



Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.


Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

The image shows the front cover of a book. The cover is decorated with a marbled paper pattern in shades of blue, yellow, and red. A dark blue spine is visible on the left side. A white paper label is affixed to the bottom left of the cover, containing library information and a reading restriction.

THE LIBRARY,
TRINITY COLLEGE,
COLLEGE STREET,
DUBLIN 2,
IRELAND

THIS THESIS MAY BE READ ONLY
IN THE LIBRARY

Abstract

Musical critics of seventeenth-century England were men of learning who felt that music, like poetry, should be governed by rules derived from Reason and Nature. Unfortunately, their desire for an ars musica was conceived in the mid-century when the "Nuove Musiche" from the continent was being introduced to England. The music, especially that employed in the novel "operas," was incomprehensible to the self-elected judges. Worse, it seemed to subvert all of their cherished poetic, aesthetic, moral, and "classical" traditions. Consequently, spurred on by resentment and fear as well as by a desire to control music with rational laws, the critics acted.

Their comments fall under four headings (which, though exhibiting common patterns of thought, are for clarity herein treated separately): 1) Musical "sense" and its relation to poetical "sound"; 2) music and the doctrine of Imitation; 3) music as a moral force; 4) the relative merits of ancient and modern music.

The present work is a history of musical criticism from 1660-to 1789 — from the authoritarian, rational pronouncements of neoclassicists to the subjective, "feeling" opinions of the Romantics. There are three distinct periods in this history:

- 1) 1660-1700, when traditionalists, disturbed by the pretensions of "Modern Learning," the perniciousness of Restoration morals, and the corrupt state of contemporary art, drew their precepts from irrefutable authority — Aristotle, Horace, and the Church Fathers. Subsequently, criticism was marked by pedantry, credulity, punctiliousness, a total ignorance of musical science, and a complete inability to deal with instrumental music.
- 2) 1700-1750, when a new generation of critics attempted to adjust themselves to a more temperate intellectual climate. Sentimentalism, new aesthetic theories, Shaftesburean benevolism, the Evangelical Revival, a deeper knowledge of musical science, and the discrediting of Aristotle all contributed towards the disintegration of seventeenth-century critical standards.

- 3) 1750-1789, when truly musical commentators paved the way for nineteenth-century critics by devising a new procedure which was subjective, unbiased, prospective, independent of extra-musical laws, and which for the first time took cognizance of instrumental music.

The present thesis is entirely my own work -- though during the period of research and drafting of the study I received the help of several people. I gratefully acknowledge my particular indebtedness to

Dr. E. F. Fyle, my supervisor, for the countless hours he spent in reading and discussing my work, a part of which was carried out in his office in the United States -- and for the generous offer to teach me subtleties of style and technique.

The Literary Criticism of Music in England: 1660-1789

My sincere appreciation is due to Dr. J. G. Barry, who has read the manuscript and has given me many helpful suggestions during moments of discouragement.

by
Frederick Hatch Teahan

The librarians of Trinity College, the National Library of Dublin, the British Museum, Columbia University, and the New York Public Library for their aid in securing the materials and references which I required.



Almost all of the materials used in this study were obtained from secondary sources, and are accordingly accurate. The author, however, is responsible for any errors and omissions which may have crept into the work.

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
Trinity College, Dublin

Acknowledgements

The present thesis as it stands is entirely my own work — though during the period of research and drafting of the study I received the help of several people. I gratefully acknowledge my particular indebtedness to

Dr. W. F. Pyle, my supervisor, for his devoting many hours to reading and criticizing my work — much of which was posted to him from the United States — and for his unceasing efforts to teach me subtleties of style and technique.

Professor H. O. White, my first champion, for his many valuable suggestions.

Dr. Ida G. Everson, who first revealed to me the delights of eighteenth-century literature, for the many times she revived my spirits during moments of discouragement.

The librarians of Trinity College, the National Library of Dublin, the British Museum, Columbia University, and the New York Public Library for their aid in securing the many half-forgotten seventeenth and eighteenth-century publications which I required.

Almost all of the material used in this study was obtained from seventeenth and eighteenth-century sources. The moderns, notwithstanding their innumerable and admirable books, essays, and articles dealing with the music and the musical criticism of the eighteenth century, have yielded less of pertinent value to my thesis. So far as I have discovered, either their sphere of observation is more restricted than mine is (such as Siegmund A. E. Betz's informative Operatic Criticism of the Tatler and Spectator)

or their musical analyses (such as Leo Smith's definitive study, The Music of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries) are too technical to suit my purposes.

There are six contemporary works, however, which despite one or the other of these limitations, have been of such great use to me that they deserve particular mention:

Edward J. Dent's Foundations of English Opera

John W. Draper's three studies, Aristotelian "Mimesis" in Eighteenth-century England; Eighteenth-century Aesthetics; and Poetry and Music in Eighteenth-century Aesthetics

Robert M. Myers's Early Moral Criticism of Handelian Oratorio

Herbert M. Schueller's "Imitation" and "Expression" in British Music Criticism in the Eighteenth Century.

This thesis has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at any other university.

Contents

Preface	1.
I. Music and the Literary Milieu	1.
Notes	58.
II. The Sound-Sense Controversy	63.
Notes	142.
III. Imitation as an Aesthetic Norm	151.
Notes	214.
IV. Music and Morals	221.
Notes	304.
V. The Ancient-Modern Controversy	315.
Notes	399.
Conclusion	409.
Bibliography	419.

Preface

The initial stimulus for the present study was a statement made by Dr Burney in the final volume of his History of Music in 1789. The musical critic, he writes, requires "not only extensive knowledge, and long experience, but a liberal, enlarged, and candid mind." He "should have none of the contractions and narrow partialities of such as can see but a small angle of the art." Acknowledging the fact that for over a century a kind of musical criticism had been practiced by English "men of wit," he nevertheless rejects their writings as worthless, declaring that except for Charles Avison's Essay on Musical Expression of 1752 (and even that was "warped by many prejudices") musical criticism as Burney defines it "has been so little cultivated in our country, that its first elements are hardly known."

At once an avalanche of questions fell. Who were these self-styled critics whom Burney repudiates so contemptuously? What kind of music had they dealt

with? What reputation had they had among their contemporaries? If, as Burney states, musical criticism had been "so little cultivated" in England before the Enlightenment, from what sources did he derive his own critical formula? What, in short, was the nature of musical criticism in England from 1660 to 1789?

Burney offers only the slightest hint for the area of investigation: early criticism, he writes, had been in the hands of men of letters who were ignorant of the most elementary knowledge of musical science. At first research yielded little more than a mass of comments on music by men whose critical "grounds" seemed to exhibit no common denominator. But at length the picture cleared. Critics did not, as Burney implied, fall into one category; they fell into four. First were those commentators who held that the two sole requisites of the "compleat Critick" were "a good Ear" and that je ne sais quoi, "Taste." An equal mixture of aesthetic sensibility and common sense dictated their judgements. In the second group

fell those whose taste was irreproachable but whose "Ear" — by their own admission — was non-existent. Swift, for instance, declared that he "would not give a farthing for all the music in the universe." Similarly, Pope confessed to a friend, "I own myself incapable of any pleasure from [music]." Years later Dr Johnson admitted that "all animated nature loves music — except myself." Undeterred by their aversion to music, these men proceeded to discuss that art as a literary genre, deriving its rules from the arts of drama and poetry. A third group subordinated the watchwords, "Taste" and "Ear," to Tradition. For them, contemporary music stood or fell by the aesthetic precepts of the ancient Greeks or by the moral precepts of the early Church Fathers. The final group was composed of men whose critical formula was an amalgamation of all of these criteria. Thus at various times we find a writer like John Dennis in the rôle of rationalist, aesthete, literary law-giver, traditionalist, and moralist.

The comments of these unorthodox critics consequently fall under four main headings: (1) Musical

- "Sound" and its relation to Poetical "Sense";
- (2) Music and the Augustan Doctrine of Imitation;
 - (3) The Efficacy of Music as a Moral Force; and
 - (4) The Position of Music in the Literary Quarrel between the Ancients and Moderns.

Each of the following chapters (with the exception of the first which is a brief survey of musical and literary tastes from 1660 to 1789) is given over to a discussion of a different one of these four issues of eighteenth-century musical criticism.

Chapter I.

Music and the Literary Milieu: 1660-1789

Oliver Cromwell did not hate music. Indeed, many of his contemporaries attest to his being passionately fond of it. The more rigorous of his subordinates, however, looked upon music as a snare of Satan and sought to lessen its bewitching effect by removing organs from the churches and by closing the theatres. To be sure, the proscription of organ-music did not lighten the burden of less rigidly inclined persons in the congregation, and the banning of stage-plays prevented the public from enjoying the music which accompanied them. But there was no dearth of music under the Protectorate. Amateur performances in private homes and at music-clubs, and the fiddler's concerts in barber-shops are only a few of the musical outlets in the interregnum. Together, they provide the important link between the great Elizabethan tradition and the musical elegance of the Restoration.

Thus, after the return of the Stuarts in 1660, the change in musical life was not as abrupt as one might expect. The amateur musicians had preserved England's musical heritage, the stage had been re-opened (though informally) in 1656, and the critics had begun their assaults.

Before proceeding to the actual criticism which appeared between 1660 and 1789, we shall examine the musical life of London during this hundred-and-thirty-year period.

1. 1660-1700

In the homes of the wealthy, concerts of music formed the greater part of the amusements presented at banquets and balls. Lavishness was the keynote. Anthony Hamilton writes that the Chevalier de Grammont, for example, always added "some unexpected stroke of magnificence and gallantry" to his entertainments, such as importing at immense costs complete orchestras and choruses from Paris for a single occasion.¹ It was not unusual for aristocratic revels to surpass even those given by Charles II which boasted the appearance of his "band" hired in emulation of Louis XV's vingt-quatre violons.

Hospitality was not always as pretentious as that extended by courtiers, and as this work deals with critics who generally sprang from a less exalted social position, an inspection of musical treats on a more modest scale is required. In the houses of less affluent Englishmen,

the talent possessed by a member of the family was usually thought to provide sufficient entertainment for guests. As today, the company was not always eager to applaud the inadequacies of these amateur performers. After returning from a dinner given by one Mr. Bland, the discriminating Pepys recalled his difficulty in stifling a guffaw at the blunders of his host's daughter, "a short, ugly, red-haired slut that plays upon the virginals and sings."² John Locke, also subjected to after-dinner musicales, reflected more solemnly than Pepys, and warned of the eventual harm in committing children to ceaseless musical tuition under the name of "recreation."³ In contrast, however, to the satirical criticism of the diarist and the common-sense estimate of the philosopher was the zeal expressed by the champions of musical study. Thomas Salmon, an "enthusiast," asserted not only that music should be made accessible to the average man, but that it was the "greatest recreation," that it was a gift of "Divine Providence," that it provided a far less expensive pastime than gaming, and that its amateur exponent "shall create a delight to the society he is in."⁴ Whatever the opinions were of critics and apologists, it is evident that private families showed an extreme interest in music. Nowhere is this more dramatically revealed than in Pepys's description of the Thames during the Great Fire when he

observed that hardly one lighter or boat in three that had the goods of a house in, but there was a pair of virginals in it. ⁵

Outside the private homes, the very air of London carried melody in the form of vendors' tunes. Whether the cry announced "Mackrell" or "Blue Plumbs" the fascinated Londoner loved to recall how

Successive Crys the Season's Change declare,
And mark the Monthly Progress of the Year. ⁶

The tunes brought, upon reflection, many a tear to the eye of the cit after he left the capital. Even ⁱⁿ the "worst cry in London, My dill and cucumber to pickle," says Etherege's Harriet who is forced to retreat to the unfashionable countryside, there is more music than in the "hateful noise of rooks." ⁷

More sophisticated open-air music was found at Bartholomew Fair in Smithfield. Here, as at the other London fairs, it was possible to listen to excellently performed music at any one of the number of "music booths" which were erected among the canvas stalls of conjurers and rope-dancers. The musicians catered for varying tastes so that while one group of patrons heard performances of current theatrical scores, another heard the latest "opera" mocked at a neighbouring booth. But at the fair, as at other places of amusement, a spoil-sport was invariably present who raised his voice against such

follies. Such a man was George Fox, the religious enthusiast and founder of the Quaker sect. Licentious and atheistical songs, as we see in his Journal, were among the many things he attacked in his inspired tirades at the fairs.⁸

The ribald singing at Smithfield, however, was not the only kind of music which ran foul of the teachings of moralists and religious leaders. When, almost immediately after the Restoration, music was re-instated as an essential part of the English cathedral-service, church-music was suspect as well. The smaller parish churches were cautious about reviving this pre-Commonwealth practice, but for various reasons certain non-conformist bodies were most vehement in refusing to use either a choir or an organ. The fate of the dissenting Quakers had been sealed by George Fox as early as 1649 when he rejected hymn-singing and organ-music as "forms without power."⁹ During the reign of Charles II, the Friends were more suspicious than ever of music in divine worship. Should mass singing be permitted, not only the elect, but "all manner of wicked profane people" would thus "take upon them to personat the experiences and conditions of blessed David."¹⁰ Other sects, fearful of discovery during their illicit services, dared not allow congregational singing. The apprehensive Baptists declined the use of music as an aid to worship in

an endeavour to prevent secular airs and instrumental virtuosity from making their way into the churches. It was, therefore, to the Abbey or St. Paul's that one went for musical services, or, as the conservative divines maintained, one went to these places for the music and was unmindful of the proceedings at the altar. The distrust of the clergy was not entirely unreasonable, either, for the French mode which had permeated English social life extended its influence to the cathedral choir-loft. As early as 1662, the scandalized John Evelyn observed that "the ancient, grave, and solemn wind music accompanying the organ" had given way to "the French fantastical light way better suiting a tavern, or playhouse, than a church." "Light and galliardizing ayres" - a contemptuous phrase to be repeated for more than a century in strictures on church-music - were introduced, and the reformation of such "vanities" became the chief concern of the more severe clergymen. Animadversions on the degenerate state of ecclesiastical music in England were published with as much fervour by the clerics and devout worshippers as were their current anti-Catholic tracts.

The man in search of more mundane harmony might resort to the numerous coffee-houses which offered convenient rendezvous to amateur musicians. At these increasingly popular music-clubs, a common love of the art momentarily

dissolved social barriers. Pepys is obviously unmindful of disparity in class when he records the merriment he felt while in the company of a carpenter and a butcher.^{12.} There were also the hundreds of inns which dotted London. Music had always been a traditional feature of the English inn, but now there was a new lure. Many enterprising inn-keepers had installed the very organs which had been removed from the churches during the Commonwealth. The sounds of the great wind-instruments in the taverns, however, only served to increase the wrath of moralists. The carousing at such places drew the attention of the righteous critic who attacked inn-music as both the cause and the effect of debauchery. Almost to the end of the eighteenth century, the "musick-house" was synonymous with profligacy and profane singing, though some of England's finest musical societies originated in these surroundings. Jonathan Swift, accustomed to regard such drinking-places as centres of vice, almost ruined the first performance of Handel's Messiah in 1741 by forbidding his cathedral choristers to rehearse in the Fishamble Street Tavern near Christ's Church, Dublin.^{13.}

New instrumental and vocal works, or the music from one of the current theatrical successes could be heard at the public concerts at various places in the city. These

concerts were innovations of Restoration England, for this country boasted the first music-meetings in the world which were open to the general public upon payment of an admission fee. John Banister began this revolutionary practice in 1672 when he opened his home to the public. Banister himself was a theatrical composer of considerable reputation and had recently headed King Charles's "Band of Violins." A steady stream of patrons to his concerts was guaranteed for he was known to be the intimate of dozens of professional musicians and aristocratic "virtuosos." One could therefore always count on hobnobbing with celebrities at his house in Whitefriars. Moreover, Banister's procedure was strikingly informal. It was simply "1^s a peice, call for what you pleas, pay ye reckoning, & welcome, gentlemen." Less profitable than the Whitefriars project was "another meeting of the like neer pauls" which, Roger North tells us, was begun in imitation of Banister, although the performances were given in a tavern. Ben Wallington, the owner, charged "no paymt but ye reckoning," and had the additional advantage of possessing an organ.¹⁴ In 1678, Thomas Britton, the "small-coalman" of Clerkenwell, started another series. Edward Ward describes his house as being "not much higher than a Bunghole of a Cask," and adds that

"here any Body that is willing to take a hearty Sweat, may have the Pleasure of hearing many notable Performances in the charming Science of Musick." The discomforts of Britton's home were notorious, but he attracted some of the greatest musical celebrities of the age. Because of the "profound Regard that he had in general to all manner of Literature," his concerts became a centre of intellectual as well as musical activity.¹⁵ The actual performances at these meetings, however, was another matter. They did not always run so smoothly. At York Buildings in Villiers Street, for instance, the concerts were painfully mis-managed. Roger North writes with disgust:

I observed well ye musick here, & altho ye best masters in their turnes as well solo, as concerted, shewed their gifts yet I cannot say whatever ye music was, that the enterteinement was good, because it consisted of broken Incoherent parts; now a consort, then a lutinist, then a violino solo, then flutes, then a song, and so peice after peice, ye time sliding away while ye masters blundered & swore in shifting places, and one might perceiv that they performed ill out of spight to one another.¹⁶

But it was the theatre which was the most enticing of all the places in London which offered music as a regular attraction. Starved for dramatic entertainment during the rule of Cromwell, the Restoration audience supported all types of theatrical presentations, few of

which were without incidental music. A new comedy could be relied upon to contain at least one song, and tragedy - particularly heroic tragedy -- was rich in musical ornamentation. In addition to the English companies in London, there was a troupe of Italian players which presumably staged plays of a semi-operatic nature as supplements to their commedia dell'arte repertory. Occasionally, a group of French actors appeared. Probably it was they who introduced Molière's musical comedies to England, soon after the re-opening of the theatres.

However, of the Restoration plays it is the opera with which we are most concerned. In order to appreciate fully the problems which confronted seventeenth and eighteenth-century musical critics in assessing this new dramatic genre, we must examine the backgrounds of continental opera and its English equivalent at some length.

In the last decade of the sixteenth century, a group of Florentine intellectuals collaborated in the production of two curious stage-works, Dafne and Euridice. Convinced that the ancients sang their tragedies throughout, the Italian dilettanti "restored" the Greek ideal with these dramme per musica. The experimenters, however, valued the poetic component of their "operas" above the musical. They feared that the complexity and repetitious nature of conventional melody would render the poetry

unintelligible and retard dramatic action. Consequently, the composers of the group rejected the use of melodic dialogue for "recitativo" in which they attempted to reproduce the natural inflexions of the speaking voice with musical tones. Those men, then, who produced the first operas, designed them as re-creations of antique tragedies-in-song.

But the original form of opera, with its continual recitative, was short-lived. When the patronage of opera passed from the nobility to the middle class in the seventeenth century, the dramatic and poetic foundations of the plays disintegrated. Italian opera began to take the form of extravaganza as scenic designers, melodic composers, and vocal virtuosos pandered to the more prosaic tastes of the new audience. What the Florentine camerati had initiated as the dramma per musica became mere musical showpieces for composers and singers. Nevertheless, even in its corrupted state, the exciting new dramatic form attracted the attention of the Italian-born Cardinal Mazarin and Lully in Paris. As a result of their patronage, opera became the rage of the French court — although the producers further altered the original intention of the camerati by adding ballet to the music-drama. French opera, like the Italian, was eventu-

ally liberated from an exclusively aristocratic patronage, and an opera house was opened to the general public in Paris in 1669.

At the time of the Restoration in England, the continental opera was an amalgamation of all the arts. Poetry, music, ballet, and resplendent decorations were combined in lavish production. Curiously, by 1660, a similar art-form had evolved in England. In his Foundations of English opera, Professor E. J. Dent surveys the pre-Restoration drama in England, drawing attention to various essentially operatic characteristics of native stage-pieces from the Elizabethan era to the Commonwealth. Italian opera, he reveals, had been a deliberately created artistic form; English opera, on the other hand appeared as the final stage in the development of a traditional musical drama. Instrumental accompaniment, song, and, in rare instances, recitative, were heard on the Tudor as well as on the Stuart stages. But it did not occur to the English playwright to unite these musical elements with drama in an artificial species of tragedy which aimed at the projection of character entirely through music.¹⁷

Not until the final years of the Puritan government did an English dramatist take the first step in utilizing the material on hand. In 1656, Sir William D'Avenant

obtained permission from the state to present a semi-dramatic entertainment at Rutland House on Aldersgate Street. D'Avenant, as a former dramatist and producer, was anxious to re-open the London theatres, not so much, it seems, for the edification of audiences long denied theatrical performances, as to re-establish his source of income and reputation. To circumvent the almost inevitable governmental refusal of his request to stage a play, a certain amount of prudence was called for. It was out of the question to label such a project "dramatic." D'Avenant therefore shrewdly entitled his piece: The First Dayes Entertainment at Rutland House by Declamations and Musick: after the Manner of the Ancients. It promised an innocuous enough diversion, and the licenser gave his approval.

The Entertainment is in the form of two lengthy dialogues which are interspersed with song and instrumental interludes. It was not a true opera, but as yet D'Avenant was simply testing his ground. In the epilogue to this curious and cautious work, the poet nostalgically reviews the artistic aims of pre-Commonwealth drama. Disguising his impatience with the Puritan suppression, he soberly condemns stage-plays, though not without ending a bit wistfully — if dangerously —

These were your Plays, but get them if you can. D'Avenant, however, is prepared to show the public that it can get them if it will bear with his attempts to insinuate drama back into the public theatres under such guises as "declamation," "moral dialogue," or even "opera."

Heartened by the success of his first venture, in the autumn of 1656 D'Avenant produced The Siege of Rhodes, known traditionally as the first English opera. The playwright again described his work in such a manner as to obviate official censure. This time, he subtitled the production, A Representation by the Art of Perspective in Scenes and the Story sung in Recitative Musick. Fifty-six years had elapsed since the camerati composed a work demonstrating the "Grecian" ideal of drama set to music from beginning to end. Now, impelled by subterfuge rather than by antiquarian purism, D'Avenant arrived at a similar art-form in The Siege.

Except for a brief dispute with the Puritan authorities over complaints against this piece in 1658, he seems to have encountered no opposition to his performances. D'Avenant, however, expressed other fears. The Siege was a departure from traditional English drama and the author felt compelled to vindicate its aberrant features. By way of an explanatory preface he protects himself

against inferences from hostile spectators that his capabilities as a playwright had declined. The grand scale of production that a "representation" of Solyman the Magnificent's siege demands, he writes, is not possible within the narrow confines of Rutland House. Not only have these "limits ... hinder'd the splendour of our Scenes," but the use of continuous recitative has impeded swiftly moving dialogue. The spectator, therefore, "cannot expect the chief Ornaments belonging to a History Drammatically digested into Turns and Counter-turns, to double Walks, and interweavings of design." Following this, D'Avenant adds another defence to forestall further criticism from the possibly skeptical reader. It is suggested, rather loftily, that the poet's "diversify'd numbers" will not be attacked by an intelligent judge. On the contrary, he will see that deviations from regular metre "rather deserve Approbation than need Excuse; for frequent Alterations of Measure ... are necessary to Recitative Musick for Variation of Ayres."^{18.}

In addition to introducing the true music-drama to London audiences, D'Avenant produced an innovation in England's public theatres by using elaborately constructed scenery. He presented two more operas before the Restora-

tion, The Cruelty of the Spaniards at Peru (1658) and The History of Sir Francis Drake (1659). The lurid stage-directions for the first of these illustrates his method.

A doleful pavin is play'd to prepare the change of the Scene, which represents a dark prison at great distance; and farther to the view are discern'd racks, and other engines of torment, with which the Spaniards are tormenting the Natives and English mariners Two Spaniards are likewise discover'd ... the one turning a spit, whilst the other is basting an Indian Prince, which is roasted at an artificial fire.

As we shall see, a Restoration play with an occasional "pavin" and a few "engines" warranted the name, "opera," as much as did the completely sung plays on the continent.

In 1661, when he received one of the two theatrical patents granted by the king, D'Avenant produced The Siege of Rhodes (probably in conventional dramatic form) at the Duke's Theatre in Dorset Garden. But more important for the purposes of this study was his presentation of The Playhouse to be Let in 1663, a curious Rehearsal-like potpourri into which he incorporated the earlier Cruelty of the Spaniards and Sir Francis Drake.

One of the first examples of satire directed against sung declamation — towards which the English audience has remained almost consistently hostile to the present day — appears in the author's defence of recitative. The first act shows a Player and Musician, each of whom is eager to

advance the merits of his own play for which the theatre is "to be let," carrying on a bantering dialogue. The Musician informs the Player that his "bait" is to be a "heroique story in Style Recitativo," to which the Player replies, "But do you think that natural?" The Player then ridicules the peculiarities of recitative by imitation:

Suppose

I should not ask, but sing, you now a question,
And you should instantly sing me an answer;
Would you not think it strange?

Mus: Well, sir, as how?

Play: Take out your watch, and tell me, sir, the hour?

[Plays and Sings.]

Then you reply

My watch, sir, is at pawn, but 'tis past four.

By reducing the ideal of recitative to the absurd, the vindication of sung dialogue, no matter how earnestly expressed, is ineffective. Who, in the audience, was now likely to listen sympathetically to the precise statement of the Musician? ---

Recitative Musick, is not compos'd
Of matter so familiar, as may serve
For every low occasion of discourse.
In tragedy, the language of the stage
Is rais'd above the common dialect;
Our passions rising with the height of verse;
And vocal musick adds new wings to all
The flights of poetry. ^{19.}

His assertions are pretty enough, but the critics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries insisted upon asking with D'Avenant's Player, is opera "natural"?

Despite the author's knowledge of operatic principles, his interest in the completely sung play as a serious dramatic form ceased with The Playhouse. At first, he had regarded opera as a means to an end. Now that his wishes for re-opening the theatres had been fulfilled in Charles's reign, he had no further need to disguise spoken drama with musical trappings.

The design of Commonwealth operas, however, was not completely abortive. Their influence extended into the field of heroic tragedy. Under the direction of John Dryden, who cited The Siege of Rhodes, as "the first light we had" of this dramatic type, D'Avenant's entertainments became stylized contests between love and honour.^{20.} Although the heroic tragedy was no longer "thorough-sung," the new authors felt that they "must ever interlard" their plays with "Songs, Ghosts, and Dances."^{21.} They appropriated the machinery of D'Avenant's operas more naturally than any other of their peculiarities. Dryden encountered little difficulty in justifying the appearance of enchanters and spectres, for his plays were "modelled ... by the rules of an heroic poem," and "an heroic poet is not tied to a bare representation of what is true."^{22.} When magic was accepted as one of the "rules," the additional source of imagination inspired the stage designer to outdo

himself in constructing awesome "transformation scenes."

It is in this period of heroic plays that "opera" became a term which English theatre-goers of the seventeenth century affixed to any dramatic production accompanied with song and dance, and adorned with spectacular scenes. That these "ambigue entertainments" which "break unity, & distract ye audience" were deplored by Roger North and ^{the} authors of The Rehearsal did not lessen the pleasure felt by charmed and excited playgoers.^{23.} Recitative was absent in most cases and vocal melody was included merely as a tuneful diversion instead of being employed as the medium of intensified emotion — the raison d'être of arias in Italian opera.

The Englishman's preference for the play-with-music is significant. By neglecting true opera in favour of musical plays, he revealed that he was intellectually incapable of accepting the artistic ideal prevalent in Europe. The Restoration Man of Taste usually went no further than only superficially resolving the problem arising from this antipathy. The Gentleman's Journal, for example, observed that

Other Nations bestow the name of Opera only on such Plays whereof every word is sung. But experience hath taught us that our English genius will not relish that perpetual Singing But our English Gentlemen, when their Ear is satisfy'd, are desirous to have their mind pleas'd, and Music

and Dancing industriously intermix'd with Comedy or Tragedy.²⁴

Modern Historians, more concerned with why the English could not accept "that perpetual Singing," have assigned various causes for the rejection of Italianate opera. Professor Dent attributes it to the fact that by the time of the Restoration, the English dramatic tradition was so ingrained that it was impossible for musical drama to be accepted as an equal.²⁵ Another writer asserts that whereas continental opera was a realization of profound and almost universal aesthetic principles, the opera of England was only a "show." Upon its return to power the restored court lacked defined convictions, and in aping European modes of artistic expression it retained only the external characteristics of a driving force.²⁶ The most persuasive argument is put forth by Professor Lang: conclusions based upon either a convention or a transient social temper are revealing but inadequate. Eighteenth-century critics were conditioned by what they referred to as "Nature," and what Dr. Lang calls "English national sentiment," which

refuses to accept music as a means of dramatic self-expression; it declines the all-important pure emotional conversion of human passions and sentiments into music, thus preventing music from progressing beyond a pleasant addition, diversion, and ornament for the play.²⁷

The contemporary English audience, however, was unaware of its cultural illiteracy. Delighting in the plumage, they forgot the bird. The people thronged to see, rather than to hear, their own naive "dramatic operas" with their spectacular scenic contraptions and ever-popular witches, enchanters, and fabulous beasts.

The professional dramatists were understandably concerned about the dangerous new rival which already threatened "to crowd out from ye stage even comedy itself."²⁸ Dryden jokingly tells the spectators at the opening of the new King's Theatre that it is "folly" to erect a playhouse for legitimate drama

Whilst scenes, machines, and empty Opera reign,
And for the pencil you the pen disdain.²⁹

Poetasters of course hastened to pander to the new taste for "dramatic operas," but in time the more competent playwrights — including Dryden — succumbed to public demand and began to experiment with the form. Among the most successful operas were the adaptations of Shakespeare's Macbeth in 1663 and of his Tempest in 1667. But for Thomas Shadwell and Dryden, the opera was a fascinating but as yet unproved contrivance. Consequently, their approach to this novel and vital dramatic genre was a guarded one.

Molière's Psyché, with music by Lully, appeared in Paris in 1671, and the opportunistic Shadwell, having already adapted the French playwright's L'Avare, "improved" the musical play for the London stage in 1673. By the time of Shadwell's pastiche, lyric dramas were no longer defined as heroic tragedies sung in recitative. Opera, by Shadwell's own definition, was simply a trifling gallimaufry which "was to entertain the Town with variety of Musick, curious Dancing, splendid Scenes and Machines." In the preface to the English Psyche he discards his work with contempt -- though he hopes that "in a good Natur'd Country" his opera, poor as it is, "would be at least forgiven." Besides, he adds hopefully, "There are so many splendid Objects in the Play and such variety of Diversion, as will not give the Audience leave to mind the Writing." With an eye to the traditionalistic critics, Shadwell then changes his manner. "I do not, nor ever did intend to value myself upon the writing of this Play. For I had rather be the Author of one Scene of Comedy, like some of Ben. Johnsons, than all the best Plays of this kind that have been or ever shall be written." The prologue presents further extenuation for the dramatist:

He hopes you will excuse his haste,
For he this gawdy Trifle wrote so fast.

And for possibly adverse critics, the poet concludes:

But none of them yet so severe can be,
As to condemn this Trifle more than he.

Notwithstanding satirical opposition and his own promise to bid

Oh a long farewell to all this sort
Of Plays ^{30.}

Shadwell followed up Psyche with The Tempest in 1674, the epilogue of which reiterates the dramatist's pose of reluctance in conforming to popular demand for operas.

In 1685, John Dryden wrote a true opera which was sung throughout — unlike his earlier Tempest of 1667 (upon which Shadwell based his musical play) and his heroic plays with "Songs, Ghosts, and Dances." Glancing at the various Tempests, Psyches, and Macbeths which had found favour in the 1670's, and "which were neither much better written nor so well composed" as his new Albion and Albanus, Dryden appended one of his most explicit dramatic essays to the allegorical opera.

The Duke of Buckingham's burlesque, The Rehearsal, had abounded with caustic allusions to the operative techniques used by the Poet Laureate in his heroic tragedies. To avoid further satirical attack, Dryden took the cue from D'Avenant and Shadwell and tempered scorn

for Albion with justification. The opera, he suggests, is little more than a kickshaw with which he had relaxed from the rigour of composing serious plays. But Dryden was careful not to overplay his part of the modest versifier. More anxious about his reputation as a dramatic poet than D'Avenant or Shadwell, he goes to some length to explain that apparent shortcomings in the verse of Albion are largely due to the dearth of vowels, double-endings, "Harmony," and refinement in the English language. If the critic realizes the difficulties a poet encounters when he attempts to adjust words to music, he will not so readily question the poet's abilities. And all sensible men know that since "Nature" has endowed Dryden with "a nicety of hearing," he cannot be entirely responsible for prosodic faults.

Of the greatest significance in this essay is Dryden's concise definition of opera. Shadwell had rejected the heroic tragedy as the model for opera librettos and had substituted for it his flimsy verse-plays. Dryden accepted neither interpretation, but recognized opera as a unique form of drama which called for special rules. Living in an age when the defining of literary types was pursued with unprecedented diligence, Dryden attempted

to add opera to the genre-canon:

An opera is a poetical tale, or fiction, represented by vocal and instrumental music, adorned with scenes, machines, and dancing. The supposed persons of this musical drama are generally supernatural, as gods, and goddesses, and heroes, which at least are descended from them, and are in due time to be adopted into their number.

To supplement these dramatis personae, "meaner persons may sometimes gracefully be introduced" by the librettist, "especially if they have relation to those first times, which poets call the Golden Age."³¹

Dryden's exposition is lucid, indeed, but he lost sight of the fact that the dramma per musica of the Italians, whom he purports to imitate, aimed at drama through music. This aesthetic ideal, unabsorbable by the English spirit, was perverted by Restoration taste to the simple alternative, drama with music. The pastoral opera of Albion and Albanus was a far cry from the Florentine experiments, and musical historians look upon its preface as the definitive statement of English operatic standards which were but a caricature of Italian objectives. Equally significant was the response of seventeenth-century traditionalists to Dryden's opinions. Few codifiers of poetic types were as willing as Dryden was to champion opera as a valid candidate for the select list. John Dennis not only omits opera from his genre-

catalogue in The Grounds of Criticism in Poetry, but specifies his reasons succinctly:

If the end of poetry be to instruct and reform the world, that is, to bring mankind from irregularity, extravagance, and confusion, to rule and order, how this should be done by a thing that is in itself irregular and extravagant, is difficult to be conceived.³²

One thing was clear: no matter what form it took, opera stimulated controversy.

11. 1700-1740

The places where one heard music during Queen Anne's reign were about the same as they had been in the late seventeenth century. Music-lovers still resorted to the coffee-houses, taverns, and public "rooms" for concerts. Amateur musicians still congregated in private homes for informal performances, and stage-plays (apart from operas) still featured incidental music and occasional intermezzi. Thomas Britten, the "musical small-coal-man," also continued to entertain the public at his music-meetings in Clerkenwell. Frequently a new salon opened,

such as the one which the father of Alexander Pope's friend, Anastasia Robinson, began in Golden Square. In the music-room at York Buildings were given the most popular public concerts, the high point of which was reached in 1710 when Mrs. Hemings (as we read in The Tatler for 13th May) sang for "the Emperor of the Mohocks, and the three Indian Kings" who had lately arrived from America.

In one respect, the musical scene differed greatly from that of the seventeenth century. The influx of foreign singers and instrumentalists and the demand for public performances made it a period of musical "personalities." Soon after William and Mary came to the throne in 1688, the names of Italian and French musicians appeared more frequently in print. A concert at York-buildings by the "Italian Lady," Margarita de L'Espine, was advertised as early as 1692. The composer, John Christian Pepusch, who later arranged the airs for Gay's Beggar's Opera, arrived in London in 1698 as a political refugee from Holland. Also in this decade, the French dancers, Subligny, Salon, and L'Abbé became greatly popular with theatre-audiences. The English public was already familiar with the names of Charles Dieupart, the

violinist, and Nicola Haym, the cellist of German and Italian extraction. In addition to these performers many native English musicians acquired fame in these years. Arabella Hunt, the singer and lutenist, who had been a favourite of Queen Mary and the music teacher of Queen Anne, was much esteemed until her death in 1705. The beautiful Catherine Tofts, whose voice, writes Cibber, was "not to be imitated by Art, or Labour," was a celebrated opera-singer during the years of operatic experimentation at the beginning of the century.^{33.}

In the first decade of the eighteenth century more colourful persons from the continent entered England. John Jacob Heidegger, the prodigiously ugly "Swiss Count," came to London in 1707. This most famous of all eighteenth-century impresarios was, in a few years time, to outrage the moralists with his management of notorious masquerades, attract the attention of Hogarth with his hideous features, and mystify the gossips of the town by his well-guarded but extremely shady past. The most popular of all the new arrivals were the Italian castrati who had long been in vogue on the operatic stages of Italy. One or two had been heard in England before this time, but they had been observed more as curiosities than as

superb singers. However, the new demand for Italian opera (which will be discussed presently) with its strange convention which called for castrati in the leading male rôles made them familiar figures on the London stage. The English theatre-goers soon perceived their genius, though the effeminate voices emanating ludicrously from enormous bodies inspired the satirists to outdo themselves in writing song, epigrams, and verses.³⁴ Indeed the comments on the male soprano's masculinity are so numerous that they are almost a poetic genre of the period.

The effect of foreign artists on English musicians was noticeable almost from the first. Mrs. Tofts gave concerts in the Italian language as early as 1703, but many English instrumentalists, irritated by the public's interest in Italian music, flocked to the Crown and Anchor Tavern where they could hear only those works composed by their fellow-countrymen. The rivalry between the English and Italian modes extended also to the theatre. In February, 1704, an ardent supporter of Mrs. Tofts caused a disturbance at Drury Lane "by throwing oranges and hissing when Mrs. L'Epine, the Italian gentlewoman, sung."³⁵ While not so rowdy as the hair-pulling fracas between the later sopranos, Cuzzoni and Faustina, the conflict between Mrs. Tofts and Margarita gave rise to

many a witty mot.

The appearance of these spectacular foreigners created a new vogue for things Italian in the early years of Queen Anne's reign. Inevitably, a new movement to introduce true opera, in the Italian style, began.

