



Review

Author(s): Sarah Day-O'Connell

Review by: Sarah Day-O'Connell

Source: *Notes*, Second Series, Vol. 63, No. 2 (Dec., 2006), pp. 435-437

Published by: Music Library Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4487813>

Accessed: 26-07-2016 17:36 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Music Library Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Notes*

move from contemplation of his upstage monument—as it surely would have been—to take his place downstage center for his aria?

The layers of alteration to Rodelinda's initial appearance, in particular, suggest an attempt to fine-tune the presentation of character with that of performer. Not only does "Ho perduto" establish balance with Bertarido's "Dove sei," it also creates a different sort of balance with "L'empio rigor del fato." For while the latter aria highlights Rodelinda's strength in defiance, "Ho perduto" distills her sense of loss. The decision to present these aspects of Rodelinda's persona in successive contrasting arias reflects the need to show off Cuzzoni's voice, of course, but perhaps also the problematic negotiation of the role of a virtuous (and therefore retiring) widow as protagonist. Certainly, given that Handel already knew well the capabilities of his leading lady, Cuzzoni, explaining his repeated alterations to her music otherwise is difficult: it is tempting, in other words, to see the tinkering with her role as reflecting Handel's awareness of the tensions present in the intersection between the social prominence of the prima donna and the

social reticence necessitated by the character's apparent status as a widow.

Perhaps because it highlighted such social tensions, the opera seems to have spoken to contemporary women: not only did the young, as Horace Walpole complained, adopt Cuzzoni's "vulgar" attire of brown silk gown "so universally, that it seemed a national uniform for youth and beauty" (p. xviii), but almost a quarter of the subscribers for *Rodelinda* were women (see David Hunter and Rose M. Mason, "Supporting Handel through Subscription to Publications: The Lists of *Rodelinda* and *Faramondo* Compared," *Notes* 56, no. 1 [September 1999]: 39). Perhaps they saw in Rodelinda not only a finely nuanced "convincing character" but also an expression of their own conflicting social circumstances. One of the beauties of a critical edition's re-imagining of a work's creation, then, is that it allows us not only to peer over the composer's shoulder at the realization of his "intentions," but also to turn backwards, to glimpse the cultural contingency of that creative process.

SUZANNE ASPDEN
University of Oxford

John Travers. *Eighteen Canzonets for Two and Three Voices.* Edited by Emanuel Rubin. (Recent Researches in the Music of the Classical Era, 74.) Middleton, WI: A-R Editions, c2005. [Acknowledgments, p. vi; introd., p. vii–xvii; texts, p. xviii–xxi; 4 plates; score, 85 p.; crit. report, p. 87–89. ISBN 0-89579-567-1. \$63.]

Emanuel Rubin's claim that the Georgian part-song repertory will "undoubtedly bring pleasure" (p. ix) to both singer and listener is rather hyperbolic in the context of notes for a scholarly modern edition, but the assertion is nevertheless nearly sustainable. With this volume in *Recent Researches in the Music of the Classical Era*, Rubin reintroduces John Travers's superb *Eighteen Canzonets for Two and Three Voices* (London: John Simpson, 1746), written for various combinations of two or three voice parts and continuo. Originally available by subscription purchase or through lending libraries, and sung for entertainment in private gatherings at homes or in public singing clubs,

these pieces will "bring pleasure" in a variety of present-day settings, from vocal studio, to recital stage, to participatory entertainment among amateurs. They would also enliven theater productions set in eighteenth- or early-nineteenth-century England. Certainly, they deserve to be recorded, perhaps with a number of selections from the enormous and under-explored repertory to which they belong (secular genres known as glees, fa-las, madrigals, Neapolitans, ayres, songs, and still other appellations), or perhaps in a collection arranged by topic (mythical characters, love, pastoral scenes) or devoted to texts of Matthew Prior (1664–1721). Listeners, singers, and continuo

players alike will be attracted by these canzonets' varied textures, alternation of syllabic and exuberant melismatic passages, counterpoint (including some artful canons), lively changes of meter, witty texts (eleven by Prior), and vivid text painting.

Canzonet 3 ("Thus to the Muses"), for instance, opens with a stately $\frac{4}{4}$ canon in which Venus ineffectually commands some muses to adorn her altar, lest her son "assume his potent darts." Abrupt changes of meter and tempo follow as the narrator pithily reports the muses' response: "twang goes the bow." Averse to worldly pleasures, the muses display "settld" thoughts and "intent" looks, set to the parallel minor and sung "slow." "Spiritoso" melismas portray Cupid's flight. In Canzonet 12 ("Haste, my Nanette"), Travers's setting intensifies the humor of the text. Prior's poem is a satire on the pastoral style, starting out with predictable and typical elements of that convention, which Travers, in turn, sets straightforwardly in an E-major antecedent and dominant consequent. From there, however, the canzonet's humorous commentary on the pastoral is through-composed, with a succession of sections varied in key, meter, and tempo that divide the text into irregular groups of lines. The canzonet ends with a tongue-in-cheek lack of conviction: "For with her swain my love shall stay, though the wolf strole and the sheep stray"—melismas at parallel tenths on "strole" emphasize the wantonness of wolf and sheep rather than the assurance of continued love.

