the relative minor of the main key. The mounting anguish of the soloist in the B section of ‘Dimmi, cara’, depicted by the modulations, is matched by the powerfully enriched accompaniment, climaxing with the dramatic seventh chord at the final desperate ‘nò’ (bar 67). The mood change is also highlighted by the increased number of ‘thick’ chords: there are six consisting of four or more notes in the B section (29 bars in length), compared with four in the longer A section (43 bars in length). Comparable G major passages in the two sections, at bars 20–22 and bars 59–61, are particularly noteworthy; the thicker harmonization in the B section matches the prevailing mood.

I would argue that this setting of ‘Dimmi, cara’ is an excellent example of the Italian aria patetica, elaborated for harpsichord in Handel’s virtuoso manner – a manner that was adopted by his English imitators, notably William Babell (c.1690–1723) and John Reading (1677–1764). The quality of the ‘Dimmi, cara’ arrangement, however, places it in a class those imitators rarely reached.

The arrangements of Reading, who was a prolific arranger of operatic arias for the keyboard, are found among the collection of his manuscripts at Dulwich College (MSS 92a–d). His volumes include numerous keyboard arrangements from Handel’s operas, from Rinaldo to Poro. It was Babell, however, who was the first to publish aria arrangements of a similar kind, in his Suits of the most Celebrated Lessons Collected and Fitted to the harpsicord or spinnet (1717). This famous volume reflected a practice that was already well-established in the private chamber, as is evident from the
keyboard arrangements published by Babell from Italian operas produced in London before Handel's arrival (such as those in the third book of the *Ladys Entertainment*). Babell's keyboard arrangements of Handel's arias are also to be found in his lesson book, British Library, Add. MS. 71209, where they are found alongside others that are either in Babell's hand or those of other copyists. This manuscript contains settings of ‘Bel piacere’ from *Rinaldo* (possibly arranged as early as 1711) and ‘Si, t’amo, oh caro’ and ‘Più non cerca libertà’ from *Teseo* (1713?). In the Gerald Coke Handel Collection at the Foundling Museum there are many similar keyboard arrangements from Handel’s early London operas, some of them in Babell’s handwriting.

Ex. 3. ‘Bel piacere’ from *Rinaldo*. This is the earliest known keyboard arrangement of an aria from Handel’s London operas. This setting is quite different from that published by Babell in 1717. Reproduction from GB-Lbl, Add. MS 71209, f. 20v, by permission of the British Library Board. All rights reserved.

On 11 May 1713, the *Daily Courant* advertised Handel’s benefit performance of *Teseo* ‘with an Addition of several New Songs, and particularly an Entertainment for the Harpsichord, Compos’d by Mr Hendel on purpose for that Day’. Otto Deutsch suggested that the ‘entertainment’ was ‘apparently an intermezzo, or a concerto, played by Handel’. Equally, however, the interlude might well have included some of
Handel’s own transcriptions of his popular operatic airs – not necessarily ‘composed on purpose’ but more likely improvised ‘for that Day’. An indication that solo harpsichord music was occasionally performed in public concerts comes from an advertisement for ‘a consort for the benefit of Signora Lody’, which took place on 21 April 1711. Included on the programme was ‘a new Cantata with a Solo on the Harpsicord perform’d by Mr Babell Junior, with Variety of Concertos’.

If not at first in public recitals, then certainly in early private performances for friends and admirers, Handel created a distinctive genre of operatic transcriptions for the solo keyboard, some of which have remained in the repertoire until the present time. Among the oldest of these perennial favourites is the keyboard version of ‘Lascia ch’io pianga’ from Rinaldo, which was first published by William Babell in 1717, and was almost certainly modelled on Handel’s own playing.

Another long-lived favourite appeared in the The modern musick-master as the ‘Gavot in Otho’ (6–7). As Burney observed, the concluding movement of the overture to Ottone (first performed in 1724) ‘was the first popular final air in any of Handel’s overtures, that were as yet composed, though now made vulgar by frequent use as a horn-pipe or country-dance’. Handel’s own keyboard arrangement of this movement was included in his first collection of Six Overtures fitted to the Harpsicord or Spinnett (London, 1726). The ‘Gavot in Otho’ afterwards soon became ‘the delight of all who could play, or hear it played, on every kind of instrument, from the organ to the salt-box’!

Like the ‘Gavot in Otho’, and many other transcriptions from Handel’s stage works, the keyboard arrangement of ‘Dimmi, cara’ was probably produced specifically for the chamber or private music salon. But this ‘Favourite Song’ from S civio is something more than just a chamber piece for the practice and delectation of the general amateur. It is a very exceptional transcription, of distinctly operatic character and virtuoso quality, and was made by a highly skilled professional musician who felt free to transpose, ornament, elaborate and even depart from some of the original notes. Despite the lack of an attribution, it is hard to avoid the supposition, first, that this very superior arrangement was produced by the composer himself and, second, that it possibly includes specific details from Senesino’s own performances of the aria.