The new era in theatrical history began in January, 1705. In that month, at Drury Lane, England heard its first opera "after the Italian manner," that is, opera in which the completely sung English text was set to Italian music. The work, Arsinoe, Queen of Cyprus, was an odd hodgepodge. Peter Motteux's libretto was a translation of a seventeenth-century opera by the Bolognese, Tomaso Stanzini, and Thomas Clayton's score was simply a pastiche of operatic airs borrowed from Italian composers. Mrs. Tofts, Mrs. Cross, and Mr. Hughes sang the leading rôles, and in the orchestra were two friends of Richard Steele, Charles Dieupart and Nicola Haym. So came Italian opera, writes Cibber, "in as rude a Disguise, and unlike it self, as possible; in a lame, hobling Translation into our own Language."³⁶ The reminiscing actor-dramatist did not exaggerate the inadequacies of Motteux's "book." In the second act, for instance, the jealous Queen discovers that her

general, Ormond, loves Dorisbe, "the Pretender to the Crown of Cyprus":

Ars. You are a Traytor, she my Enemy.

Orm. I am innocent —

Ars. Thou art guilty.

Dor. My Queen! —

Ars. Thy Fury!

Orm. In what have I offended?

Ars. In Treachery.

Dor. At least —

Ars. At least with Death I'll punish thee.

Orm. The Crime! —

Ars. Is too evident.

Dor. What Torment

Orm. What Anguish

Ars. What Despair

Dor. I understand

The Queen's my Rival.

Ars. Thou vile, rash Man!

Orm. Not so, my Fair Arsinoe.

Ars. Base, aspiring Woman!

Dor. I am Loyal and True.

Ars. Your Loves and Lives

At once shall end —

The rest decide between your selves. [Exit.

Orm. Thus, sinking Mariners

In sight of Land are lost;

Dash'd on the Rocks,

And cannot reach the Coast. [Exit.

Wretchedly contrived as this is, the successors of Arsinoe echoed two characteristics illustrated here: the dominating love-theme and the periodic simile. So inextricable from Italian opera were these to become, that by 1728 the audience laughed knowingly at John Gay's ridicule of them in his Beggar's Opera.

The year 1705 was truly a theatrical annus mirabilis;

three months after the sensational Arsinoe appeared, Sir John Vanbrugh opened his great new theatre in the Haymarket. The structure, known in Anne's time as the Queen's Theatre, was originally designed for the presentation of conventional plays. The architect, Vanbrugh, and his partner, William Congreve, however, soon discovered that "almost every proper Quality, and Convenience of a good Theatre had been sacrific'd, or neglected, to shew the Spectator a vast, triumphal Piece of Architecture." The immensity of the house made the actors' voices sound "like the Gabbling of so many People, in the lofty Isles in a Cathedral."³⁷ In a few months' time, Congreve relinquished his share in the white elephant to Owen Swiney (or MacSwiney). Under this impresario and his successors, the Queen's Theatre became the centre of operatic productions which were recognized as the only entertainments compatible with the acoustics of the enormous house.

Meanwhile, the imitative operas, The Loves of Ergasto and The Temple of Love repeated the success of Arsinoe. A number of writers, however, were already eyeing the new "tramontane taste" with distrust, and about this time, English musical criticism entered a new phase in which

comment was confined almost entirely to Italian operas.

But even then, we must not look for comments on the actual music of the operas. Any one could judge mere music, John Dennis wrote contemptuously in 1706:

There are few judicious Spectators at our Dramatic Representations, since none can be so, but who with great Endowments of Nature have had a very generous Education, and the rest are frequently mortify'd by passing foolish Judgments; but in Musick the Case is vastly different; to judge of that requires only Use and a fine Ear, which the Footman often has a great deal finer than his Master. In short, a Man without common Sense may very well judge of what a Man writes without common Sense, and without common Sense composes. ^{38.}

But opera could not be ignored. Hence, Dennis places it under the heading of "dramatic Representations." There, at least, it was within the reach of the "judicious Spectator" who could dismiss the musical component of opera with impunity; though he was still considered a "music-critic," his business was the libretto and general production of the opera. What Dennis objected to most (and this holds good not only in 1706 but in 1740 as well) were the shoddy romances, the silly recitative, and the miserable verses which made Arsinoe and its imitators the very antithesis of the "correct" play. Its deviation from normal drama, however, was not the only reason for Italian opera's dominating musical

criticism for the next half-century. At about the time Dennis's pronouncements first appeared in print, professional dramatists were also beginning to complain. Opera too easily seduced audiences from legitimate plays. Dennis had warned his readers that "the English Stage is like to be overthrown by the Progress of these new Operas," and the public's infatuation with Arsinoe seemed to confirm this.³⁹ There was an undertone of envy beneath many a playwright's jibe when he joined forces with Dennis's "Judicious Spectator." Armed with common sense, envy, and an indifference to instrumental music, these two groups of writers composed the most formidable body of musical critics in the eighteenth century. Their influence, as we shall see, extended well into the 1750's.

To present a clearer picture of the deviations of eighteenth-century Italianate librettists from what English playwrights considered the correct procedure in composing an operatic "book," George Granville's British Enchanters will be examined in some detail. In 1706, this playwright tried to supplant the "un-English" trifles with a neoclassical music-drama. He wrote an original libretto, and, in the style of the seventeenth-century "dramatic operas," his Enchanters had spoken dialogue

instead of recitative. Illustrated in the preface to this dramatic opera is the reluctance of classical dramatists to depart from stringent rules — even in this form which Granville scorns as trivial. In the case of the Enchanters, the dictated formula is remarkably old fashioned. Like Dryden, Granville fused the principles of heroic poetry with the decorum of neoclassical tragedy in an effort to produce a libretto of high literary quality. English playwrights still liked to think that poetry was the major component of opera.

Granville describes The British Enchanters, or No Magick Like Love on the title-page as "a Dramatick Poem with Scenes, Machines, Musick, and Decorations." He gives a more specific definition in the preface:

The Nature of this Entertainment requires the Plot to be formed upon some Story in which Enchanters and Magicians have a principal Part: In our modern Heroick Poems, they supply the Place of the Gods with the Ancients, and make a much more natural Appearance by being Mortals, with the Difference only of being endowed with supernatural Power.... The Characters should be great and illustrious.... by consequence the Sentiments must be suitable to the Characters in which Love and Honour will have the principal Share.

In addition, he composed the dialogue in rhyme instead of prose since the rhythms of verse are more congenial to music, and he observed decorum in the characteriza-

tions. As for the delivery of dialogue in "Representations of this Heroick Romantick kind," Granville insists that it be spoken and not sung in recitative. But lest such "entertainments" become strangled by inflexible precepts of composition, Granville allows room for occasional "Relaxations" — for "in Writing, like Dress, is it not possible to be too exact, too starched, and too formal? Pleasing Negligence I have seen: Who ever saw pleasing Formality?" One would expect from this romantic peccadillo or urging poetical freedom that the author might advocate a less strict adherence to Aristoteléan rules. Instead, he follows this plea for elegant informality with unabashed approval of the British Enchanters as a model for operatic propriety.

Here,

The Unities are religiously observed: The Place is the same, varied only into different Prospects by the Power of Enchantment: All the Accidents fall naturally within the very Time of Representation: The Plot is one principal Action, and of that kind which introduces variety of Turns and Changes, all tending to the same Point: The Ornaments and Decorations are of a Piece with it, so that one could not well subsist without the other: Every Act concludes with some unexpected Revolution: And in the End, Vice is punished, Virtue rewarded, and the Moral is Instructive.

In conclusion, the author insists that the composer is under no circumstances to interfere with the poetic expression in the drama by distorting the sense of the sung words, or, as Dryden had put it, by forcing the poet

to "cramp his Verses." The poetry should be free from all musical restrictions, for "in this consists the Solid and Substantial."^{40.} Such was the ideal "literary" opera-libretto of 1706.

Other librettists, such as Owen Swiney and Peter Motteux, had less exalted ideas of the opera-poet's responsibilities. Nevertheless, to the neoclassicists' dismay, the Italianate operas of the poetasters appealed more to the taste of theatre-goers than did the refined British Enchanters. Gothic unnaturalness triumphed over Roman severity at least on the musical stage. Less than two months after the appearance of Granville's piece, Owen Swiney snapped his fingers at the Rules and presented his translation of Stampigli's Camilla at Drury Lane. The new opera was set to the music of Bononcini and was performed by the same cast that sang Arsinoe. Swiney's work was even more painful to rationalists than Arsinoe had been. As a sample of the slipshod manner in which he adapted Camilla we find the fierce aria of the first act,

Barbara si t'intendo
T'intendo si crudel...

appearing in translation as the English Lament (though the character of the music remained unchanged),

Frail are a Lover's Hopes,

And fatal is the Fair...

The indiscriminating audience was ecstatic and Addison observed "the most refined Persons of the British Nation" at Drury Lane "dying away and languishing to Notes that were filled with a Spirit of Rage and Indignation."⁴¹

Exasperated, Addison was the next English dramatist to attempt a rescue of the London stage from melodic fatuousness. His opera, Rosamond, with Mrs. Tofts in the leading rôle, appeared in March, 1707, but far from pleasing the audience, it managed to survive for only three nights. So tedious was the production that one wit wrote, "I think the only thing to be lik'd in it, is it's short."⁴² The fault lay in the music. Unfortunately, Addison had overestimated the genius of Thomas Clayton whom he chose as his musical collaborator.

Clayton's music to Arsinoe (the only thing about the opera Addison admired) had been merely a re-working of Italian airs written by others. In writing the music for Rosamond, he revealed a deplorable inability to compose an original score. Needless to say, Addison does not mention Rosamond in his brief history of operas in the Italian style which he printed in the Spectator for 21st March, 1711.

Motteux's Thomyris, Queen of Scythia, (the English libretto was an original one) with arias by Scarlatti and Bononcini and recitative by Pepusch, was the immediate successor of Rosamond. But more important this year than the production of Thomyris was the first appearance in England of the castrato, Valentini, and the mysterious soprano known as "the Baroness." The manager of Drury Lane engaged the two foreigners to sing in a revival of Camilla in the autumn of 1707, but since neither of them could speak English they performed their parts in Italian. Thus, writes Addison in his history, was "the next Stage in our Refinement," the introduction of bi-lingual operas. The novelty caught the fancy of spectators, and for the next two years similarly produced polyglot operas such as Love's Triumph and Pyrrhus and Demetrius (in which the famous Nicolini made his debut) were the rage of London.

Thus, by 1709, there were three kinds of opera on the English stage. First, there were the "dramatick operas" of purely English growth such as Granville's British Enchanters (and, in 1709, Alarbas, "written by a Gentleman of Quality"). Secondly, there were operas translated into English from the original Italian, like Arsinoe and Camilla. Finally, there were operas like

Motteux's Thomyris with English librettos "after the Italian manner," with original English words set to already existent Italian music and sung throughout. An added complication, of course, was the bi-lingual production of any of these foreign operas.

Granville's "classical" formula for the first type has been examined. The bulk of Augustan musical criticism, however, dealt with the pot-boilers, Arsinoe, Camilla, and Thomyris. What were the "methods" of Swiney and Motteux? Why did they so antagonize the critics? For one thing, it was thought that the creators of these operas debased the high objectives of musical drama. Popular taste, not Aristotelean precepts, guided them. Clayton, Swiney, and Motteux, however, freely admitted that dramaturgically correct verse-plays were not their aim. Moreover, they held that Italian melody, not transcendent "Heroick Romantick" poetry was the prime ingredient of opera. In the preface of Arsinoe, the very first of the Italian operas in England, Thomas Clayton stated that

The Design of this Entertainment being to introduce the Italian Manner of Musick on the English Stage... I was oblig'd to have an Italian Opera translated: In which the Words, however mean in several Places, suited much better with that manner of Musick, than other more Poetical would do.

To say that the poetry was "mean in several Places" was a monument of understatement, but to the horror of the poet-critics, Arsinoe made vast sums of money. The following year, 1706, Owen Swiney produced the "foreign Composition," Camilla, in order to "give us a Taste of the Italian Musick" as he explains in the dedication. Both Clayton and Swiney knew that it was simple enough to invalidate the assertions of Granville. It was only necessary for them to remind the beaux and belles of London that Italian opera was the dernier cri of Paris and Rome and that their own musical recreations were old-fashioned and unrefined. These writers scorned English voices which "are not equal to the Italian"^{43.} and derided "dramatick operas" for their lack of recitative. In short, England was laughably behind the times.

In 1707, Peter Anthony Motteux, a competent playwright and respected dramatic critic of the Gentleman's Journal (1692-94) fell in with the designs of Clayton and Swiney. He announced in the preface of Thomyris that "with more Pleasure yet than Pain" he had subordinated everything in his original drama to music. All these statements were contrary to the basic rule of the camerati, of Dryden, and more recently of Granville, that poetic sense was not

to be sacrificed to musical sounds. Bi-lingual performances served to remove the new Italianate works even further from the ideal.

Motteux introduced his next translated opera, Love's Triumph (1708) with the assertion,

to be... subservient to the agreeable Amusement of the Great and Fair, is perhaps as commendable as the Attempts of those, who will allow you to like nothing but what is Grave and Elaborate.

It was a hit at Granville and Addison who had vexed Motteux with their frigid operatic precepts and their sneers at mercenary librettists. Recalling the dullness of Addison's ill-fated Rosamond, Motteux remarks slyly of his own opera, "'Tis something at least to aim at pleasing." He was, nevertheless, too conscientious a dramatist to be satisfied with the monotonous love-plots of translated operas. In Love's Triumph he therefore modified the original Italian text by adding a "comic Part." Furthermore, in his attempt "to keep Sound and Sense together" he was particularly careful in choosing English words to fit the Italian music. Had Motteux continued his experiments which would, he hoped, give opera "a genteel Tune," he might have given his contemporaries what Dryden, Granville, and Addison failed to --

an intelligent, poetic drama sung in English from beginning to end.⁴⁴ As it was, even Motteux's operas were performed bi-lingually.

In 1710 a new kind of opera put an end to all hopes for an English music-drama. In that year Heidegger informed the public that

Several Persons of Quality, and Encouragers of the Opera's, having found fault with the Absurdities of those Scenes, where the Answers are made in English, to those that sing in Italian, and in Italian to those that recite in English: and it being impossible to have the whole Opera perform'd in English, because the chief Actors would not be able to perform their Parts in our Language: I hope I shall be pardoned if I have made all the Parts in Italian.⁴⁵

He is speaking here of Almahide, England's first opera sung completely in the Italian language by Italian singers. Librettists immediately fell to imitating Almahide, and operas sung entirely in a foreign language became a vogue which was to last half a century.

The champions of dramatic sense were appalled at the success of the unintelligible Almahide. "To ease themselves intirely of the Fatigue of Thinking," wrote Addison, audiences abandoned the spoken English drama "of a much higher Nature, and capable of giving the Mind a much nobler Entertainment," and flocked to hear these absurdities.⁴⁶

But in imitation of Heidegger's piece, Hydaspes, or L'Idaspe fedele, opened four months later.^{47.} True Italian opera was now firmly established in England and London's musical stage was set for the appearance of its greatest figure -- George Frideric Handel.

The new era in musical history began on the night of February 24th, 1711, the night Handel's Rinaldo received its first performance. The twenty-six-year-old composer who was at this time musical director of the Hanoverian court had obtained permission from the Elector to pay a temporary visit to England. He arrived in London in the autumn of 1710. In the winter, Aaron Hill, the shrewd manager of the Queen's Theatre, suggested that he compose an opera for the coming season. Handel complied, and in the miraculously short time of two weeks composed the glorious Rinaldo, the greatest Italian opera yet to be heard on the English stage.

Critics were at once up in arms. For one thing, they were disgusted by the manner in which Hill prepared the libretto for the press. Impudently dedicating Rinaldo to Anne, that "Best of Queens," he proceeded to infuriate dramatists by describing the work as the fruit of his "Pursuit of all Improvements, which can possibly

be introduc'd upon our English Theatre." Improve the stage with Italian opera! Next, he enraged neoclassical poets with his eulogy of the conceit-ridden Tasso from whom he took his story. As if that were not enough, Giacomo Rossi, the librettist, added to this shameless hyperbole by appending a florid epistle in Italian which announced Rinaldo as a product of Parnassus, set by "Signior Handel, Orfeo del nostro Secolo." Though critics scoffed at this description of Handel and disbelieved reports that he had written Rinaldo in a fortnight, they none the less sensed his genius. He was no ordinary composer, nor was his Rinaldo an ordinary opera. The following year he gave London two more operas of superior merit, Il Pastor Fido and Teseo.

There remains little to be said about the nature of Italian opera in England after 1711. The form of Rinaldo was more or less the standard of such works during the remaining years of the eighteenth century. The action of the story, with its predominating love-theme, generally took place in some remote time -- preferably classical or medieval. The librettist divided his drama, which seldom called for more than six characters, into three acts. The composer stipulated that the leading male and female rôles

were to be sung by sopranos, and he provided for at least one "grand duet" between the hero and heroine. Finally, the opera was produced with the usual extravagant setting, costly machines, and exquisite costumes.⁴⁸ There are many more characteristics of this highly stylized art-form, but they are irrelevant to this study. As we shall see, it was the unintelligible librettos and, most of all, the enormous success of these works that disturbed the London literati.

iii. 1740-1789

During the forty-nine years covered in this section, the English musical scene broadened considerably. In London, the public gardens at Vauxhall, Ranelagh, and Marylebone offered almost perpetual concerts to their patrons, and in this "clubbiest" of all periods, an ever-increasing number of musical societies sprang up. Music-lovers banded together at the Society of Musicians, the Noblemen's and Gentlemen's Catch Club, and the Glee Club. They flocked to the new music-rooms at the Pantheon

or at Hanover Square to pay homage to Handel or to the latest arrival from the continent. The more select gathered at the fashionable (and, it was whispered, slightly wicked) salon of Madame Cornelys. The older Academy of Ancient Music, founded in 1710, and the Castle Society (1724) prospered as never before. Outside London, choral festivals were eagerly supported. A series of such concerts began at Birmingham in 1768, and in 1772 at both Chester and Gloucester. Dublin and Edinburgh vied with London as musical centres, and as a fashionable resort, Bath attracted many enthusiasts.

It was London, however, with its theatres, great new concert-halls, pleasure gardens — and wealthy patronage — which remained the Mecca of native and foreign musicians. Gluck appeared there in 1745 with two new but ill-received operas, and in 1762 Johann Christian Bach, the eighteenth child of Sebastian (who was still virtually unknown) took up residence as music-master to the royal family. It was this composer who popularized the piano-forte in England, thereby providing the virtuoso-performer, that curse of later musical critics, with a new play-thing. Among the novelties to appear on the concert-stages were the child-prodigies. In 1765, the eight-year-old Mozart astonished

the public with a series of remarkable performances. A few years later, the four-year-old William Crotch gave daily organ recitals at Piccadilly. In the latter half of the century, Galuppi, Clementi, Cherubini, and Gabriele Piossi (whose elopement with Mrs. Thrale in 1784 scandalized the literati) also visited the city.

Each theatre had in its repertory a large number of ballad operas, pasticcios (new librettos to which old operatic airs, and, in many cases, specially composed music were added), and English operas. Among the most popular of these last were Bickerstaffe and Arne's Love in a Village (1763) and Jean-Jacques Rousseau's Le Devin du Village (which Charles Burney adapted for the English stage in 1766 as The Cunning-Man). Nor was the first of the English ballad operas forgotten amidst the jumble of imitations in later years. Captain Macheath and his underworld gang re-appeared at Covent Garden in 1767 in a revival of The Beggar's Opera. At the theatre in the Haymarket in 1777, forty-eight years after the Lord Chamberlain refused Gay permission to stage it, Polly was given its first production.

New theatrical composers established their names at this time. If for nothing else, Thomas Arne will always be remembered for "Rule Britannia!" part of his score for

Thomson and Mallet's masque, Alfred, and for his new settings of Shakespeare's songs. In addition to performing his annual, and unenviable task of setting the poet laureate's birthday odes, William Boyce composed several sets of incidental music for the stage. Charles Dibdin, long associated with David Garrick at Drury Lane, provided that company with many pieces of note. Thomas Linley, Richard Brinsley Sheridan's father-in-law and head of a large family of musicians situated at Bath, was long active as a theatrical composer. His most celebrated work was the music for his son-in-law's Duenna in 1775.

Eclipsing all the music which appeared in the London theatres during the second half of the eighteenth century was the new species of musical drama, "oratorio." Introduced almost fortuitously to the British public in 1732 by Handel, the novel art-form (which was sung in English) was to absorb musical critics for the remainder of the century. This was no mere operatic genre which could be dealt with by the Rules alone. To be sure, the new dramatic entertainments, divided opera-like into aria and recitative, were presented in the public theatres. But the fact that their presentation involved neither acting, movement, costumes, nor stage-setting bewildered codifying rationalists. The sacred character of oratorio

even more complicated the critic's task. Were they extended "acts of worship," beyond criticism, or were the grounds of musical criticism now to include that of religious propriety?

Other things were to be taken into account. Owing to the intensified evangelical fervour in the mid-eighteenth century, conscientious critics were compelled to animadvert on the beneficial or deleterious effects of oratorios upon an emotionally unstable public. Moreover, reasonable adverse criticism was hampered by the fact that English composers and poets (Christopher Smart, Richard Jago, Mrs. Delany and others wrote librettos) found the oratorio congenial to their talents.

After the twenty-five-year reign of Italian opera in England, it was difficult to disapprove of this intelligible art-form whatever one's moral or aesthetic principles were. Clearly, there was required in the second half of the century a new critical formula. Its development will be discussed in the final sections of each of the following chapters of this work.

Despite the presence of so many notables, the growing enthusiasm of the public for musical perform-

ances, and the progress of the controversial oratorios, the criticism of this period lacks the colour of the previous ones. A glance at any modern history of music will show this. Until he prepares to give us an account of musical London after 1740, the historian can draw from an almost unlimited number of theatrical prologues to enliven his narrative with contemporary allusions. But with the completion of Handel's final opera, Deidamia, in 1741, the dramatic prologue rarely touched upon music. Peace was declared between Italy's "Harlot form" and England's Tragic Muse. It was no longer necessary for the playhouse-wits to introduce their pieces with couplets which slighted the competing operas.

Likewise, another energetic body of musical critics which supplied the historian with colourful allusions was becoming extinct by the middle of the century. In general, poetic satirists had lost their potency. And at least one great one had suffered a change of heart. In reply to a friend who asked him why, since he disliked music, he eulogized Handel in the final book of his Dunciad (1742), Alexander Pope stated with surprising

magnanimity that

Merit, in every branch of science, ought to be encouraged; that the extreme illiberality with which many persons had joined to ruin Handel in opposing his Opera, called forth his indignation; and that though nature had denied his being gratified by Handel's uncommon talents in the musical line, yet when his powers were generally acknowledged, he thought it incumbent upon him to pay a tribute due to genius. ^{49.}

Owing to the decline of interest in Italian opera, satirical essays on music such as those of Addison and Aaron Hill also appeared less frequently. Their mid-century imitators had no such fruitful subject as the Italians to poke fun at. Instrumental concerts and the new oratorios were comparatively dull affairs.

Nevertheless, there were numerous compensations for the lack of dramatic, poetic, and prose satire in the musical criticism of the second half of the century. Slowly, sobriety, introspection, and open-mindedness supplanted levity, controversy, and prejudice in musical commentaries.

One of the earliest indications of progress appeared in 1752 when there was printed for the bookseller, Davis, a treatise which began:

As the public Inclination for Music seems every Day advancing, it may not be amiss, at this

Time, to offer a few Observations on that delightful Art; such Observations, I mean, as may tend to correct any Errors that have arisen, either in the Composition, or the Practice of Music.^{50.}

This Essay on Musical Expression, modest as its preface is, is England's first piece of true musical criticism.^{51.} It is a systematic analysis and judgment of musical composition and performance by a literate musician. The Essay is the work of the organist-composer, Charles Avison (though his friend, John "Estimate" Brown, helped him to arrange his materials for publication). A controversy began almost immediately after the book appeared. Who was this upstart who found fault with Handel and slighted English composers? An antagonist declared that Avison was a charlatan and called into question several of the musician's judgements. Avison answered the attack, and before long others were engaged in a pamphlet-war. Brown also attracted abuse, not only for his collaboration with Avison but for certain observations on music which appeared in his own phenomenally successful work, An Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times. Horace Walpole accused him of hypocrisy, and William Cowper ridiculed the town for the hysterical reception it gave the "Inestimable Estimate" of the

undeserving Brown.^{52.}

But capricious as many of Avison's judgements were, most of the critics in the last third of the century accepted him as an "authority" -- though for a decade or so after the Essay appeared, English critics revealed little tendency to follow Avison's lead by discussing music as an independent science. "Music" was still more or less an abstract term to them, although they raised its status somewhat by referring to it as one of the "mimetic arts." Thus, in their interminable dissertations, James Harris and Dr. John Gregory (Smollett's "eminent physician of an amiable character") avoided mentioning more than a handful of compositions by name.^{53.} Detailed studies of a particular work by, say, Johann Christian Bach or Muzio Clementi are equally scarce.

At first, the inward-turning of critics threatened to lead them into a cul-de-sac. The "efficacy," not the mechanics of music was the province of these writers; theory, not practice, possessed the greater appeal for them. But eventually, despite their indifference towards music as a living art, the mid-century speculators became highly important in the development of musical aesthetics.

They were "Men of Feeling," true products of the Enlightenment, to whom the greatest of all conjectural subjects was the emotional content of music. It is to this new generation of critics -- Lord Kames, James Beattie, Thomas Robertson, and Alexander Gerard -- that nineteenth-century romantics owe those sentimental conceptions of art which are examined in the present work.

The new temperament contrasted sharply with the boisterousness and irresponsibility of the Augustans. Consequently, the reaction against the "rational" opinions of the earlier Pope and his circle was widespread. This was especially so in later decades when music was at last recognized as the art of sound, governed by its own rules and assessable only by those who knew the rules. Such a critic was Dr. Charles Burney, the eminent musician who was esteemed as well by literary men for his learned comments on ancient authors and for his Present State of Music in France and Italy (1771) and its sequel, The Present State of Music in Germany, the Netherlands, and the United Provinces (1773). He had no patience with Addison, Swift, and Pope, those pretenders to "universal knowledge." Indeed a large part of the introduction to his great History of Music (the first volume

of which appeared in 1776) is devoted to the castigation of those Augustan "critics"

who discover, in what is within their competence, a vigour of mind, and elevation of genius, which inclines mankind to regard them as being of a superior order, whenever they hope by the power of thinking to supply the place of knowledge discover an imbecility, which degrades them into common characters. ⁵⁴

Similar statements appear in the work of Sir John Hawkins, the musicologist whose five-volume History of Music also appeared in 1776. Like Burney, he was an intimate of the great men of his day (his biography of Samuel Johnson antedated Boswell's by four years) though he was reputed to possess neither the conviviality nor the generosity of his rival. ⁵⁵ Again, like Burney he was impatient with the self-styled "omniscience" of the Wits and was anxious to release musical criticism from the bonds of Augustanism.

The common goal of the two historians was achieved in 1789, the year in which the fourth and final volume of Burney's History was printed. On the threshold of the nineteenth century, they bequeathed to their romantic successors a critical formula shorn of those irrelevant considerations which had inhibited progress for more than one hundred and thirty years: the relation

of the ars poetica, the doctrine of imitation, morality, and the ancient-modern controversy to music.

Happily, the historians' task was lightened during the last decades of the eighteenth century. There remained few critics like Swift who announced with one breath that they "knew music no more than an ass" and with the next pontificated on musical matters.^{56.} Dr. Johnson admitted his ignorance of music (though doubtless he was merely teasing Mrs. Thrale's friend whom he asked, "And pray, Sir, who is Bach? is he a piper?") but he wisely left musical criticism in the expert hands of Charles Burney and that "most unclubbable man," Sir John Hawkins.^{57.}

Notes to Chapter I:

1. Anthony Hamilton, Memoirs of Count Grammont, edited by Sir Walter Scott, London, Chatto and Windus, 1876, p. 155.
2. Pepys, Diary, 24th July 1663.
3. John Locke, Some Thoughts Concerning Education (Section 185), London, A. and J. Churchill, 1693, pp. 235-37.
4. Thomas Salmon, An Essay to the Advancement of Musick, London, J. Maceock, 1672, p.9.
5. Pepys, Diary, 2nd September 1666.
6. John Gay, Trivia; or, the Art of Walking the Streets of London, London, B. Lintott, 1716, p. 401.
7. George Etherege, The Man of Mode, Act V, scene ii.
8. George Fox, Journal, edited by John L. Nickalls, Cambridge, University Press, 1952, p. 38.
9. Ibid., p. 35.
10. Robert Barclay, An Apology for the True Christian Divinity, London, n. p., 1678, p. 289.
11. Evelyn, Diary, 21st December 1662.
12. Pepys, Diary, 6th March 1660.
13. See Chapter IV, p. 272-3.
14. Roger North, The Musically Grammarian, edited by Hilda Andrews, London, Humphrey Milford, 1925, p. 31.
15. Edward Ward, A Compleat and Humorous Account of all the Remarkable Clubs and Societies in the Cityes of London and Westminster, London, Joseph Collier, 1745, pp. 300, 302.

16. North, op. cit., p. 32.
17. Edward J. Dent, Foundations of English Opera, Cambridge, University Press, 1928, pp. 127.
18. Sir William D'Avenant, preface to "The Siege of Rhodes," Dramatic Works, Edinburgh, William Paterson, 1873, III.
19. D'Avenant, "The Play-house to be let," Works, II, p. 23.
20. John Dryden, "Of Heroic Plays," Works, edited by Sir Walter Scott, revised by George Saintsbury, Edinburgh, William Paterson, 1883, IV, p. 19.
21. George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, The Rehearsal, edited by Montague Summers, Stratford-on-Avon, Shakespeare Head Press, 1914, Act III, scene 1.
22. Dryden, "Of Heroic Plays," p. 23.
23. North, op. cit., p. 34.
24. Sybil Rosenfeld, "The Restoration Stage in Newspapers and Journals, 1660-1700," Modern Language Review, XXX, October, 1935, p. 454.
25. Dent, op. cit., p. 3.
26. Manfred F. Bukhofzer, Music in the Baroque Era, London, J. M. Dent, 1948, p. 187.
27. Paul Henri Lang, Music in Western Civilization, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, p. 412.
28. North, op. cit., p. 30.
29. Dryden, "Prologue Spoken at the Opening of the New House" [the King's Theatre,] Works, X, p. 320.
30. Thomas Shadwell, preface to "Psyche," Works, edited by Montague Summers, London, The Fortune Press, 1927, II.
31. Dryden, preface to "Albion and Albanus," Works, VII, pp. 228-29, 232.

32. John Dennis, Critical Works, edited by Edward Niles Hooker, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1939, I, p. 138.
33. Colley Cibber, An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber, Comedian, London, John Watts, 1740, p. 226.
34. Thomas D'Urfey's Wit and Mirth includes an obscene song which plays upon the sexual incapacities of Cavaliere Nicolini: "CAPONIDES; or Lyrical Remarks made on the famous Signior Nico---- Grimaldi," (Wit and Mirth; or, Pills to Purge Melancholy, London, J. Tonson, 1719-1720, reprinted in facsimile 1872, II, pp. 1-3). The cleverest of such poems is Nicholas Rowe's double-entendre verse: "On Nicolini's and Valentini's first coming to the House in the Haymarket," Works of the English Poets, edited by Samuel Johnson and Alexander Chalmers, London, 1810, IX, p. 469.
35. Charles Burney, A General History of Music, London, T. Beckett, 1776-1789, II, p. 654.
36. Cibber, op. cit., p. 185.
37. Ibid., p. 183.
38. John Dennis, "Essay on Operas," Critical Works, II, p. 387.
39. Ibid., p. 382.
40. George Granville, Lord Lansdowne, preface to "The British Enchanters," Works, London, J. Tonson, 1732, I, p. 195-203.
41. Spectator for 21st March 1711. Richard Estcourt's parody of Italian operas, Prunella (London, Bernard Lintott, 1708), which he incorporated as an interlude in a revival of The Rehearsal, repeated this ridicule of silly translations. Metius, in Camilla, II, xii, had sung:

Love leads to Battel
Who dares oppose him?
The Rebel Squadrons his Presence fly;
See how our Heroe
Drives all before him,
Arm'd with Light'ning shot from her Eye.

Estecourt gives the song to Fico in Act IV of Prunella:

Bring me the Bottle;
Who dares oppose him?
The Spleen and the Vapours
Before him fly.

See how my Colour
Mends all before ye,
And for a Pale,
A Red does supply.

42. L'Abbé Ragueneau, A Comparison between the French and Italian Musick and Opera's, London, William Lewis, 1709, p. 69.
43. Arsinoe; Queen of Cyprus, London, J. Tonson, 1705, preface.
44. Peter Anthony Motteux, Love's Triumph, London, Jacob Tonson, 1708, dedication.
45. Almahide, London, J. Tonson, 1710, "To The Reader."
46. Spectator, for 21st March 1711.
47. Despite the critical antipathy towards foreign-language productions, the scene in Hydaspes in which Nicolini subdues the ferocious lion became one of the most celebrated moments in English theatrical history. See Spectators for 15th, 16th, 26th March 1711, and for 29th February 1712. See also the parodies of Mrs. Aubert (Harlequin-Hydaspes; or, The Greshamite, London, T. Roberts, 1719) and Thomas D'Urfey (The Two Queens of Brentford; or, Bayes no Poetaster, London, William Chetwood, 1721).

48. Leo Smith, The Music of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, London, J. Dent, 1931, passim.
49. William Coxe, Anecdotes of George Frederick Handel, London, J. Bulmer, 1799, p. 40.
50. Charles Avison, An Essay on Musical Expression, London, C. Davis, 1752, p.1.
51. Not only do modern musicologists recognize it as such (Percy A. Scholes, "Criticism of Music (4)", The Oxford Companion to Music, 7th edition, London, Oxford University Press, 1947, pp. 238-9); in 1789, Burney cited Avison as the "first" critic (op. cit., IV, "Essay on Musical Criticism.")
52. Horace Walpole, Letters, edited by Mrs. Paget Toynbee, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1903-1905, IV, pp. 134-5; William Cowper, "Table Talk," Poetical Works, 4th edition, edited by H. S. Milford, London, Oxford, University Press, 1934, p. 9.
53. Tobias Smollett, The Expedition of Humphry Clinker, London, W. Johnson, 1771, III, p. 10.
54. Burney, op. cit., I, xv-xvi.
55. Frances d'Arblay, The Early Diary, edited by Annie Raine Ellis, London, 1889, I, p. 65.
56. See Chapter IV, p. 262.
57. Frances d'Arblay, Memoirs of Dr. Burney, London, Edward Moxon, 1832, II, p. 78; and the same writer's Early Diary, II, p. 153.

Chapter II.

The Sound-Sense Controversy

1. 1660-1700. The Englishman's antipathy towards florid music; the effects of the new musical style on the Restoration dramatist; the operatic experiments of D'Avenant, Shadwell, and Dryden; the theatrical depression of the 1690's; the playwrights' strategem for preserving "sense" in song.

The recurrent opinions on the structure of Restoration opera have been examined in some detail in the first chapter. But there is another, and more pregnant theme characteristic of operatic prefaces in the seventeenth century: the librettist's invariable comments on the inferiority of music to poetry. It reflects more than a casual ill-humour on the part of the writer, for since antiquity, the lyric poet had combated the application of sense-destroying musical embellishment. In a species of entertainment where poetry and music were intimately related, the seventeenth-century poet desired more than ever to maintain the supremacy of his art.

Historians of aesthetics identify the situation more profoundly as an excrescence of the revolution in artistic principles of sixteenth and seventeenth-century

Europe. Rather than appearing as an unheralded prodigy, the opera initiated by the sixteenth-century Italians was simply the manifestation of an artistic impulse which was fostered on the continent in the late Renaissance.¹ The attempts of poets and musicians to create a musical drama in which the two arts were ideally balanced were expressions of a baroque principle by which the effect of the whole instead of the parts was stressed. A similar tendency may be seen in the masque-form of early seventeenth-century England, but in the English presentations the continental ideal of absolute artistic parity was never achieved. Here, the arts employed were never in harmonious balance. Spectacular machinery detracted from the poetic component, and music was habitually subordinated to the poetry.² The English tradition of "sense" before "sound" is exemplified by John Milton's encomium of "tuneful" Henry Lawes who wrote the music for Comus in 1634. He praises him for dutifully restraining musical elaboration which would destroy poetic metre and meaning:

To after age thou shalt be writ the man,
That with smooth aire couldst humor best our tongue.
Thou honour'st Verse....³

With the conception of the poet as the master-artist, it is clear that England could not at that time develop an

art-form analogous to the continental opera.

A change did not occur until the Restoration. During the reign of Charles II, when French and Italian musical styles began to influence English composers for the stage, the "natural" superiority of the poet was encroached upon. The new music gradually upset the accepted gradation of the arts which granted music only the rôle of accessory. Its vigorous character made it impossible for it to submit to literary dictation, and the English dramatic poet shortly began to surrender his sovereignty in music-dramatic productions to the composer. Thus, by the end of the seventeenth century, we find Dryden eulogizing Henry Purcell in much the same manner as Milton had praised Lawes, though the Poet Laureate openly admits a concession which would have scandalized the older poet. In the preface to King Arthur (1691) Dryden states, "I have been obliged to cramp my verse." That is, he has been compelled to write with an irregular cadence and verse-form in order to facilitate the musician's expression.