The edition will also "bring pleasure" to scholars in musicology and other fields who seek to recover and understand the widely overlooked role of music in the culture of Georgian England. (Further historical background, bibliography, and especially useful clarification regarding nomenclature may be found in Rubin's *The English Glee in the Reign of George III: Participatory Art Music for an Urban Society*, Detroit Monographs in Musicology/Studies in Music, 38 [Warren, MI: Harmonie Park Press, 2003].) In his introduction to the edition, Rubin helpfully summarizes the collection's ancestry. In the sixteenth century, the part-song flourished alongside the madrigal. Distinction between the two genres, in fact, was blurry: the madrigal was understood to be possibly more contrapuntal, while the part-song in-

cluded lute accompaniment—although when sufficient voices were available, the lute was dispensable, making the part-song more madrigalian. In the seventeenth century, a proliferation of singing clubs mirrored increased class mobility. "You would do well," Edward Ravenscroft's *Citizen Turn'd Gentleman* is advised, "to have a Musick Club at your house, and play and sing in consort, it will much benefit you" (act 1, scene 1, quoted on p. x of the introduction). Repertoire by John Blow, Henry Purcell, and others fed the voracious appetites of these clubs, and persisted in collections into the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, even while new clubs also demanded new part-songs "as fresh as their food and drink" (p. ix). The tradition reached the apex of its popularity in the late eighteenth century. Rubin counts more than three thousand glees alone that were published during the reign of George III (1760–1820), "a number that would quadruple if the canzonets, rounds, catches, and madrigals were included" (p. xi). Not only did this repertory serve as an impetus for the massive explosion in London's commercial music publishing, it also brought into contact singers from different walks of life. Rubin accepts conventional wisdom here, citing Percy M. Young's overstatement that "British music was, insofar as . . . possible, democratized" (*A History of British Music* [New York: W. W. Norton; London: Ernest Benn, 1967], 342), but he is right to suggest that social music and the institution of the singing club had social, economic, and political significance. These are the musical equivalents of the eighteenth-century coffeehouse culture celebrated by philosopher and political theorist Jürgen Habermas as a site at once reflecting and actualizing the newly mobilizing public sphere (*The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. by Thomas Burger, Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989]). Church organist John Travers (ca. 1703–1758) enters this picture in 1746 with his *Eighteen Canzonets*, dedicated to his teacher Johann Christoph Pepusch (1667–1752). A subscription list including 171 names, additional printings in 1750 and 1755, and later appearances of the canzonets in anthologies attest to

the collection's immediate and lasting presence.

Rubin's edition itself is of pleasing quality. Ease of use for the performer appears to have been the guiding principle in editorial decisions, but Rubin has been judicious regarding modernizations, which he documented in the critical report. Clefs appear as treble and bass only, continuo figures are standardized and consistently placed above the bass line, and superfluous accidentals are deleted. The addition of vocal range-finders are particularly helpful in determining the appropriate voice part. Of these editorial changes, only the decision to replace original titles with first lines, and the standardization of typesetting in the score (though not in the separately printed texts), seem to impoverish the finished product. Meanwhile, Rubin retains much of the original "flavor," with spellings, text underlay, punctuation, and concluding overfilled measures. Readers interested in consulting original editions would likely have appreciated some information on their present locations (British Library shelf mark G.805.e.(1.), for example), especially since Rubin prepared his edition from an exemplar in his private collection. The quality of printing and legibility are very high, as is the clarity of the facsimiles of the title page, dedication, and two excerpts from the score. The binding is average; the score will not of its own accord lie flat on a music stand, but the ample margins will allow for photocopying on standard-sized paper for performance. In addition to the historical background described above, Rubin provides one-paragraph commentaries on the individual canzonets, reminiscent of program notes, remarking on form, compositional aspects, text setting, and so forth. Particularly helpful is a separate section in the edition containing the texts alone, with explanations regarding character references (Ida, Charon, Bibo) and notes on changes made by Travers to Prior's original lines.

With his dual emphasis in the introduction on the compositional relationship of the *Eighteen Canzonets* to part-songs both

past and present, Rubin implies that Travers's set was at once a pinnacle of what had come before and a model for what was to come. This inference is unrealistic—and, more important, unnecessary. Meanwhile, adjectives such as "pleasing" and "charming" (which Rubin also uses) do not capture the significance of the set either, for these are words that risk connoting superficiality and "mere-ness." While I have argued that the canzonets themselves and Rubin's edition are, from a variety of vantage points, "pleasing," I also second the editor's claim that "rediscovering this music opens a new window into the cultural life of Georgian England" (pp. viii–ix). This is social music; its commercial role (to which Rubin refers) is only one aspect of society and culture (such as notions of gender and class identity, as well as other realms of human experience and inquiry) elucidated in, indeed in dialog with, the music (see my Ph.D. dissertation "Anatomy, Industry, and the English Canzonet, 1770–1820: Placing Women in the Private Sphere" [Cornell University, 2004]). This is all the more true in the case of the *Eighteen Canzonets*, given that they are vocal music, with the relative explicitness afforded by the presence of texts. Rubin's emphasis on relatively unremarkable aspects of formal structure in the individual notes to some extent obfuscates this import. Of all the possible alternative emphases, perhaps one of the richest and most timely is the music's participatory nature, which ought to be of particular interest today when musicologists are broadening their focus to include historical listeners and performers, not just composers. This music, contemporaneous with the birth of public concerts, demanded and rewarded active engagement, not just passive listening. In sum, Travers's *Eighteen Canzonets* repay repeated and close examination from a variety of perspectives. It is for this reason that Rubin's contribution is better than pleasing.

SARAH DAY-O'CONNELL
Knox College

Daniel Read. *Musica Ecclesiae, or Devotional Harmony*. Edited by Karl and Marie Kroeger. Middleton, WI: A-R Editions, Inc., c2004. (Recent Researches in American Music, 48–50.) [Part 1: Acknowledgments, p. ix;