While there was little need for Handel to write out ornaments for accomplished singers who were masters of improvisation, he is known to have supplied embellished versions of a few arias. In a different and very special class, however, are Handel’s own ‘reminiscences’ of his arias (and occasionally oratorio choruses too) for the keyboard. Two of the finest specimens of the composer’s operatic reminiscences are probably the arrangements for harpsichord of ‘Come, se ti vedrò’ from Muzio Scaevola, and ‘Sventurato godì o core’ from Floridante (both produced in 1721). These superb arrangements were edited by Terence Best in 1988.

Does the anonymous arrangement of ‘Dimmi, cara’ bear some resemblance to the ornamented arrangements from Muzio Scaevola and Floridante (though it comes from an opera written five years later)? Commenting on the harpsichord version of ‘Come, se ti vedrò’, Best noted that this arrangement involves considerable re-composition of the material, and is so stylishly written, that it is very likely by Handel himself, although it survives only in two manuscript copies. Even without the desirable support of authorised manuscript copies, the same could be said of the ‘Dimmi, cara’ transcription, the additions and changes to which closely resemble those of ‘Come, se ti vedrò’. Both feature the same kinds of ornaments: trills, mordents, appoggiaturas, slides, turns and volate, or running divisions in semiquavers and demisemiquavers. ‘Come, se ti vedrò’ was sung by the tenor Matteo Berselli in the role of Orazio. Although the ornamentation style is similar to that of ‘Dimmi, cara’, it could reflect that of Berselli.
While Handel was not always happy in working with Senesino, he certainly recognized and valued the extraordinary talents of the arrogant castrato. Senesino took leading roles in Handel’s stage productions from 1721 until 1733, and it was for him that the composer wrote some of his greatest arias. ‘Sventurato godì o core’ from Floridante was written for Senesino. Comparisons between its arrangement for harpsichord and the arrangement of ‘Dimmi, cara’ are therefore particularly significant. It, too, is in a slow tempo (Larghetto) and features added trills, turns, mordents and appoggiaturas, running divisions, and a single slide tied to the preceding note across the bar-line (bars 101–2). Numerous similarities of ornamental detail suggest that the ‘Dimmi, cara’ arrangement was made by the same masterly hand.

One feature of the notation in The modern musick-master is worth drawing attention to, since it potentially casts doubt on an ascription of the ‘Dimmi, cara’ arrangement to Handel. It includes an ornament symbol not found in the two aria arrangements edited by Best: this is the wavy line in bar 65. Though this sign was commonly used in Handel’s time, and often in contemporary copies of his music, the composer himself seems not to have adopted it in general. It briefly appears in the early editions of the Andante from the Suite Septième in G minor for harpsichord (HWV 432:2), but not in the preceding Overture where the ornament symbols used are limited to the trill (‘tr.’) and mordent. Curiously, in the version of the Overture published in a pirated edition of Roger, dating c.1720, both these ornaments are replaced throughout by the wavy line symbol. This small, but significant, change suggests that the person who took this ‘surreptitious’ copy from Handel’s manuscript knew that the composer used the ‘tr.’ sign ambiguously – to indicate either a sustained trill or a short trill. The intended execution of the wavy line ornament in Handel’s music is demonstrated by the movements he composed or arranged for the musical clocks built by Charles Clay in the 1730s,10 Here, it is realised as a trill with only one iteration of the upper note.

So, while the wavy line symbol is admittedly unusual for Handel, its appearance in the keyboard transcription of ‘Dimmi, cara’ is no argument against his authorship of the arrangement: it could be another rare instance of the composer’s own use of this notation, or it might simply indicate that the text has been modified by the transcriber or editor of the publication.

Viewed together with the arrangements of ‘Come, se ti vedrò’ and ‘Sventurato godì o core’, then, the arrangement of ‘Dimmi, cara’ appears to preserve reminiscences of highpoints in the history of a fine but ephemeral art. The arrangements of ‘Sventurato godì o core’ and ‘Dimmi, cara’ probably also reflect, to some extent, the creative collaboration of two great artists. They certainly provide insights into the musical tastes, performance styles and technical refinement of the late Baroque Opera Seria. The transcription of ‘Dimmi, cara’ is another grand specimen of the Pathetic, emanating from its best period on the London stage, and represented at the harpsichord, probably by the composer himself, for discerning patrons, fellow artists and favoured friends, in the private chamber.

---

1 Charles Burney, A General History of Music, from the earliest ages to the present period... Volume the fourth (London, 1789), 304.
2 This rare edition consists of a single engraved folio entitled ‘Sung by Sgr. Senesino in Scipio’, without any details of the publisher, date or place of publication (presumably London). The British Library catalogue entry for its copy is dated [1730]. The British Union Catalogue of Early Music (ii, 936) lists two copies with the suggested date c.1726. Another copy is held by the Archives of the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, which kindly supplied me with a photocopy.
See Michael Tilmouth, ‘A Calendar of References to Music in Newspapers Published in London and the Provinces (1660–1719)’, Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle 1, whole issue, 78.