Mr. Sherard Vines notes a less perceptible baroque principle which operatic projectors of the seventeenth century unwittingly advanced. The author declares that such works as Dryden's Albion and Albanus are artistic productions which express an unconscious desire for the

"outward and visible", an aesthetic which "appears in a more skeptic, scientific, and even materialistic epoch, when attention is paid to a Bacon or Hobbes."⁴ Complicated and surprising machinery partly satisfied this desire for tangibility, but it has been suggested by another modern writer that European music of the seventeenth century could, by itself, supply the requisite "visibility" to stage production. In that music, "the pictorial quality of baroque art is notably present":

The increasing tendency to underline important words in the text by suggestive melodic or harmonic passages, the play of light and shadow, the expressive utilization of dissonance and chromaticism, the echo effects of the double choir are all pictorial.....⁵

The bulk of such abstruse analyses of artistic trends are, of course, controversial. In The Parallelism between Literature and the Arts, Mr. Rene Wellek warns the literary student against the dangerously deceptive analogies between literary and artistic movements which are made by twentieth-century writers of what he terms the Geistesgeschichte.⁶ In connexion with the operative criticisms in seventeenth and eighteenth-century England, however, the ground is fairly safe. Though the writers were unacquainted with vague "baroque" elements in art, they were aware of a disturbing force. Their straight-

forward criticisms have merely been translated into the highfalutin terminology of the moderns. Dryden knew that music forced poetry into a subsidiary position in opera. Pepys complained about songs in which the words were obscured by musical embroidery, and he thrilled to the musically "pictorial" echoes in The Tempest.⁷ Many remembered the imitative shivering in Purcell's score for the "Frost Scene" in Dryden's King Arthur for years after its first performance.

But even then, although musical imagery amused the poets they did not yet approve of music as a completely equal sister-art. It must serve poetry, not obstruct it. Consequently, the most persistent musical controversy which raged in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was that in which the advocates of poetic "sense" ranged themselves against those who extolled musical "sound." The circumstances surrounding the production of Sir William D'Avenant's First Dayes Entertainment in 1656 illustrate concisely the discord which English opera generated at its very inception. Diogenes, the champion of conservative stage presentation (and ostensibly D'Avenant's mouthpiece in the play), decrees that "Poetry is the subtle engine by which the wonderful body of the

opera must move."⁸ Such a procedure is praiseworthy from the dramatist's point of view, but a few years later, one of D'Avenant's musicians pooh-poohed the notion that the author was the directing genius of The Entertainment and The Siege of Rhodes. Samuel Pepys overheard the arrogant Captain Cooke say "that he was fain to direct Sir, W. Davenant in the breaking of his verses into such and such lengths, according as would be fit for music," adding that he used to "swear at" and "command" the dramatist when he found "fault with this or that note."⁹

There seems to have been no doubt in Shadwell's mind that the poet reigned supreme. He was willing to praise his associates, Locke, Draghi, and Saint-Andrée, but he was equally anxious to minimize the reciprocal effect that the musicians had upon him. "In all the words which are sung," he states, "I did not so much take care of the Wit or Fancy of 'em, as the making of 'em proper for Musick." Restrictions on the poetry are of my own choice, Shadwell insists, for "I chalk'd out the way to the Composer."¹⁰

Playwrights who followed Shadwell persisted in announcing their operas as models of literary correctness.

Unhappily, it was the lowly music that usually stole the show. Consequently, in the final quarter of the seventeenth century there are many assertions of dramatists' "rights" as well as attacks on the irrational English opera. At bottom, the contention was merely an expression of a fundamental antagonism existing between two irreconcilable aesthetic codes. Neoclassical criticism, armed with antique ratio, attempted to drive out the alien baroque artistic tenet of sensus.

In the years following Shadwell's Psyche (1673), the classicists continued advising the playwright to allow no interference from the musician. Saint-Evremond ruled that one must "leave to the Poet the chief authority for the direction of the piece: The Musick must be made for the Verses, far rather than the Verses for the Musick. The Musician is to follow the Poets orders." // Dramatists, though, knew that it was far easier to demand than to carry out such a procedure. Dryden, for example, realized that since melody was essential to opera, the poet was forced at times to depart from regular ^{metrical} patterns and to avoid complicated sentiment. The "songish part must abound in the softness and variety of numbers; its principle intention being to please hearing rather than to gratify the understanding." He admits being "a slave

to the composition" in the melodic sections, though ordinarily it is the poet's responsibility to invent, and "the musician's to humour that invention."^{12.}

Few critics, nevertheless, were interested in Dryden's theories. The play was the thing, and Albion had too many faults. The "sounds" of Grabut, the musician, did not compensate for the poet's uneven verses, and the "vain show" of Thomas Betterton's machines made the neoclassicists wince. One critic dubbed Albion "Bayes raree-show," and another dismissed it as pretentious claptrap reminiscent of the semi-operatic heroic tragedies in the previous decade:

Bayes, thou wouldst have thy skill thought universal,
Tho' thy dull ear be to music untrue;
Then whilst we strive to confute the Rehearsal
Prithee learn thrashing of Monsieur Grabu.^{13.}

None the less, in spite of critical objections to poetical nonsense, the popularity of opera increased. More ominous was the fact that librettists now declared that in opera the art of poetry "ought to be subservient" to that of music. Worse, the poet audaciously justified his statement in the name of "Reason!"^{14.}

In the last decade of the seventeenth century, a theatrical depression intensified the sound-sense controversy. Cibber informs us that at this time "Plays were of course

neglected, Actors held cheap, and slightly dress'd, while Singers and Dancers were better paid, and embroider'd."^{15.} When Betterton and his friends withdrew from the patentees at Drury Lane to form their own company at Lincoln's Inn Fields in 1695, the resultant competition between the two acting troupes provoked a different kind of criticism from that which neoclassicists had voiced. In order to draw the crowds away from the rival theatre, the other company offered spectacle and music as well as conventional drama. An advertisement in the Post-Boy illustrates the tactics employed for tempting jaded audiences:

Great preparations are making for a new OPERA ... of which there is great Expectation, the Scenes being several new Sets and of a model different from all that have been used in any Theatre ... being twice as high as any of their former scenes. And the whole Decoration of the Stage not only infinitely beyond all the Opera's ever yet performed in England, but also ... much exceeding all that has been seen on any of the foreign Stages.^{16.}

The allurements of such novelties was, of course, effective.

To vie with the magnificence of decorations and machines, the opposing group engaged foreign dancers and singers. Newspaper notices again played upon the curiosity of spectators. Puffers let it be known through the Post Boy that the directors valued "the extraordinary Desert" of Clementine (a male soprano) so highly that they were willing to pay him the astounding salary of five hundred

pounds per year.¹⁷ No one could resist patronizing the Theatre Royal after reading the advance account.

Because of the prodigious expenses involved in the frequent stagings of exotic entertainments, the playwrights had a more practical reason than the theorizing critics had for condemning vehicles of "Sound." Bankruptcy faced the acting companies, and a change in theatrical taste threatened the dramatic poet's livelihood. Scarcely a play appeared in this period which did not have a prologue or epilogue complaining of "Expensive Foreigners" and operatic nonsense. Joe Haynes's epilogue to Farquhar's Love and a Bottle presents a humorous picture of the succession of singers that the directors of the Theatre Royal engaged. His remark about Ramponi's virility is a fair sample of the brutality with which eighteenth-century satirists attacked the popular castrati.

What Arts, what Merit ha'n't we us'd to win ye?
First to divert ye with some new French Strowlers;
We brought ye Bona Sera's Barba Colar's [mocking the late
When the Male Throats no longer drew your Money, singers.]
We got ye an Bunuch's Pipe, Seignior Rampony.
That beardless Songster we cou'd ne'er make much on;
The Females found a damn'd Blot on his Scutcheon.
An Italian now we've got of mighty Fame,
Don Segismundo Fideli — There's Musick in his Name,
His voice is like the Musick of the Spheres,
It shou'd be Heavenly for the Price it bears. [20 l. a time.]

In the epilogue to Feign'd Friendship, produced at the other theatre, the dramatist upbraids the audience

for deserting Lincoln's Inn Fields for these male sopranos at the Theatre Royal. Henry Smith's Princess of Parma was presented at Lincoln's Inn Fields in the same year (1699), and Peter Motteux's epilogue gives us an example of the expenses incurred by that theatre. The speaker tells of a dream in which

Stage Wars were ceas'd, both Houses shrunk to One,
And all Expensive Foreigners were gone.

To "Bribe" the audience, "ten times Thirty Pounds" had been paid to dancers alone, but in his dream he imagined that

Five Hundred Guineas were not given this Season,
To please your Wars and Mortifie our Reason.
Nor were the Fair so fond of Musick grown,
To be diverted with the Voice alone.

So, by the end of the seventeenth century, professional dramatists had joined forces with neoclassical purists in censuring the emptiness of musical entertainments. The fact that English drama was undergoing a transition added point to the contention. It was an unsettled period in the theatre. There was an ebb-tide of the Restoration creativeness, and rather than admit artistic sterility, the dramatist pointed accusingly at real or imagined enemies in the theatre. The future looked indeed unpromising. Musical extravaganzas had nearly ruined theatre-managers, and the public appeared to have rejected

didactic drama for Italian singers and the diluted Shakespeare of Shadwell's operas. In the epilogue of his Jew of Venice (1701), George Granville mourned the passing of a rational age:

Plain Beauties pleas'd your Sires an Age ago,
Without the Varnish and the Dawb of Show.
At vast Expence we labour to our Ruin,
And court your Favour with our own Undoing.
A War of Profit mitigates the Evil,
But to be tax'd and beaten, is the Devil.
How was the Scene forlorn, and how despis'd,
When Timon, without Musick, moralliz'd!
Shakespear's Sublime in vain entic'd the Throng,
Without the Charm of Purcell's Syren Song.

Only five years after The Jew of Venice was performed, Italian opera became the vogue in London. So completely devoid of sense were these new musical presentations that the poets of Queen Anne's reign urged the restoration of these same operas that Granville decried. If operatic nonsense was to be tolerated on the stage, the despairing poets cried, let it at least be English nonsense.

However much opera dominated seventeenth-century criticism, it was not the only musical form discussed by the sound-sense controversialists. Apart from creating critical disapproval by subordinating operatic texts, the new music tended to impair the intelligibility of non-operatic songs written by the later seventeenth-century poets. Milton, Herrick, Carew, Suckling, Lovelace, and

Waller had entrusted their poems to Henry Lawes for musical setting, confident that his accompaniment would enhance rather than obscure the meaning. A change was observable as early as 1667, at which time Pepys noted with reprehension the tendency of Restoration composers to exploit musical innovation at the expense of the words.^{18.} This rivalry between music and poetry had two effects. First, able lyrists withdrew from the musical scene in which Grub Street pandered to the musician's inventions. Clarinda, in Thomas Shadwell's Virtuoso (IV,ii) attests to the fact that the London poetaster was more at liberty than ever to submit doggerel for composers to set when she remarks, "How a good Tune and tinckling Rhime atones for Nonsense." One may examine the song-books of this period to corroborate her sally; the standards of lyric poetry gradually deteriorated as the popularity of singable tunes increased. Secondly, more persevering poets of the legitimate stage fought the domination of composers. Liberally interspersed songs were a feature of Restoration comedy and tragedy, and the vanity of the poet-dramatist prompted him to introduce an artifice with which he hoped to outwit the musician's obscuring of words. An example of the feared musical elaboration is found in the

first act of Dido and Aeneas (c. 1689) where Henry Purcell has extended Naham Tate's octosyllabic couplet,

Pursue they Conquest, Love -- her Eyes
Confess the Flame her Tongue Denyes

into the da capo air,

Pursue thy Conquest, Love,
Pursue thy Conquest, Love,
Pursue, pursue,
Pursue thy Conquest,
Pursue thy Conquest, Love,
Pursue thy Conquest, Love,
Pursue thy Conquest, Love,
Pursue, pursue,
Pursue thy Conquest,
Pursue thy Conquest, Love.

Her Eyes confess the Flame,
Her Eyes confess the Flame her Tongue Denyes.
Her Eyes confess the Flame
Her Eyes confess the Flame her Tongue Denyes.

Pursue thy Conquest, Love,
Pursue thy Conquest, Love,
Pursue, pursue,
Pursue thy Conquest,
Pursue thy Conquest, Love,
Pursue thy Conquest, Love.

Notwithstanding Purcell's and his fellow-musicians' immortalizing many a commonplace couplet, the playwright wanted his audience to judge his songs for their literary merit. Mr. W. J. Lawrence suggests that such a desire led to the theatrical convention by which a character reads his song before singing it. The author refers to Field's Amends for Ladies, IV, i, (c. 1610), Brome's Novella, III, i (1632), Etherege's Man of Mode, IV, i (1676),

and Cibber's Refusal, IV (1721).¹⁹ The present writer has found the same device in Crowne's Sir Courtly Nice, V, 11 (1685), Southerne's Maid's Last Prayer, III, 11 (1692), and Steele's Tender Husband, III, 1 (1705). We do not know the extent of the public's gratitude for this stratagem, but judging from the quality of the jealously presented poems, the dramatist could well have refrained from exhibiting his poetic "sense" to the spectator.

Such, then, was the state of English musical criticism just before the turn of the century. Already, opera dominated the discussions. It failed to conform to conventional drama and thereby distressed the classicists. Its popularity provoked the envy of some playwrights and stimulated others to experimentation. The new music was equally troublesome. In operatic productions, the composer tended to overshadow the resentful librettist and assume the position of dictator. In non-dramatic song, the complaints of the poet-critic were similar. The complexities of instrumental accompaniment rendered the words unintelligible. Moreover, it forced the lyricist to employ irregular and uncongenial rhythms.

But perhaps the most significant of all developments in musical criticism was the conception of "music" itself.

Music for instruments was a topic alien to commentators. We look in vain for contemporary reviews of, say, Purcell's Sonata in E Minor, for the critic dismissed purely instrumental, absolute music as "empty sound," undeserving of attention. To seventeenth-century rationalists, sensible song, alone, was music. Even in the St. Cecilia Day odes where the glories of all music were supposedly extolled, the poets refused to define that art in terms of instrumental harmony. In the Platonic tradition (for who, among the English classicists, would confute Plato's dismissal of instrumental music as "an unmeaning thing"?) the notion is explicit in each of the annual odes offered between 1683 and 1703 that music is irrational when divorced from words.^{20.}

- ii. 1700-1740. The literary critics' application of dramatic rules to Italian opera; the entering of satirists, playwrights, and actors into the Sound-Sense Controversy; the rise and fall of Italian opera on the English stage.

Of the few literary discussions of non-theatrical music during this forty-year period, John Hughes's preface to his Six Cantatas (c. 1706) is the most extensive. His purpose in writing these poems for music is to champion the Italian cantata-form (composed of alternate passages of "recitative" and "aria") as a legitimate genre of English poetry. In them he substitutes the English language for the Italian but explains that "if Reason may be admitted to have any Share in these Entertainments," poets who adopt this form must take special care in preserving verbal sense. Perhaps more sympathetic to musical expression than any other poet of the time, Hughes declines to advocate the complete subordination of music in the setting of lyric poetry. Instead, he urges the craftsmen of these "two Sister Arts" to acquaint themselves with each other's resources and limitations. Song is a blending of music and poetry, and though undistorted sense is still the ideal, Hughes holds the poet as well as the musician responsible for deficiencies of sense in vocal music.²¹ In this, and in the recognition of music as a "sister-art," Hughes' essay is significant as a step towards a much desired artistic enlightenment. Critical enlightenment was another matter. An

understanding of musical techniques and objectives was not yet a prerequisite of judgement. Sense was the criterion of value according to the critics, and seventeenth-century prejudices were still rampant.

It has already been stated that the sound-sense criticism of this period is related chiefly to the playhouse, where "show-business" and serious drama were at odds. The disposition of musical judgements in the early 1700's, before Italian opera appeared, is characterized in Thomas Baker's Tunbridge Walks (Drury Lane, 1703):

And pray, what are your Town Diversions? -- to hear a parcel of Italian Eunuchs, like so many Cats, squall out something you don't understand -- The Song of My Lady's Birth-Day, by an honest Farmer, and a merry Jig by a Country-Wench that has Humour in her Buttocks, is worth Forty on't.^{22.}

The Restoration critics, preoccupied with the improprieties of "un-English" machines, gawdy decorations, and sense-destroying music here give way to the Augustans and their more practical judgements of truly foreign theatricals. The new foreign-language songs were genuinely nonsensical and presented a real threat to the Englishman's taste for the indigenous and unsophisticated songs of the "honest Farmer" and the "Country-Wench."

During the first years of the new century, many a

true-blue Englishman attributed the vicissitudes of theatrical taste to a natural curiosity in novelty. Heroic tragedy and the completely sung English operas of D'Avenant had held the stage only as long as the public fancied them. The subsequent vogue of sumptuous musical plays and the low-comedy of French actors had been as ephemeral as that of the earlier, and more worthy, entertainments. Later, continental singers and rope-dancers offered such popular diversion that by the beginning of the eighteenth century the English theatre seemed to be little more than a repository of empty spectacle and cheap sensationalism. But even then, some reflective critics had faith in the native good sense of their countrymen. At the end of this song-and-dance procession, drama of sense and wit — they hoped — would again emerge. Thus Jonathan Swift declined to enter a concerted campaign against opera because he believed that the "capricious" English public would soon revolt against such fripperies of their own accord.²³ Likewise, Martin Bladen, in his epilogue to Solon (1705), comments optimistically on the decline of taste since the heyday of Wycherley and Etherege. As these playwrights had fallen out of favour with the advent of the "taking Grin, and

Arch Grimace" of the French harlequinade, writes Bladen, so this buffoonery was eclipsed by the vogue of the singer, De Ruel, and the dancers, L'Abbé and Subligny. So regular were the changes in theatrical fashions, that

L'Espina's admir'd a while, and by degrees,
Ee'n hideous Bawling Toft's wild Notes will please.

It seemed fairly predictable to Bladen that plays of "good Sence" would again prevail.

However, the Italianate Arsinoe, with words "mean in several Places," rose instead, and the greatest of all theatrical fads began. The criticism of these translated operas which were completely sung was not very different from that of the dramatic operas in the preceding century. The professional playwrights still complained that they were compelled to pepper their plays with song and dance if they are to survive, for without such musical embellishments,

Scarce HAMLET clears the Charges of the Night.²⁴

By far the wittiest of these prologues is Addison's written for Edmund Smith's Phaedra shortly after bilingual production reduced opera to a virtually meaningless babble. Pleading for his friend's play, he writes,

Long has a Race of Heroes fill'd the Stage,
That rant by Note, and through the Gamut rage;
In Songs and Airs express their martial Fire,

Combate [sic] in Trills, and in a Feuge expire;
While lull'd by Sound, and undisturb'd by Wit,
Calm and Serene you indolently sit;
And from the full Fatigue of Thinking free,
Hear the facetious Fiddles Repartee:
Our Home-spun Authors must forsake the Field,
And Shakespear to the soft Scarlatt yield.

To your new Taste the Poet of this Day,
Was by a Friend advis'd to form his Play;
Had Valentini, musically coy,
Shun'd Phaedra's Arms, and scorn'd the proffer'd Joy,
It had not mov'd your Wonder to have seen
An Eunuch fly from an enamour'd Queen:
How would it please, should she in English Speak,
And could Hippolitus reply in Greek?
But he, a Stranger to your Modish Way,
By your old Rules must stand or fall to Day,
And hopes you will your Foreign Taste command,
To bear, for once, with what you understand.

The librettists answered such jibes with lengthy, apologetic prefaces. They replied to the severity of the musically ignorant critics by reminding them of operatic subtleties. And in answer to charged of being a slave to the musician's whims, the librettists printed elaborate denials of subservience. As a counter-blast to those critics who declared that the preference for opera was only an affectation, the lyric dramatist wrote sarcastically that "People of the best Sense, as well as the rest of Mankind, are Admirers of the Harmony of Sound, as well as that of Sense."²⁵

Some accusations, however, could not be successfully invalidated. The greater part of operatic poetry was wretched, recitative could never be made congenial to

British taste, and between 1707 and 1710, when bi-lingual operas were the rage of London, no amount of apology could extenuate the preposterousness of these productions.

With the same devotion to classical "correctness" that prompted Dryden to write Albion and Albanus in 1685, Granville and Addison produced operas which employed the desiderata of unity, didactic sentiment, faultless decorum — and Sense. Despite their intellectual superiority, though, the authors revealed a hesitancy in risking the good will of so influential an audience as that composed of opera-enthusiasts. Granville, for instance, thought it advisable to introduce his British Enchanters with a cautiously flippant prologue which ends,

If here and there some evil-fated Line
Should chance thro' Inadvertancy to shine,
Forgive him, Beaux, he means you no Offence, }
But begs you for the love of Song and Dance, }
To pardon all the Poetry and Sense.

All the same, Granville had a special fondness for this play. Years later, after "classical" operas had been superseded by Handel's productions and the rowdy ballad-operas, he defended his principles in a more serious preface. In 1732, he was still convinced that in an opera, "the Seasoning must be the Sense; unless there is wherewithall to please the Understanding, the Eye and Ear will soon grow tired." He merely repeats the conviction

that years before had moved him to prescribe a reasonable diet for a public too long accustomed to exotic entertainments: "An English Stomach requires something solid and substantial, and will rise hungry from a Regale of nothing but Sweetmeats."^{26.} Be that as it may, The British Enchanters failed to convert the giddy beaux.

In 1707, Addison wrote Rosamond in a much-publicized attempt to set the musical drama free from foreign domination. He was not lacking in support of his aims, (he was, after all, Under-Secretary of State!) and by the time Rosamond appeared, "the Town had been full for a year together" of its promised glories.^{27.} Thomas Tickell rejoiced in its uncompromising verse:

No Charms are wanting to thy artful Song,
Soft as Corelli, but as Virgil strong,
From words so sweet new grace the notes receive,
And Musick borrows helps, she us'd to give.
... in such charms the noble thoughts abound,
That needless seem the sweets of easie sound.^{28.}

But "noble thoughts" and Virgillian strength were not the fare of those who were transported with the feather-weight Arsinoe and The Temple of Love. Furthermore, the very music that Addison thought he had "subordinated" proved to be so lamentably composed that the critics forgot the text and damned Rosamond as "a confus'd Chace of Musick, where there is ev'ry thing and nothing."^{29.} Experiments in

rationalistic opera were laid aside for the time being. The public was interested in the incomprehensible strains of Valentini and the Baroness, and the rule-of-thumb pastiches of Motteux and Swiney.

Between the productions of The British Enchanters and Roamond, John Dennis's Essay on the Operas after the Italian Manner appeared. Dennis suggests that a "reasoned" reformation of opera is destined to abortiveness; opera by its very nature is irrational and counter to classical severity. He had already rejected the opera libretto as a literary genre, and to him it seemed lack of insight on the part of the dramatist to try to make a rational entertainment out of operatic gewgaws. An "improving" drama "must be writ with Force"; but an opera, "if 'tis writ with Force, 'tis incompatible with Musick." If a libretto, presuming to be didactic, is not forcefully composed, it is hardly likely that the sentiments will "make Impression enough to work any Change in the Souls of an Audience."³⁰ The dilemma should be apparent to playwrights from the start.

Compromise with "Gothick" elements in the drama was not Dennis's policy. His aim was to nip the operatic bud completely. Instruction through delight was still the

watchword of formal criticism. Drama that is sung throughout, rendering nine-tenths of the words unintelligible, was inherently incapable of pointing a moral. Consequently, the neoclassicist unflinchingly pressed his charge that though opera was sensuously pleasing, the absence of that solitary raison d'être of true drama, moral elevation, transformed musical drama into an ethical monster. Music was an "inferior or illiberal Art," hence it was dangerous to accord it a parity with utilitarian drama. The verdict of Reason was that music may only "be made profitable as well as delightful if it is subordinate to some nobler Art, and subservient to Reason."³¹ In short, opera had been weighed in the neoclassical balance and found wanting.

Thus far, Dennis simply reiterates the hue and cry which had been raised by seventeenth-century purists. Where he differs from earlier critics, however, is in his unique application of Platonic censorship and Hobbesian psychology. Soon after England entered the War of the Spanish Succession in 1702, Dennis availed himself of the occasion to cry up native English drama as a bolsterer of chauvinistic spirit. Patriotic sentiments, he hoped, would draw the public from Italian singers and dancers and the abominable claptrap of translated operas. He tried

to "advance the British Muse" with his play, Gibraltar (1705), and though the audience would have none of it, Dennis was not disheartened. He next resorted to the promulgation of Plato's strictures which the musical critics of the seventeenth century had invested with new significance. What better time than this to remind the people of the philosopher's attacks on enervating music? Dennis dexterously transferred the musical judgements in the Republic to war-time opera: when music "presumes" to

set up for itself, and to grow independent, as it does in our late Operas, it becomes a mere sensual Delight, utterly incapable, of informing the Understanding, or reforming the Will; and for that Reason utterly unfit to be made a Publick Diversion; and then the more charming it grows, it becomes the more pernicious. Since when it is once habitual, it must so far debauch the Minds of Men, as to make them incapable of those reasonable Diversions, which have got the just possession of the Stage.^{32.}

Such carping was not unassailed by the besieged librettist. Motteux's admission that he has purposely subordinated the "Words," "Thought," and "Design" of Thomyris to the music, is obviously a puckish flouting of the critic's demands.^{33.}

The really new thesis in "sensible" criticism of music is announced by Dennis's assertion that "'Tis undeniable, that in whatever Countries Operas have been establish'd after the Manner of Italy, they have driven out Poetry from among that People."^{34.} Adopting the egoistic philosophy of Thomas Hobbes, the critic demonstrates the

validity of his premise. An innate "Love of Glory," he explains, is the ruling passion which stimulates the poet to write great epic and tragic verse — a conception, incidentally, somewhat at variance with currently held notions of poetic "inspiration" and the desire to emulate the ancients. The decline in dramatic quality, already noticeable on the English stage, he continues, is the result of the poets' slighted egos. When operatic tinsel meets with greater applause than tragic grandeur it follows that the poets' "Pride is immediately mortify'd, and their Fire extinguish'd." The debilitating effects of opera on literary creativeness is as yet only slight; the real danger is that the public's taste for musical drama may become permanent. Echoing Hobbes, Dennis declares that "Man naturally pursues Pleasure, and flies from Pain." A man, he continues, is moved to relinquish his pleasurable pursuits only when his "Interests" and "Reputation" require it. When such "Motives" are lacking, as they are in the opera-devotee, no amount of argument will persuade him to abandon his unprofitable recreation. A benevolent government, therefore, recognizing the perniciousness of operas, will ban them before the public becomes accustomed to their pleasing, but irrational

diversions.^{35.}

How ineffaceable was this idée fixe of Dennis that opera should be stamped out! It was inevitable that some unfriendly librettist should cock a suspicious eye. Peter Motteux, who seems to have delighted in a deliberate noncompliance with Dennis's rules, thought the essay a bit vehement for supposedly disinterested criticism. In the preface of his opera, Love's Triumph, Motteux attributes the severity of this critic "with whom 'tis hard to be serious" to jealousy. Recalling Dennis's series of dramatic failures, Motteux brushes him aside as just another of those "Splenetic Brothers of the Quill" who "use Legerdemain, yet would suffer none but at their own Show."

Most of Dennis's fellow-critics, however, agreed with the opinions he expressed in his Essay. Yet there was something so irresistibly funny about his zeal that they preferred to satirize him rather than the abominable operas. For example, the twenty-second chapter of Pope's projected "Treatise in Folio" on this "Rinaldo Furioso" promised to recount how "the Critick fell into a Swoon at hearing an Opera, and what he said at his Recovery."^{36.} Perhaps Charles Gildon, of all the Augustans, remains as Dennis's only second in this kind of operatic criticism. The alliance was a weak one, though, for Gildon's Life of

Betterton presents no more than the by then shopworn observations on music's "subservience" to poetry, its exclusion from the "rational Diversions," and its corrupting "sensual Pleasures."³⁷

Dennis's Essay on Operas, then, even in its own day, was largely dismissed as the effusions of a fussy crank. Today, certainly, it survives as little more than a literary curio or as another instance of the sterile musical criticism which fell regularly from the Augustan press. In relation to this study, however, the Essay is significant. It illustrates once again the devious means by which the rationalist of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries criticized an art-form which was at once a drama and not a drama. Unwilling to accord the libretto the standing of a literary genre, and incapable of accepting opera as a vehicle for expressing the passions, the dramatic critic was compelled to abandon his Aristotelian measure and attack opera with "common sense," ethical concepts, and unrestrained vituperation.

No palliative for swooning Dennis was the presentation of Swiney's englished version of Pirro é Demetrio in the winter of 1708. For some reason or other Pyrrhus and Demetrius epitomized for the critics the preposterousness of bi-lingual operas. Jonathan Swift, who was in London

at the time, complained to Robert Hunter that the public was "nine times madder" about Swiney's melange than any previous opera. Just as absurd was the furore over "the new castrato from Italy," Nicolini.^{38.} Steele, contemptuous as Swift was of this "noble Entertainment," chose this production as the scene for his satire on John Dennis's passionate denunciation of operas. On April 18th, 1709, the following dispatch from Will's coffee-house (an establishment which Saint-Evremond, another opera-hater, had frequented) appeared in the Tatler:

... on Saturday Night last the Opera of Pyrrhus and Demetrius was performed with great Applause. This Intelligence is not very acceptable to us Friends of the Theatre; for the Stage being an Entertainment of the Reason and all our Faculties, this Way of being pleased with the Suspence of them for three Hours together, and being given up to the shallow satisfaction of the Eyes and Ears only, seems to arise rather from the Degeneracy of our Understanding, than an Improvement of our Diversions. That the Understanding has no Part in the Pleasure is evident, from what these Letters very positively assert, to wit, That a great Part of the Performance was done in Italian: And a great Critick fell into Fits in the Gallery, at seeing, not only Time and Place, but Languages and Nations confused in the most incorrigible Manner. His Spleen is so extremely moved on this Occasion, that he is going to publish a Treatise against Opera's....

Dennis printed his proposed "treatise," An Essay on Publick Spirit, in 1711.^{39.} And it is perhaps not irrelevant to state here that in this same year Dennis retaliated upon those coffee-house critics who had laughed at his

conviction that the immediate appeal of opera to the senses discouraged the subtler taste for poetry and drama. By that time, he writes, literary criticism itself was in danger. "A most notorious Instance of this Depravity of Genius and Taste" was Pope's Essay on Criticism. Here such "monstrous Judgments are pass'd," one must conclude that "when the Italian Opera drove Poetry from out this Island, Criticism thought it a very great Impertinence for her to stay long behind!"^{40.}

The next opera to add to the irritation was the anonymously composed Clotilda. One wit remarked of the inferior production that he thought "the Composer played a very prudent Part, when he endeavoured so industriously to have his Name conceal'd."^{41.} But more thoughtful writers were genuinely alarmed at the success of the bi-lingual operas. Illustrating the new concern are two contrasting letters of Swift, dated only a week apart. On March 15th, 1709, he joked with Ambrose Philips about the sputtering frenzy of John Dennis over Pyrrhus and Demetrius. On March 22d, after the success of Clotilda was ensured, Swift complained to Robert Hunter that these "uproars" called for concerted attack:

I design to set up a party among the wits to run them down by next winter, if true English caprice does not interpose to save us the labour.

By the following winter, bi-lingual opera was discarded, but not as a result of fickleness or literary censure. In January, 1710, Almahide started the vogue for foreign-language operas which was to plague the sense-critics for the next thirty years. Swift's preoccupation with politics in 1710 made the progress of these operas all the easier. His promised "party" of opera-opponents never materialized.

Just a year after the appearance of Almahide, Aaron Hill produced Handel's Italian opera, Rinaldo, at the Queen's Theatre. Ten days after the staging of this first of Handel's works to be seen in England, the best-known operatic criticisms in the English language began in the Spectator. There is no need here, however, to repeat all of Addison's and Steele's comments on the Italian opera. Though they surpassed others in wit, there was little originality in their methods. They simply depended upon those elements of "musical criticism" which had already been well-defined by 1711: (a) non-operatic music was disregarded, and, even when applied to opera, "music" was usually only an abstract term; (b) opera was primarily a dramatic form, hence subject to the rules of dramatic critics who decided that (c) the

lyric-drama was "irrational" and therefore it must be suppressed, that (d) opera threatened to kill the "correct" drama of the legitimate stage, and that (e) Italian opera ruined the taste for English poetry; (f) "sensible" literature was the highest form of artistic endeavour, and since meaningless music tended to subordinate the written word in opera, the musician must be distrusted, made subservient to the librettist, and required only to emphasize, not create single-handedly, dramatic effect. Nor did Addison's music-critic differ substantially from Dennis's footman. "Musick," he writes, "is not designed to please only Chromatick Ears, but all that are capable of distinguishing harsh from disagreeable Notes. A Man of an ordinary Ear is a Judge...."⁴²

Yet, despite Addison's lack of originality and his too-simple definition of the musical critic, he reveals an interesting dissatisfaction with the current standards of musical judgement. To judge every component of Italian opera but the music occasionally struck him as absurd. The Spectator, though, failed to provide its readers with an alternative method. Addison comments on the lack of criteria in the paper for 21 March 1711, and promises to give remedial suggestions:

At present, our Notions of Musick are so very uncertain that we do not know what it is we like; only in general,

we are transported with any thing that is not English: So it be of foreign Growth, let it be Italian, French, or High-Dutch, it is the same thing. In short, our English Musick is quite rooted out, and nothing yet planted in its stead.

When a Royal Palace is burnt to the Ground, every Man is at liberty to present his Plan for a new one; and thought be but indifferently put together, it may furnish several Hints that may be of Use to a good Architect. I shall take the same Liberty in a following Paper, of giving my Opinion upon the Subject of Musick....

Except for his defence of recitative and church-music, Addison never made good his promise.^{43.} On the contrary, he later denied that music was a sister-art of any magnitude, and placed it lowest on the scale of "representative" arts.^{44.} He thereafter resumed his infinitely more congenial task of satirizing the operatic libretto, singer, and production. That he ignored the enormous output of instrumental, or "absolute" music of contemporary composers, however, cannot be taken as a sign of personal prejudice or critical incompetence as Professor Saintsbury would have us believe.^{45.} Nor is it fair to single Addison out as being a uniquely virulent opponent of opera as Burney later did. He simply stated better than anyone else in his time the common grievances against what his fellow-critics called "music." Here, in his musical criticism, was indeed the "true Wit" of the Augustans.

But criticism in the form of essays was scarce during the first half of the century. The perennial attempts, such as Granville's, to reform the opera-libretto along "English" lines was also becoming rarer as Italian opera gained popularity. At this time, musical criticism was chiefly in the hands of the dramatic poets whose interest in Italian opera was of a more practical nature. Though like Addison they deplored its irrational character, they were much more concerned with opera as a menace to their livelihood. The protest, of course, was not a new element in dramatic criticism, but after 1711, playwrights voiced their disapproval more ardently than ever before. The sorcerer, Handel, now seemed to stand like a Colossus over the English stage. His opera, cried the dramatists, subverted all their attempts to discipline British minds with rational diversion.

The truth of the matter was that the Tragic and Comic Muses were languishing in England not merely because Italian opera vitiated the public's taste, but because they themselves lacked the vitality of the seventeenth century. It was a time in theatrical history, Dr. Johnson recalled, when "The Pow'r of Tragedy declin'd" as it was

Crush'd by Rules, and weaken'd as refin'd.

When "philosophy" and uncompromising virtue banished Nature

from the Augustan stage

From Bard to Bard, the frigid Caution crept,
Till Declamation roar'd, while Passion slept.^{46.}

Reason and the rules were ineffective substitutes for emotion and imagination. Elegant expression, noble sentiments, and impeccable craftsmanship did not compensate for the absence of freshness and fire in early eighteenth-century tragedy.

Opera, then, was a convenient scapegoat for playwrights blind to their own shortcomings. Consequently, the objective of the dramatists appears to have been as much to purge the English stage of Italian opera as to purge Drury-Lane spectators of potentially dangerous passions. Nevertheless, one by one the playwrights failed to rout the foreigners. The new adaptations of French tragedies, as Steele tells us in the prologue of Philip's Distrest Mother (Racine's Andromaque), tempered "French correctness" with "British Fire." Edmund Smith's Phaedrus (Racine's Phaedra), however, failed to hold the stage for more than four nights because audiences "stupidly fond of the Italian Opera" abandoned it for the gawdy productions at the Queen's Theatre.^{47.} Nicholas Rowe's "she tragedies" were better attended, but Jane Shore (1714) only temporarily revived the spectator's "good old Taste" for "downright English Feasts."^{48.} Nor was Joseph Addison more successful in putting the Italian to flight with his admirable Roman tragedy, Cato. There was great

excitement about this play even before it was produced, and exultant poets were more certain than about any other play that Cato would deal the death-blow to Italian opera. In the prologue, Alexander Pope exhorted men to declare war on harmonious nonsense (and, incidentally, on the well-frayed sentiments of Smith and Philips):

Our Scene precariously subsists too long
On French Translation and Italian Song.
Dare to have Sense your selves; Assert the Stage;
Be justly warm'd with your own Native Rage:
Such plays alone should please a British Ear,
As Cato's self had not disdain'd to hear.

Another poet thanked Addison for attempting Britain's rescue from "the Brood of tuneful Monsters," but concludes his praise with the sensible reminder that it will require more than one play to drive ^{opera} out of England:

Ev'n Cato is a doubtful Match for All,
And Right, opprest with Odds, again may fall;
Let our just Fears your second Aid implore, ^{49.}
Repeat the Stroke, this Hydra springs no more.

This greatest of eighteenth-century Roman tragedies was an enormous success, but the crowing of poets and playwrights proved to be premature. Italian opera did not die on the night of April 14th, 1713. ^{50.}

In the remaining years of this decade neither Addison nor any other English dramatist repeated the "Stroke." Worse, the musical Hydra revealed other heads. The sound-sense battle was to rage on the comic stage as well. The

new drama of eighteenth-century England had got off to a bad start. There were no settled notions as to what constituted "true" tragedy or comedy. Restoration immorality was absent in most of the new Augustan plays. So, unhappily, was the wit. The sophisticated comedy of the previous century was dead, and the new sentimental middle-class plays, like Steele's Conscious Lovers, were insipid substitutes. It is not surprising, then, that if Italian opera could coax patrons away from Addison and Rowe, lighter kinds of musical entertainment could seduce audiences from the lack-lustre comedies of the day. Even the tiny puppet-operas begun by Martin Powell in the piazza of Covent Garden in 1712 (where Dryden's old opera, The State of Innocence, may have been first performed) succeeded in stealing customers from Drury Lane.⁵¹

The bigger houses were a more serious threat to "sensible" comedy. Theatre-managers were no longer intimates of the sovereign from whom they received special patents as they had in the seventeenth century. They were business-men and to them the presentation of every play was a commercial venture. Therefore, in view of the impotency of contemporary playwrights, these showmen-managers inevitably turned to less exalted dramatic forms

in order to ensure full houses. John Rich was such a man, In 1715 he capitalized on the taste for operas by financing a series of English operas at the renovated theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields. How successful he was is revealed by the rapidity with which the competing company at Drury Lane imitated him. Less than two months after Rich produced his first opera, Drury Lane advertised Colley Cibber's "masque" Venus and Adonis. The same author's Myrtillo soon followed and the traditional rivalry between the two theatres became more intense. Consequently, in 1716, there began at both houses an almost interminable succession of musical pantomimes -- what the repentent Cibber later called "these monstrous Medlies," "these poetical Drams, these Gin-Shops of the Stage." Farces, with liberal sprinklings of music, also made their appearance at this time. John Gay's notorious What d'ye Call It (1717) -- referred to by the perplexed Mrs. Aubert as "The Thing" in her preface to Harlequin-Hydaspes -- was one such play. Thus, by 1720, the struggling playwright had not only to contend with operas, but with highly successful "lyric plays" of other descriptions as well.

Meanwhile, though the rivalry between Music and Letters continued noisily in public, there was little private animosity among musicians and writers. Indeed, shortly

before George I came to the throne in 1714, a supremely eminent group of such artists lived together amicably at the house of Lord Burlington in Piccadilly. An incomparable collection of geniuses it was too, for it included the dazzling names of Handel, Pope, Swift, Gay and Arbuthnot. Their relationship, however, was more of a personal than an artistic nature. Each admired the others' characters and peculiar ability, but seldom did each display any profound appreciation for another's particular achievements. Handel was a foreigner, and one may infer from his occasional blunders in setting English texts that he was not deeply responsive to the subtleties of Pope's or Gay's couplets. But his desire to collaborate with both men — which he did on two later occasions — shows that he was fully aware of their superior talents. Nor did Swift or Pope exhibit particular enthusiasm for Handel's compositions. At different times in his life Swift indicated his dislike for all music (he refused, for instance, to attend Queen Anne's concerts at Windsor) and doubtless Burlington's musical entertainments were to him no more pleasant than any others were.^{53.} Nevertheless, literally to his dying days Swift never denied the genius of Handel.^{54.} Pope, so Coxe tells us, heard Handel's

performances at Burlington House "with perfect indifference, if not impatience."^{55.} On one occasion the skeptical poet asked a friend if he did not agree that "the raptures which the company express upon hearing the compositions and performances of Handel, did not proceed wholly from affectation?"^{56.} But no matter how cynically Burney may have viewed Pope's encomium of the composer in Book IV of the Dunciad, the poet admired Handel as a man. Pope was at least honest enough to admit his ignorance, and humble enough to accept the testimony of more competent judges that Handel possessed superior merit. Dr. Arbuthnot, on the other hand, had "nerves more tunable," than Pope's, and as a composer of some ability he recognized and championed Handel's works at every opportunity.^{57.} John Gay's tribute in Book I of Trivia reveals that poet's esteem for the German musician, and although at a later date he poked fun at the composer's dramatic works in The Beggar's Opera his love for Handel never diminished.

The friendship bore fruit, too, although for the time being the results of their collaboration were exhibited only privately. Shortly after Handel moved from Burlington House to Cannons near Edgware, he produced his and Gay's pastoral cantata, Acis and Galatea at the

italianate mansion of James Bridges. The following year (1720) Cannons was again the scene of a tour de force, Pope and Handel's Haman and Mordecai. A dozen years later, both works were given their first public performances. Pope's work is of particular interest, for Haman (enlarged and renamed Esther for the presentation of 1732) was to be the first English oratorio which London ever heard.

During his temporary retirement from the operatic stage from 1717 to 1720, however, Handel was not constantly in the company of the Wits. There was a movement afoot to form an academy of music under the patronage of George I, and Handel was engaged in contracting singers and other musicians from the continent. In the meantime, although no Italian operas appeared at the Haymarket Theatre during Handel's years at Cannons, irate dramatists continued their attack on the senseless musical plays which inundated the English stage. This time it was the thriving musical farces, or "operas," of Rich, Theobald, Cibber, and Booth that received the abuse of legitimate dramatists. By 1719 it was again time for the "savior" of English tragedy to banish irrational "Minstrelsie" from London. In that year, Elijah Fenton elected Thomas Southerne as the new "Alcides" of the theatre whose

Spartan Dame would revive the Muse of Tragedy and "court Her to be Great again."⁵⁸ But the Spartan Dame, alas, received meagre praise from the critics, and musical drama, far from being exiled, entered its golden age with the foundation of the Royal Academy of Music.

From the very beginning, the career of the Academy was a tempestuous one. Giovanni Porta's Numitor was the first production of the Academy at the theatre in the Haymarket (now known as the King's Theatre), and it was soon followed by Handel's Radamisto and Bononcini's Astarto. The noblemen in charge might in time have met the immense and unforeseen costs of producing these three operas. Meanwhile, however, a catastrophe occurred which ruined thousands financially, including some of the directors of the Academy. To make matters worse, many of the patrons who were untouched by the bursting of the South Sea Bubble viewed this costly operatic "project" with suspicion and shrewdly withdrew their subscriptions. The financial burden which fell on the remaining directors was almost ruinous. The enormous fees demanded by the new castrato, Senesino, and the female sopranos were almost as great as the amount spent on staging the operas. Francesca Cuzzoni alone received two thousand pounds for

a season. Conflicting temperaments and petty jealousy among the artists at the King's Theatre added to the tension of heavily losing supporters. "Every Performer," Gibber wrote in his memoirs, "would be a Caesar, or nothing; their several Pretensions to Preference were not to be limited within the Laws of Harmony; they would all chuse their own Songs, but not more to set off themselves, than to oppose, or deprive another of an Occasion to shine."⁵⁹ Handel found great difficulty in managing the vain and arrogant Senesino; and the two women sopranos, Cuzzoni and Faustina, were notorious for their insisting upon starring rôles. When they appeared in the same opera, Handel was forced to make their parts exactly equal in importance. In Alessandro (1726), aria for aria and trill for trill their parts were balanced. John Gay was to make the most of this absurd rivalry in his devastating Beggar's Opera in 1728. The feud between the champions of Handel and those of Bononcini was second in boisterousness only to that which raged over Cuzzoni and Faustina. In 1721, the two composers together with Attilio Ariosti each set an act of Rolli's Muzio Scevola and from the night of its first performance the supporters of Handel were openly at odds with the followers of Bononcini. Whatever merits poor Ariosti possessed as a composer were obscured in the

musical imbroglio between the two great "parties" at the King's Theatre.

The critics — that is those writers who possessed Addison's simple requisite of "an ordinary Ear" — were at first contemptuous of the rivalries at the Haymarket. The noises made by Handel and Bononcini were indistinguishable even to the fine ear of John Byrom, and the wits^{were} soon repeating his mocking couplet:

Strange! all this difference should be
'Twixt Tweedle-dum and Tweedle-dee.^{60.}

But their amusement swiftly turned to resentment against irresponsible directors who neglected English artists and threw away thousands of pounds on exotic termagants, fiddlers, and sexless monsters. Angry verses like Henry Carey's Satire on the Luxury and Effeminacy of the Age gradually replaced the good-humoured epigrams on Handel, Bononcini, Cuzzoni, and Faustina in the "occasional" literature of the day.

The defenders of British Tragedy again assumed the postures of martyrs to the Italianate taste now fostered by the Royal Academy. As late as 1726, John Dennis fussed and harped on opera as the cause of the "Decay of Dramatick Poetry."^{61.} And Moses Browne spoke for a host of playwrights when he lamented the decline of tragedy in

the prologue to his Polidus. There is no longer an incentive to move spectators to pity and fear

When Otho and Astartus win the Prize,
And Hamlet and Othello you despise.

In contrast to the harassed tragedians, the comic playwrights saw the futility of complaining. It was time for another Rehearsal to laugh an absurd art-form off the English stage. In 1727, Moore printed the text of a pantomime, The English Stage Italianiz'd, in which an attempt is made to revive Buckingham's tactics. In the introduction, the author (spuriously identified as Thomas D'Urfey) suggests that the reason for the failure of modern dramatists lies in their copying wrong models. Burlesquing the grandiloquent prefaces of current Italian librettos he introduces his play with a preposterous flourish:

Enough my loving Countrymen of Phlegm and Dulness, let us cast away our native Heaviness, and soar to the very tip-top of human Excellence: Let us purge ourselves from Dross, and become light and spirituous, as those generous People, who are now come in pure Charity to refine us, and make us fit for human Conversation....Let us therefore graft upon their Stock, and improve our English Stage by their Model. You are not insensible to what a pitch of Perfection we have already brought the Italian Opera here in England.... How much will it add to the Interest and Glory of Great Britain, if we can bring our Tragedy and Comedy to the same Perfection! I know of no better a Method, than at once to abolish our old-fashion'd Stuff, and for ever to banish from the Stage, Shakespear, Johnson, Dryden,

Otway, Wycherley, Congreve, Rowe, Addison, and all these formal Fellows, who with their ponderous Sentiments, thicken the Blood of their Auditors.

The text ends with the note, "For the Benefit of the English Quality, and others who have forgot their Mother-Tongue, this Play is Translating into Italian by an able Hand; and will be sold by the Orange-Women and Door-Keepers, at Six-Pence each." The pantomime itself is indescribably obscene in parts and it is doubtful whether the most mercenary theatre-manager would dare to produce it. However, Buckingham's spirit hovered over the London theatre, and a few months after this piece appeared in print, John Gay's vastly more refined play delivered the coup de grâce to the Haymarket-opera.

Despite the jealousies and quick tempers of everyone connected with the operatic productions at the Haymarket, there was seldom any indication during performances that anything was amiss. News of quarrels usually seeped out of the green-room or during rehearsals. On the night of June 6th, 1727, however, London had a first-hand view of the hair-pullings which back-stage gossips had been talking about for years. During a performance of Bononcini's Astyanax, one of Faustina's followers hissed Cuzzoni in the middle of an aria. Cuzzoni's champions retaliated, and in full view of the audience the two furious sopranos,

clawing and screaming, flew at each other. A riot resulted and the horrified Princess Amelia, who represented the King at this performance was quickly ushered out of the theatre. Enemies of the opera revelled in the disgraccia, and within a few days an avalanche of skits fell from the press. Swift, who was in London at the time, recommended Peter the Wild Boy (a savage prodigy from Hanover under Dr. Arbuthnot's care) as the most suitable mediator for the two singers in It Cannot Rain but It Pours. On June 10th, The Craftsman suggested that only the equally ridiculous Senesino could settle their differences. A hastily contrived farce, The Contre-Temps; or, The Rival Queens, was rushed shortly to the stage where it provoked giggles even from the most ardent supporters of the Royal Academy. Nor did his great admiration for Handel prevent Arbuthnot from levelling his blunderbuss at the Haymarket-fracas in his Devil to Pay at St. James's.

The eighth season of the Royal Academy ended abruptly on the night of the Astyanax riot. Soon after the subsequent season began in the autumn of 1727, John Gay succeeded where Dennis, Addison, Southerne, and a dozen other English playwrights had failed. He stuck a pin

in the opera-bubble which had been growing since 1711. The Beggar's Opera burlesqued the Haymarket presentations brilliantly and mercilessly, from the introduction where the author compares his two strumpet-heroines with the two unnamed shrews of the Academy, and where he mocks Handel's diplomacy -- "I have observ'd such a nice Impartiality to our two Ladies, that it is impossible for either of them to take Offence" -- to the irrational but characteristic happy ending. Gay laughingly debases the settings of Italian opera (his scene is a den of thieves); he caricatures the dramatis personae by peopling his "opera" with prostitutes, highwaymen, pickpockets, "fences," and informers; and he parodies the stock verbal symbols of the Italian librettos by sprinkling his songs with "the Similes that are in all your celebrated Opera's; the Swallow, the Moth, the Bee, the Ship, the Flowers, etc." To crown this concoction of absurdities, Johann Pepusch (whom Handel had replaced as chapel-master at Cannons in 1718) furnished The Beggar's Opera with a score made up of ballad-tunes and airs pilfered from the works of Bononcini, Purcell, Geminiani, Frescobaldi, and even Handel himself.

but more particularly relevant to this chapter are the ways in which Gay ridicules certain operatic practices which had vexed the critics since the Restoration. Following the example of Saint-Evremond and Granville, he comically emphasizes the fact that the dialogue is spoken and not sung in recitative. Secondly, he deliberately allows musical ornamentation and stresses to fall upon unimportant -- and in this opera, frequently obscene -- words in the arias. Finally, in other places, he repeats Addison's satire on the "Enemies of Sense" by allowing Pepusch to set his verses to music which called for the ⁶⁴répétition of insignificant and often ugly words.

People deserted the King's Theatre and flocked to see the ballad-opera at Lincoln's Inn Fields. Receipts fell sharply at Vanbrugh's old opera-house. Less than four months after Gay told Swift that the presentations in the Haymarket were the true "beggar's operas," the Royal Academy finally collapsed. The bankrupt Academy produced its final work, Handel's Admeto, on June 1st, 1728. Faustina, Cuzzoni, and Senesino, along with their foreign gibberish were at last "tutti abbandonni" for the comprehensible airs of Polly Peachum and Captain Macheath. ⁶⁵ Even in far away Dublin, Dean Swift celebrated the deposing of the opera-queens by singing "Away with

66.

Cuzzoni, away with Faustina."

Sense, it was true, had at last returned to the English stage, but in a few months' time the English cure was worse than the Italian disease. Between 1728 and 1732, one hundred and twenty ballad-operas (most of which were as mechanical and commonplace as Gay's work was fresh and inspired) appeared in the London playhouses, obscuring, as Italian opera had done, dramatic works of a more serious nature. The Beggar's Opera proved after all to be only one more in the succession of musical novelties that for more than fifty years had driven Eden damn'd Shakespear out of door." ^{67.}

Meanwhile, Handel went into partnership with "Count" Heidegger of the Haymarket and instituted a New Royal Academy of Music. They engaged new singers and instrumentalists at prodigiously high salaries -- a fact which infuriated Carey, Ward, and Fielding, the champions of destitute English actors -- and spent enormous sums on new productions at the King's Theatre. ^{68.} The "Italian Taste" presumably vitiated by The Beggar's Opera was for a short time as strong as ever. Fashionable drawing-rooms buzzed with operatic chit-chat, and empty-headed devotees of "dear Opera's" once again explored the

"Lamentable Degeneracy" of the legitimate stage. "As to Julia's preferring Poetry to Musick," Lady Warble remarks disgustedly of her patriotic ward, "'tis owing purely to her want of Taste."⁶⁹ Resuscitated with the Italian operas were the old jealousies and rivalries. This time they extended into the Royal Family. Simply out of hatred for his father, who idolized Handel, Frederick, the Prince of Wales, formed a competing "Opera of the Nobility" at Lincoln's Inn Fields where he tried every means to ruin Handel and Heidegger. But although the stratagems of Frederick amused aristocratic circles, the high jinks of the satirists were forced. They were bored, and as a result new critical attacks on the Italian music-drama were rare. Even the usually fretful Aaron Hill simply yawned and resorted to re-printing Saint-Evremond's fifty-year-old Essay on Opera's in his theatrical periodical, The Prompter, for April 30th, 1736. Satirists, too, were just as half-hearted in their attempts to depreciate the Italians. Fielding's Author's Farce, in which the Goddess of Dulness elects "Signior Opera" as her poet-laureate, was only a rehash of Pope's Dunciad. And the anonymous author of Blunderella (as well as Lynch in his Independent Patriot) found it necessary to elaborate a tired, century-old joke of Henry Lawes.⁷⁰ The public as

well was daily becoming more indifferent to the once absorbing intrigues and disputes of castrati and fiddlers.

In 1736, the alarmed music-lover, Mrs. Pendarves informed Swift that "the reigning madness" of London was no longer Farinelli, the male soprano, but Fielding's Pasquin, "a dramatic satire on the times."⁷¹ Thereafter, the decline of Italian opera was rapid. In the following year, the confident Lynch told fellow-playwrights that they had no longer to exert themselves in striking "at Musick's Trunk the furious Ax," for to the astonishment of the literati the public had abandoned opera and subscribed to an extensive revival of Shakespeare's plays. In this newly found preference for Shakespeare, continues Lynch merrily in the prologue to his Independent Patriot, the English are at last

inclin'd

To make the Ear the Passage to the Mind.

Dramatists had cried wolf a good many times since Dryden's day. Now, for the first time, they were right. The great infatuation of the public with Italian opera was over. In 1737 both opera-companies failed. Handel completed Deidamia, his thirty-ninth and final opera, in 1740, and thereafter, devoted his time to the composition of oratorios, non-dramatic vocal music, and instrumental

works. Other opera-groups were formed, but the great heyday of Italian opera during the first four decades of the eighteenth century was never again paralleled. Large numbers, of course, continued to patronize opera, but the greater part of the musical public turned either with Handel to "serious" music of a different nature or to English ballad-operas -- which Swift said they had always secretly preferred. ^{72.} Most important, by the middle of the century the critics were beginning to turn from satire and invective to earnest attempts to judge music by more pertinent standards.

iii. 1740-1789. The appearance of the "new critic"; his reliance upon the Augustan ars poetica; his ineffectual dealings with opera, oratorio, and song; his eventual discovery of a critical principle which rescued instrumental music from a century of neglect and terminated the sound-sense controversy.

For the Augustans, the critic of music was a literary man equipped with what they vaguely termed "a good Ear" and "Taste." One or two protesting voices had risen in the first third of the century against the presumptuousness

of writers who styled themselves judges of music yet who were ignorant of the simple gamut. One might as well write a treatise on poetry, argued the dissenters, without being able to distinguish between a dactyl and an anapest. Not until the 1740's however, was it obvious to all that musical criticism grounded solely on "Ear" and "Taste" could never progress to anything more than a collection of superficial and disordered appraisals. During these years there appeared the new critic whose major qualification was contrary to the Augustans'. Like John Frederick Lampe and Charles Avison he was a musician with a literary bent. Taste and "Ear" were still essential, but, as Avison reminded an antagonist of the old school, Pope's advice to the literary critic applied as well to the critic of music:

Let such teach others who themselves excel,
And censure freely who have written well.^{73.}

Along with this insistence upon a technical knowledge of music was the disparagement of earlier writers who had passed for critics. The animadversions of Addison, Pope, and Steele, it was now decided, are of value only in as far as they "shew the possibility of writing well on what is neither felt nor understood."^{74.}

All in all the new temper augured well. Nevertheless,

mid-century criticism was never free from literary domination. The critic still required a "system" and although he discredited Aristotle as an arbiter of opera and sneered at the "A. B. C." ways of over-punctilious Augustans, he clung to the belief that the criteria of musical worth closely paralleled those of poetry.⁷⁵ Thus in 1747 we find John Lockman suggesting that "Maxims might be laid down, equally solid with those which constitute the Arts of Poetry."⁷⁶ This notion so inspired Avison that many of his rules were not only "equally solid" but identical with those expounded in Horace's Ars Poetica, Pope's Essay on Criticism (which, incidentally, contained the reassuring statement, "Music resembles Poetry") and Roscommon's Essay on Translated Verse. In one place, Avison advises musicians that "it is in the Works of the great Masters that we must look for the Rules."⁷⁷ On another page, when he tells the composer that variety of tone-colours is to be striven for, "that Inequality makes a Part of the Character of Excellence; That something ought to be thrown into Shades, in order to make the Lights more striking," he quotes analogous advice from Roscommon:

Far the greatest Part
Of what some call Neglect, is study'd Art.
When Virgil seems to trifle in a Line,

'Tis like a Warning-Piece which gives the Sign,
To wake your Fancy and prepare your Sight,
To reach the noble Height of some unusual Flight. ^{78.}

In another work, Avison excuses the musical "genius" for "nobly over-leaping the too narrow bounds of human art" with another precept from Pope:

Music resembles Poetry; in each
Are nameless Graces which no Methods teach,
And which a master-hand alone can reach. ^{79.}

So, paradoxically, while men like Burney castigated the neoclassicists, mid-century musicians felt no compunction about borrowing a rule or two from the same writers. Others soon adopted the habit. Mainwaring, in his Memoirs of Handel, echoes the neoclassicists' contempt for trivial "graces and flourishes," and applies their maxim to music: "It is from their relation to the whole, that these minuter parts derive their value." ^{80.} William Hughes exhorted the composer of church-music to abandon his sophisticated harmonies and theatrical "divisions" and "to make the Airs of his Music put on a Likeness to his Subject." He cries with Pope, "First, follow Nature!" ^{81.} Not all writers in this period approved of such a facile musico-literary code. The Scottish primitivist, John Gregory, for example, insisted that since "philosophy ascertains and methodizes the ideas and principles on which art depends," musicians should be forced to submit

to an intellectual dictatorship of classical philosophy,
not neoclassical belles-lettres.^{82.} But in the main, from
about 1740 to 1770 standard-seeking critics preferred to
glean their rules from Pope.

This curious reliance upon the formal ars poetica,
however, was not the only contact the new critic had with
his predecessors. Despite the feeling of superiority
which his knowledge of music gave him, he seldom attempted
to apply this knowledge, preferring instead to sustain the
sound-sense controversy of those same Augustans whom he
affected to despise. Unhappily, the old critical devices
which he adopted had lost their force. This is particu-
larly apparent in mid-century comments on opera. For one
thing, satire was deprived of its targets. The various
components of opera which had once provoked ridicule had
by now in the 1750's become accepted conventions of the
musical stage. The foreign language which had so vexed
earlier critics of opera was now taken as normal for that
form of drama. John Lockman and others tried to re-
establish English-language operas -- as Granville and
Addison had done before them -- but the public was in-
different to their efforts. By 1789, when John Brown
addressed his Letters on the Poetry and Music of Italian
Opera to Lord Monboddo, it was no longer necessary to

defend the unintelligibility of music-drama. The attitude towards the male soprano, another oddity of Italian opera, also changed in time. The evirato, whose grotesque figure and incongruously high voice had filled the wits of Swift's day with laughter, was now pitied for his physical defects and justly praised for his superb musicianship.⁸³ As for the recitative, continual music, and elaborate machinery of the operas, the possibilities for satire had been pretty well exhausted at a comparatively early date. In The Beggar's Opera and The Dragon of Wantley, John Gay and Henry Carey said all there was to be said.

Nor, except in a half-dozen instances, could the old complaint be sustained that opera threatened the survival of legitimate drama. In 1766, "nothing," Walpole wrote, was "so much in fashion" as Piccini's new opera buffa, La Buona Figliuola.⁸⁴ Accordingly, in the epilogue of The Clandestine Marriage, David Garrick chastized those music-enthusiasts who supposedly "resolved to exterminate this vulgar passion" for "nasty" plays by patronizing Piccini's piece. Five years later, soon after the successful revival of Dryden's King Arthur, Richard Cumberland came forth to defend the legitimate stage "with Wit's sharp Weapons," and to seduce theatre-goers from Merlin's magic

with the sentimental rakishness of his West Indian. But Garrick's and Cumberland's cries to arms against operas were exceptional. Important changes had taken place on both the musical and the dramatic stage since Handel's death in 1759. The quality of musical-drama had deteriorated and there were fewer people who preferred the opera-house to the play-house than there had been during the palmy days of the Royal Academy under George I. The numbers who might desert Drury Lane for a night at the opera-house in the Haymarket were negligible in the 1760's. The adapters of Shakespeare and the French dramatists, and the authors of "plotty" farces and sentimental comedies had little to fear. If by chance their plays did not succeed on their own merits, the appearance of Garrick, Woffington, or Quin ensured them at least of a third-night's hearing. Later, when Goldsmith and Sheridan revitalized the English theatre with their "laughing comedies," anti-operatic prologues disappeared altogether.

Thus deprived of readers who would relish his satire and of theatre-goers who would heed his battle-cry against the usurping Italians, the mid-century critic wearied of commenting on operas. His subsequent dismissal of the musical drama, however, was ill-timed for there was no

moment more propitious than the mid-eighteenth century was for the English critic of music to join forces with European commentators. At this time a reformist movement arose on the continent which sought to re-establish the literary ideals upon which Italian opera had originally been based. Enraged at the abuses of fashionable, uninventive composers, and tired of the banal and vapid librettos that they set, continental critics -- among whom were the French Encyclopedists -- demanded a return to the idea of the Florentine camerati: poetry comes first. Francesco Algarotti's Essay on the Operas (1755) illustrates the new tendencies. In opera, he writes, "the poet should resume the reins of power, which have been so unjustly wrested from his hands," for the art of the usurping musician "derives its greatest merit from being no more than an auxiliary, the handmaid of poetry." How familiar this all sounds! The balance is precisely what the seventeenth-century experimenters in English music-drama had striven for. Similarly, there is a familiar ring to Algarotti's censuring of sense-destroying musical conventions. The "tediously prolix" orchestral ritornelli, he declares, and the da capo arias in which "the repeating of words and those chiming rencounters... are made for the

sake of sound merely," serve only to impede the dramatic action and offend the "judicious ear."^{86.} The manifesto of this Italian literary critic was received with interest in England, but curiously, no-one remarked on the similarity of Algarotti's to earlier English points of view. In their haste to repudiate the rash judgments of Saint-Evremond and Addison, British writers failed to recognize the fact that these men had said precisely the same things. Thus, while on the continent Gluck was making practical use of ideas expounded by D'Avenant, Dryden, Saint-Evremond, and later the "novel" Algarotti, Italian opera was a dead issue with the English men of letters.^{87.} With Dr. Johnson, they had dismissed it without further ado as "an exotick and irrational Entertainment" not much worth the trouble of investigating.^{88.}

If critics wrote on dramatic music at all it was of a different nature. When Handel completed Deidamia in 1740, he abandoned Italian opera. "Strong in new Arms," Pope recalled in his New Dunciad of 1742, "Giant HANDEL" thereafter devoted much time to the composition of oratorios. Once again, he rose

Like bold Briareus with a hundred hands;
To stir, to rouse, to shake the Soul....

Almost unanimously, the "sense-critics" approved of what

they called "religious drama" (though Handel's and his imitators' new works actually were not stage-plays). Samson and Messiah possessed nearly all the qualities which enemies of Italian operas had felt were missing from Rinaldo and Deidamia. The texts were familiar to everyone. Their predominately religious character appealed especially to the English Protestants, who had more than once detected papist sentiments in opera. Moreover, oratorios were performed without stage-action, special costumes, or scenery. Neither theatrical machines nor extravagant decorations therefore distracted one as the trappings of the earlier operas had Addison. If castratos from the King's Theatre continued to appear in oratorios -- well, at least they were restrained from strutting and posturing. Most important of all, the new works were performed in English. Reason, for once, seems to have been generally satisfied. True, those writers whose moral and religious convictions tempered their criticism continued to voice their disapproval. Their comments, however, are more pertinent to another chapter of this work.^{89.} In general, the commentators celebrated with John Lockman the replacing of Italian operas with this "Drama of an infinitely superior Nature, I mean Oratorios."^{90.}

The critics' recognition of "sense" in oratorio is gratifying -- but it indicates no progress in critical thought. These writers who flaunted their conversance with musical science still persisted in treating of things which were essentially extra-musical.

Nowhere was the mid-century critic's impotency and short-sightedness better illustrated than in his resuscitation of the old controversy over "sensible" songs. Despite his rôle of villain in early operatic criticism, Handel heartened writers of the middle decades by proving in his oratorios that English was neither too barbarous nor too unmelodic a language for composers to deal with. Hence, oratorio brought with it a renewed interest in English song. But as in the case of Italian opera, the critics were out of touch with the times; the art of song for singing had been all but dead since the end of the seventeenth century. Pope had written an Ode for St. Cecilia's Day, but such a work was meant to be read, not sung. Addison's praise of Chevy Chase had promoted an interest in the ballad, but only as a poetic form. Later in the century, Christopher Smart, Thomas Chatterton, and William Collins wrote pieces in the popular cantata-form, but like Pope's Ode they were merely "closet-songs." Except in one or two instances,

Gay's verses were written for music already in existence. There was no true collaboration between poet and musician in his Beggar's Opera or Polly.

Mr. Clinton-Baddeley assigns several causes to the decline of English song in his interesting study, Words for Music.⁹¹ In the early eighteenth century, he writes, poets adopted a refined "poetic diction" and abandoned the lyric for satire and didactic moral verse. The expression of genuine passions in simple language -- an essential in song -- was not the aim of the fashionable poetic genres. Mid-century taste was equally hostile to song. New social edicts stifled the high spirits and spontaneity which characterized seventeenth-century singing. It was no longer permissible in polite society to "let oneself go." In a letter dated 19 April 1749, that arbiter of gentlemanly pursuits, Lord Chesterfield, admonished his son for indulging in certain "illiberal" pleasures. Among them was music.

If you love music [he writes] hear it; go to operas, concerts, and pay fiddlers to play for you; but I insist upon you neither piping nor fiddling yourself. It puts a gentleman in a very frivolous contemptible light; brings him into a great deal of bad company; and takes up a great deal of time, which might be much better employed.

Compare this self-conscious snobbery with the rollicking

abandon of songsters in Pepys's day. Then, the time of the finest gentleman in Charles's court was not "better employed" than when he fiddled in his own or his friends' drawing-room. Nor was he more admired than when he joined his companions in singing madrigals at an ale-house.

Such was the state of song when heavy-lidded writers attempted to revive interest in the problem presented by D'Avenant and Dryden: in the collaboration between poet and musician, which should "direct" the composition of vocal music? The once vital question was incongruous in the 1740's. There were no new song-writers of the calibre of Herrick, Waller, or Milton who could treat the subject intelligently. The character of music had also changed since the time of Lawes and Grabut. The complexities and subtleties of Bononcini's and Handel's compositions discouraged the would-be lyricist. He no longer understood music. Nameless poetasters now supplied the demand for song, for though songs "of my Lady's Birth-Day" and "merry Jigs" were despised by Chesterfield's society, such gaucherie prevailed in the theatre, in taverns, and in the streets as it had in Baker's day.^{92.} Therefore, while composers were thus

"employ'd in gilding the Rubbish of Parnassus," Lockman complained, an academic debate on "collaboration" was impossible.^{93.}

Soon after Pope's death, new voices in poetry hinted that the revival of song was indeed imminent. Inspired by recent researches into Norse éddas and sagas, Thomas Gray and others produced a kind of "lyric poetry" in imitation of the ancient bards. But the excitement of these critics who heralded this as a return to song was premature. Such poetry did not lend itself to the art of Gray's musical contemporaries. It was often fragmentary, too minutely descriptive, and too rhapsodical in character. Such pieces were popular in their day, but, asked Daniel Webb in 1769, can poetry which repels musicians truly be styled "lyric"?

Our modern lyric poesy is a school for painters, not musicians.... To what purpose do we solicit the genius of music, while we abandon, without reserve, the plectrum for the pencil, and cast aside the lyre, as a child doth its rattle, in the moment that we claim it to be the object of our preference?^{94.}

The lyric breath was smothered, and fourteen years after Webb grieved for the death of song, Joseph Ritson wrote its epitaph. In his Historical Essay on the Origin and Progress of National Song, he says, "We have solely to regret the loss of melody and song, which ... are fallen

95.
to rise no more."

We must regret with Ritson that at the inception of the "new criticism" in the second third of the eighteenth century there was a paucity of lyric poetry. But on the other hand it is partly owing to this poverty of song that critics -- now placed in the ironic position of searching for something to criticize -- at last turned their attention to instrumental music. There was indeed no dearth of that.

It was the first time that English writers seriously examined this long-neglected branch of musical art. Consequently, they were nonplussed. In song they knew precisely what they wanted from the poet, the musician, and the performer. When it came to wordless music, they echoed the exasperated Fontenelle: "Sonate, que me veux tu?" Ostensibly, they were free from any rules or preconceived notions about orchestral music. One would expect, therefore, to find a variety of new and perhaps startling theories advanced at this time. During the 1740's and 1750's, however, the results of the "enlightened" search for standards are disappointing. Critics were hampered by an instinctive love of rules -- if only the poetic rules of Horace and Pope -- and, despite

their curiosity about it, a seemingly imperishable bias against instrumental music. The musicians' appeal to poetic authority has already been pointed out. The second, and more persistent attitude is observable in two treatises on music, John Frederick Lampe's Art of Music and Charles Avison's Essay on Musical Expression. While it was possible in 1740 for Lampe to make the daring assertion that "Musick is preferable to other Arts and Sciences," it was understood by his readers that the preference nevertheless still lay with vocal music.^{96.} As late as 1752, when sentimental theories of art were no longer novel, Avison, too, clung to the belief that music, separated from poetry, was an unsatisfactory medium for expressing the emotions. He therefore excludes such music from the definition of his subject:

What then is true Musical Expression? I answer, it is such a Concurrence of Air and Harmony, as affects us most strongly with the Passions or Affections which the Poet intends to raise....^{97.}

Though by this time the English lyric was obsolescent and the English critic affirmed his desire to find something more than "empty Sound" in music, belief in the superiority of song was as strong as ever.

Still, it would be wrong to insist that blind prejudice was solely responsible for the critics' adherence

to the old notion of the poet-dictator. The time was unfavourable for music when English writers at last set about assessing compositions for instruments alone. The abuses of currently popular composers and performers impeded the progress of open-minded enquiry. The ultra-refined bagatelles from France -- the divertissements of Rameau, and the sparkling, ingenious harpsichord pieces of Couperin -- may have intoxicated the audiences, but to the more austere English men of letters these glittering displays were effeminate and decadent. Empty conceits and a seemingly dégagé technique were especially repugnant to those who continued to derive musical precepts from neoclassical poetry. ^{98.}

Equally distasteful to the critics was the craze for those "Fain-wou'd-be" virtuosos, who, with their "ridiculous out-of-the-way Flourishes," further disguised these thin pieces. ^{99.} Entranced by the dazzling virtuosity of the harpsichordist, Jozzi (who was also a distinguished male soprano), and the violinists, Giardini and Abram Brown, London audiences neglected matter for manner. Consequently, English writers began gradually to recognize the merits of the older Handel, Corelli, and Bononcini. Their instrumental works were sublimely simple and virile; their effect did not depend upon sensational execution.

Where now was the genius of the Old Masters? Nowadays (1757), "Estimate" Brown complained, "the elegant Simplicity of BONONCINI; the manly, the pathetic, the astonishing Strains of HANDEL, are neglected and despised." Concert halls are now "disgraced with the lowest Insipidity of Composition," and the "question now concerns not the Expression, the Grace, the Energy, or Dignity of Musick... but the Tricks of the Performer."^{100.} In the view of the abundance of such abuses it was impossible for English writers to formulate a positive theory of musical aesthetics. Instead, they bent their efforts towards reforming what they felt were the "anti-classical" elements of modern music, and chastising composers for deviating from the rules of the newly appreciated "Masters."

Happily, this reactionary tendency was of comparatively short duration. At about the time John Brown's Estimate appeared, and particularly after Handel's death in 1759 (when it became fashionable to eulogize him as a "natural" genius, a musical counterpart of Shakespeare) new words found their way into the vocabulary of English aestheticians. With increasing frequency, writers spoke of "sentiment", "imagination," "originality," "genius," and, as we have seen in the quotation from Brown, pathos and "expression,"

as desirable artistic qualities. Simultaneously, these same writers began to discredit the easy device their predecessors had adopted in applying to music the poetic rules of Roscommon and Pope -- rules, it might be added, which no practicing composer observed anyway.

The exponents of primitivism were to a large degree responsible for terminating the couplet-quoting vogue popularised by Avison. When Lord Kames examined all the arts in his Elements of Criticism, he revealed that far from being peculiar to music, as Avison and others had suggested, banal expression and frothy ornamentation had infected poetry as well. "At present," he writes in 1762, "literary productions are crowded with words, epithets, figures: in music, sentiment is neglected for the luxury of harmony, and for difficult movement." Musical fioritura was only a visible form of a universal degeneration in art. How stupidly inconsistent, therefore, was the critic who on the one hand decried musical virtuosity and embellishment, and on the other drew precepts from a kind of verse which abounded with analogous imperfections. The solution to the music-critics' difficulties, Kames suggests, lay in "Nature" -- meaning Originality, not "Nature methodiz'd" as by Homer. The

musician must be allowed to create with that "original candour and simplicity" which distinguished the art of earlier civilizations, before the imposition of refined rules. He cannot work to laws forced upon him by rules-obsessed littérateurs.^{101.}

Popean aphorisms disappeared from musical criticism in the last decades of the century. But there was something of far greater consequence in primitivistic theories than the mere disparaging of Augustanism. It was not owing to a personal grudge that Kames (as quoted above) remonstrates with contemporary composers for their neglect of "sentiment," for the idea of a sentimental objective of music was a prominent one in the revaluation of art in the 1760's. Instrumental music could, it was now suggested, convey unarticulated emotions to the listener. For those with developed "sensibilities," musical sound was perhaps not senseless. It was an aesthetic which defied rational analysis, but new writers no longer conceived of reason as the one immutable test of art. Nor, moreover, did they approve of that music composed in compliance with reasonable laws. "The poetry, painting, or Music," Burney declared, "that leaves us on the ground, and does not transport us into the regions of imagination beyond the reach of cold criticism, may be

correct, but is devoid of genius and passion."^{102.}

This theory of affective music (which, though new to the English men of letters, was a centuries-old conception of musicians) provided new arguments for attacks on the abominated virtuoso-performer.^{103.} By 1766, when John Gregory published his Comparative View, it was accepted as imperative in listening to orchestral music, that "the mind must be disengaged, must see no contrivance, admire no execution; but be open and passive to the impression." It was stating only half the truth to argue as Lampe had done that brilliant, but unrestrained execution indicated simply a lack of discipline. Kames and Gregory now deprecated the "wild excursions" of these tricksters on psychological grounds: they obstructed the free operation of the listener's emotions.^{104.}

Because psychological and aesthetic considerations as well as abstruse problems of composition and execution had complicated musical criticism, writers recognized the need for a new critical procedure. None of those criteria which had been previously accepted was alone of value in judging music. It was only in synthesis that the old touchstones of Reason, Taste, "a good Ear," an extensive and practical knowledge of music, honesty, sensitivity and

lack of bias could be productive of sound estimates.