6 Terence Best (ed.), George Frideric Handel; twenty overtures in authentic keyboard arrangements, Volume two (London 1985), 12.

7 Burney, A General History of Music… Volume the fourth, 286.

8 See James S. Hall, ‘Handel’s Graces’, Händel-Jahrbuch (Leipzig, 1957), 25–43; Winton Dean (ed.), Three ornamented arias; G.F. Handel (London, 1976). There are numerous other early keyboard arrangements of Handel’s operatic arias in manuscript, some possibly going back to the composer himself. To my knowledge, these have not yet been brought together and studied systematically.


10 Pieter Dirksen (ed.), George Frideric Handel; Twenty pieces for a musical clock (ca. 1738) (Utrecht 1987). In Dirksen’s transcriptions from tape-recordings of the original pinned cylinders, short shakes frequently appear: see, for example, p. 11, bars 5, 13, 17 etc.
Lully’s Death, the Myth Revisited

Peter Holman

Just about the only thing that most people who go to concerts or buy classical CDs know about Jean-Baptiste Lully is that he died as a result of hitting his foot with a stick while conducting. Here is the received version of the story as set out in Jérôme de La Gorce’s entry on the composer in Grove Music Online: ‘Lully died on 22 March 1687 as the result of a self-inflicted wound to his foot three months earlier, when he was conducting his Te Deum in the church of the Feuillants in the rue Saint-Honoré. Gangrene subsequently spread to his leg, and despite the efforts of several doctors it finally killed him’. The Lully Death Myth, as I shall call it, appears in virtually every account of the composer, and has even penetrated modern popular culture, featuring in 2011 in a BBC Prom at the Albert Hall devoted to the children’s TV show Horrible Histories. A skit entitled ‘Stupid Deaths’ featured a dialogue between Death dressed as a skeleton and Lully in seventeenth-century costume wielding a silver-topped walking stick; it can be seen on YouTube.

I became interested in the Lully Death Myth as part of my work on the history of conducting and musical direction. Long-standing readers of EMP may remember that in 2006 I wrote an article exploring a newspaper article of 1788 in which the composer Stephen Storace was criticized for trying to conduct the first performance of one of his operas from the wings of the Drury Lane Theatre. One thing led to another while working on the article, as it tends to do in historical research. I have ended up committing myself to writing a full-length book, provisionally entitled Before the Baton: Conducting and Musical Direction in Georgian Britain. My discussion of the Lully Death Myth will form part of the contextual material to be included in the first chapter.

My interest in the Lully Death Myth deepened when I realised that even supposedly scholarly studies of Baroque music include versions of it without giving a source. Even when the source is identified it is always partly misunderstood, in my opinion. The story is told by the French aristocrat and writer on music Jean-Laurent Le Cerf de la Viéville (1674-1707), seigneur of Freneuse near Rouen, in the first part of his Comparaison de la musique italienne et de la musique française (Brussels, 2/1706). On p. 190 Le Cerf gives the following account of the events that were to lead to Lully’s death, supposedly begun by his beating time in his Te Deum: ‘Lulli n’avoit rien négligé à la composition de la Musique, & aux préparatifs de l’execution; & pour mieux marquer son zèle, il y battoit la mesure. Dans la chaleur de l’action, il se donna sur le bout du pié un coup de la canne dont il la battoit [the time]. A little maggot appeared, which grew little by little.’

There is no doubt that Lully died from gangrene in his foot: the marquis de Sourches wrote on 15 January 1687 that Lully was suffering ‘from an illness stemming from his foot where gangrene took hold’ (‘d’un mal qui était venu au pied où la gangrène s’était mise’), and several other documentary sources record...
the progress of his illness, ending with his death on 22 March. However, I know of no other contemporary source that mentions the precise circumstances, and at a period when the recording and writing of history was in its infancy we must be cautious about an anecdote published nearly twenty years after the event. Furthermore, even if Le Cerf was recording an actual event accurately there are several aspects of his story that are open to question.

First, the setting for the story is not necessarily the performance of Lully’s Te Deum in the church of the Feuillants. Le Cerf mentioned the location of the performance (‘aux Feüillans de la ruë Honoré’) earlier on in the passage, though he did not say that that is where Lully hit his toe, nor that it occurred during a performance. Indeed, the way Le Cerf juxtaposes ‘preparing it [Lully’s music] for performance’ with ‘to bring out its fire more effectively he beat time’ suggests that he was thinking of a rehearsal rather than a performance. Second, Le Cerf did not actually say that Lully used a stick to beat time throughout the Te Deum, only that he beat time ‘to bring out its fire more effectively’. What I suspect Le Cerf is saying is that Lully, exasperated by the way things were going in a rehearsal, snatched up his cane — his ordinary walking stick — to energise his musicians. The unexpected (and I believe unprecedented) use of an audible beat in a piece of church music would doubtless have galvanised them, forcing them to sing and play in exact time.

What seems extraordinary is that anyone, least of all experts on Lully and French Baroque music, could have accepted that the composer or anyone else might have used a stick to beat time in church music. What evidence there is suggests that he used a roll of paper to direct large forces, in sacred as well as secular music. He is portrayed with a roll of paper as the emblem of his authority in his portrait by Paul Mignard and the engraving derived from it, published in 1685 (Illus. 1), and he holds one in the illustrations of Le Parnasse Français by Evrard Titon du Tillet, a projected monument to the poets and musicians of Louis XIV’s reign (Illus. 2). Titon du Tillet wrote as follows in the accompanying book explaining his project. ‘LULLY le Prince des Musiciens est debout, il est attentif au concert de la Lyre d’Apollon, & à la danse des Graces; il tient un papier roulé dont il bat la mesure: ce qui marque son caractère de grand Musicien, & le sublime où il a porté son Art, qui le rend digne de barre la mesure au Concert du Parnasse’. This might be rendered as: ‘Lully the prince of musicians stands [on the left], attending to Apollo’s lyre and the Graces dancing. He holds a roll of paper with which he beats time, representing his status as a great musician, and the sublime [realm] where he has taken his art, which makes him worthy to beat time in the concert [of the Muses] on Parnassus’.

It is routinely asserted that Lully beat time audibly with his stick in the theatre, but again the evidence suggests that this practice only developed after his time. Prints of the performances at Versailles in 1674 of Lully’s Alceste and La grasse de Versailles and Le malade imaginaire, the comédie-ballet by Molière and Marc-Antoine Charpentier, show figures
beating time with a roll of paper;9 in the one illustrating the performance of Alceste in the courtyard at Versailles the time-beater can just be seen wielding his roll of paper next to the stage at the extreme right of the left-hand box of musicians (Illus. 3). However, the later example of the Paris opera, the Académie Royale de Musique, suggests that time-beaters of this sort were not necessarily the composers of the music being performed, as is routinely assumed. The Académie employed a battueur de mesure in the first half of the eighteenth century, who was to share the direction with the maître de musique and the maître de ballet unless the composer choose ‘to direct rehearsals and performances of his own works’, according to ordinances of 1713 and 1714.10

Illustration 2. Illustration in Evrard Titon du Tillet. Le Parnasse Français (1727)
Furthermore, there does not seem to be any evidence that Lully used audible time beating in the theatre, or that anyone else did so in his lifetime. Indeed, Charles Dufresny, writing in 1699, likened the batteur de mesure at the opera to a musical Louis XIV, wielding a roll of paper rather than a sceptre: ‘Everyone depends on the sovereign of the orchestra, a prince whose power is so absolute that by raising and lowering his sceptre, the roll of paper he holds in his hand, he regulates every movement of this fickle populace’. The first unambiguous evidence of audible time-beating in France I have been able to find comes from an English source, a footnote added to the translation of François Raguénét’s Parallèle des français et des italiens en ce qui regarde la musique et les opéra (Paris, 1702), published in London in 1709:

Some Years since the Master of the Musick in the Opera at Paris, had an Elboe-Chair and Desk plac’d on the Stage, where, with the Score in one Hand, and a Stick in the other, he beat Time on a Table put there for that purpose, so loud, that he made a greater Noise than the whole Band, on purpose to be heard by the Performer. By degrees they remov’d this Abuse from the Stage to the Musick Room, where the Composer beats the Time in the same manner, and as loud as ever. However, the conflation of the roles of maître de musique, batteur de mesure and composer does not inspire confidence that the anonymous annotator (presumably the English translator) had experienced the practice of the Académie at first hand, and the reference to the ‘Musick Room’ (the Académie’s orchestra was placed in front of the stage, as in modern practice) suggests that he was thinking of theatres in London rather than Paris.

Nevertheless, the idea that Lully had used his stick to beat time was current in the eighteenth century, doubtless fostered by Le Cerf’s account of his death. Writing to André Cardinal Destouches on 6 December 1729, Antoine Grimaldi, Prince of Monaco, even claimed to have used Lully’s ‘famous stick’ (‘cette illustre canne’) to beat time and set the tempi (‘battre la mesure et donner les mouvements’) at the first performance of Issé, the pastorale-héroïque by Destouches produced for the king at Fontainbleau on 7 October 1697. However, the prince did not actually say that he used Lully’s stick to beat time audibly, or that the composer had done so. Perhaps Lully’s conducting canne was actually a short wooden baton rather than a long walking stick. In general, the extent to which audible time-beating was used in French opera was

Illustration 3. Depiction of a performance of Lully’s Alcide at Versailles (1674) with detail showing part of the left-hand box of musicians.
clearly exaggerated in the later eighteenth century, particularly by Jean-Jacques Rousseau and other writers hostile to French musical culture. For instance, in 1753 the writer Mathieu-François Pidansat de Mairobert imagined Lully appearing to Jean Monnet, the current director of the Opéra-Comique: ‘And Lully tapped me with the cane with which he beat time, for he was the woodchopper.’ The woodchopper – *le batteur de mesure* – was the term of abuse coined by Friedrich Wilhelm von Grimm for the *batteur de mesure.* In fact, France was the place where modern-type conducting with a (silent) baton first developed.