Fittingly, it was in the works of the first English historians of music — Sir John Hawkins and Dr. Charles Burney — that the "new criticism" made its initial appearance. As historians, their first consideration was the systematic study of all music, ancient and contemporary. Their second objective, however, was the re-assessment by modern methods of that music which their predecessors with "false" standards of criticism had either ignored or abused. Consequently, in their histories (Hawkins's appearing complete in five volumes in 1776 and Burney's four volumes appearing separately between 1776 and 1789) such musicians as Purcell and Corelli were at last given their due as composers of instrumental masterpieces. Of particular relevance to the present chapter are the historians' reviews of Italian operas from Queen Anne's reign to the end of the eighteenth century. Opera by opera, beginning with Thomas Clayton's Arsinoe of 1705, they minutely examined the harmony, counterpoint, melody, and modulations of orchestral as well as vocal music. As a result, one of their most valuable contributions was the favourable re-appraisal of such works as Handel's Rinaldo whose reputation had been damaged by Addison and

those parrot-critics of the mid-century who repeated the "decisions" of The Spectator "with a degree of triumph as great as if they were mathematical demonstrations." ^{105.}

Through the efforts of these two historians, the literary domination of musical criticism was virtually terminated by the last decades of the eighteenth century. The sound-sense controversy, however, persisted and it is not until we reach the final volume of Burney's History in 1789 — thirteen years after the publication of Hawkins's complete work — that we find the solution to that problem.

Between 1776 and 1789, the increasing emphasis which commentators placed upon the emotional content of music invalidated, one after another, all of the old arguments in favour of "sensible" compositions. Even in Hawkins's day, it had been considered contrary to ethical teaching to submit oneself without resistance to the passions and affections raised by music. But by 1784, when Thomas Robertson published his Inquiry into the Fine Arts, "enthusiasm" in art — that "affable and enlightened, though fervid emotion" which "inflames" the creative artist and his audience — had received such universal endorsement that the ascetic theories which had been

handed down by ancient commentators were completely nullified.^{106.} The moralistic finger-wagging of St. Cyril, Prynne, and Collier were out of place in this milieu of romanticism. For the same reason, Plato's censuring of instrumental music as an "unseaning thing" also fell into disrepute. Of what value to modern conceptions of art were the philosopher's pronouncements on obsolete musical modes?

Thus, "emancipated" as Hawkins had been in 1776, he had been incapable of developing his anti-rationalism to the extent which his successors were to do. Nowhere in his work do we find a disclosure analogous to Burney's, thirteen years later, that Haydn's

adagios are often so sublime in ideas and the harmony in which they are clad, that though played by inarticulate instruments, they have a more pathetic effect on my feelings, than the finest opera air united with the most exquisite poetry.^{107.}

"Ideas" expressed by "inarticulate instruments"! No less startling than the paradox itself was the assenting nod of Burney's colleagues who as recently as the 1770's had adhered to a critical "system" grounded upon the dictum that poetic sense would always be preferable to purely musical sounds -- that of the two kinds of music, vocal and instrumental, the former was always the "better."

The new critical principle which enabled Burney and his contemporaries to make such astonishing statements about the symphonies, quartets, and sonatas of "the admirable and matchless HAYDN" and of Mozart, "the wonder of the musical world," is explained elsewhere in this final volume of the historian's great work.^{108.} Each type of music, he writes, possesses merits of its own. True, poetry lends immediate intelligibility to music. But the enlightened critic of 1789 must decline to follow a century of intellectuals by casting wordless music aside as a "meaningless thing." Instead, he must surrender himself and listen to the strange but not incomprehensible, difficult but not impossible language of the instruments. He must lay aside reason -- and feel.^{109.}

With this decree -- a synthesis of the sentimental theories of Brown, Kames, Gregory, and Robertson -- Burney delivered the coup de grâce to that last remaining offshoot of "reasonable" judgment, the sound-sense controversy. Nearly a century had passed since critics raged over the improprieties of the newcomer Handel's Rinaldo and ignored his non-operatic works. How different was the temper of English musical criticism in 1791 when Franz Josef Haydn paid his first visit to London! Commentators now discussed with authority not one but all the musical

forms in which a composer expressed himself. By substituting "feeling" for Reason, they no longer dismissed as insignificant time-killers those works which did not utilize the human voice. Haydn's twelve "Salomon" symphonies (which he composed during his stay in England) were as "affective" and as meaningful as any of his operas or oratorios were. In short, by the end of the century, English critics had abandoned the practice of judging music by arbitrary "rules" and literary maxims, and had initiated a method of subjective, sympathetic, non-dictatorial analysis and commentary based upon experience.

Notes for Chapter II.

1. Lang, Music in Western Civilization, p. 335.
2. Sherard Vines, The Course of English Classicism, London, The Hogarth Press, 1930, p. 69.
3. John Milton, "To Mr. H. Lawes on the Publishing his Airs," English Poems, London, Oxford University Press, 1948, p. 79.
4. Vines, op. cit., p. 70.
5. Lang, op. cit., p. 325.
6. Rene Wellek, "The Parallelism between Literature and the Arts," English Institute Annual (1941), New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. 29-63.
7. Pepys, Diary, 15th September and 17th November 1667.
8. D'Avenant, Works, III, p. 205.
9. Pepys, Diary, 13th February 1667.
10. Shadwell, "Psyche," Works, II, p. 280. The playwright's assertion provided great amusement for Thomas Duffet. In Psyche Debauch'd (a parody of Shadwell's piece), the "librettist," Redstreak, confides to None-so-fair (Psyche), "I value not my self upon the wit, but the fitness of the words, for air and melody.... I myself chalk'd out the way to the Tune-Maker."
11. Charles de Saint Denis, Seigneur de Saint-Evremond, "Upon Opera's," Mixt Essays, London, Timothy Goodwin, 1685, p. 23.
12. Dryden, "Albion and Albanus," Works, VII, pp. 229, 237.
13. Ibid., pp. 225-26.
14. Dryden, "King Arthur", Works, VIII, p. 136.

15. Cibber, Apology, p. 109.
16. Rosenfeld, op. cit., p. 449.
17. Ibid., p. 451.
18. Pepys, Diary, 15th September 1667.
19. W. J. Lawrence, "Music and Song in the Eighteenth-century Theatre," Musical Quarterly, January 1916, p. 72.
20. Mr. J. W. Draper calls attention to this influence of Plato in "Poetry and Music in Eighteenth-Century Aesthetics," Englische Studien, LXVII, 1932, p. 72, note.
21. John Hughes, preface to "Six Cantatas," Poems on Several Occasions, London, J. Tonson, 1735, I, p. 30. The exact date of the cantatas is unknown, but The Tatler for 2nd May 1710 has an advertisement for Pepusch's score with the note that "this is the first Collection of this Kind." John Hughes (1677-1720) received early recognition as both poet and musician. In 1703, his Ode on Musick was performed at Stationers' Hall, and a few years later he contributed many articles to The Tatler, The Spectator, and The Guardian. In 1711, Steele asked him to revise Dryden's Alexander's Feast for Thomas Clayton, the composer. Clayton's score, however, failed to please the audience at York Buildings, of which Steele was manager. (Hughes, Poems, I, p. xvii.) In 1712, Hughes presented his English opera, Calypso and Telemachus, which, Dr. Johnson writes indignantly, "was impudently opposed by those who were employed in the Italian opera." Shortly after this, Addison requested that Hughes write the final act of his unfinished Cato. After receiving Hughes's work, however, Addison completed the tragedy himself. (Johnson, Lives of the English Poets, London, Oxford University Press, 1946, I, pp. 467-471.) Hughes died shortly after the presentation of his greatly successful tragedy, The Siege of Damascus.

22. Thomas Baker, Tunbridge Walks, London, Bernard Lintott, 1703, pp. 4-5. This opinion of the "Town's Diversions" persisted well into the century. Cf. Gay's Beggar's Opera.
23. Jonathan Swift, Correspondence, edited by F. Elrington Ball, London, G. Bell and Sons, I, p. 144.
24. Granville, The British Enchanters, epilogue.
25. Motteux, Thomyris, dedication.
26. Granville, op. cit., pp. 195-6.
27. Raguenet, Comparison, p. 68.
28. Joseph Addison, Works, London, J. Tonson, 1721, I, p. 86.
29. Raguenet, op. cit., p. 69.
30. Dennis, Essay on Operas, p. 389.
31. Ibid., p. 385.
32. Ibid., pp. 385-6.
33. Motteux, Thomyris, dedication.
34. Dennis, Essay on Operas, p. 385.
35. Ibid., p. 387.
36. Alexander Pope, Prose Works, edited by Norman Ault, Oxford, Shakespeare Head Press, 1936, p. 15.
37. Charles Gildon, The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton, London, Robert Gosling, 1710, pp. 157-8.
38. Swift, Correspondence, I, p. 135.
39. An extract from this work is found in Chapter III, p. 159 of the present work.
40. John Dennis, "Reflexions Critical and Satyrical, Upon a Late Rhapsody, call'd An Essay Upon Criticism," Works, I, p. 396-7.

41. Raguenet, op. cit., p. 80.
42. Spectator for 3rd April 1711. (Cf. Dennis, Chapter I, p. 33 of this study.) The more extensive comments on opera are found in the issues of the Spectator for 6th, 15th, 16th, and 21st March, and for 5th April -- all 1711. The last number is particularly entertaining as a burlesque of current librettos.
43. See Spectator for 3rd April 1711.
44. See Spectator for 27th June 1712, the sixth essay on "The Pleasures of the Imagination"; also, Chapter III, p. 167 of this work.
45. George Saintsbury, A History of English Criticism, London, Thomas Blackwood, 1911, p. 180.
46. Samuel Johnson, prologue for Garrick's revival of Addison's Cato in 1747.
47. Spectator for 21st March 1711.
48. Nicholas Rowe, The Tragedy of Jane Shore, prologue.
49. Richard Steele, Poetical Miscellanies, London, J. Tonson, 1727, pp. 111-12.
50. As late as 1747, poets hoped that Addison's tragedy would put an end to foreign musical drama. See Johnson's prologue and note 45 above.
51. W. J. Lawrence, "Marionette Operas," Musical Quarterly, X, 1924, p. 238.
52. Embarrassed by Pope's persistence in taunting him for writing such trifles, Cibber explains in his Apology: "If I am ask'd (after my condemning these Fooleries, myself) how I came to assent, or continue my Share of Expence to them? I have no better Excuse for my Error, than confessing it. I did it against my Conscience! and had not virtue enough to starve, by opposing a Multitude, that would have been too hard for me." (Apology, p. 300)

53. Jonathan Swift, Journal to Stella, edited by George A. Aitken, London, Methuen and Company, 1901, pp. 266, 270.
54. See Chapter IV, p. 280.
55. Coxe, op. cit., p. 16.
56. Burney, History of Music, I, p. 343 note.
57. Ibid., I, p. 343.
58. Elijah Fenton, "An Epistle to Mr. Southerne," printed in Thomas Southerne's Works, London, Jacob Tonson, 1713, vii. Though The Spartan Dame was written in 1684 and printed in 1713, it was not produced until 1719.
59. Cibber, Apology, p. 244.
60. For many years the couplet was attributed to Jonathan Swift. Byrom's complete verse is as follows:
- Some say, compar'd to Bononcini,
That Mynheer Handel's but a Ninny;
Others aver, that he to Handel
Is scarcely fit to hold a Candle:
Strange! all this difference should be
'Twixt Tweedle-dum and Tweedle-dee.
61. John Dennis, "The Stage Defended," Works, II, p. 304.
62. By 1728, of course, the way had been made easier. The public was seeking new diversions, and even the Haymarket audience (though they disliked admitting it) were becoming bored with the constant squabbles of musicians and with the unchanging character of Italian operas.
63. W. H. Grattan Flood, "The Beggar's Opera and its Composers," Music and Letters, October 1922, pp. 402-406. Also Arthur V. Berger, "The Beggar's Opera, The Burlesque, and Italian Opera," Music and Letters, April 1936, pp. 93-105.
64. Cf. Spectator for 21st March 1711.

65. Henry Carey, "Polly Peachum," Poems, edited by Frederick T. Wood, London, The Scholartis Press, 1930, p. 131.
66. Swift, Correspondence, V, p. 414.
67. James Ralph, The Fashionable Lady (Act I, scene xi) London, J. Watts, 1730.
68. See Henry Carey, The Honest Yorkshire-man (Act I, Air 6) Dublin, Thomas Wilkinson, n. d.; Edward Ward, A Seasonable Reproof, Dublin, George Faulkner, 1736, p. 3; and Henry Fielding, Pasquin (epilogue), London, J. Watts, 1736.
69. Francis Lynch, The Independent Patriot; or, Musical Folly, (Act III, scene 1), London, J. Watts, 1737. The character of the "sensible" hero, Medium, is modelled upon Lord Burlington.
70. For the words of his burlesque song, Tavola, Henry Lawes merely strung together the titles of old Italian songs. Seventeenth-century listeners languished to the "sweet sounds," but they were considerably embarrassed upon learning that the song was really nonsensical. Cf. Spectator for 2nd November 1711 in which Anthony Freeman deceives his wife (who is "far gone in the Italian Taste") by presenting her with a musically arranged passage from Tully's Paradoxa as an "Opera Tune." In the paper for 7th November we learn of Mrs. Freeman's "terrible Fit of the Vapours" when she discovered the hoax.
71. Swift, Correspondence, V, p. 318.
72. Swift, "Intelligencer" (Number 3), Prose Works, edited by Temple Scott, London, George Bell and Company, 1897-1908, IX, pp. 321-22.
73. Charles Avison, Reply to the Remarks on the Essay on Musical Expression, printed with the 2nd edition of his Essay on Musical Expression, London, C. Davis, 1753, p. 178.

74. Burney, History, I, xv-xvii.
75. Avison, Reply to the Remarks, p. 194.
76. John Lockman, A Discourse on Operas, London, G. Woodfall, 1747, xii.
77. Avison, Essay on Musical Expression (1752), p. 70. Cf. Pope Essay on Criticism, lines 124-140.
78. Avison, Essay, p. 86. Cf. The anonymous Advice to the Composers and Performers of Vocal Musick, London, T. Edlin, 1727, p. 12.
79. Avison, Reply to the Remarks, p. 194. See Chapter III, p. 173 of the present work for Avison's use of a better known section of Pope's Essay on Criticism.
80. John Mainwaring, Observations on the Works of George Frederick Handel, London, R. and J. Dodsley, 1760, p. 187. Cf. Pope's Essay on Criticism, lines 243-66.
81. William Hughes, Remarks upon Church Musick, Worcester, R. Lewis, 1763, p. 5.
82. John Gregory, A Comparative View of the State and Faculties of Man with Those of the Animal World, London, J. Dodsley, 1767, p. 124.
83. Burney, History, IV, pp. 44ff. In particular, Burney writes at length on the saintly character and phenomenal abilities of Farinelli (1702-1782), the greatest of all artificial sopranos (pp. 412-417).
84. Horace Walpole, Letters, VII, p. 77.
85. Richard Cumberland, The West Indian (Prologue), London, W. Griffin, 1771.
86. Francesco Algarotti, An Essay on the Opera, London, L. Davis, 1767, pp. 27, 37.
87. Gluck's preface to Alcestis (1767) -- the "manifesto" -- is summarized by Scholes, "Opera (5)" Oxford Companion to Music, p. 633. "(a) The music to be secondary to the poetry and drama, not to weaken them by unnecessary ornaments -- to be, in fact,

something like the addition of colour to drawing, giving more life to the figures without changing their shapes. (b) Halts in the poetry and action for the sake of any kind of display to be particularly avoided, whether such halts be for the sake of vocal display or for that of the added interest of interpolated instrumental passages (*ritornelli*). (c) The overture to be of such a character as to prepare the audience for the drama to follow. (d) The orchestration to vary according to the degree of interest and passion in the words. (e) Too great a disparity between recitatives and arias to be shunned."

88. Samuel Johnson, "John Hughes," Lives, I, p. 468.
89. See Chapter IV.
90. John Lockman, "An Inquiry into the Rise and Progress of OPERAS and ORATORIOS," prefixed to Rosalinda, London, W. Strahan, 1740, xx.
91. V. C. Clinton-Baddeley, Words for Music, Cambridge, University Press, 1941, passim.
92. See p. 80 of this chapter.
93. Lockman, Inquiry into Operas, ix.
94. Daniel Webb, Observations on the Correspondence between Poetry and Music, London, J. Dodsley, 1769, p. 133.
95. Clinton-Baddeley, op. cit., p. 87.
96. John Frederick Lampe, The Art of Musick, London, C. Corbett, 1740, p. 6.
97. Avison, Essay on Musical Expression, p. 61.
98. The new composers, Lampe exclaimed, "grow giddy with their Fancies;" discipline is an essential to the musician as it is to the poet (op. cit., p. 48). Avison, recalling Pope's dictum, decried the composer's habit "of bestowing his Labour and Attention on some trifling and unfruitful Subject." (Essay on Musical Expression, p. 39).

99. William Turner, "A Discourse Concerning the Abuse of Musick," Sound Anatomiz'd, London, William Pearson, 1724, p. 4.
100. John Brown, An Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times, London, L. Davis, 1757, p. 31.
101. Henry Home, Lord Kames, Elements of Criticism, 5th edition, Edinburgh, A. Kinkaid, 1774, I, pp. 205-206.
102. Burney, History, III, v.
103. For the critics' reacting against reason, and for their fostering sentimental theories in eighteenth-century musical criticism, see Chapter III.
104. Gregory, op. cit., pp. 140, 144.
105. Burney, History, IV, p. 50. Cf. pp. 203 and 225-229 of this same volume.
106. Thomas Robertson, An Inquiry into the Fine Arts, London, W. Strahan, 1784, pp. 10-11.
107. Burney, History, IV, p. 602.
108. Ibid., pp. 599, 602.
109. Ibid., p. 619.

Chapter III

Imitation as an Aesthetic Norm in Eighteenth-century Musical Criticism

"Imitation," like "Nature," played a dominant part in the aesthetic theories of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. During those years, to "imitate" Nature was the supreme end for which the artist was to strive. Like the naturalistic conceptions of the age, however, the interpretations of the word Imitation were numerous and often equivocal. Poets attached one, dramatists another, aestheticians another, and musicians still another meaning to the term.¹ Since musical criticism in eighteenth-century England amounted more or less to the imposing of literary precepts upon music, an inevitable difficulty arose. Certain musical practices simply could not be reconciled to those mimetic theories which neoclassicists gleaned from the writings of Aristotle, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Vida. Though employed extensively by contemporary composers and applauded wildly by the musical public, such practices were nevertheless condemned by men of letters as aesthetically "bad."

The present chapter deals with four conceptions of

mimesis current at one time or another in eighteenth-century literature, and traces the history of each in its application to music. In these various conceptions of mimesis one finds the explicit judgement of neoclassicists giving way to the arid, academic conjecturing which characterized musical criticism in the middle of the century. From 1730 on, references to musical compositions by name are almost non-existent. One observes also in later interpretations of Imitation the gradual turning of intellectuals from restrictive classicism to individualistic romanticism and the ideal of artistic freedom. Finally in this account of Imitation in eighteenth-century musical criticism is illustrated the trend, accelerated by mid-century sentimentalism, toward emotionalizing the objectives of art.

The first two meanings assigned to Imitation — the dramatic representation of "men's actions," and the copying of accepted masterpieces — were comparatively short-lived in literary theories. These two notions which appeared principally in operatic criticism from the Restoration through the first third of the eighteenth century will be discussed first. The third conception, that the musician should depict or imitate Nature

literally, and the fourth, that the musician should suggest or "express" the various emotional states of the human mind, were more consistently the "matter" of musical criticism during the entire century. A more extended account of depictive and expressive imitation is therefore given in this chapter.

I. Dramatic Imitation, and the Copying of Models

Tragedy, Aristotle declares in Poetics (II, ii-iv, vii, xiii), is an "imitation" of human action which excites pity and terror in the spectator. Accompaniments and embellishments are graceful adjuncts of this dramatic action, and of these music is the most agreeable. However, concludes Aristotle, the poet should remember that music and decorations are only handmaids of the fable, manners, diction, and sentiment of the drama. The attempt to raise pity and terror by sensuous ornamentation betrays the inferior playwright, and imitative tragedy degenerates into mere spectacle.

To seventeenth-century traditionalists occupied with

the refinement of contemporary tragedy, Aristotle's "laws" of dramatic imitation (whatever that meant) presented as good reasons as any for denying authority to the form of English opera. As early as 1678, Saint-Evremond asserted in his influential Essay upon Opera's that recitative entirely destroys the essential vraisemblance which is implicit in Aristotle's opinion that drama should imitate human actions. Furthermore, these new-fangled plays which were sung from beginning to end violated the ruling that music, though a legitimate part of tragedy, should be but a pleasurable accompaniment and decoration. "Is it to be imagined," jeers the French classicist,

that a Master calls his Servant, or sends him on an errand, singing; that one friend imparts a secret to another, singing; that men deliberate in a Council, singing; that Orders in time of Battle are given singing; and that men die melodiously killed with Sword, Pike, and Musket? That's to lose the life of representation, which without doubt is preferable to that of Harmony; for Harmony ought to be no more but a bare attendant.²

As a safeguard against this perversion of ancient tragic ideals, Saint-Evremond ends his essay by exhorting producers of opera to emulate Greek tragedy, to abolish unnatural recitative, and to revive the dramatic chorus for what little musical commentary is needed in drama.³

Practising dramatists who were impatient to experiment with the new dramatic form took little heed of Saint-Evremond, and as opera gained a foothold in England other deviations from the Rules became evident. The un-Aristotelian design of the libretto, as it was delineated by apologists for English opera, is illustrative of the widening breach between irate classicists and the delighted playwrights who championed the new dramatic genre. John Dryden's definition of opera in 1685, for instance, was monstrously contrary to Aristotle's injunctions. In the new music-drama, the poet audaciously explains, where "human impossibilities are to be received as they are in faith," the plot "admits of the marvellous," and the important "songish part" is incorporated to "please hearing rather than to gratify the understanding." There is no mention here of raising pity and terror, but only of charming the senses. Nor does the author attempt to pacify severe critics by cleverly reconciling his representations of "human impossibilities" with the imitation of Nature stressed by Aristotle and his followers. Yet, despite the outcry of neoclassicists, dozens of similar operas appeared in the later years of the seventeenth century. The operatic form of drama, with its fantastic

plots and gaudy trappings, held the stage until the early 1700's.

When the Italian opera superseded the older English type in London during Queen Ann's reign, less eminent librettists — at work either translating the clap-trap operatic "books" from the original Italian or contriving their doggerel for opportunist composers — troubled even less with ancient dramatic precepts. The receipts from the novelty-hunting public at Vanbrugh's new Haymarket-theatre were more gratifying to the rhymesters than the meagre satisfaction derived from obeying the Rules. One finds, on the other hand, that critical censure of the wildly extravagant and distracting "decorations" and of the slovenly deus-ex-machina plotting of operas tended to lessen in the first decade of the eighteenth century. They had become the stock in trade of the operatic stage and though pained by the degeneracy of the modern theatre, the Aristotelian Man of Taste abandoned his attack on the excessive spectacle and the irrational "fables" of Italian opera.

But recitative, as a valid imitation of the "actions of men" was another matter. English librettists of the seventeenth century had eventually rejected recitative

for spoken dialogue, not because it interfered with the realistic imitation of Nature, but because audiences preferred the greater intelligibility and the quicker delivery of the spoken word. The new Italian Arsinoe and Camilla, however, re-introduced recitative (which Grub-street librettists promptly aped) with the result that patriotic Englishmen once again resorted to the Poetics to combat this revived bugbear. The dramatists of the old school, contending that no man was worthy of the name of poet whose declamatory verses, themselves, were not "harmonious," derided the modern playwright's dependence upon unnatural, complementary music. In his "correct" opera, The British Enchanters (1706), which he wrote to reform the taste for the immensely popular Italian opera, Granville refused to use recitative. Urging the return to the spoken dialogue of the seventeenth-century English opera, he echoes Saint-Evremond:

... a good Verse, well pronounced, is in it self musical, and Speech is certainly more natural for Discourse, than Singing.... The Singing, therefore, should be wholly applied to the Lyrical [part] of the Entertainment, which by being freed from a tiresome, unnatural Recitative, must certainly administer more reasonable Pleasure.⁵

Instead of being an imitation, recitative, was a distortion of Nature.

But the Three Unities, the subordinated decoration, the instructive moral, and the spoken declamation of The British Enchanters failed to convert the opera-public to a taste for Aristotelian music-drama. The boot was now on the other foot; librettists fell to taunting Granville and other dramatists who refused to supply what the public demanded. Besides, hooted Peter Anthony Motteux (whose librettos "after the Italian Manner" had been repeatedly successful) the Haymarket operas were no more unrealistic than that same type of traditional tragedy which Granville so tirelessly defended. Let critics be silent on the lack of verisimilitude and mimesis in the opera. Their own pseudo-classical tragedies, "as most are written and utter'd, have not much more of Nature."⁶

Shortly after Handel's first triumph, Rinaldo, opened at the Haymarket Theatre in 1711, Aristotelian opinions were once more aired. Saint-Evremond's friend, Joseph Addison, repeated much of the satire on recitative found in the French critic's earlier essay. Although not so much a stickler for the Rules as Saint-Evremond was, Addison none the less deplored the unrealistic imitation of men's actions in current librettos. He disapproved

especially (though good-naturedly) of the incongruous interruptions of the orchestra during the course of an opera: "The Famous Blunder in an old Play of Enter a King and two Fiddlers solus, was now no longer an Absurdity; when it was impossible for a Hero in a Desert, or a Princess in her Closet, to speak any thing unaccompanied with Musical Instruments."⁷

Not all critics, however, were as good-humoured as Addison was in dealing with Handel's works. Some of the more violent opponents of Italian opera declared that this luxurious nonsense, composed and sung by England's ostensible enemies, threatened native English productions with bankruptcy. Coupling his chauvinistic rage with horror at the debasing of Aristotelian rules, the explosive Dennis wrote:

A Play, they say, is the Imitation of human Life, in order to its Improvement; and yet that is an Art that is about to be lost among us. But what is an Opera? 'Tis so foolish a Thing, that 'tis impossible to give a serious Description of it: 'Tis the Imitation, or rather the Burlesque of Catterwawling, where Love and Battel are wag'd together with perpetual Squawling. And yet this is the Thing that is so much encourag'd, O noble Encouragement!⁸

In the second and third decades of the eighteenth century, condemnation of opera along these lines all but disappeared. The outbursts had had little effect

upon librettists and their enthusiastic supporters at the Haymarket. One of the last appeals to classical tradition appeared in The Prompter for 4 December 1734 — though by that time it was the castrate and not recitative which was "unnatural." Aaron Hill, the editor (and curiously enough, the librettist of Handel's first opera) resumed John Dennis's attack by defining "Publick Spectacles" as those designed to correct abuses, ridicule folly, "to instruct, by drawing characters to be imitated, or avoided," and, "finally, to move the Passions by such Images as imprint in the Mind Terror and Compassion, Grief and Joy." Neither the libretto nor the male soprano can effect any of these changes in an audience. Are we to emulate the character, he asks, presented by a eunuch whose personality is "not to be acquired but by committing a Violence upon Nature"? Are we to suppose that the sophisticated and more prurient ladies in the audience are to be moved to pity and terror while their minds dwell upon the sexual incapacities of the castrato-hero?

Thus it is evident in mid-century criticism that Aristotle's law was no longer compelling per se; it was necessary to reinforce one's appeal to The Poetics with

hysterical patriotism and unpleasant vilification of singers. But by that time, England was accustomed to the irregularity of librettos and few sensible critics continued to waste invective on anti-classical recitative, spectacle, and irrational music. Furthermore, reverence for Aristotle's restrictive rules had lessened considerably among serious dramatists. The "imitation of men's actions" had become a worn-out ideal by the middle of the eighteenth century as well on the "legitimate" as on the operatic stage.

There was another conception of mimesis which was considerably more important in literary criticism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries than the principle discussed above was. It was in part also derived from Aristotle's Poetics. Neoclassicists reasoned thus: the ancient critic enjoins us to imitate Nature; the works of Homer and Sophocles have been found to be "Nature methodiz'd"; therefore, we may imitate Nature by copying the works of the masters. The eighteenth-century vogue of imitating ancient poetic models is too well known to require further comment here. But the practice of copying models extended to other arts as well. Thus, in the early operas, such as D'Avenant's First Dayes Entertainment (1656),

librettists sought critical approbation by describing the works as being composed "after the Manner of the Ancients."⁹

What, one is curious to know, was the ancient "Manner" so far as operas are concerned? D'Avenant does not instruct us in this; he described his work in this way only as a subterfuge in circumventing Cromwell's ban on plays. Not until the Restoration did critics question the "antiquity" of opera. Upon discovering that opera was a recent innovation of the Italians (c. 1597), the majority of neoclassicists scorned it as an illegitimate genre of drama. We derive our dramatic laws, they asserted, from works tested by two thousand, not by sixty years.

John Dryden, on the other hand, justified seventeenth-century operatic practices. He agrees with the traditionalists that modern poetic forms should be imitations of those forms which time has proved to be perfect. Therefore, he argues, since we imitate Homer's epics and Pindar's odes because they are flawless models, we are "obliged to imitate the design of the Italians, who have not yet invented, but brought to perfection, this sort of dramatic musical entertainment."¹⁰ Despite the fact that the works of the camerati were modern, they were worthy of imitation. After Dryden's pronouncements on English opera

in 1685, critics were apparently reconciled to the idea that such works were, after all, based upon an acceptable authority. We hear little more from them on this score in the seventeenth century.

The old controversy flared up again briefly after Italian-style operas were introduced to London with the magical phrase, "in imitation of the Ancients." The librettes of these patch-work productions were appallingly pedestrian, dozens of long-winded arias held up the action, and characters were nothing but inconsequential puppets. Yet librettists persisted in palming them off as reproductions of ancient "Dramatick Pieces," which "were undoubtedly Sung."¹¹ The Florentine dilettanti had been justified in making such an assertion, but it was preposterous to say the same of these gallimaufries. Incensed at the presumptuousness of Haymarket-hacks, John Dennis retorted in a Parnassian huff that only in the great poetic genres do we emulate the sublimity of ancient models. In the petty Italian opera (the product of a country then at war with England) we only have the modern and "prodigious Luxury of Italy, with an awkward and vile Imitation."¹²

In Queen Anne's reign, the opera-critics' allegiance

to the Rules was obviously stimulated to a great extent by excessive patriotism and the conviction that all art from modern Italy was degenerate. We found this to be so in the various judgements noted above on "dramatic imitation" in operas. This second interpretation of mimesis, however, did not even survive as long as the first had as a touchstone in musical criticism. Structures similar to Dennis's became rarer after Handel's operas were introduced to England. Soon thereafter, Handel became the idol of London, and if critics were harsh with many of his practices few denied that his works were the models which other composers should imitate.

Two conceptions of Imitation, then, while popular for many years, were obsolete by the middle of the century when Dr. Johnson boomed in the tenth chapter of Rasselas, "No man was ever great by Imitation."

II. The Contrasted Ideals of Imitation as "Depiction," and as "Expression"

1. The late Seventeenth and early Eighteenth Centuries.

The third conception of Imitation current in the eighteenth century made the accurate pictorial representation of Nature aesthetically desirable. It sanctioned what we should call "photographic reproduction," the extreme in artistic verisimilitude. The theory, however, was troublesome for eighteenth-century critics of art. They agreed that it was an admirable rule for painters and sculptors. But they were confused about its being a legitimate precept for musicians, for the two sources from which the theory was derived were contradictory. Had Plato been the sole authority upon whom eighteenth-century critics based their criteria of judgement, the Augustans would have condemned depictive music (of which there was a great deal) without further ado.^{13.} Certain of Aristotle's observations, however, were incompatible with Plato's. At the beginning of his Poetics (I, iv), Aristotle remarks that music is an imitative art, while in Politics (V, viii) he adds that it is the most imitative of the arts. Both statements appear to be a recommendation of pictorial imitation in musical composition. One would assume that traditionalists made much of this single instance when an Aristotelian dictum, without any far-fetched interpretation, provided a touchstone for judging current musical practices. But as we shall see, an

examination of early eighteenth-century criticism of music proves otherwise.

Quite apart from the English critics' questioning its "legitimacy," depictive imitation was prevalent in baroque music. The composer effected this kind of musical imagery in two ways. First, it was possible for him to mimic the sounds and motions of Nature by instrumentation. With flutes and flageolets he simulated certain bird-calls, or, by varying his tempi he set before the listener torrents, gales, and a multitude of other motions observed in Nature. Imitation, in this sense, was primarily orchestral in execution, and was a practice greatly valued by less acute commentators on theatrical music. Charles Gildon, for example, in his Art of Poetry, expressed admiration for "Harry Purcel" and his "Art of Painting in Musick." Indeed, one of the great theatrical coups of the seventeenth century, to Gildon's mind, was Purcell's setting of the Frost Scene in Dryden's King Arthur (1691), "where, by the admirable Conjunction of Flats and Sharps, he makes you almost shiver."¹⁴

During the years of Handel's early triumphs in London, however, more fastidious classicists hesitated to extend unqualified approval to the "painting" which

was ubiquitous in the music of that period. As a conjuring trick it was diverting enough, but it was hardly worthy of serious comment. Besides, they asked, can a simple succession of notes really reproduce Nature in facsimile? Was it not necessary for the composer to furnish some kind of "programme," or guide, for the audience beforehand? Gildon himself had revealed that he was prepared to shiver at Purcell's quavers by his precognition of a "Frost Scene" in Dryden's opera. Aristotle or no, the rationalists of Queen Anne's time were dissatisfied with the artistic validity of this kind of music. Consequently, Addison, perhaps the most incisive musical critic of Augustan London, refused to recognize music as a representational art in his sixth essay on the Pleasures of the Imagination. Common sense tells us, he writes, that a painter cannot "give the Picture of a Conjunction or an Adverb"; it is folly then to suppose, like Gildon, that a musician can "represent visible Objects by Sounds that have no Ideas annexed to them, and... make something like Description in Musick." ^{15.} Addison's scorn, no matter how much he disliked dissenting from Aristotelian authority, typifies the man of letters' attitude towards this first kind of musical mirror-imagery.

Musical theorists of the Renaissance furnished the precedent for the second way in which musicians mimicked Nature. The English point of view is exemplified in Thomas Morley's Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke (1597):

If the subject be light, you must cause your musicke go in motions, which carrie with them a celeritie, or quicknesse of time as minims, crotchets, and quauers: if it be lamentable, the note must goe in slow and heavy motions, as semi-breues, breues, and such like. Moreouer, you must haue a care that when your manner signifieth ascending, high heauen, and such like, you make your musicke ascend, and by the contrarie, when your dittie speaketh of descending, lowness, depth, hell, and others such, you must make your musicke descend.^{16.}

A century later we see the theory objectified in such works as Henry Purcell's ODE FOR ST. CECILIA'S DAY (1692):

Thou tun'st this world, this world be---low the
 spheves a---bove the spheres..... a-----

bove. Which in the heaven-ly round...

... do their own mu-sic move...

... do their own mu-sic move.

offered by the ability for setting language's meaning.

Despite their greater interest in vocal than in instrumental music, the Augustan critics were even less impressed by the Morley-Purcell mode of imitation than they had been by the pictorial. Whereas the objects which the musician fondly imagined he reproduced in

music were too vague and equivocal, the falling and rising of musical notes attached to descriptive words indicated a too close attention to detail. Greatness in art, as Pope averred in his Essay on Criticism, consists not in

th'exactness of peculiar parts,
'Tis not a lip, or eye, we beauty call,
But the joint force and full result of all.

Critics of imitative music were fond of repeating Pope's observation, but worse that its violation of taste by exactitude, sniffed John Gregory, the musical practice was a "miserable species of punning" unrefined as the false wit of bouts rimés and acrostics in poetry.¹⁷

It was in the works of inferior composers, of course, that the absurdities of Morley's method were most conspicuous. One meets with literary satire on such imitative music at the very turn of the century. In 1699, four composers had competed for the "Musick Prize" offered by the nobility for setting Congreve's masque, The Judgement of Paris. The four separate works were subsequently performed on the stages of Drury Lane and Dorset Gardens from 1701 to 1704. The masques, with Congreve's words "faithfully reproduced" in music, elicited a burlesque of the current musical fashion from Richard Steele in his Funeral; or, Grief a-la-Mode

(1702). In the second act of the play, Trim reads aloud a money-order for three hundred pounds which he has just received:

Ay, this is Poetry, this is a Song indeed! Faith, I'll set it, and sing it my self — Pray pay to Mr. William Trim — so far in recitative — Three Hundred, (singing ridiculously) Hun — dred — Hundred — Hundred thrice repeated, because 'tis Three Hundred Pounds.... If they'd bring me such sensible Words as these, I'd out-strip all your Composers, for the Musick Prize.^{18.}

Quite clearly, exacting critics considered neither type of musical depiction to be artistic although composers used them extensively and often ingeniously. Musical representation of Nature was not specific enough; musical mimicking of verbal symbols was too specific. Both, it was agreed, were puerile. So, in spite of Aristotle's declaration that music is imitative, the Queen-Anne classicists were disposed rather to maligning than to analysing the peculiarities of depictive music. Theorizing about the bothersome statements of Aristotle was reserved for the more conscientious mid-century Critics.

That is not to say, however, that in the early years of the century there was no speculation on mimesis and its application to music. It is in the second and

third decades that the fourth conception of imitation — "expressiveness" — gained currency.