All in all, the Lully Death Myth needs to be taken with a large pinch of salt. Le Cerf de la Viéville was writing nearly 20 years after the event, and even if we accept that he was reporting an actual event precisely, its location may have been a rehearsal of Lully’s *Te Deum* rather than a performance. Moreover, Le Cerf seems to be describing a momentary blow with a walking stick rather than continuous audible time-beating on the floor. There is certainly no other evidence that Lully, or any of his contemporaries, used audible time-beating in church, or for that matter anywhere else. Large-scale performances of choral and orchestral music were almost certainly directed in France silently with a roll of paper, as they were elsewhere in Europe.

3 Peter Holman, ‘“Storace’s Dictatory Nod”: a Frustrated Composer at Drury Lane in 1788’, *Early Music Performer*, 18 (May 2006), 18–24.
5 For Le Cerf de la Viéville, see Julie Anne Sadie (with Albert Cohen), ‘Jean Laurent Le Cerf de la Viéville, Seigneur de Freneuse’, *Genre Music Online*. I am grateful to Peter Bennett for helping me with the translations.
7 For portraits of Lully, see La Gorce, *Jean-Baptiste Lully*, 315–16.
17 Argued in Charlton, ‘“A maître d’orchestre … Conducts”: There will be an extended discussion of this point in *Before the Baton.*
The ‘Roots of Revival’ conference at the Horniman Museum, 12–14 March 2014

John W. Briggs

The ‘Roots of Revival’ conference was held from 12–14 March, 2014, at the Horniman Museum and Gardens, Forest Hill, London. The aim was to present the latest research on the lives and work of the personalities – whether musicians, craftsmen or collectors – who initiated and contributed to the modern revival of ‘early music’. This international conference was organised as a one-off event by the museum itself and co-ordinated by Mimi Waitzman, Deputy Keeper of Musical Instruments, who corralled 26 individual papers, two panel discussions and two lecture-recitals into nine themed sessions spread over the three days. (There seem to be no plans for the publication of proceedings.)

The Horniman Museum’s musical instrument collections consist of 8,000 examples – some 1,300 of which are on display in the Music Gallery. New for 2014 is a display of domestic keyboard instruments from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries called ‘At Home With Music’. In addition, the Victoria and Albert Museum has loaned some of its best instruments which are incorporated into a temporary display called ‘The Art of Harmony’. The loan includes a German positive organ of 1627, a 1521 harpsichord by Jerome of Bologna, and a 1699 Stradivarius violin.

The evening before the conference saw a concert at the conference venue. Music by Jan Sweelinck, Peter Philips, William Byrd, Orlando Gibbons and Giles Farnaby was performed by Hank Knox, David Smith, Rachelle Taylor and Pieter Dirkxen on a single-manual harpsichord by David Evans, after an Italian instrument of c.1660 attributed to Guarracino.

The conference opened with a keynote address by Peter Holman, ‘The Shock of the Old: Early Music in Britain from Purcell to Sting.’ Professor Holman made the point that, until the late eighteenth century, music barely outlived its creators (Handel was the first composer whose music stayed permanently in the repertory, followed by Mozart and Haydn.) He argued that it was no coincidence that this should have happened first in England: all religious music had to be ‘revived’ after the Civil War, and this engendered an interest in Elizabethan and Jacobean music, with Henry Purcell as one of its first collectors. There was thus already something of an early music scene when Arnold Dolmetsch forged a career for himself in Britain as a scholar-performer. The first paper (in the session on personalities), by independent scholar Brian Robins, built upon this theme by rejecting the German-led revival of early music (stemming from Mendelsohn’s 1829 performance of the St Matthew Passion) as a myth and looked at prominent seventeenth- and eighteenth-century British figures, starting with Henry Aldrich (d.1710.) This was followed by a paper by the baroque flautist Jed Wentz, who examined the role of the music critic Hermann Rutters (1879–1961) in forming an early music aesthetic in The Netherlands, in particular by attacking the inauthenticity of Willem Mengelberg’s performances of Bach’s St Matthew Passion, and championing the concept of ‘the composer’s intentions.’ There followed a panel of three young Spanish scholars examining different aspects of the early music revival in Spain.