Expression, at once the most subtle and the most ill-defined interpretation of mimesis, was at first simply a poetic ideal acquired from the writings of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Vida rather than from Plato or Aristotle.¹⁹ Dionysius, as Dr. Johnson tells us in his account of poetic expression, had written that in the Homeric epics "there are innumerable passages, in which length of time, bulk of body, extremity of passions, and stillness of repose; or, in which, on the contrary, brevity, speed, and eagerness, are evidently marked out by the sound of the syllables." Marco Vida, in the sixteenth century, made similar observations on the expressive, or imitative, cadences of Virgil's poetry. He, too, concluded that the finesse of poetic art consists to a great extent in the poet's ability to make the sound "the picture of the sense."²⁰ Alexander Pope popularized the discoveries of Dionysius and Vida in eighteenth-century England, and, in doing so, suggested to a good many musical critics that the musician as well as the poet might observe the rule illustrated in the lines,

'Tis not enough no harshness gives offence,
The sound must seem an Echo to the sense:
Soft is the strain when Zephyr gently blows,
And the smooth stream in smoother numbers flows;
But when loud surges lash the sounding shoar,
The hoarse, rough verse should like the torrent roar.²¹

Cadence, tone, volume, and "harmony" artfully employed in poetry, must seem to echo the sense conveyed by the words. There are analogous devices in music by which the composer may suggest, without photographically reproducing, man's natural actions and sentiments. In neither case was the imitation of single words the ideal; the artist must attempt to reproduce with sound the meaning of a phrase, a line, a sentence, or even of an entire passage. In Pope's time, however, writers hesitated to declare that musical sounds not specifically "imitative" (as in Morley's "plaine and easie" method) could convey extra-musical ideas to the hearer. The only reasonable place for this "expressive" music, therefore, was in song. There, the words, which Dionysius, Vida, and Pope accepted as the true medium of expression, directed and defined what the skeptical Dacier called "the rambling and indeterminate sounds" of music.²² The effectiveness of the two arts thus ideally united pleased both poet and critic. As for the practicing musician, he must have been astonished indeed at the literary men's belated interest in the "new" idea of musical expression. It had been a fundamental ideal of compos

tion centuries before Pope was born. But English men of letters, as it has been amply illustrated, were either ignorant of or indifferent to actual musical precepts. They were concerned with judging music by their standards.

Not until Addison's conjectures were published in The Spectator, however, was the distinction between expression and depiction as two very different interpretations of mimesis explicitly set forth. He suggests in the paper for 3d April, 1711, that musicians observe and endeavour to reproduce the "Tone" of "ordinary Speech" during moments of various emotional stresses. By tone, he adds, he does "not mean the Pronunciation of each particular Word, but the Sound of the whole Sentence." Hence, instead of striving to imitate the meanings of particular words (which Morley had advocated) the musician should attempt to "express the Passions" conveyed by the entire sentence. Addison here of course falls in with the prevailing aesthetic that it is in the disposition of the whole, not in "th'exactness of peculiar parts" that we perceive grandeur and beauty in art. As a whole, the essay is disappointing in that Addison declines to speculate on how the passions may be translated into musical tones. Also, by confining

his statements to vocal music Addison passes over the equally interesting subject concerning the possibilities of expression in wordless, instrumental music. But it need not be pointed out that such omissions do not necessarily reflect a lack of critical acumen peculiar to Addison. Musico-psychological speculation and the study of purely orchestral music simply did not play a part in the aesthetic theories of Augustan England.

Nevertheless, various numbers of The Spectator mark the beginning of the outspoken antipathy of English critics toward depictive music. From that time until the 1740's it was characteristic of critics to disparage pictorial and to exalt, however vaguely they defined it, "expressive" music. Even contemporary musicians assented to the essayist's distinction and insisted -- rather incomprehensibly -- that poetry and not music was the primary vehicle of expression. A few months after Addison's essay appeared, Steele printed a letter in The Spectator from Clayton, Haym, and Dieupart in which the three musicians commend Addison's "Method of Judging" wherein he considers "Musick only valuable as it is agreeable to and heightens the Purpose of Poetry." "Musick," they emphasize,

is to aggravate what is intended by Poetry; it must always have some Passion or Sentiment to

express, or else Violins, Voices, or any Organs of Sound, afford an Entertainment very little above the Rattles of Children.²³

Not only depictive, but a vast quantity of absolute music as well is thus written off as child's play.

Hitherto, neoclassicists had attacked depictive music without troubling to offer another mimetic principle as a substitute aesthetic. Now, with the increased support of "expression" as a desideratum in music, critical values altered. Literally imitative music was no longer treated merely as catchpenny trickery; it came to be regarded as a debasement of the ideal, expression. Furthermore, since the public persisted in admiring Purcell's musical blizzards (and vulgar admiration naturally made certain music suspect) the new "expressionists" set out to correct the public's taste for such inelegancies. Roger North, for example, stressed the importance of chastising "ye rabble" for fostering this aesthetically "evill" music in his Musicall Gramarian where he writes of

ye hurry of football play, ye madfolks at bedlam or mortall Battells at Bear Garden, all w^{ch} Bizarrie ye masters of musick will undertake to represent, and many persons that doe not well distinguish between real good & evill, but are hurreyed away by caprice, as in a whirlwind, think such musick ye best; & despise those who

are not of ye same opinion and (as ye rabble)
crye, it is brave sport.²⁴

More consistently attacked in the first third of the century as a deviation from the new norm of expression, was the other type of depictive music which slavishly "imitated" verbal symbols. This practice, since it involved poetry, was more repugnant to the literati than the "Bizarrie" was which North condemned. It, too, however, enjoyed a popularity among the unrefined. Steele, who had already ridiculed the musical embroidery of individual words in The Funeral, resumed his raillery in The Theatre. In the issue for 1st March, 1720, "calculated for the service of the present refiners of our taste in Music and Poetry," he prints the words of a nonsense-song completely devoid of the emotions and sentiments requisite for expressive music. The first stanza runs,

So notwithstanding heretofore
Strait forward by and by,
Now everlastingly therefore,
Too low and eke too high.

The composer of imitative music of the Morley type will at first find difficulty in devising "sounds proper for the syllables" in this nounless ballad. But with a little ingenuity, Steele continues with mock confidence,

he will single out the "particular words," perhaps setting notes of "due impatience" on the phrase "by and by." Then, "it is not to be doubted but this piece will meet with applause."

But humorous as The Theatre is, when James Beattie recalled these early satires on imitative music, he chose as his favourite not Steele's but Swift's skilful and extravagant joke on musical mimics. The Cantata (c. 1730), which Beattie jubilantly described fifty years later, was the work of Jonathan Swift and his friend, John Echlin (or Ecclin), the musical prebendary of Tuam. The poem was not the first of Swift's satires on current musical conventions. In 1714, he had parodied the "Italian Manner" in his obscene Ode on the Longitude by indicating passages for "Recitativo," "Ritornello," and "da Capo."²⁵ Years later he satirized the craze for Italian castrati in the suggestive verses of Apollo; or, a Problem Solved. Thus (though he tells us in The Dean to Himself that he knew "music no more than an Ass") he attempted at various times in his life to expose the musical absurdities cried up by an unenlightened public. Consequently, writes Beattie, the wide acclaim for the "puerile mimicry" of musicians did not long remain unnoticed by the Dean during the Age of Expression.²⁶

Slow.

In Har-mo-ny wou'd you Ex-cel,

Fast.

Suit your Words to your Mu-sick well, Mu-sick well, Mu-sick well,

Suit your Words to your Mu-sick well, Suit your Words to your Mu-sick well,

Slow.

For Pe-ga-sus runs,

tr. Fast. Fast.

runs . . . ev-ery Race by Gal

Slow. tr
 - - - - - *lop-ing high, or Le - vel Pace, or Am - bling or*
 - - - - - *Sweet Can - ter - bury, or with a down a high down der-ry,*
 - - - - - *No, no Vic-to-ry, Vic-to-ry he ev - er got, by Jog - - -*
 - - - - - *ling, Jog - - - - - ling,*
 - - - - - *Jog - - - - - ling trot, * * * * **
 - - - - - *No Muse har - mon - ious En - ter-tains, Rough*

The score consists of six systems of music. Each system has a vocal line (treble clef) and a piano accompaniment line (bass clef). The key signature is one sharp (F#). The tempo is marked "Slow." and there are trills indicated by "tr". The lyrics are written below the vocal line. The piano accompaniment includes various chords and figures, with some numbers (6, 5, 4, 2) written below the notes, possibly indicating fingerings or chord types. The piece ends with a double bar line and repeat signs.

Royst-ring Rus-tick Roar - - - ing Strains nor

6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6

shall you twine the Crack

6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6

- - ling, Crack-ling Bays by Sneak-ing Sniw'l-ling

6 6 5 6 6 6 6 6

Round . . . De-lays. Now slow-ly move your

6 6 6 4 6 6 6 6

Fid-dle stick, Now, tan-tan-tan-tan-tan-ti-vi

6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6

Now, tan-tan-tan-tan-tan-ti-vi quick ♪ ♪ ♪ ♪ ♪ ♪ ♪

6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6

quick, now trem - bling Shiv - ring Quiv - ring
 - ring Quak - ing, . . . Set hop - ing, hop - ing,
 hop - ing hearts of Lov - ers ake - ing, Fly, fly, . . .
 a - bove, a - bove the Sky Ram - bling, Gam - bling,
 - bling, Ram - bling, Gam - bling,
 Gam - bling,

Musical score with two staves (treble and bass clef) and lyrics. The score includes various musical notations such as trills (tr), slurs, and dynamic markings. The bass staff contains guitar-style fingering numbers (e.g., 6, 6, 6, 7, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 5).

Trol-lop-ing, Lol-lop-ing, Gal-lop-ing, Trol-lop-ing, Lol-lop-ing, Gal-lop-ing,

Trol - lop, Lol - lop - ing, Trol - lop - ing, Gal - lop - ing, Lol - lop - ing,


Trolloping, Galloping, Lol - lop, Now Creep, . . . Sweep, Sweep,

Sweep the Deep, See, see, . . . Ce - lia, Ce - lia

Dies, Dies, Dies, Dies, Dies, Dies, Dies, Dies,

While true Low - ers . . . Eyes Weep - ing Sleep,

Fast.
S



Sleep - ing Weep, Weep - ing Sleep. Bo peep, bo peep, bo
peep, bo peep, peep, bo bo peep.

The image shows a musical score for a piece titled "Sleep - ing Weep, Weep - ing Sleep. Bo peep, bo peep, bo peep, bo peep, peep, bo peep, peep, bo bo peep." The score is written in G major (one sharp) and 3/4 time. It consists of two systems of music. The first system has a vocal line (Soprano) and a piano accompaniment. The tempo is marked "Fast." and the vocal line is marked "S". The lyrics are "Sleep - ing Weep, Weep - ing Sleep. Bo peep, bo peep, bo". The second system continues the vocal line with "peep, bo peep, peep, bo bo peep." and ends with a double bar line and a repeat sign. The piano accompaniment consists of simple chords and eighth notes.

Thus, from about 1660 to 1730, depictive music received almost unanimous disapproval. In spite of Aristotle's ostensible recommendation and the practices of Renaissance theorists, the obviousness and frequent banality of such music offended the Augustans. During those years, satire had been the most effective means of revealing the absurdities of "imitative" music. After 1730, when the era of Steele and Swift gave way to a period of more sober criticism, open-minded analysis of music replaced the biased, though rollicking banter of The Theatre and The Cantata.

ii. The Attempts from 1730 to 1760 to adjust
Classical Imitation to Contemporary Thought

During the middle decades of the century, the desire for freedom from Augustan restrictions stimulated the revaluation of artistic precepts in accordance with "enlightened" theories of aesthetics. Consequently, a great number of critical essays on the so-called "sister-arts" appeared in which avant-gourier romantics

questioned the validity of traditionalistic judgements. The trend of mid-century criticism is reflected in these writers' attempts to deduce from a comparative study of the arts new criteria of judgement which stressed sentiment more than reason, and variety more than uniformity. As a detailed history of eighteenth-century taste is beyond the scope of this study, it suffices to say here that through the work of such men as Harris, Hogarth, Kames, and Beattie the differentiae of romantic aesthetics were fairly well agreed upon by the end of the century. Diversity, "genius," and imagination became the new touchstones of enlightened criticism.

Yet, despite their rejection of pseudo-classical precepts, most of the new "analysts" and "standardizers" of taste were reluctant to dismiss Imitation as an outworn ideal. By the 1760's, it is true, the problem of imitation in the arts was simplified. The two interpretations of the principle discussed in the first section of this chapter — the two most applicable to the art of poetry — had already fallen into disesteem. But the conception of mimesis as the artistic reproduction, either depictive or expressive, of Nature was not so easy to discredit, especially since as yet no one had discovered an alternative principle which explained what other function

there might be of art. Responsible to a great degree for the sustaining of this dilemma among English critics was the assumption of the influential Abbe Du Bos that

The first principles ... of music are the same as those of poetry and painting. Music, like these two Arts, is an Imitation; and like these Arts it must conform to the general Rules....^{28.}

This virtual restatement of the Aristotelian ideal became a platitude among English writers on the sister-arts from about 1730 to 1760. They found it far simpler to accept and modernize the age-old and apparently immutable idea of Imitation than to posit and defend the existence of a substitute. Hence, essayists like James Harris, who adopted Du Bos' postulate found it impossible to dispose of Imitation, the common denominator of the arts. In order to determine which of the three sister-arts "is more excellent than the other two," declared Harris, we must accept the initial proposition that the arts "agree, by being all MIMETIC, or IMITATIVE."^{29.} Thus we find in this period of emancipated criticism the survival, indeed the new currency, of the ancient precept.

It has been mentioned that the manner in which writers discussed mimesis altered considerably since the early decades. New names superseded the old ones in musical criticism, and satire, such as Swift's, was

no longer the prevailing mode of critical attack. The new criticism, as Mr. J. W. Draper shows, was carried on "in conformity with the romantic Zeitgeist." Finding themselves heirs to a seemingly unalterable aesthetic, these critics attempted to adjust the principle of Imitation "to sentimental theories of aesthetic and to the psychology and historical contributions of the Rationalist philosophers."³⁰ In addition, they introduced other favourite eighteenth-century themes into musical criticism in the effort to bring Imitation up to date. Among those which will be discussed presently are primitivism, Shaftesburian benevolism, and Locke's principle of the association of ideas.

Before a satisfactory compromise between the traditionalistic concept and current thought could be effected, the critics realized, it was necessary to determine once for all what music can depict and what it can express. To begin with, the depiction of individual verbal symbols by corresponding musical notes was rejected unanimously as too low a practice to warrant detailed examination. Du Bos had pointed out earlier that such music is like "a picture that is only well-coloured," and English critics (who habitually cited analogies among the sister-arts) warned the composer

of this "ignis fatuus" which threatened to "bemire" the user in the musical counterpart of the pun.^{31.} The musical depiction of Nature, not words, was the important subject of the investigation, and by 1744 the tabulation of the things which music can depict was completed.

In that year, James Harris expounded the findings in his Three Treatises, a work on music which Harris's fellow-critics accepted as definitive. "Fittest" for depictive music, he explains, "are all such Things and Incidents, as are most eminently characterised by Motion and Sound." In the inanimate world there are for example sounds and motions perceived in water and wind which present legitimate models for depiction. In the animal world, music may depict the sounds of various animals, but most successfully that of birds. "It can also," he adds, "faintly copy some of their Motions." Of human beings, music can also depict some motions and sounds, but of sounds "those most perfectly which are expressive of Grief and Anguish," for "Grief, in most Animals, declares itself by Sounds, which are not unlike to long Notes in the Chromatic System."^{32.} In short, the musician can depict some sounds and some motions of Nature. All such representations, however, are imperfect,

and Harris's followers generally concluded that pictorial imitation, since it was almost entirely confined to external Nature, was the least refined interpretation of mimesis. Therefore, concluded Adam Smith in one of his rare excursions into the field of artistic commentary,

Great reserve, great discretion, and a very nice discernment are requisite, in order to introduce with propriety ... imperfect imitations, either into Poetry or Music; when repeated too often, when continued too long, they appear to be what they really are, mere tricks, in which a very inferior artist, if he will only give himself the trouble to attend to them, can easily equal the greatest.³⁵

Meanwhile, aestheticians decided that Aristotle's seeming contradiction of Plato, which had confused the Augustans as to which of the authorities they were to follow, was not a contradiction at all. What Aristotle really meant by "imitation" was expression, asserted the new critics. Consequently, it was to the more complex study of expressive representation in music that they next turned.

There was never any real indecision over which mode of imitation was the more desirable. Two damning preconceptions against literal imitation in instrumental music had survived neo-classical criticism. First, such music reproduced the particular, not the general. Secondly, its execution was not conditioned or directed

by a poetic component; the traditional belief that music should be subservient to poetry was too much ingrained for critics to entertain even the slightest preference for music independent of poetry. No, pathetic expression was the new ideal sought for in the fine arts, and, as Kames decided, "sentimental" music can only be realized in song where instrumental harmony accompanies and sustains (he does not tell us how) the poetically evoked feelings.³⁴

To justify this preference, at least a half-dozen musical historians adopted the currently fashionable primitivistic attitude toward the arts. From time immemorial, they revealed, expression had been the very raison d'être of music among all races, and the only music we may correctly call "natural" was in song. The argument of Webb, Jones, Lockman, and Gregory is simple. Primitive language originated as the articulation of man's natural passions. Later, this expression of Nature by words gave rise to a primitive music which was employed to convey or enforce the sentiments of the spoken words. Thus, the original union of poetry and music gave double articulation to natural sentiments. The combination of the sister-arts deteriorated, however, as the more refined poets during the course of centuries

showed a predilection for striking verbal imagery, which, instead of reproducing abstractedly the several mind-states, described minutely the concrete components of Nature. Composers, lamented Webb and his colleagues, were henceforth limited in their application of expressive, though not depictive music. In conformity with the romantic primitivism which pervaded mid-century thought, enthusiastic critics cried, "follow Nature!" Let us turn to the ancient ideal where strong imagery and detailed description in the verbal element of song were excluded in favour of "those verses formed on the easiest numbers" which evoked a general sentiment the musician then "expressed."³⁵

The ideas derived from their research seemed promising enough so far, and had the historians continued their investigations in the same manner they might have formulated a detailed aesthetic of expression satisfying both theorists and musicians. But the logical sequel to their discoveries -- the deduction of a working principle by which the composer was to effect this expression -- was seldom touched upon. Daniel Webb was one of the few to consider this practical aspect so oddly neglected by avid "expressionists."³⁶ A few abstruse reflexions of one

man, though, hardly constituted a guide for the composer beleaguered by un-musical conjectures.

The doctrine of imitation was a long time dying, and critics, many of whom like Swift "knew music no more than an Ass," were sinking more and more into impotent theorizing. Instead of minimizing the importance of Imitation as Rousseau and others were doing on the continent, English aestheticians expended their energies on vindicating its soundness by historical example.

Shaftesburian ethics, too, played a prominent part in these discussions. Advocates of benevolism agreed with the historians who proved that primitive music expressed the passions called up by poetry. As men of taste they urged the adoption of this truly "civilised" mode of expression.³⁷ But, before this can be accomplished, they argued, the primitivists' theories demand qualification, for it is clear that the natural elegance of music precluded an ability to express certain "unsocial" states of mind manifested in Nature by "harsh and discordant" tones, "grumblings," "screamings outcries," and "hideous howlings."³⁸ Shaftesbury's equation of Beauty and Good still held true, and Charles Avison, with his collaborator, "Estimate" Brown (whose exegesis of the Characteristicks

ran into several editions at the end of the century), asks his reader "whether he ever found himself urged to Acts of Selfishness, Cruelty, Treachery, Revenge, or Malevolence by the Power of musical Sounds? Or if he ever found Jealousy, Suspicion, or Ingratitude engendered in his Breast either from HARMONY or DISCORD?" No, the author answered for his reader, such an effect would be quite impossible, for "it is the peculiar quality of Music to raise the sociable and happy Passions." ^{39.} And what are these "musical Passions"? They are those, explained Adam Smith, "which unite and bind men together in society: the social, the decent, the virtuous, the interesting and affecting, the amiable and agreeable, the awful and respectable, the noble, elevating, and commanding passions...." ^{40.} How did the composer express these benevolent passions musically? None of the writers troubled themselves with such practical considerations. Like Shadwell's musical "virtuoso," Sir Nicholas Gimereck, to whom similar questions were put, each could reply in turn, "I seldom bring any thing to use, 'tis not my way, Knowledge is my ultimate end." ^{41.}

By far the most vital extra-musical topic discussed in the new theories of expression was John Locke's

concept of the association of ideas. Perhaps more than in any other aspect of eighteenth-century musical criticism one may here observe the evolution of the later sentimental theories of aesthetic from those dictated by rationalism. Briefly stated, Locke's conception of association is as follows. There is such a strong connexion existing between ideas in the mind, that the consciousness of one idea can call up the memory of another closely allied to it. The act of association can be brought about in several ways. It may be the result of a cause-effect relationship. It may be brought about by the relationship of things contiguous in time or space. Again, the association may be effected by an idea calling up its opposite. As types of association, these of causality, contiguity, and contrariety were expounded with great frequency in the critical and psychological literature of the eighteenth century.⁴² But it is a fourth kind of association -- that brought about by the resemblance of ideas -- which musical critics emphasized in their dissertations upon the end, or "chief delight" of imitation in the arts.

Joseph Addison, Locke's earliest literary champion, was the first to use the philosopher's theory of association in explaining the ultimate value of artistic

expression. After discussing the "secondary Pleasures of the Imagination" (those arising from an "Affinity of Ideas") in the Spectator for 27 June 1712, he concludes that imagination as prompted by the association of ideas is the result of an intellectual, not an emotional, process. True pleasure exists in the rational act of comparing the artistic copy with the original, in noting the resemblance or "analogy" of one to the other. To surrender oneself unthinkingly, as later romantics exhorted one to do, to the multitude of pleasurable associations necessarily evoked by imitative art would be dangerously close to enthusiasm. Only through exercising the mind in recognising the similitudes between Art and Nature can a refined and creditable imagination be stimulated. It is not of great importance that Addison refuses to admit the possibility of "analogous Ideas" being raised by imitative music.⁴³ What is significant about these essays on the sister-arts is the emphasis laid upon the reason in associating ideas, a conception as we shall see which was antithetical to the romantic ideal of sensation.

Addison's point of view was not abandoned with the advent of more introverted speculations in aesthetics. By the 1740's, critics no longer believed that music

was totally incapable of imitating Nature. Purely depictive music was still thought to offer only indefinite and confused representations, but the images presented by expressive music were quite positive. The concept of associationism was again employed to explain the "pleasures" derived from art, this time from expressive harmony. James Harris, like Addison, declares in his Three Treatises that the pleasures of the imagination provoked by music are the products of an intellectual act which springs in turn from our innate "Joy in Reasoning," which is "the Energy of that principal Faculty, our INTELLECT or UNDERSTANDING." Hence the delight in musical associations, for we are enabled in listening to expressive music "to exercise the Reasoning Faculty... by comparing the Copy with the Architype in our Minds."⁴⁴ The same kind of subjective activity appealed to Adam Smith, who, like many of his contemporaries, dealt with musical imitations as a "philosophical subject."⁴⁵ Addison, Harris, and Smith, we see, looked upon the association of ideas as a reflective process more or less controlled by the intellect.

A step away from this deliberate and rational associationism toward the later emotionalized inter-

pretation of Locke's theory was the adapting of the "sympathetic response" to the moral philosophy of Shaftesbury. According to the Earl of Shaftesbury, it should it should be the aim of all thinking men to strengthen their inborn but undeveloped "moral sentiment" with which they distinguish between right and wrong. The goal to be attained is complete harmony with the universe. Now there are several ways in which one may achieve the ideal identification with a "Divine Uniformity." The repeated contemplation of numbers and mathematical proportions may instill into us the feelings of oneness with the Creation. So might the constant perception of all beautiful or symmetrical objects lead one to think of the Creator of all Beauty, all Good, and all Truth.^{46.} Many of Shaftesbury's followers stressed the importance of yet another path to Unity: the constant attention to terrestrial music raises the imagination to the harmony which pervades the universe. The belief that man-made harmony can excite feelings of affinity with celestial order was very ancient, and one finds it reiterated many times since Pythagoras. It was inevitable that from the great number of eighteenth-century "enquiries" into ethics, the imitative arts, and empirical philosophy,

there should result a new interpretation of this affinity. So it was that as early as the third decade of the century, both Francis Hutcheson and Roger North propounded a theory based upon all three studies. Man, they postulated, is born with a moral sense; music (by its very nature an echo, or "imitation" of celestial harmony) aids in the development of this sense by imbuing man with the feelings of an over-all harmony. After a series of such "associations," man's soul will attain a Christian nirvana by "a sort of Sympathy or Contagion,"⁴⁷ It was a rarefied conception of associationism which they arrived at, one in which the active process of reasoning which Addison and Smith had extolled was not taken into account. Locke might have disapproved of the mental passivity implied in this peculiarly intuitive associationism, but devotees of Shaftesbury insisted, nevertheless, upon labeling this operation the "association of ideas." This ethical use Locke's concept survived well into the century. One finds it in John Gilbert Cooper's didactic poem, The Power of Harmony (1745). Designed as a vindication of the by now old-fashioned theories of Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, the poem emphasises the "harmonious association of ideas" as a utilitarian (though essentially

irrational) by-product of the "imitative arts." To idealists, then, the rational pleasure of comparing originals with their musical copies was not nearly so important as the "enthusiasm" derived from contemplating through music the eternal fitness of things.

It was a short step from this to the criticism of the 1750's and 1760's which rejected both the intellectual and the ethical for the sentimental content of Locke's principle. During these years, depictive music was repudiated not so much because of its banality, but because of its forcing the listener to mark similitudes between music and things it described. For Addison this had been the summum bonum of imitative music; for Charles Avison, this provoking of a "Reflex Act of the Understanding" was the very thing which obstructed the free working of the imagination. Avison consequently put forward an exciting new conception of what he calls "Association" in his Essay on Musical Expression: Nature connected certain sounds with certain feelings and it is the peculiar power of music not to make us think of the passions expressed but to create those passions before our very eyes. ^{48.} There is no place here for leisurely reflexion; we are in this to be

immediately transported with emotion. Despite his preoccupation with Imitation as "expression" and his desire to reconcile it with eighteenth-century rationalistic philosophy, Avison unwittingly heralds the radical revision of musical aesthetics made by the romantics. With the appearance of the Essay on Musical Expression in 1752, a critical era drew to a close.

iii. The Decline of the Doctrine of Imitation, and the Advancement of the Belief in a "greater Efficacy" of Art.

Avison's statements are indicative of the trend in the second half of the century toward the promoting of emotion as the end of art, particularly of music. There were several factors contributing to the change in attitude toward Imitation which one finds in the later inquiries of the 1770's and 1780's. For one thing, scorn for all Aristotelian writings, not only the restrictive Poetics, was fairly widespread. Under the heading of a "modern Glossary" in his Covent Garden Journal for 14th January, 1752, Henry Fielding defined

"Nonsense" as the works of Aristotle. The new poets, too, defiantly expressed their freedom by professing ignorance of any of the philosopher's works.⁴⁹ Together with this plain-spoken disparagement of Aristotle was the skeptical examining of the earlier eighteenth-century interpretation of Imitation as "expression." In the Ramblers for 2nd and 9th February, 1751, Samuel Johnson pooh-poohed the notion that in either Homer's or Pope's poetry the sound ever echoed the sense. We must conclude from Dionysius's eulogy of Homer's verse "that either he was fanciful, or we have lost the genuine pronunciation; for I know not whether, in any one of these instances, such similitude can be discovered." As for Pope, even the famous sound-sense verses in the Essay on Criticism are illusory. Johnson's final comment, that "Sound can resemble nothing but Sound," struck a blow at the theory of musical expression which had developed to a large extent from its analogy with this kind of poetic expression.

A few years after the Ramblers appeared, Johnson "praised its humour, and seemed much diverted with" Bonell Thornton's burlesque ode for St. Cecilia's Day which ridiculed this false analogy.⁵⁰ Poking fun at

critics who perpetuated the error, Thornton introduces the ode (which was to be accompanied by a band of salt-boxes, jews-harps, marrow-bones, cleavers, and hurdy-gurdies): "N. B. I have strictly adhered to the Rule of make the Sound the echo to the Sense." Thus the "Air" for tenor and salt-box:

In Strains more exalted the SALT-BOX shall join,
And Clattering, and Battering, and Clapping combine:
With a Rap and a Tap while the hollow Side sounds,
Up and down leaps the Flap, and with Rattling rebounds.^{51.}

Supplementing the irreverence toward Aristotle and the depreciation of a hitherto esteemed Augustan standard, was the impatience of the new generation of critics at the refusal of earlier theorists to treat the "imitative arts" realistically. Common sense should have informed them that the much cried-up artistic theory of Mimesis is fallacious because of the innumerable contradictions to it in actual music. A child could have proved to any of these men, said Sir William Jones, that there are not "the smallest traces of imitation in ... fugues, counterfugues, and divisions."^{52.} This disgust for abstruse theorizing prompted critics to exhort these "abstract and clogsetted men, who speak of Imitation" to abandon their virtuoso methods, to "come forth ... into the world,

and join with us in turning to fact."^{53.}

It is difficult to identify the actual "beginnings" of the move to make the raising of emotions an end in itself. Various writers earlier in the century sensed that the rational analysis of music had revealed only half the answers to the questions about that art. But either convention or hazy thinking stood in the way of further investigation. So it was with James Harris whose notorious vagueness of expression and preoccupation with Shaftesburian ideas prevented his striking out on any new paths of musical criticism.⁵⁴ The title of the sixth chapter of his Discourse, "On Music considered not as an Imitation, but as deriving its Efficacy from another Source," promises much, but all Harris does is reiterate the old prejudice against absolute music and insist that only when joined with poetry does music have a positive function. Musically raised affections, that is, are soon dissipated if not "directed" by rational poetry, "for here a double Force is made cooperate to one End."^{55.} The "end," presumably, is the instilling of feeling into the hearer and the "greater Efficacy" of music is no more than its ability to sustain poetically raised passions. There is nothing really new here although later English critics were

fond of alluding to the Discourse as the first great contribution to the sentimental theory of music. Other writers, not nearly so equivocal as Harris, suggested different "efficacies," but for one reason or another they failed to develop their theories. Had Lord Kames, for instance, expanded upon his remark that music, instead of being an imitative art, "is productive of originals," he might have changed the direction of musical criticism as early as 1762. Instead, he states the idea almost parenthetically in his Elements of Criticism.^{56.}

Not until ten years later was there any serious attempt to examine Imitation in the light of new romantic standards. In 1772, Sir William Jones's Essay on the Arts, Commonly Called Imitative, a work conceived in an anti-authoritarian spirit, in part consolidated and clarified the vague theories and fugitive ideas of such men as Harris and Kames. In the main, the Essay is an exhortation of critics to dissociate themselves from the doctrinaire judgements of the Augustans and to adopt the author's contempt for what he feels is intellectual bondage. As preface to his appeal, he reviews impatiently the eighteenth-century subservience to Aristotle:

It is the fate of those maxims, which have been thrown out by very eminent writers, to be received implicitly by most of their followers, and to be repeated a thousand times, for no other reason, than because they once dropped from the pen of a superior genius: one of these is the assertion of Aristotle, that all poetry consists in Imitation, which has been frequently echoed from author to author, that it would seem a kind of arrogance to controvert it; for almost all the philosophers and criticks, who have written upon the subject of poetry, painting, and musick, how little soever they agree in some points, seem of one mind in considering them as arts merely imitative.^{57.}

In defiance of this narrow opinion, parrotted by English critics for years, Jones assumes that the objective of music, at least, is the raising of emotions. He then proceeds to develop Kames's idea of "originality" and to reconcile it with Harris's hint that the "great Efficacy" of music lies in its power to affect the passions. Now despite all the high-sounding assertions of previous authorities, the listener's emotions cannot be raised by a sympathetic response to music which supposedly "imitates" passions. Sounds, as Dr. Johnson had declared, can resemble nothing but sound. The power of the composer, Jones writes, lies not in Imitation but in Originality. The musician achieves "his end, not by imitating the works of nature, but by assuming her power."^{58.} The "greater efficacy" of music lies in its directness, in its ability actually to create emotion.

Eager to supplant the outworn ideal of Imitation

with one more compatible with the new artistic ideals of unrestrained self-expression, the critics assented almost unanimously to this idea of the musician as a creative artist. Before long, even more daring assertions were made. When Thomas Robertson found it "expedient to take up the controversy" over Imitation in 1784, he, like Sir William Jones deplored the persistence of the Aristotelian dogma. Of the fine artist preparing to work, he asks,

Stoops he to copy? Imitation is to him the maxim of earth; invent, the mandate of Heaven.... ^{think} he of imitation in the enraptured moments? ^{59.}

The musician, then, a truly "creative" being (since according to Jones he assumed the power of Nature and produced something from nothing) is moved to create by this "rapture" which Robertson elsewhere refers to as "enthusiasm." Equally important, the listener responds to this music by a similarly irrational process in which he is "lifted up," perhaps, suggests Robertson, even to feelings of "immortality." ^{60.}

The confuting of Imitation as a modus operandi and Robertson's conception of the means and end of art were diametrically opposed to the old idea that passions ^{are} and raised artistically in order to effect a catharsis. Instead of purging ourselves of potentially unhealthy emotions, we are to sustain them and revel in them by way

of enthusiasm as long as we possibly can. These opinions, which were indeed antithetical to Aristotle's, were nevertheless almost immediately endorsed by English critics.

Implicit in these ideas, too, was the re-admittance of absolute, or non-representational music to a place among the fine arts — a place consistently denied it by eighteenth-century rationalists on the grounds that it was meaningless, hence non-utilitarian. The new rôle of absolute music as a "functional" art is illustrated in yet another concept of associationism which found its way into musical criticism. Quite inexplicitly retaining the phrase, "association of ideas," the advocates of enthusiasm described the reaction which instrumental music stimulated in the listener's mind. The composer, they held, does not attempt to raise in the listener thoughts identical with those which he, himself, had while writing a particular piece of music. By listening to those non-imitative sounds in purely orchestral music, the hearer "associates" the tones with ideas of his own. In other words, the composer does not impose his ideas upon us through music, but, as Colley Cibber had written long ago of this "Enchantment," we "annex Ideas to it of our own Creation, and, in some sort, become our selves the Poet to the Composer." ^{61.} Critics in the last third of the century

wrote glowingly of this "association," or "free operation," offered by the hitherto despised abstract music and named it "a pleasure ... one of the most delicious that music iscapable of affording."^{62.}

The statements of Harris, Kames, Jones, and Robertson typify those found in the writings of musical critics in the latter half of the century where Imitation as a precept of musical composition is completely discredited. By 1789, it was commonly held that music does not "represent" emotion, it is emotion; the listener does not "recognise" the emotions presented by music, he feels them. That year brought with it a new translation of The Poetics by Thomas Twining to which he added an essay on musical imitation. Twining is more or less in accord with the declarations of contemporary critics; he tells us that there is little in Aristotle's use of the word, "Imitation," to substantiate the complex theories of their predecessors. His main concern is to prevent a recurrence of these "unnecessary difficulties" brought on by the Englishman's native "disposition to extend and generalize [Aristotle's] assertions." Twining's primary rule, therefore, for all would-be aestheticians who cling to erroneous notions of Imitation is simple: read the Poetics. Rather

than adopt the obtuse expedient of learning Aristotle's "precepts" at second hand, return to the original treatise where

the reader will observe that he does not there assert in general terms, that "Music is an Imitative Art," but only, that the Music "of the flute and the lyre," is imitative; and even that, not always, but "for the most part." ^{63.}

III. Summary

For an entire century English musical critics had been unwittingly working away from the dicta of Plato and Aristotle which made Imitation mandatory towards the exalting of Originality and what Philestratus named "a wiser crafts-mistress than Imitation" — Imagination. ^{64.} Two principles of Imitation which the literati imposed chiefly upon opera became obsolete when they ceased to be of importance in judging literary works. Critics no longer complained that modern opera failed to conform to Greek or Italian "models" after Johnson, Hurd, and Young had convinced them that imitation, as the copying of accepted masterpieces, was irreconcilable with "genius"

and inventiveness. Nature and Homer were not the same. Similarly, comments such as John Dennis's on imitation as the dramatic representation of human actions lost their significance as criticism tended to emphasize the importance of individualistic sentimentality and not the Rules in constructing the ideal drama.

Two other theories of mimesis prevailed for a longer period of time. Although Aristotle hinted that the literal imitation of Nature was the end toward which the composer of music, "the most imitative of the arts," should bend his efforts, the eighteenth century abominated this slavish copying as a hindrance to the working of imagination in both the composer and his audience. Toward the middle of the century, the limitations of such imagery became increasingly apparent. Flageolet-birds and drumroll-tempests were clichés, and this banality, accentuated by the crudity of minor composers who thus imitated Nature, prompted literary advocates of original art to condemn these pictorial effects as vulgar and undesirable. At the same time, however, they advanced a fourth principle of Imitation as a substitute for that of exact copying. This "expression," which analysts of the sister-arts eventually explained was the "true" meaning of Aristotle's "Imitation," was closer to the ideal of Philostratus than the other three mimetic theories. Unlike them, it

presupposed an imaginative audience. Subjective activity was becoming the ne plus ultra in the perception of art, and expressive music better than any of the other arts stimulated the imagination by its suggestiveness. Even in the dark decades, when musical criticism issued from a sort of mid-century Academy of Lagado, interested theorists tried to adjust the associationism of Locke and the "nobler" enthusiasm of Shaftesbury^{65.} to the ideal of imaginative music.

At the end of the century, romantic criticism placed even more emphasis upon Originality, and in doing so provoked a thorough repudiation of Aristotelian Imitation in both its depictive and expressive forms as the greatest of all restraints on artistic creativeness. The musician, sentimentalists insisted, moved his listener not by imitating emotion, but by creating it.^{66.} There was therefore no need to carry on the academicians' "adjustment" of Imitation to current thought.