The following session focussed on instruments. Recorder player and scholar Douglas MacMillan examined the origins of the recorder revival in the nineteenth century – sufficiently advanced for Arnold Dolmetsch to have heard recorders played at the Brussels Conservatoire when he was a student there. Jeremy West then spoke on the role of his friend Christopher Monk in the revival of the cornett.
and serpent. John Griffiths gave an outline of the history of the vihuela revival. It is only in the last few years that truly historically-sensitive instruments have been constructed, using the results of the latest research. This theme was taken up in the next paper, by Martin Elste, who considered the changing relationships between harpsichord performance practice and how instruments were constructed in the twentieth century. Wanda Landowska treated the harpsichord more like an organ than as a predecessor to the pianoforte. Her successors, including Gustav Leonhardt, treated it more like a mechanical lute. The day finished with a lecture-recital by the harpsichordists and academics Hank Knox and Rachelle Taylor who demonstrated the technique of ‘transliteration’ invented by Kenneth Gilbert for the transcription of lute and chittarone tablature by Kapsberger for keyboard performance, and its relevance for the performance practice of Frescobaldi’s keyboard music.

The second day commenced with a continuation of the session on instruments. Independent scholar and viol expert, Thomas McCracken, concentrated on Arnold Dolmetsch’s stay in the USA from 1906 to 1911, where he was employed to make historic keyboard instruments by the Boston piano manufacturing firm of Chickering & Sons. McCracken also described the history of nine viols that Dolmetsch made at this time (three trebles, three tenors and three basses). Lute maker David Van Edwards told the story of the magnificent striped ebony and ivory liuto attiorbato by Matteo Sellas, dated 1637, which was stolen from Arnold Dolmetsch when he moved house in London in January 1901. Detective work by Van Edwards has established that the stolen instrument is now in a museum in The Netherlands, and that Dolmetsch had later made a replacement for his own use. The replacement instrument re-surfaced last year in a storage depot in New Zealand (no-one knows how it got there) and was acquired by the Horniman Museum.

The next session was entitled ‘Pioneering Individuals’. Biographer Thea Abbott spoke about the lutenist Diana Poulton (1903–1995) who was Arnold Dolmetsch’s first lute student. Baroque violinist and musicologist Mimi Mitchell is researching and interviewing the pioneers of the baroque violin revival. She presented the life and career of Marie Leonhardt (b.1928) from studying the modern violin in Switzerland, meeting Gustav Leonhardt at the Schola Cantorum Basiliensis, to becoming one of the first baroque violinists in The Netherlands. Eva Moreeda Rodriguez described the career of the Spanish priest and musicologist Higini Anglès who edited the most important works of the Hispanic medieval and renaissance repertoire. Although appointed to a state position by the Franco regime, he maintained a correspondence with several Spanish exiles with an interest in early music, including the composer Roberto Gerhard. Beatrix Darmstaedter spoke about the correspondence between the teacher and historic organ expert Josef Mertin (1904–1998), and the musician and musicologist Siegmund Levarié (1914–2010), who was forced to leave Vienna in 1938 and emigrate to the USA. The last paper of the session was by Edmond Johnson who spoke about Arnold Dolmetsch and the Modernists. Although more often associated with the Arts and Crafts movement, and the tail-end of the Pre-Raphaelites, Dolmetsch was also closely associated with figures in the Modernist movement. Both the surviving Pre-Raphaelites (William Morris and Edward Burne-Jones) and the Modernists (James Joyce, Ezra Pound, Roger Fry) considered his work to be as modern and ground-breaking as their own.

The fourth session was entitled Arnold Dolmetsch and the Workshop Legacy’, and was devoted to the company, Arnold Dolmetsch Ltd, which was established at Haslemere in 1918. It was a very important manufacturer of early instruments, and undertook restoration work on historic instruments. Harpsichord maker and conservator Malcolm Rose described the work that Leslie Ward of the Dolmetsch firm had undertaken in 1953 to put an English rectangular virginals of 1685 in playing order. It was donated to the Warrington Museum in 1876. Although Ward’s work on the instrument had caused some damage, it was surprisingly conservative, and seemingly intended to keep intervention to a minimum. Mimi Waitzman then moderated a round-table discussion with people associated with the Dolmetsch firm. The discussion described the working conditions and the ethos of the company, before its closure in 1981.

The last session of the day was devoted to Wanda Landowska (1879–1959). Sonia
Gonzalo Delgado described the Spanish reception of her performance practice for the harpsichord repertoire, and that of her rival Joaquin Nin (1879–1949). As a last-minute replacement for a missing speaker, Edward Breen gave a paper which linked to the following day’s session on vocal techniques. He described the vocal style that the Dutch-born mezzo-soprano Jantina Noorman employed for her collaboration with the ensemble Musica Reservata, led by Michael Morrow (1929–1994). This was devised by Noorman, Morrow, and the folklorist A.L. Lloyd (1908–1982) from Balkan voices and those of Genoese fishermen.

The first session of the third day began with Anne Smith’s contribution on the musical aesthetic of the Singbewegung, and its influence on historically-informed performance practice. Jacob Sagrans then discussed the choir of King’s College, Cambridge, and their 1962 recording of John Taverner’s five-voice responsory Dum transisset Sabbatum (i), which has inspired a further 25 recordings. Mary Ann Parker next reported on performances of Handel’s Messiah in Paris (and in French translation) by Charles Lamoureux in 1873, 1874 and 1875.

The seventh session, on Folk Traditions, began with a lecture-recital by Jean-Pierre Van Hees describing the work of his friend, the bagpipe maker and restorer Remy Dubois. Van Hees demonstrated many of Dubois’s instruments, showing the closed-fingering techniques they require. This was followed by a paper by student Fatima Lahham on Mabel Dolmetsch (third wife of Arnold Dolmetsch) and her role in the revival of historical dance. Ronnie Gibson then discussed ideas of early violin performance practice in nineteenth-century Scotland.

The eighth session was devoted to museum collections, and their influence on performance practice, particularly by permitting the playing of historic instruments. Madeleine Modin described the role played by the Stockholm Museum of Music History in the revival of early music in Sweden. Bradley Strauchen-Scherer, of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, described the role of Emanuel Winternitz in the historical performance movement in New York. Katherine Hawnt presented on the commencement of a research project at the University of Southampton, supported in conjunction with the National Trust. This will focus on the role of Raymond Russell (1922–1964) in the harpsichord revival in England and on his childhood home, the National Trust’s Mottisfont Abbey. It is hoped that the project will benefit other National Trust properties, such as Fenton House and Hatchlands, which both house playable historic keyboard collections.

The final session had a single paper: George Kennaway described Arnold Dolmetsch in the unfamiliar guise of a character in fiction! He was depicted thus in George Moore’s 1898 novel Evelyn Innes, which also combined discussion of ‘early music’ and post-Wagnerian ‘contemporary music’.

The concluding concert was held in the museum’s Gallery Square. It was given by members of Brandywine Baroque (Delaware, USA): the soprano Julianne Baird, John Burkhalter on recorders and Karen Flint on harpsichord. They performed songs by Henry Purcell, Henry Lawes and William Lawes. The instrumental music was by William Byrd, Robert Woodcock and Handel. Flint played the 1772 two-manual Kirkman harpsichord from the ‘At Home With Music’ exhibit – she could have been seen there earlier in the conference practising on it! The programme was entitled ‘Kindred Spirits: William Morris, Arnold Dolmetsch and Music’, and had originally been devised for a 2010 conference on William Morris.

This formed a fitting climax to an excellent and surprisingly wide-ranging conference. Its success is a tribute to its organisers, and the quality of the papers presented is a measure of the strength and academic rigour of the discipline.
Jean-Philippe Rameau: International Anniversary Conference, St Hilda’s College, University of Oxford, 11–14 September 2014

Adrian Powney

‘Grotesque, discordant music’, replete with ‘noisy instrumentation’, and harmony that has a ‘geometric quality that frightens the heart’.¹ Today, it is hard to imagine that negative comments such as these, by Cartaud de la Vilate, and other detractors – during the Querelle des Bouffons – had any validity at all where the music of Jean-Philippe Rameau is concerned. During his lifetime, Rameau’s detractors gradually became outnumbered by his supporters, and while he fell into obscurity not long after his death, he is today considered one of the ‘giants’ of the Baroque, both from the point of view of his musical and theoretical outputs.

Taking place over four days (the second day coincided exactly with the 250th anniversary of Rameau’s death on 12 September 1764), this was the first ever UK conference on Rameau. It took place in the beautiful surroundings of St Hilda’s College and was attended by over eighty Ramoneurs(euse).²

This conference was organised jointly by the acknowledged Roi de Rameau, Professor Graham Sadler, together with Dr Shirley Thompson and Dr Jonathan Williams. With the help of Dr Anna Davies, Giulia Galasso, Rebecca Sharp and Lisete da Silva, it ran seamlessly. Scholars working in diverse fields from Europe and North America contributed to a packed three-and-a-half day event, among them some of the world’s leading French Baroque specialists from music, history, literature and theatre. As such, topics were extremely wide ranging. They included: examinations of Rameau’s theoretical output against the backdrop of eighteenth-century European music theory; the economics of opera; and inter-textuality in the libretti of his operas, and their cultural contexts. In sum, as Rebecca Harris-Warrick noted, the conference provided the perfect meeting point between performance (in its widest sense), theory and historiography, and as such was entirely befitting of the man who revolutionised the tragédie en musique.

The conference opened with an extra special treat for all Ramistes, and particularly those interested in iconography. Aileen Dawson gave a detailed account of a little-known porcelain bust of Rameau, made in Sevres in 1764, which together with its companion bust of Voltaire, is held in the British Museum. Dawson highlighted the genesis of these artefacts and their journey through various hands before they reached the British Museum.