With the new sine qua non of originality in art definitely established, Twining terminated the century-old discussions by attributing the entire controversy to constant misinterpretations of a passage from the Poetics — a passage itself hopelessly ambiguous. The perspective

Notes on Chapter III:

of two hundred years reveals to us, however, that it was not because of successive misunderstandings of the word that Imitation received a series of contradictory definitions. The changing critical temper of the eighteenth century naturally gave rise to mutations in meanings of many terms, each of which was no more or less invariable than the others were. Imitation, as well as "Pride" and "Nature" is one of these terms.⁶⁷

1. John Dryden, *Discourse of Criticism and Poetry*, p. 250.
2. George Hickes, *Prolegomena to Criticism*, p. 157.
3. Peter Collier, *Remarks, Collection of Poetical Tracts*, London: Jacob Tonson, 1700.
4. *Quarterly Review*, April 1711.
5. John Dennis, "An Essay upon Poetical Criticism," *Critical Review*, II, p. 258.
6. Sir William D'Avenant, "The First Degree of Improvement of English Verse by Deductions and Analogy after the Manner of the Ancients," *Review*, III.
7. Dennis, *op. cit.*, p. 259.
8. Dennis, *op. cit.*, dedication.
9. Dennis, "Essay on the Opera after the Italian Manner," *Review*, III, p. 291.
10. Cf. Plato, *Republic*, III, 377.
11. Charles Gildon, "The Complete Art of Poetry," *Review*, II, (1710), *Critical Review of the Poets of the Ancients*, edited by Richard Bristow, London: University Press, 1880, p. 31.

Notes on Chapter III:

1. The Doctrine of Affections (Doctrine of Musical Figures, Affektenlehre, etc.) which decreed a type of "imitation" through the use of musical figures, or "emblems," was advocated by composers of the baroque era. But this, and "imitation" in the canonic sense, though of great interest to the musical historian, were not considered by the literary critics of music in eighteenth-century England. An account of them is therefore omitted from this chapter.
2. Charles de Saint-Evremond, Upon Opera's, pp. 20-21.
3. Ibid., p. 21.
4. John Dryden, preface to Albion and Albanus, p. 229.
5. George Granville, preface to British Enchanters, p. 197.
6. Peter Anthony Motteux, dedication of Love's Triumph, London, Jacob Tonson, 1708.
7. Spectator for 3rd April 1711.
8. John Dennis, "An Essay upon Publick Spirit," Critical Works, II, p. 395.
9. Sir William D'Avenant, "The First Dayes Entertainment at Rutland House by Declamations and Musick: after the Manner of the Ancients," Works, III.
10. Dryden, op. cit., p. 230.
11. Motteux, op. cit., dedication.
12. Dennis, "Essay on the Operas after the Italian Manner," Works, II, p. 391.
13. Cf. Plato, Republic, III, 397.
14. Charles Gildon, "The Complete Art of Poetry," Dialogue II, (1718), Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century, edited by Willard Higley Durham, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1915, p. 31.

15. Spectator for 27th June 1712.
16. Thomas Morley, A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke, Shakespeare Association Facsimile Number 14, London, Oxford University Press, 1937, p. 178.
17. John Gregory, Comparative View, p. 154.
18. Richard Steele, The Funeral; or Grief a-la-Mode, II, 1.
19. The idea of Expression as the "feeling" execution of music was of little interest to literary critics. It is therefore omitted from this chapter.
20. Rambler for 2nd February 1751.
21. Two of the writers who recognized this analogy and quote Pope's lines are Charles Avison (in the 3d edition of his Essay, pp. 63-4) and William Hughes, Remarks upon Church Music, Worcester, R. Lewis, 1763, p. 5.
22. Aristotle's Art of Poetry, translated from the French of Dacier, London, Daniel Browne, 1705, preface.
23. Spectator for 26th December 1711. Cf. Spectator for 18 January 1712. It will be remembered that Thomas Clayton had a few years previous to this set Addison's opera Rosamond to music. Presumably, Clayton's appallingly bad score was the sole cause of the opera's failure. This perhaps may account for the fact that although Clayton's name appears frequently in the Spectator, it is found only in those numbers attributed to Steele. The paper quoted is actually an advertisement for a series of concerts to be held in York Buildings, Strand. The management of these premises later fell to Steele.
24. North, Musicall Gramarian, pp. 17-18.
25. Jonathan Swift, Works, XIII, pp. 350-351. The subjects of the ode were Ditton and Whiston, two "experimental philosophers" who had "conceived a visionary plan for discovering the longitude at sea."

26. James Beattie, "On Poetry and Music," Essays, 3d edition, London, E. and C. Dilly, 1779, pp. 124-5. On 1st October, 1745, George Faulkner wrote to Bowyer, the London publisher, about his edition of Swift's works: "I shall finish the volume with a cantata of the Dean's, set to music, which in my opinion, will have a greater run with the lovers of harmony than any of the Corelli's, Vivaldi's, Purcell's, or Handel's pieces. When Arne, the famous composer, was last in Ireland, he made application to me for this cantata, which I could not then procure, to set it to music. Perhaps he may do it now, and bring it on the stage, which, if he does, will run more than the Beggar's Opera; and therefore I would have you get it engraved in folio, with scores for bass, etc., which will make it sell very well, I believe you might get something handsome for it from Rich, or the managers of Drury-lane...." (Swift, Correspondence, VI, appendix x, pp. 223-4.)
27. Swift, Poems, III, pp. 956-61.
28. Abbé Du Bos, Critical Reflexions on Poetry, Painting, and Music (1719), translated by Thomas Nugent, London, John Nourse, 1748, I, p. 374. The Reflexions, though, was well known among English critics before the translation appeared. See Lockman, note 29.
29. James Harris, "A Discourse on Music, Painting, and Poetry," Three Treatises, London, John Nourse, 1765, p. 58. John Lockman repeated Du Bos almost verbatim in his "Inquiry into the Rise and Progress of OPERAS and ORATORIOS," xix.
30. John W. Draper, "Aristotelian 'Mimesis' in Eighteenth-century England," PMLA, XXXVI, September 1920, p. 387.
31. Avison, op. cit., p. 60. Cf. Beattie, op. cit., p. 123, and Gregory, page 16 of this chapter.
32. Harris, op. cit., pp. 66-7.
33. Adam Smith, "On the Nature of Imitation," Essays on Philosophical Subjects, London, T. Cadell, p. 167.
34. Henry Home, Lord Kames, Elements of Criticism, I, p.138.

35. Lockman, op. cit., xix; Avison, Essay (1st edition) p. 60; Daniel Webb, Observations on the Correspondence between Poetry and Music, p. 70ff; Jones, op. cit., p. 550ff; Gregory, op. cit., passim.
36. Webb, op. cit., pp. 42-3. Volume, he explains, since it "so proportions the enforcement or diminution of sound to the force or weakness of the passions," is an expedient indispensable to the mechanics of expression. The same is true of tonal modulations in the accompaniment: "the descent of sound from the forte into the piano" corresponds with "the conditions of the nerves, when from a state of exertion ... we feel the sweet relief of a gradual relaxation."
37. North, op. cit., p. 18.
38. Smith, op. cit., p. 420.
39. Avison, op. cit., first edition, p. 6; cf. Kames, op. cit., pp. 137-9; and Beattie, op. cit., p. 122.
40. Smith, op. cit., p. 420.
41. Thomas Shadwell, "The Virtuoso," Works, III, p. 127.
42. Kenneth MacLean, John Locke and English Literature of the Eighteenth Century, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1936, passim.
43. These, he believes, can present only "confused, imperfect Notions" of the original in Nature.
44. Harris, op. cit., p. 81.
45. Smith, op. cit., p. 154. Smith, however, affirmed that it is really through the contrariety of ideas that we are affected by mimetic music. The musical gamut is far removed from the animate Nature the artist attempts to represent, but this very disparity is the basis for appreciation. It prompts a mental operation in distinguishing the differences between the original and the copy, and in this "the mind ... cannot only be contented, but delighted, and even charmed and transported."

46. Anthony Ashley Cooper, "Miscellaneous Reflections," Characteristicks, 4th edition, London, 1727, III, p. 30.
47. Francis Hutcheson, "An Inquiry concerning Beauty, Order, &c," An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue, London, J. Darby, 1725, p. 78; Roger North, op. cit., pp. 16-17.
48. Avison, op. cit., 1st edition, p. 4.
49. William Cowper, Correspondence, edited by Thomas Wright, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1904, II, p. 196.
50. James Boswell, The Life of Samuel Johnson, London, Henry Baldwin, 1791, I, p. 227.
51. Bonnell Thornton, An Ode on Saint Cecilia's Day, London, T. Becket, 1763, p. 6. Dr. Burney set the ode to music in 1769; it was performed at Ranelagh in that year.
52. Jones, op. cit., IV, p. 559.
53. Thomas Robertson, An Inquiry into the Fine Arts, p. 441.
54. Boswell, op. cit., II, p. 199. Of his Three Treatises, Johnson remarked that although "Harris is a sound sullen scholar ... I looked into his book, and thought he did not understand his own system."
55. Harris, op. cit., p. 98.
56. Kames, op. cit., II, p. 3.
57. Jones, op. cit., IV, p. 549.
58. Ibid., p. 560.
59. Robertson, op. cit., p. 10.
60. Ibid., p. 442.
61. Cibber, Apology, p. 67.

62. Thomas Twining, Aristotle's Treatise on Poetry ... and Two Dissertations, on Poetical, and Musical Imitation, London, Payne and Son, 1789, p. 49.
63. Ibid., pp. 59-60.
64. Philostratus, "The Life of Apollonius of Tyana," quoted by George Saintsbury, Loci Critici, London, Ginn and Company, 1903, p. 39.
65. Which Shaftesbury had contrasted favourably with the distrusted religious enthusiasm in "The Moralists," Characteristicks, passim.
66. In this, one notes, is the germ of nineteenth-century theories which appeared after aestheticians had once more returned to the deciphering of the troublesome term, Imitation, as Aristotle used it in Poetics. Later commentators carried on the work of Jones and Robertson by divesting Imitation of accumulated false meanings. Interestingly, however, they succeeded in reconciling Originality with Aristotelian Imitation, that very principle which to Robertson's contemporaries was most preclusive to artistic creation. The nineteenth-century attitude is reflected in the studies of Professor Bosanquet. He reminds us that Aristotle's concept of Imitation sprang from Plato's aesthetic theories in which he used the word, "imitation," to describe that ability of the arts to embody "spiritual ideas in sensuous forms." Aristotle elaborated upon this by holding that music "directly contains the essence of emotion" for "in practice it produces emotion." Therefore, concludes Bosanquet, far from its copying, or "representing," emotion, the movement of the music is the actual movement of the mind ... which arises when music is heard." (Bernard Bosanquet, A History of Aesthetic, 2d edition, London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1949, pp. 49, 60-61. Cf. Bosanquet, Three Lectures on Aesthetic, London, Macmillan and Company, 1915, p. 53; and S. H. Butcher's Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, London, 1902, p. 153.) Thus, nineteenth-century theorists pointed out, though writers of the previous century were right to reject the purely representational interpretations of Mimesis, they erred in setting up Originality in antithesis to

classical Imitation. The terms were virtually identical.

67. Cf. A. O. Lovejoy, "'Pride' in Eighteenth-century Thought," Modern Language Notes, XXXVI, (1921), pp. 31-37; and "'Nature' as an Aesthetic Norm," Modern Language Notes, XLII, (1927) pp. 444-450.

Chapter IV.

Music and Morals.

During the past hundred years there have been several instances in which musical critics have abandoned objectivity in order to deliver moral indictments. It was not an analysis of Verdi's score, but a reproof of the "prurient" libretto which occupied many contemporary reviewers of La Traviata. A similar departure from conventional criticism occurred a few years later when the bizarre plot and double-entendre title of Gilbert and Sullivan's Ruddigore offended Victorian sensibilities. In the twentieth century, the morbid sexuality of Strauss's Salome and the sordidness of Berg's Wozzeck caused much the same kind of disturbance. The response to these works, however, was exceptional. Normally the critic does not pass moral judgment upon musical themes. He evaluates instead the artistry of the composer in expressing them.

Of the ethical philosophers of the seventeenth and most of the eighteenth centuries, whose own special "school" of musical criticism is the subject of this chapter, the converse was true. The "theme" of a

composition was of primary interest. If it were deemed morally acceptable, the music was automatically approved, regardless of the composer's proficiency. If it were classified as immoral (which was more often the case) not even the greatest musical genius of the age escaped censure.

The critics were not being intentionally perverse. They had taken the ancients as their models, and the ancients, we recall, taught that music was a moral art. Failing to detect ambiguity in the antique theory, modern commentators derived two maxims from it. First, certain themes, such as piety, were "good"; others, such as voluptuousness, were "bad." Secondly, under proper supervision, music "goes hand in hand with gardening and architecture, her sister-arts, in humanizing and polishing the mind"; under improper direction, it prompted a taste for "lust-provoking, vice-fomenting, soule-empoysoning pleasures."¹ Thus the "rules."

Their application was less straightforward. The seventeenth-century critic's ignorance of music per se precluded his examining, say, a sonata, or, in later years, a symphony. Therefore before he could assess contemporary music he was compelled to devise a "common-sense" procedure. The resultant scheme was typical of

the rationalistic mind which restricted its observation of music to the "outward and visible."² One estimates the ethical value of musical composition, he held, by considering the environment in which it is played (such as churches and public theatres), by studying its textual component (such as opera-librettos), or by observing the actions which it accompanied (as in pantomime-ballet).

The account of seventeenth and eighteenth-century moral criticism however, involves more than merely the tabulation of curious "reviews." Manners and morals are not immutable. While it was almost obligatory in 1680 to condemn Papist church-music as sacrilegious and scandalously mundane, it was perfectly normal in 1743 for a good Anglican to call "the Miserere of Rome" the "finest piece of vocal music in the world."³ Again, though Defoe's contemporaries assailed the "perniciousness" of The Beggar's Opera, Dr. Johnson's, fifty years later, were apt to declare with Boswell that "there is in it so much of real London life, so much brilliant wit, and such a variety of airs, which ... engage, soothe, and enliven the mind, that no performance which the theatre exhibits, delights me more."⁴ And in contrast to those in 1732 who had raged against Handel's "blasphemous" oratorios, were those at the end of the century who hailed them as the

noblest form of devotional music.

Each era of English letters, then, applied its own moral touchstones to music. Consequently this chapter is divided into four parts, each representing a period of development in moral criticism. The first, covering the years 1633 to 1700, deals with the effect upon seventeenth-century commentators of William Prynne's Histrio-Mastix which brought the subject of "musical ethics" into prominence in English literature. The second, from 1700 to 1720, concerns the transition from the Puritan severity of Prynne's followers to the Deistic tolerance of the Augustans, from the critics' reliance upon invective to their discovery of satire, and from the mere cataloguing of abuses to the remedying of them. The third deals with a period of reaction, 1720 to 1742, when despite the recent advance of unbiased judgement, there was a rigorous resurgence of Puritanism among musical critics owing to Handel's "dangerous innovation" of 1732, the oratorio.⁵ In the fourth part (1742-1789) are discussed the changes which sentimentalism and the Evangelical revival wrought upon manners and religious thought, the subsequent triumph of Handelian oratorio, and finally the emergence of modern musical criticism in which the

verdicts of moralists no longer played a significant part.

1. The Seventeenth-century Background: William Frynne and the Restoration Stage-reformers' preoccupation with musical immorality.

Everyone is familiar with that passage in Plato's Republic where Glaucon and Socrates speculate on the potency of certain musical modes and conclude that the state should banish those harmonies and rhythms which are contrary to "a well-regulated and manly life." The similar comments of Pythagoras, Aristotle, and Polybius are equally well-known. Their vagueness in defining musical propriety need not detain us. It is more essential that we recognize the fact that the conception of music as a moral force is a very old one.

The theory, however, was not restricted to Greek philosophy. The later Romans, as we learn from one of Plutarch's Opera moralia also attached importance to it.⁶ Indeed speculation continued in the early days of the Christian era, though here the idea achieved that cast-

iron association with the drama which was to affect eighteenth-century musical judgements so deeply. In anathematizing the licentious Roman stage the Christian Platonists and the post-Constantine Church Fathers stressed as particularly offensive those plays with incidental music. The attack was perfectly reasonable, for "plays" were in many instances simply excuses for stringing together a number of obscene songs and voluptuous dances. Unhappily, Saints Clement of Alexandria, Basil, Cyril, and Jerome lumped these divertissements together under the title, "music," thereby establishing the precept that while all music is potentially dangerous that of the playhouse is unequivocally wicked. Perpetuated by St. Thomas and St. Augustine the notion re-appeared in the dramatic criticism of the Elizabethan Puritans, John Northbrooke, Stephen Gosson, Philip Stubbes, and John Rainolds. Gosson's complaint in The School of Abuse (1579) is typical of the traditionalistic attitude: "As poetrie and piping are cozen germans: so piping and playing are of great affinity, and all three chayned in linkes of abuse."⁷

Thus, vague as it was, the ethical criticism of music was fairly common in Charles I's reign. It remained for someone to synthesize all extant indictments

of music into formal "principles" of criticism. Fittingly, it was in another protest against the theatre, William Fyenne's Histrion-Mastix (1633), that this was accomplished.

Fyenne's objective was to crush all apologists for stage-plays by appealing to classical and ecclesiastical authority. Defending his remarks against various kinds of music in a book dealing with the theatre, the Puritan author addresses his "Christian Reader":

You shall finde them all materially pertinent to the theame in question; they being either the concomitants of Stage-playes, or having such neare affinity with them that the unlawfulnessse of the one are necessary mediums to evince the sinfulnessse of the other. Besides, though they differ in Species, yet they are homogeniall in their genericall nature, one of them serving to illustrate the quality, the condition of the other: It is no impertinencie therefore for me to discourse at large of all or any of these, the better to display the odiousnesse of Stage-playes, with which they have great analogie, to which they have more or lesse relation, as the passages themselves sufficiently manifest.

Fyenne apparently senses the inadequacy of his logic-chopping on the infectious nature of theatrical indecencies. But this was no time to speculate on the exact nature of musical abuses. In order to silence the skeptical he adds: "It is no absurdity by way of digression, to touch on such particulars, as other Writers oft time doe, yea and the Fathers too" -- and even "the very best of Pagans." Eased of the burden of further reasoning, Fyenne concludes:

"their practice therefore may be my excuse."⁸

The Puritan's subsequent comments upon music fall into three categories. The first concerns playhouse-songs, the second incidental music. The third, we are startled to find, refers to church-music.

His animadversions on "Ribaldrous Songs" are the least eccentric, though the cause of his rage is at first puzzling. One reads the songs in Caroline plays and concludes that although many are racy most of them are conventional love-lyrics. None would be described as "unprintable." The author -- not that he was above cavilling at love-songs -- later informs us that it is the ephemeral entr'acte "Ditties" which he has especially in mind. Again he vindicates his attack by citing "Reinholds, Gosson, Stubs, Bulenger, Brissonius, Mariana, and others":

Few Writers, against Stage-plays; but have particularly condemned these lascivious, amorous, ribaldrous Songs ... as Diabolicall, unchristian, lust-exciting, vice-fomenting, soule-impoysoning pleasures, which all Christians should eternally abominate, as the very snare of Hell, the very plagues of that Commonweale wherein they are tolerated, and the very baites of Satan to draw men on to sinne, and so to endlesse destruction.⁹

Less reasonable are his complaints against another "unlawfull Concomitant of Stage-playes," incidental music.

Just why it deserves the epithets, "effeminate," "delicate," and "lust-provoking," is difficult to determine. It was not set to obscene lyrics; nor, presumably, did it accompany dancing. Possibly he felt that instrumental interludes, while perfectly innocent in themselves, somehow became tainted by their continual proximity to risqué plays. But one suspects that Prynne was simply repeating a similar dictum of Plato without bothering to ascertain its validity. As always, however, he manages to check enquiries with an impressive recitation of authorities:

That Musicke of it selfe is lawfull, usefull, and commendable; no man, no Christian, dares denie, since the Scriptures, Fathers, and generally all Christian, all Pagan authors extant, doe with one consent averre it. But that lascivious, amorous, effeminate, voluptuous Musicke (that I onely here incounter) should be either expedient, or lawfull unto Christians, there is none so audacious as to justifie it, since both Scriptures, Fathers, moderne Christian Writers; yea and Heathen Nations, States, and Authors have past a doome upon it.

This "explanation" leaves us as much in the dark as we were to begin with. But to Prynne and his pious imitators it was a satisfactory corollary of St. Cyril's maxim: "Where there is the sound of the Harpe, the beating of Cymbals, the consort of Fiddlers, with the concinnity of numbers and applauses, there also is all kinde of filthinesse."¹⁰

The author follows this section of Histrio-Mastix with an examination of church-music. The new subject is no "impertinencie." Prynne and his co-religionists were averse to all elaborate components of the divine service. Particularly distasteful was the increasing "levity" of ecclesiastical music. Compared with the religious music which St. Jerome condemned for frivolity, Prynne writes, ours is "so light, vaine, madde, fond, foolish and fantastically, that Hickscorner himselfe could not devise a more wanton pastime." ^{11.} To what, he asks, can we attribute this debasing of church-music but the influence of playhouse-composers? Having successfully demoralized theatre-goers, they have now invaded the choir-loft. Again he avails himself of ancient "Canons," this time to exhort the "Ministers of God ... to abstaine from all things which pertaine to the enticements of the eares or eyes, from whence the vigor of the minde may be thought to be effeminated: which may be imagined of certaine kindes of Musicke." ^{12.} His examples of offensive church-music are of no great interest, though it is worth pointing out that his resentment was not altogether gratuitous. Several church-musicians had connexions with the playhouse. A trill or two in an organ-voluntary was

to be expected.

No formal criticism of this magnitude appeared again during Charles I's reign. The amputation of Master Prynne's ears and the burning of his "seditious" book by the hangman doubtless discouraged imitators. As a matter of fact the only Puritan discussion of musical improprieties at that time which is of any significance was anything but "puritanical." Where Prynne had been solemn in his allegations, John Milton was humourously ironic. In his attack on the suppression of the free press Milton writes: "If we think to regulat Printing, thereby to rectifie manners, we must regulat all recreations and pastimes, all that is delightful to man. No musick must be heard, no song be set or sung, but what is grave and Doricke. There must be licensing dancers, that no gesture, motion, or deportment be taught our youth, but what by their allowance shall be thought honest; for such Plato provided for." Moreover, "the lutes, the violins, and the ghittars ... must not be suffer'd to prattle as they doe, but must be licens'd what they may say ... The villages also must have their visitors to inquire what lectures the bagpipe and the rebbeck reads ev'n to the ballatry, and the gammuth of every municipal

fidler...."^{13.} One wonders how much of this is a parody of Histrion-Mastix.

In 1642 the public theatres were closed. Not long afterwards began the methodical removal of organs from the cathedrals and the suppression of choirs. Consequently there was no call for an up-to-date Histrion-Mastix -- though Milton came perilously close to stirring up another tempest among his more captious brethren. Apparently he originally conceived of Paradise Lost as a kind of opera. If only for the inevitable set-to, one wishes that Milton had carried out his initial plan. How Prynne would have railed at this alliance of a religious text with unspeakable music and the still more unspeakable playhouse ! A painted, bewigged Adam and Raphael discoursing on the nature of the universe -- in recitativo!¹⁴ Such an encounter stimulates the imagination. However, eighty years were to pass before the Puritans actually came to grips with religious "operas," or as Handel's audiences knew them, oratorios.

When florid anthems re-appeared in the churches during 1660's, we again hear complaints. While John Evelyn would have scarcely described himself as puritanical, he was none the less disturbed by the "consort of twenty-four violins" which punctuated the chaplain's prayers.^{15.}

That the late "improvements" distracted less conscientious worshippers is revealed by Pepys who savoured the "mighty sport" which was afforded by blundering choristers.¹⁶ More sensitive members of the congregation detected the stamp of the playhouse on voluntaries and hymn-accompaniments. Their objections were not groundless. Few musicians lived, reported Tom Brown, who did not "hang between the Church and the Play-house, as Mohamet's Tomb does between the two Load-Stones, and must equally incline to both, because by both [they] are equally supported."¹⁷ There was, for example, Henry Cooke, the Master of the Children at the Chapel Royal, who set to music either all or part of D'Avenant's First Dayes Entertainment and The Siege of Rhodes. Matthew Locke — and later John Blow and Henry Purcell — enjoyed similar double employment. But not all Englishmen thought the secular elements in church music improper or unattractive. In 1663, King Charles — whom Pepys once observed tapping time to the dance-rhythms of an anthem — "achieved the characteristic and subtle stroke of humour of sending [Pelham Humfrey] over to France to study the methods of the most celebrated composer of theatrical music of the time in order to learn how to compose English church music."¹⁸ Curiously, ecclesia-

stical authorities remained calm. They attempted indifferently in 1666 to suppress "profan'd" church music when they "Pre-accus'd Censur'd and Obstructed" a work by Locke.^{19.} But in the main, the presence of courante-measures in devotional music occasioned little more than fingerwagging from conservative church-goers in this decade.

Not until Charles's reign wore on, did commentators become less indulgent. They watched with distress the contamination of the playhouses by the salacious wit of Etherege and Wycherley. In no time moralists revived Prynne's dictum that since music was an auxiliary of corruptive plays it shared in the guilt.

In the 1670's and 1680's the problem of "immoral" music was not a simple one. The area of musical abuses had expanded considerably since Prynne's day. Never before had so many songs and "symphonies" been lavished upon plays. Even more extravagant were the musical embellishments of the new English operas -- most of which were no more renowned for virtuous sentiments than the gross legitimate comedies. The new version of Shakespeare's Tempest as well as Duffett's Psyche debauch'd and The Mock-Tempest were as "vice-fomenting" as the text of any courtier-playwright. No less damaging to the reputation

of composers was the fact that operas appeared to draw a particularly libidinous audience. How well she might "spark it in a Box, and do honour to her Profession" at the "Operie," every mask and orange-girl knew. ^{20.}

Thus, approximately the same pattern of abuses which preceded Histrio-Mastix preceded the outburst of neo-puritanism in the pious reign of William and Mary. Fittingly, the new generation of "Saints" made Prynne's sixty-year-old diatribe their model.

In 1697, after the reforming spirit had revived in earnest, Jeremy Collier published his second volume of Essays upon Several Moral Subjects. One of them carried the significant title, "Of Musick." A miniature Histrio-Mastix, the treatise begins with a re-sounding of the battle-cry of 1633: "The Fathers declaim against their Theatre Musick, as Lewd and Licentious." But Collier's elaborate restatements of ancient decrees are negligible. They are essentially the same as those with which Prynne — now esteemed as a "Father" — crammed his masterpiece.

Though Collier never loses sight of his model, it is in his remarks on contemporary abuses that we find originality. He next examines church-music. Here, although he exhibits a greater sympathy than Prynne did for the secular composer's problems in writing for the church,

he insists upon decorum. Music for religious services should

imitate the Perfume of the Jewish Tabernacle, and have as little of the Composition of common Use as is possible. There must be no Voluntary Maggots, no Military Tattoos, no Light and Galliardizing Notes; nothing that may make the Fancy trifling, or raise an improper Thought. This would be to Profane the Service, and bring the Play-house into the Church. Religious Harmony must be Moving, but Noble withal; Grave, Solemn, Seraphick. Fit for a Martyr to play, and an Angel to hear.²¹

The mandate is comparatively mild. The author was reserving his fund of Puritan wrath for a more recent, though no less notorious, abuse of church-music. In a stinging parenthesis he writes:

And without doubt if the Morals of the Quire were suitable to the Design of the Musick, it were no more than requisite. To come reeling from a Tavern, or a worse Place, into a Church, is a monstrous Incongruity. Such irregular People are much fitter for the Exercises of Penance, than Exultation. The Use of them disserves the Interest of Religion: and is in effect little better than Singing the Praises of God, through the Organ of the Devil.²²

The choristers of St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey winced at Collier's blast, but they survived to plague more than one eighteenth-century reformer. Not many years later, we find Tom Brown writing that "they daily come wreaking hot out of a Bawdy-House into the Church; and others stagger out of a Tavern to Afternoon-Prayers, and Hickup over a little of the Littany, and so back again." And

this, Brown reveals, is no "Novelty."²³

In 1698, Collier again turned to the attack on theatrical music in his incandescent Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage. Although the complete title contains the familiar words, "together with the Sense of Antiquity upon this Argument," he is not readily disposed to parrot the ancients' comments upon the "Lewdness" of all music. More acute than Prynne, he recognizes the fact that music can be condemned on moral grounds only when it is united with words. Thus departing from the pattern of Histric-Mastix, he leaves the castigation of instrumental music to others. He himself "is not willing to Censure at Uncertainties."

Collier's protestation of his love for music is genuine, and his refusal to meddle with wordless music marks an advance in seventeenth-century moral criticism. Theatrical music, however, is a different matter. The cunning use of the orchestra to support the indecorous songs of a Dryden, a Congreve, or a D'Urfey would always deserve reproof. Collier "is sorry to see Art so meanly Prostituted: Atheism ought to have nothing Charming in its Retinue." In a gradual crescendo of eloquence he falls upon stage-music: "It helps a Luscious Sentence to slide, drowns the Discords of Atheism, and keeps off the Aversions of Conscience. It thrown a Man off his

Guard, makes way for an ill Impression, and is most Commodiously planted to do Mischief. A Lewd Play with good Musick is like an Lodestone Arm'd, it draws much stronger than before.... Their Songs are often rampantly Lewd, and Irreligious to a flaming Excess. Here you have the very Spibit and Essence of Vice drawn off strong scented and thrown into a little Compass."²⁴ Breathless, Collier resumes his celebrated attack on the Restoration dramatists.

All in all theatrical music suffered little from these attacks. Certainly producers made no move to curtail its use. The same was true of the "secularized" church-music. Moreover, the wits weakened the effect of the narrow "short views" which flooded the town by poking fun at the "Fanaticks."²⁵ Congreve, for example, whom Collier singled out as a particularly offensive playwright, answered the clergyman in part by ridiculing his half-serious suggestion (reminiscent of Milton's in Areopagitica) that music should be controlled by the government.²⁶ Later, in 1700, he again bobbed the reformer in The Way of the World.²⁷ But perhaps the most cynical comment on the ever-present spoil-sports came from an anonymous, disgruntled musician:

Tho' our reforming pious Age
 Does so in Grace abound,
 And neither Smiles upon the Stage,
 Or Musick's charming sound:
 Yet a Fool may divine
 If his Thoughts are like mine,
 That your pious Design
 Is to come at our Coin:
 'Tis for that you Dissemble and Wheedle,
 By your leave Master Cant,
 Tho' as grave and as quaint,
 As the Devil turn'd Saint,
 It is Musick I want,
 And we must have a Touch at the Fiddle.^{28.}

Not that these taunts made any difference to the reformers. As long as the theatre remained "Lewd and Licentious" they would continue their attack. Moreover, not everyone opposed the censors. The "Master Cants" had an ally in the Society for the Reformation of Manners which King William instituted in 1692. And weak as it was, Colley Cibber's novel device of reclaiming his libertine-hero in the final act of Love's Last Shift (1696) indicated the willingness of at least one dramatist to leaven his work with morality. Hope for regeneration was not completely vain.

11. 1700-1720. The Introduction of Italian Opera. Arthur Bedford's Eighteenth-Century Version of Histrion-Mastix. The Common-Sense Moral Standards of The Spectator begin to replace Puritanism in Moral Criticism.

The eighteenth century, however, brought disenchantment. From the very beginning, moralists began to express doubt about the efficacy of William III's Society for the Reformation of Manners. It seemed to encourage vice-ridden playwrights to devise new sugar-coatings for their works. Jeremy Collier was particularly bitter about this defiance of the reform society (which was now under the patronage of Queen Anne) in his Dissuasive from the Play-house (1703). Not content, he writes, with using English tunes to supplement their "old Batteries" of obscene prologues and unchaste wit, dramatists "have strengthened the attack, and levied Recruits of Music and Dancing beyond Sea." ²⁷ The new Italian music, avows the clergyman, is the most pernicious of all disguises of smut. Worse, he gravely declares, passing to another favourite theme of dramatic critics, it is likely to "dispirit" church-goers, for "when a luscious Song becomes relishing, a Psalm will be a flat Entertainment." More than ever there was cause for heeding the old Puritan

maxim: "If the Stage once gains our Fancy, the Service of God will grow burthensome and heavy."^{30.}

Anne's God-fearing subjects sensed the dangers of Italian music, but as yet they were more vexed with the Restoration "operas" which were being revived at the time Collier's Dissuasive appeared. As a matter of fact, these English stage-pieces were more reviled for blasphemy and atheism by eighteenth-century reformers than by those who were active in Charles II's reign. Especially grievous were the revivals in 1703 of the old musical versions of Macbeth and The Tempest. Unluckily, a storm occurred a few weeks later in which Admiral Beaumont and fifteen hundred seamen of Britain's wartime navy were drowned. The damage was estimated at a million pounds — and to Collier's circle the opportunity for moralizing was irresistible. The hurricane, they cried, was no less than a manifestation of God's anger at those who "ascribe the Lightnings, Thunder, Storm, and Tempest to the Force of Magical Arts," and who "mock'd the Great Governour of the World, who alone commands the winds and the seas, and they obey him."^{31.} The extraordinary punishment, however, was ineffectual. The unbelievers of the opera-house ignored the divine augury. The author of A Representation of the Impiety of the English Stage reports that although

Queen Anne declared a day of "Fasting and Humiliation" in order to appease God, the players, "'tis to be observ'd with Indignation, did, as we are assur'd, within a few Days after we felt the late dreadful Storm, entertain their Audiences with the ridiculous Representation of what had fill'd us with so great Horror in their Plays call'd MACKBETH and THE TEMPEST, as if they design'd to Mock the Almighty Power of God."^{32.} The Society for the Promoting Christian Knowledge was also riled by this sacrilege.^{33.} Three years later, the Reverend Arthur Bedford revived the charges in The Evil and Danger of Stage-Plays. "The Design" of these wizard-packed operas, he hints darkly, "is to recommend the Study of Magick."^{34.}

The Queen's variability also disturbed reformers. Shortly after her coronation, Anne had publicly denounced the "irregularities" of the playhouses. Collier, Bedford, and Tenison (the Archbishop of Canterbury and spokesman for the Society for the Reformation of Manners) congratulated her upon her ordering the Master of the Revels to suppress further immorality. Naturally her subsequent and equally public affection for Vanbrugh and Congreve was interpreted as a betrayal. Tenison was furious with her and denounced anew the two playwrights who had "debauch'd"

the stage "to a degree beyond the Looseness of all former Times,"³⁵ But the Queen did not yield. Four days after the publication of Tenison's Letter she granted to the two "Trusty and well-beloved" dramatists the exclusive management of the new theatre in the Haymarket. Owing to Anne's obduracy, critics were harsh with the productions at her favourites' theatre. Vanbrugh's new comedy, The Confederacy, was attacked as the nadir of licentiousness, and the plays-with-music which alternated with regular plays fared little better with Collier's colleagues. Bedford, for instance, singled out a revival of Congreve's Love for Love (with John Eccles's incidental music) as being especially repugnant. It was, he snapped, part of a conspiracy to restore seventeenth-century lewdness to the stage by wrapping it up in the "cleaner Linnen" of music.³⁶ The new century, it seemed, had ushered in something less than a moral millennium. Certainly theatrical music had gained no prestige.

New mischief appeared in January, 1705, when Arsinoe, the first "Opera after the Italian Manner, all sung," was produced at Drury Lane. The romantic libretto, with its almost obligatory conjuring-scene, had been translated into English from the original Italian. The music was

simply a medley of tunes which had been pillaged from Italian masters. It at once gave great offence to moralists -- though to us it has all the "noxiousness" of a children's pantomime.³⁷ It seemed to them that the players of Old Drury had deliberately compounded those evils which Collier and Bedford had anathematized -- sorcery, atheism, and Italian music. Unmindful of the critics, Vanbrugh's competing company at the Haymarket presented the imitative Temple of Love in the spring of 1706.

The "Phanaticks" were out of all patience. After having seen only two of these wicked Italianate entertainments, they forgot or dismissed as venial the improprieties of The Confederacy and Love for Love. "The Italian Opera," John Dennis raged, "is a Diversion of more pernicious Consequence, than the most licentious Play that has ever appear'd on the Stage."³⁸ But few play-goers took such sputtering seriously, and for the next few years a half-dozen similar musical pastiched "perverted" all-too-willing audiences.