Issues relative to the performance of Rameau’s music occupied a significant portion of the papers delivered in the subsequent sessions. Stephen Gutman’s lecture-recital examined the practical problems encountered when playing Rameau’s Pièces de clavecin en concerts on a keyboard instrument alone. Gutman applied the advice supplied by Rameau himself for the realisation of these pieces by one performer, in addition to his own solutions (including octave transposition). He was concerned particularly with the issue of maintaining tone in melodic passages featuring notes of long duration, and with the challenge of accommodating all three parts in works such as the fifth concert, something that Rameau’s instructions do not consider. Similarly, Lucy Robinson’s examination of these pieces from the perspective of a viol player looked at both the idiomatic nature of the viol parts, and their legacy in the eighteenth century. Davitt
Moroney, on the other hand, took as his departure Rameau’s hand positions in Louis Carrogis Carmontelle’s 1760 watercolour of Rameau. He examined the two meanings behind the terms mécaniques in Rameau’s De la mécanique des doigts sur le clavecin, doing so from the perspective of keyboard fingering and hand positions, in addition to discussing Rameau’s ideas within the context Newtonian theories of motion.

Performance practice issues in Rameau’s stage works were addressed by several scholars from several different angles. Through analysis of stark changes in the level of movement, affekt, tempo, instrumentation and harmony, Rebecca Harris-Warrick and Hubert Hazebrourcq presented highly convincing arguments both for and against a literal approach to choreography, based on clues within the music and libretti. Here, Harris-Warrick and Hazebrourcq concluded, in qualified agreement with Cuthbert Girdlestone, that Rameau’s dances impose movement mimicry. Meanwhile, Guillaume Jablonka’s lecture-demonstration provided a fascinating insight into the problems of performance practice faced by modern choreographers. Using clues outlined in the Ferrère manuscript, which contains numerous choreographies for danses et pantomimes from the second half of the eighteenth century, Jablonka (re)constructed a possible choreography for the ballets figurés from Naïs (1749).

Moving from the physicality of dance to the physical staging of the operas themselves, Rémy-Michel Trotier and Lois Rosow provided valuable insights into considerations modern opera producers should give to set design and scene changes. They drew upon evidence from contemporary descriptions, as well as from the music. Through an imaginative use of PowerPoint, Trotier drew attention to the fragments of music in Rameau’s operas that are related to the movement of the on-stage set. Rosow’s offering, complementing Trotier’s, outlined the merits of ensuring that entr’actes, in modern performances, do not distort or obscure depictions of the passage of time.

Sources of Rameau’s music were given expert attention by both Sylvie Bouissou and Graham Sadler. Building on her discovery and attribution to Rameau, in 2008, of three canons, Bouissou drew attention to the discovery of additional canons attributable to the composer in a manuscript by Francœur, which includes the well-known ‘Frère Jacques’. Bouissou’s re-examination of evidence relating to the Traité de la composition des canons avec beaucoup d’exampl es concluded with a short coda from Graham Sadler, whose archival research into the account books of the Noblemen and Gentlemen’s Catch Club in London has revealed the sale, and distribution across its membership, of numerous copies of an English translation of Rameau’s Méthode pour faire les canons. In a separate paper, Graham’s penetrating and tenacious research on Rameau sources has led him to consider the recent discovery of the 1749 production score of Rameau’s Zoroastre in the archives of the publisher Durand. By examining the multitude of annotations within the score, Sadler has been able to identify that these relate to seven different uses, including those relating to modifications for the 1757 and 1770 revivals at Versailles and the Opéra respectively. In addition, Sadler has also identified annotations in the hand of Saint-Saëns that relate to the preparation of an early twentieth-century edition of this work scheduled for publication by Durand, but which was never completed. A memorable part of this presentation came in the form of a computer-generated performance of Sadler’s transcription of Saint-Saëns’s arrangement of the famous ‘Trio des Parques’.

At the mid-point of the conference, Davitt Moroney switched hats effortlessly, treating attendees to a concert of Rameau’s harpsichord music in the acoustically excellent concert hall of the Jacqueline du Pré music building. The programme included the first suite in E minor from the Pièces de clavecin of 1724, and three character pieces from the
Moroney interspersed his performances with insightful comments, which included observations on harpsichord tuning systems (particularly with regard to the use of equally spaced fifths for *L'enharmonique*), altogether making for a concert that was both stylish and technically assured.

Where recorded performances of Rameau’s music are concerned, both encouraging and revealing was Patrick Florentin’s presentation on Rameau discography. He outlined details of all the extant recordings of Rameau’s music in a balance sheet format, which revealed the most popular works, as well as those for which no recorded performance exists. Particularly noteworthy was the outpouring of superb recordings made since the mid-1980s, including those by William Christie, who has helped to ensure a place in the repertory for Rameau’s music.

In this anniversary year, and beyond, it is hoped that the continued resurgence of interest in performing Rameau’s music will eventually fill the gaps outlined by Florentin. Without doubt, the research presented here, and ultimately the publications arising out of the conference, will stand all who consult it in good stead: performers as they continue to bring Rameau to the wider concert-going public, and scholars and editors as they continue to deepen our understanding of Rameau, the man and his music.

---

2 The term Ramoneur (chimney-sweep) was used during the Lulliste–Ramiste dispute to describe partisans of Rameau’s music. Moreover, as Graham Sadler notes, this ‘label though originally pejorative..., became a badge of pride to the composer’s supporters’. See Graham Sadler, *The Rameau Compendium* (Woodbridge, 2014), 178.
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