At length moralists renewed their attack on operas. In the manner of Prynne, they set about transcribing offensive passages from librettos. One of the first of the resultant "catalogues" to be printed was Arthur

Bedford's Great Abuse of Musick (1711). The author's premise is a familiar one:

The profane Plays [or librettos] debauch the Nation, and the fine Musick invites People thither. These are Copartners together, and Confederates in the Mischief, and consequently equally guilty; and what is spoken against the Stage, may be as truly apply'd against the Musick.^{39.}

^a
Never had/Puritan commentator been more punctilious in tracking down "profanities" than is Bedford. His indictments, needless to say, are unconvincing. He quotes, for example, some "blasphemous" sentiments from current operas and asks the "pious Reader" to "observe if his Blood doth not turn cold at the Perusal of them":

- (g) The Charming Idol of mine Heart
- ... (u) I Prize no Joy above her
- ... (b) It is Life to be with her, and worse than Death to be without her
- (c) I swear by all that's Good, my Life! my Love!
- ... (e) So much, so tenderly, your Slave adores, He hath no Thought of Happiness but Yours.^{40.}

Although The Great Abuse of Musick is a departure from the conventional playhouse "Scourge" in that it treats only of the musical stage, it is largely a réchauffé of Histrionic-Mastix. Once more an author reviews for us the remonstrances of the "Pagans" and the "Primitive Fathers". Again we are asked to regard with horror the playhouses of London, "whose chief Design and Tendency is to corrupt the Age, to banish all serious Thinking and

Reflection, and to lull the Conscience asleep, or sear it
with an hot Iron."^{41.} And once again a reformer associates
the public theatres with another abuse of music:

They who guide the Congregation in Singing Praises
to God, do afterwards compose Tunes for the Syno-
gogues of Satan, revel at a Tavern or an Ale-house,
in Serving the Devil, and teach such Songs as are
Incentives to Profaneness, Atheism, and Debauchery
.... How many have there been (and I wish may not
be still) who serve first at the Church, and then at
the Play-house; first Singing Hallelujahs to God,
and then spending the Evening in the Worship of the
Devil?^{42.}

Yet, although the bulk of his Great Abuse of Music is
tiresomely unoriginal, one of Bedford's conclusions is
worth mentioning. Despite the great number of offensive
expressions he gleans from the pages of translated operas,
Bedford lauds the general propriety of the Italian originals
— though one wonders how many patrons of the Queen's
Theatre knew or cared that Clotilda "hath several moral
Sentiments, and concludes with very excellent Instructions."
It is rather the operas "made in England" (such as Thomyris,
for which Motteux wrote an original English text in 1707)
which he bears down upon. Were we to compare the true
Italian operas with the blasphemous imitations in order
Nations, we must to our
"to judge of the Religion of both
Shame conclude, that we are the Hebeticks, and they are
reform'd." The irony cries for Swiftian wit but the

humourless Bedford merely warns of the loss of face which attends the patronage of such works as Motteux's. If the "Papists," he concludes, "whose Religion is more corrupt, are in their Diversions more regular, it shews that they have some Regard to God and Man

Shall not they, tho' most corrupt in their Worship, if they observe a Decorum, rise up in Judgment against us, if we, who pretend to separate from them for Conscience sake, do such things as they avoided upon the same Principle?⁴³

The English musicians who collaborated in these "Diversions" are no less culpable. In 1703 moralists had attributed a devastating hurricane to God's anger at irreverent librettists. Bedford exhorts operatic composers to mend their ways in order to avert a similar catastrophe. Already, he points out, it has "pleas'd God to shew his Resentment ... by taking away our Furcel in the Prime of his Age, and Dr. Blow soon after."⁴⁴

No sooner had The Great Abuse appeared in the book-stalls than a new plague broke out on the London stage. Owing to the success of Almahide which was sung completely in the Italian language at the Queen's Theatre in 1710, producers cast aside the old-fashioned operas and presented the originals. Bedford began to reconsider operatic propriety. The actions and sentiments of the Italian entertainments (especially those of the newcomer, Handel) were

more censurable than he had previously supposed. Consequently from 1711 to 1719 he once again exercised his genius for ferreting out blasphemies and obscenities from opera-librettos. The fruits of his research, A Serious Remonstrance in behalf of the Christian Religion against the Horrid Blasphemies and Improprieties which are still us'd in the English Play-house, reads like a parody of his earlier work. He lists in the third chapter, for example, several instances in which "Witchcraft and Magick are encourag'd" by operas:

At one time, the (y) Furies enter, carrying in the one hand a Knife, and in the other hand a Torch. At (z) another time they enter, (a) tormenting an Actress, and (b) afterwards carry her off. At one time, (c) a Troop of Devils seize a Man, and carry him to an Inchanted Palace. At another time they (d) seize a Man, and carry him into Hell: And that neither Sex may escape, another time (e) a Cavern opens, and several Devils appear, and carry a Woman under ground, to the same Place. At another time, they (f) stand in various Forms and Aspects, guarding an Inchanted Palace.... and an (i) Inchanted Palace, (k) plac'd upon a Rock, (l) guarded with Devils, and (m) delightful Gardens adjoining to such a Palace.

(y) <u>Theseus</u>	(d) <u>British Enchanters</u>	<u>Rinaldo,</u>
(z) <u>Theseus</u>	(e) <u>Hercules</u>	<u>Theseus</u>
(a) <u>Theseus</u>	(f) <u>Rinaldo</u>	(k) <u>Hercules</u>
(b) <u>Theseus</u>	(h) <u>Theseus</u>	(l) <u>Hercules</u>
(c) <u>Hercules</u>	(i) <u>Hercules,</u>	(m) <u>Hercules</u>

45.

Bedford was indefatigable. He cites over 7000 similarly "unwholesome" passages! But happily, by the time his work appeared his old-fashioned method of dealing with

musical iniquities had begun to fall into disesteem. Apart from the fact that a waning belief in witchcraft deprived The Serious Remonstrance of much of its bite, readers were becoming bored with the repetitious haranguing of neo-Puritans.

Equally obsolescent was Bedford's bible-thumping in reference to secularized church-music. Invective was valueless in fighting the corruption of ecclesiastical music by champions of the new Italian operas. Moreover, Bedford's observations were so general and had so little to do with the very recent theatrical innovation that they might have been written in 1633. The newer voices in Augustan criticism were more specific and as a rule preferred to expose these enemies of religion at the Haymarket through satire.

A brief comparison of Bedford's with Addison and Steele's comments will illustrate the new trend in moral criticism.

The clergyman, for example, had railed at length against the potpourri of operatic "Jigs" which organists passed off as voluntaries. He weakened his attack, though, by omitting proof of this frivolity — a curious oversight, considering his scrupulosity in documenting

operatic offences. Nor is the reader convinced that anyone other than captious divines were aware of the hoax. Addison and Steele, on the other hand, succeed in dispelling any doubts in the minds of their readers. Nothing is more fashionable, writes the gently chiding Steele in his Tatler for 30 August 1709, than resorting to "the Organ-loft in a Church" where for our "Edification" we hear "some few Opera Songs." More oblique is Addison's remark on the same subject. Howsubtly pregnant is his extract from "Clarinda's" diary for Saturday:

From Twelve to Two. At Chappel. A great Deal of
good Company. Mem. The Third Air in the new Opera. ^{46.}

As for the incongruously gay "farewell Voluntaries," or recessionals, which Bedford assails, The Spectator humorously asserts that they reflect more the dramatic taste of the time than irreligion: "Many of our Church-Musicians being related to the Theatre," have merely imitated the current practice of appending "facetious Epilogues" to high tragedy. ^{47.}

Again, in several places Bedford complained of Italianate hymn-tunes at St. Paul's or the Abbey. This influence of Italian opera on the music of the great London churches was relatively unimportant to Addison.

Of greater consequence was the fact that similar "little Indecencies" were appearing in rural churches. Once more he hides his attack behind the naiveté of a "correspondent." Appearing in The Spectator for 25 October 1711 is a letter from a country clergyman complaining of a certain "Widow Lady" whose foibles distract his parishioners. "What gives us the most Offence," he explains, "is her Theatrical manner of Singing the Psalms."

She introduces above fifty Italian Airs into the Hundredth Psalm, and whilst we begin All People in the old Solemn Tune of our Fore-fathers, she in a quite different Key runs Divisions on the Vowels, and adorns them with the Graces of Nicolini; if she meets with Eke or Aye, which are frequent in the Metre of Hopkins and Sternhold, we are certain to hear her quavering them half a Minute after us to some sprightly Airs of the Opera.

Even more significant of the changing attitude of younger moralists was the nature of the remedies they offered. Bedford simply urges the suppression of extempore voluntaries; should church-goers object to the adoption of decorous harmonies, the introduction of more extensive improvements would be futile. "If we prefer not Divine Musick," he concludes calvinistically, "the Fault is not in the Musick itself, but in our vicious Inclinations."⁴⁸ The authors represented in The Spectator and The Ladies Library (edited by Richard Steele in

1714) were more optimistic. They agreed with Bedford that the "Divine Uses" of music were the best. But they rejected the notion that a taste for devotional music could not be developed. Imbued with Shaftesburean "benevolence," both Addison and Steele felt compelled to direct their readers in cultivating this taste. Hence, much of the didactic "Essay on Employment" in Steele's miscellany is given over to practical "hints" on the matter. The Spectator is equally accomodating. The writers knew, however, that success was unlikely without the cooperation of composers. The Ladies Library proposed somewhat feebly that they give "a Christian Turn" to their music.^{49.} But the remedy was unattractive. Musicians were not apt to abandon their lucrative and exciting activities at the opera-house for the comparatively insipid task of hymn-writing. Because of this, The Spectator shrewdly suggested a compromise. "The Treasury of Words" in the Scriptures, and the full gamut of passions which they express are superior to the doggerel and cheap sentimentality of Italian librettos. Since "Pleasure and Duty go hand in hand," Addison writes, Christian composers would do well to develop a kind of musical entertainment based on such texts. Unlike opera

it would have utilitarian value as well as a much desired "Foundation in Reason." Furthermore, he writes persuasively, it would be in the finest theatrical tradition, for "the first Original of the Drama," Addison reminds us, "was a religious Worship ... which was nothing else but an Hymn to a Deity":

Had we frequent Entertainments of this Nature among us, they would not a little purifie and exalt our Passions, and give our Thoughts a proper Turn, and cherish those Divine Impulses in the Soul....^{50.}

It is clear that while much of the moral criticism of music from 1700 to 1720 was built upon seventeenth-century ethical conceptions, secular intervention was breaking up the traditional pattern. While no less intent upon reform than were the seventeenth-century divines, lay moralists of Anne's reign were impatient with the exorcising of musical demons and the interminable cataloguing used by Prynne's successors. Puritanical hypersensitivity was equally out of date. With Pope at the helm, a new generation of critics was beginning to repudiate those of Bedford's fraternity

who, scandalously nice
Will needs mistake an Author into Vice.

Their abuse of scholarship was more dangerous than the supposed abuses of music.

Satire also helped to clear the air of calvinistic thunder. But by far the most notable contribution of the new critics was their attempt to reconcile three divergent convictions: (a) that the main objective of dramatists was ethical instruction, (b) that "the most moving Strains of Musick" are those "which consist of the Praises of our Creator," and (c) that the public was incurably addicted to theatrical music.

The most original (and, as we later learn, prophetic) solution was Addison's. Although it was not immediately acted upon, his advocacy of a sort of scriptural play-with-music was not altogether visionary. True, Gay's Mrs. Clinker spoke for her generation when she remarked in 1717 that "neither our stage nor actors are hallow'd enough for sacred story."⁵¹ But private theatres were another matter. Hidden away at the estates of their patron, the Duke of Chandos, the two most eminent poetical and musical voices in England were experimenting with biblical themes. Whether or not Pope and Handel consciously worked from The Spectator's hints we do not know, but their epoch-making "masque," Haman and Mordecai, was a virtual realization of Addison's theories. We must, however, reserve discussion of this

work. Only a small, private audience knew of its existence in 1720 and for the next dozen years it lay forgotten by its composers. Its true significance as a link between Addison's projected "Entertainment" and Handel's new art-form, "oratorio," was not apparent until 1732 when it re-appeared in a modified version. It will suffice to say here that Pope and Handel's "trifle" was destined, first, to whip up a controversy more vehement than any which Prynne or Bedford had entered into, and secondly, to force eighteenth-century musical critics to alter their conception of "morality."

- iii. 1720-1742. The Beggar's Opera. The ostensibly "de-theatricalized" church-music. The moral critics' preoccupation with Handelian oratorio. The dying cult of Prynians.

The Haymarket-sorcery continued to enthrall spectators during the palmy days of the Royal Academy from 1720 to 1728. Nevertheless, reformers were less severe with Italian operas than they had been. Apart from William Law, few regarded those arias which celebrated

"the Charming Idol of Mine Heart" as blasphemous.^{52.} And the inevitable assortment of spirits, fiends, and pagan deities more often excited amusement than pious horror. But there were other abuses of theatrical music which vexed the pure-minded. Indeed one would infer from contemporary accounts that during this period the musical stage reached the ne plus ultra of depravity. John Rich's musical pantomimes in which "Smut and Profaness reign'd" were particularly obnoxious, though in time even they were outdone by similar diversions which touring French companies offered.^{53.} The moral quality of the non-operatic entertainments at the Haymarket Theatre were not much higher. Early in the 1720's, John Jacob Heidegger, the manager, began a series of masked balls, or "ridottos," which he alternated with operas. The advantages of disguise were numerous and shortly the playhouse was reputed to be a haunt of libertines, harlots, and thieves.

As did the Great Storm in Anne's reign, the South Sea disaster of 1720 provided a convenient illustration for reformers. On the one hand some asserted that it caused the current national depression, both financial and ethical. Heidegger, accordingly, was accused of

abetting corruption with his fashionable musical "Mummeries." On the other hand several clergymen, including Bishop Berkeley, held that the collapse of the South Sea project was the result of Englishmen's new dependence upon masquerades and operas.⁵⁴ Subsequently the Grand Jury of Middlesex attempted to close the Haymarket Theatre in 1723. But this action, together with the Bishop of London's scathing sermon on Heidegger's musical diversions, merely served as advertisements for the "Nursery of Lewdness."⁵⁵ The wits, of course, made capital of the furor. Not since "Tremendous" Dennis's "fits" at the Queen's Theatre in 1709 had a musical mêlée so delighted them.⁵⁶

Until 1727 the wicked ridottos were the talk of London. But in the winter of that year it was rumoured that a new musical entertainment, so indecorous that Quin refused the leading rôle, was in rehearsal at Lincoln's Inn Field. Apprehension increased when it was learned that the infamous pantomime-manager, John Rich, was directing it.

The play, John Gay's Beggar's Opera, opened on 29th January 1728. Moralists immediately denounced both the ballad opera and its patrons. That a play which glorified

the underworld could so "take" the town was "an undeniable
Mark of a vitiated Taste and a degenerate licentious Age."^{57.}
Gay, of course, revelled in the publicity and joked
about Dr. Thomas Herring's sermon on the lewd crew at
Lincoln's Inn Field.^{58.}

Anxious to profit by the success of Gay's "new
Species of Dramatick Poetry," Cibber rushed his "reformed"
ballad opera, Love in a Riddle to the stage of Drury Lane.
His sole intent, he protested, was to counteract the
"vulgar Vice" and "Wickedness" of Gay's piece with a
musical play "recommending Virtue and Innocence."^{59.} But
the public would have none of Dr. Herring's ranting or
Colley's insipidity. It was Polly Peachum, not Mrs.
Grundy whom London toasted.^{60.} Nor were clergymen un-
animous in vindicating the actions of Herring. Dean
Swift wrote angrily in the Dublin Intelligencer that
The Beggar's Opera "exposeth with great Justice, that
unnatural Taste for Italian Musick among us," and that
despite its obscenities the play "will probably do more
good than a thousand Sermons of so stupid, so injudicious,
and so prostitute a divine." As for the efficacy of
Cibber's Love in a Riddle, it was reported in Fog's
Weekly Journal (11th January 1729) that since "no Thief
or Robber of any Rank was satyriz'd in it ... it met

with the Reception it well deserv'd, and was hiss'd off
the Stage." ^{61.}

Unfortunately for music the moral criticism of Gay's play did not expire with Cibber's "Bawble." The Beggar's Opera had a more sinister effect on London than the mere depraving of theatrical taste. For months after the play opened, Caleb D'Anvers, the Tory editor of The Craftsman, printed a series of ironical essays which played up "analogies" between Macheath's gang and Walpole's ministry. On 2d March 1728, for example, he remarked half-seriously that the streets were filled "with Robbers and Foot-Pads, who have swarmed in this Town ever since that mischievous Piece was first exhibited on the Stage." There was no levity in the similar observations of Daniel Defoe. All efforts to encourage a reformation of manners, he writes in Augusta Triumphans, are undone by Gay's apotheosis of highwaymen. This "pious Opera," he implies, is more responsible than gin was for the recent increase in crime. ^{62.}

Thus far it is evident that though censure of the musical stage had not ceased, indictments were more defensible than those which the witch-hunting Bedford

drew up in 1711 and 1719. Several surviving scenarios (D'Urfey's English Stage Italianiz'd, for one) prove that certain pantomimes were every bit as coarse as their critics contended. We may infer from the tongue-lashings of Steele -- who was certainly not a prude -- that the repertory of the visiting French players was no purer.^{63.} And, after D'Anvers and Defoe's proof that it occasioned a wave of crime, who could deny the corruptiveness of The Beggar's Opera?^{64.}

But there was a more striking aspect of criticism in the 1720's. Even the more rigid reformers thought it unnecessary to animadvert upon church-music, for in contrast to the moral decline of the musical stage, religious music appeared to flourish between 1715 and 1730. This may be attributed to a number of things. After the expulsion of the Catholic Pretender in 1715, there had been a tendency among churchmen not only to underscore the protestantism of English worship but to make the manner of worship more attractive. Among their subsequent reforms had been the improvement of music, one of the more conspicuous features of the ritual. Doubtless, too, the common-sense reflexions of Addison and Steele, as well as the musical theories of Shaftesbury, suggested

certain improvements. But perhaps the greatest encouragement came from the common man. Were it not for a similar interest in devotional music which the hymns of Thomas Ken, Isaac Watts, and Mrs. Rowe awakened among the lower and middle classes during these years, the enthusiasm of the clergy and the men of letters would have come to nothing.

Dean Swift's efforts to perfect his cathedral choir illustrate the diligence with which clergymen undertook musical reforms. At first, he admitted that he acted more on the advice of "the race of gentlemen lovers of music" than from any personal conviction. He understood music "like a Muskovite," and confessed to Lady Carteret in 1720 that he "would rather say ... prayers without it."⁶⁵ However, once the project was begun his antipathy vanished. Neither the controversy over Wood's half-pence nor the publication of Gulliver's Travels deterred him. No-one, Patrick Delany revealed, "was ever more critical, or conscientious than SWIFT was, in promoting the members of his choir, according to their merits."⁶⁶ His correspondence from 1720 to 1740 shows dozens of instances in which he begged various authorities for their advice on singers and organists. Of

particular interest are his letters to Dr. Arbuthnot, John Gay, and Dr. Pepusch, entreating them to scour London for choral-candidates.

Within a decade, St. Patrick's cathedral was renowned for its choir -- though not all of the Dean's musical innovations were unopposed. He had, for instance, offended certain of the Irish clergy on 23d November 1730 when he initiated celebrations in honour of St. Cecilia. Dr. Thomas Sheridan further scandalized them with an introductory sermon recommending a more extended use of music during church-services. Despite the subsequent charges of "Romishness," the "worthy Dean Swift" (we learn from The Dublin Journal) "seemed highly pleased with the decent and becoming Order observed through the Whole." The consciences of parochial divines were to him of importance only as inspiration for a mocking "occasional" poem, To Himself:

Grave Dean of St. Patrick's, how comes it to pass,
That you, who know music no more than an ass,
That you who so lately were writing of drapers,
Should lend your cathedral to players and scrapers?
To act such an Opera once in a year,
So offensive to every true Protestant ear,
With trumpets, and fiddles, and organs, and singing,
Will sure the Pretender and Popery bring in;
No Protestant Prelate, his lordship or grace,
Durst there show his right, or most reverend face:
How would it pollute their crosiers and rochets,
To listen to minims, and quavers, and crotchets!^{67.}

On the whole, such rapid and conspicuous improvements as Swift's gratified critics. It seemed to them that church-music, at last free from the contaminating influences of the theatre, was enjoying a renaissance.

But rejoicing over the "separation" was short-lived. In 1732 occurred the most ironical event in the history of eighteenth-century moral criticism: Handel once again made the church and theatre yokesmates in his "oratorios." Thunderstruck moralists fell into a fury. The bawdy songs of Drury Lane and the recent advancements in church-music were all but forgotten.

The occasion on which oratorios were introduced to England was a sentimental one -- Handel's birthday. As a surprise for the maestro, Bernard Gates, the Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal, revived the forgotten Haman and Mordecai which Pope and Handel had written in 1720. The masque so delighted the small group of well-wishers at Gate's house in 1732 that the Academy of Ancient Music repeated the performance at the Crown and Anchor Tavern a few weeks later. No-one was more charmed than Princess Anne was. She proposed to Handel that Haman be produced for the general public at the King's Theatre in the Haymarket.

All was well until word of her proposal reached the church authorities. Dr. Gibson, who was both Bishop of London and Dean of the Chapel Royal, forbade the performance. The reasons for his interdict were numerous. To begin with, the mere notion of presenting a religious drama in a worldly playhouse was an insult to pious Englishmen. The fact that Princess Anne had chosen Heidegger's theatre added to the bishop's indignation. That Haman and Mordecai should appear in the theatre which housed bacchanalian masquerades was monstrous. Furthermore, the loose-living of the Haymarket singers hardly recommended them for performing religious music. Equally distressing was the manner in which Handel planned to present Haman. As a private entertainment it had, perhaps, been no more noxious than any other masque was. As a public diversion it would be little more than a vulgar spectacle, redolent of Roman Catholic "theatricalism." Possibly the fact that Alexander Pope was a Catholic contributed to Protestant uneasiness. Had not his blasphemous First Psalm (1716) supported the belief that that church instilled into its members a contempt for Holy Scriptures?^{68.} Among long-remembered critics there may well have been misgivings about the propriety of Haman and

Mordecai.

Despite objections, Handel resolved to bring the work upon the public stage. He engaged Samuel Humphreys to expand Pope's six scenes to three acts, and on 19th April 1732 The Daily Journal carried an advertisement, not for a masque but for

An Oratorio in English, formerly composed by Mr. Handel, and now revised by him with several Additions. The notice concluded primly: "There will be no acting on the Stage, but the House will be fitted up in a decent Manner for the Audience."

Clerical censors were outwitted by euphemisms — and not for the first time in English theatrical history.^{69.} Esther, as Handel re-titled his work, opened at the King's Theatre on 2d May 1732. Playgoers were entranced by the novelty, but a great number of lay critics were as hostile as the churchmen were. Baffled by the designation, "Oratorio," one defined Esther as a "Religious Farce ... a mere Consort, no Scenery, Dress or Action, as necessary to a Drama." This "Thing" which has "set the whole World a Madding," he surmises, is only another money-making scheme of the shrewd composer.^{70.} Others resented the fact that Esther escaped the Lenten ban on public entertainments. The ruse is transparent, James Bramston growled: Heidegger

had already circumvented the Lenten law by calling masquerades "ridottos"; "Oratorio" is simply another "lucky Name" which the impresario devised to "charm the pious Pit." Why not name them "Convocations" and be done with it?^{71.} Several writers cavilled at some of Hester's arias. The "baudry" they detected in them was something less than elevating, and the alternating of these songs with "anthems to The Lord of Host" only heightened their offensiveness.^{72.}

The sentiments expressed in the oratorio also disturbed the less bigoted, though in a different way. It was clear that the general public loved Esther. They saw nothing blasphemous or indecorous either in the libretto or in the production. In fact, friendly commentators observed, they perceived nothing of moral significance in it at all. The experiment was laudable, of course, but the aim of such entertainments, as Addison had expressed it in 1712, was "to improve our Virtue in Proportion as it raised our Delight."^{73.} Not even its most ardent apologists could vouch for the didacticism of the new oratorio, for (as Mrs. Delany remarked of Porpora's imitative David and Bathsheba): "most of the people that hear the oratorio make no reflection on the meaning of the words, though God is addressed in the most

solemn manner."⁷⁴

There was an uglier kind of criticism. Early in the century, detractors of the new Italian operas had frequently referred to the existence of sexual depravity among the singers. Many of the remarks were due to ignorance — especially of the novel, mysterious, and ubiquitous castrati — but stories of paederasty among this "mutilated Tribe"⁷⁵ circulated widely. The female singers, nevertheless, were not exempted from abuse. With few exceptions they also were pictured as unnaturally libidinous. The unpleasantness might have abated had not the War of the Spanish Succession so intensified anti-Italian feelings that even the more serious critics began to pepper their musical writings with allusions to "Italian" aberrations.⁷⁶ Unfortunately, such libels, venial during wartime, survived the Peace of Utrecht in 1713 and became more or less routing in operatic criticism. It was, for instance, not owing to especial prurience that Swift implied in 1728 that castrati had been so successful in perverting the London beaux that we "want nothing but stabbing or poisoning to make us perfect Italians."⁷⁷ That the prejudice should find new currency in the criticism of oratorio is understandable. When Esther opened

at the King's Theatre there appeared on the bills the ignominious names, Senesino, Strada, and Bertolli. Thus the allegation, born of credulity and misdirected nationalism: the so-called "sacred drama" was performed by moral degenerates!^{78.}

This inundation of abuse would have disheartened a less resolute man. But the disapproval of churchmen, cynics, and bluestockings meant little to Handel. The public loved the music of his oratorio, and it was for them he composed. He was not discouraged by their ignorance of deeper meanings in the librettos. Consequently, in March, 1733, he presented his second "Religious Farce," Deborah, at the King's Theatre. The receipts, however, was disappointing; only 120 tickets were sold. Unluckily, Handel had blundered. Despite his regard for "the people" he had raised the prices of boxes and gallery-seats to a guinea and a half-guinea, respectively. As a result, he incurred the hostility of anonymous concert-goers as well as that of celebrated critics.^{79.} There appears to have been only one writer in England at his time who was sympathetic. In 1734, Dr. Arbuthnot published Harmony in an Uproar: A Letter to F---d---k H-n--l, Esq., an elaborate, unexpected defense of this

composer who "dar'd to rouse the roaring Lions, and wily Foxes of the British Nation." It had been a long time since Handel heard an admirer exclaim, "By G-d, you have made such Musick, as never Man did before you, nor, I believe, never will be thought of again...."^{80.}

Handel partly regained prestige when he presented his third oratorio, Athaliah, at Oxford. But the remaining years of this decade were not happy ones. One after another, his operas and oratorios failed. The public was indifferent even to the monumental Saul and Israel in Egypt in 1739. Ballad operas, Fielding's Pasquin, and the productions of a rival opera-house attracted the crowds.

These misfortunes, however, did not lessen the impact of Handel's "what-d'ye-call-its" on moral criticism. Except for their persistent denigration of Italian singers and the perennial attacks on Gay's Beggar's Opera, reformers had already begun to ignore the operas and stage-plays which had once been so engrossing. Their new subject-matter was Handelian oratorio -- though by 1740 the composer had produced only five of them. The shift of critical emphasis, moreover, entailed a new approach to musical morality. The anti-theatrical shibboleths of

the Puritans were being set aside. No-one, we have seen, who discussed the novel art-form carried on the tradition of Prynne and Bedford by citing the animadversions of Plato or St. Cyril. No-one seriously contended that Athaliah or Saul were "lust-provoking," vice-fomenting," or "soul-impoysoning." And although oratorios appeared at the infamous Haymarket Theatre, no-one shrieked that they were "the very baibes of Satan to draw men on to sinne, and so to endlesse destruction." Instead, we find critics condemning them either for their "blasphemy" and sacrilegiousness, for their profanation of sublime sentiments, or -- in the case of milder commentators -- for their ineffectiveness in disseminating Christian ethics. The fanatical siege of playhouse-music was a thing of the past. It was becoming clear that it was Anglican conservatism, not Puritan scrupuloßity, which determined what was right and what was wrong in oratorio.

Nevertheless there was much to be accomplished.

Although musical criticism was throwing off the fetters of seventeenth-century puritanism, it was not yet distinguished for tolerance. Certainly the malicious jibes at Italian artists were unworthy of enlightened writers.

The tide began to turn in 1741. In the autumn of

that year, the Duke of Devonshire, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, invited Handel to conduct a number of musical performances in Dublin. The proceeds, he was informed, were to go to Dublin's three charitable societies. Handel consented, and arrived in Dublin in November. In December, he began a series of concerts at John Neal's magnificent new music hall in Fishamble Street. They were a phenomenal success. Handel, who for the past few years had been playing to empty houses, now wrote joyously that "besides the Flower of Ladyes of Distinction and other People of the greatest Quality," there were "Bishops, Deans, Heads of the Colledge, and the most eminent People in the Law as the Chancellor, Auditor General, &c." who assembled to hear his music.^{81.}

But Handel failed to note that one Dean remained at home. Swift despised and distrusted the visiting oratoriomongers at Fishamble Street. Their preoccupation with "sacred" music did not disguise the fact that it was they who had so recently perverted English youth with their Italian operas. To complete the picture of hypocrisy was the presence of Susannah Cibber among Handel's pious singers. Colley's daughter in law, whose public disclosure of an adulterous love-affair had been the sensation of

London in 1738! And what was Neal's Music Hall but just another "club of fiddlers" in the sinister alleys of Christ church-yard?

The storm-clouds gathered early in December when the concert managers invited members of the choir from Christ Church to participate in the entertainments. Anticipating a similar invitation to his own beloved choir of St. Patrick's, Swift forbade his choristers to accept. Their singing in the St. Cecilia Day festivities at the cathedral was one thing; their consorting with Handel's lecherous crew at the music hall was another. Three of his singers, however, could not resist the entreaties of Handel's associates. The Dean — who at this date was suffering from "the outrageous reign of his passions" — was infuriated, especially with Dr. Wynne, the praecentor of St. Patrick's, who had apparently given the three singers his consent.⁸² On 28th January 1742, Swift expressed his saeva indignatio. "To show who and what the Dean and Chapter of St. Patrick's are," he vehemently denounced the public musical entertainments in Fishamble Street, "intreating" the "sub-dean and chapter to punish such vicars as shall ever appear there, as songsters, fiddlers, pipers, trumpeters, drummers, drum-majors, or

in any sonal quality, according to the flagitious aggravations of their respective disobedience, rebellion, perfidy, and ingratitude." "My resolution," he concludes, "is to preserve the dignity of my station, and the honour of my chapter."^{83.}

The efficacy of this "exhortation" (possibly the last thing Swift ever wrote) can be judged by a newspaper advertisement of 27th March 1742: "On Monday the 12th of April, will be performed at the Musick Hall in Fishamble Street, Mr. Handel's new Grand Oratorio, called the MESSIAH, in which the Gentlemen of the Choirs of both Cathedrals will assist." Swift's cathedral chapter had dismissed his once authoritative voice as the raving of a lunatic and had placed themselves at Handel's disposal.

The readiness of the Irish clergy to assist in these entertainments was indeed novel. The press revealed that it, too, was not going to ape the English habit of damning oratorio. Of a public rehearsal of Handel's new Messiah on 8th April 1742, Faulkner's Journal exultantly reported that "Mr. Handel's new Grand Sacred Oratorio ... gave universal Satisfaction to all present; and was allowed by the greatest Judges, to be the finest Composition of

Musick that ever was heard, and the sacred Words as properly adapted for the occasion." After the first public performance of the work, Dublin was at Handel's feet. "The best Judges," Faulkner's Journal announced on 17th April, "allowed it to be the most finished piece of Musick.... The Sublime, the Grand, and the Tender, adapted to the most elevated majestick and moving Words, conspired to transport and charm the ravished Heart and Ear." Most significant was the enthusiasm of the Irish clergy. Here was no murmuring about "sacrilege" and the "profanation" of sacred text. So bewitched was Dr. Delany by the expressive singing of that strumpet from the London playhouses, Mrs. Cibber, that during the performance he cried aloud, "Woman, for this, be all thy sins forgiven!"⁸⁴

It remained to be seen whether or not moral criticism in England was to take such an extraordinary turn.

iv. 1742-1789. The Evangelical Revival and Romantic Sentimentalism. Handel's Appeal to Religious and Nationalistic Feelings. The Growth of the Handel Myth, and the symbolical "Grand Music Festival" of 1784. The final Disintegration of seventeenth-century Criteria.

Handel's conquest of England proved to be less rapidly accomplished. London society yawned at its first hearing of Messiah in 1743, and a number of years were to pass before an English clergyman was to behave as Dr. Delany did or an English newspaper to emulate Faulkner's Journal. Still, one detects encouraging signs of progress in the 1740's and 1750's. Supplanting puritanism, which had so long dictated moralistic watchwords, was a new and chastened religious sentiment, fostered by the evangelical revival. Conspicuous, too, in this period is the growing tendency to sentimentalize the character of Handel.

Before resuming the account of Handel's career in England it would perhaps be helpful to consider en bloc the mid-century phenomena of evangelicalism and romantic sentiment.

The evangelical movement was not a spontaneous product of the mid-eighteenth century. It had its roots in the religious revival which had begun in reaction to the reign of the Catholic James II. Protestant unity had been the goal and so far as the clergy were concerned a measure of success was achieved with the Act of Settlement in 1701 and with the accession of the Protestant House of Hanover after Anne's death. The harmony proved

proved to be illusory. The ecclesiastical and dynastic reforms provoked as many grievances as they cured. We are familiar with the subsequent wrangling among intellectual laymen. Quarrels over the relative merits of the High Church and the Low, of dissent and non-conformity, and of "revealed" and "natural" religions are inescapably prominent in Augustan literature. None the less this was but one aspect of a growing religious sentiment. More significant is the fact that multitudes of lower-class Englishmen were also awakening to a true-blue Protestantism. In this instance, however, the stimulus was non-intellectual. Christian politics and deistical freethinking meant little to those who were ignorant of theological niceties, and who attended no church of any description. It was England's war with the Catholic powers on the continent during Anne's reign and the ever-present threat of the Jacobites which aroused them. If not denominationally united, the masses were unanimous in their hatred of Papism. Thus, by the 1730's when evangelicalism was intensified, there was already a semblance of religious unity among "underprivileged" Christian Englishmen -- though in the main it was manifested in such ways as jeering at fanatics, smashing the windows of Catholic

chapels, and mocking the unintelligible Italians of the opera-house (who, it was rumoured, were really singing Mass on the Haymarket stage).⁸⁵ It remained for mid-century revivalists to nurture this spirit, to purge it of unwholesome tendencies, and to give it direction.

The most important of the revivalist groups, both musically and historically, was the "Methodist" society. Initiated as an evangelical communion by the Wesley brothers at Oxford in 1729, it soon assumed the proportions of a "movement." Under the leadership of John Wesley its inspired members took their doctrines of Providence, "Conversion," and Good Works to every corner of the kingdom. Thousands of the spiritually hungry fell under the spell. Naturally, rationalists railed at the enthusiastic demeanor of Methodist preachers and their followers. How devastating is Foote's baiting of George Whitefield in his farce, The Minor! How comical the vignette of the "wrong-headed enthusiast," Humphrey Clinker, "running after the new light of methodism"! How malicious the assertion of the orthodox that the Methodist's

aim was mischief, and his zeal pretence,
His speech rebellion against common sense.⁸⁶

But there was something which distinguished the Wesleyans from Oliver's Saints and Fox's Friends. Religious

emotionalism was, after all, an old story to the wits. In his account of the "frenzied" Clinker's proselytizing for the Methodists, Smollett made capital of this special characteristic. Not only did his hero finish his sermon with a psalm ("the first stave of which he sung with peculiar graces"), but his enrapt audience "joined in the psalmody, with strong marks of devotion." Cowper also commented upon this musical penchant of Wesley's followers. Half resentfully, the poet informed his cousin that the ignorant inhabitants of Huntingdon had taken the household of his hymn-singing friends, the Unwins, for a Methodist camp!⁸⁷ Thus at a comparatively early date the coupling of piety and music was popularly associated with Wesleyanism. Indeed, those with conservative taste felt that the Methodists laid too much stress upon music. Cowper was particularly disgusted. Upon hearing of the Sunday concerts given by "Occiduous" (Charles Wesley) he warns his readers of the dangers attending these "wire and catgut" entertainments which "the fiddling priest" excuses as "evangelical and pure":

Observe each face, how sober and demure!
Ecstasy sets her stamp on ev'ry mien;
Chins fall'n, and not an eye-ball to be seen.

If Occiduous, continues the poet,

the tinkling harpsichord regards
As inoffensive, what offence in cards?
Strike up the fiddles, let us all be gay!
Laymen have leave to dance, if - parsons play.
Oh Italy! — thy sabbaths will be soon⁸²
Our sabbaths, clos'd with mumm'ry and buffoon.

In this calvinistic answer to Swift's poem, To Himself, Cowper, of course exaggerated. But there is none the less more than a little truth in this caricature. Unlike the leaders of most earlier sects (Fox, we remember, was moved "to cry out against all sorts of music"), the Wesleys emphasized the importance of music during devotion. To them, it played a more than incidental part in worship. It was a symbol of unity, a mystical communion with God, and an instrument of conversion.

Handel was soon to feel this change in the religious climate. Audiences were no longer to regard his oratorios as beautiful, though somewhat stuffy substitutes for Italian operas. Familiarized with scriptural themes and bound together in a spiritual fellowship, listeners were to discern for the first time the verities of Saul and Israel in Egypt.

Concurrent with the rise of evangelicalism was a change in attitude toward Handel. The almost universal practice of linking his name with gluttony, lechery, and self-conceit — a kind of "musical criticism" which

Addison had engendered in 1711 with his mockery of "Minheer Hendel" — was dying out. Sympathetic appraisals of the old "Man-Mountain" were becoming commoner. Dr. Arbuthnot had been the first of the die-hard Augustans to soften. Soon after the appearance of his tribute to the composer, Harmony in an Uproar, others followed suit. Even Swift eventually recanted. When the recently be-laurelled composer was about to leave Dublin in August, 1742, he went to the deanery of St. Patrick's to pay his respects to "the Ruins of the greatest Wit that ever liv'd along the Tide of Time." Upon announcing the visitor's name, reports Letitia Pilkington, Swift's "Servant was a considerable Time, e'er he could make the Dean understand him." When the sequestered lunatic finally comprehended the speaker, he cried: "O! a German, and a Genius! a Prodigy! admit him."⁸⁹ Forgotten was the bitter "Exhortation" of January and the vitriol of The Intelligencer. Equally affectionate — and no less astonishing — were the verses with which Alexander Pope greeted "Giant HANDEL" upon his return to London.⁹⁰ By 1745 Arbuthnot, Pope, and Swift were dead, but a new generation of writers was presently to carry the eulogizing of Handel a step further by

excusing or denying his faults and by investing him with certain qualities which he never possessed. The effect of sentimentalism upon mid-century moral criticism was to be felt within a decade.

Meanwhile, when Handel departed from Dublin for London in the autumn of 1742 there was reason to believe that he would at once recover his popularity with the English. The reports of his successes in Ireland, and the lavish praise which Pope bestowed upon him seemed to assure him of this. But Handel ever had to reckon with conspiracy. When he resumed the production of oratorios at Covent Garden in 1743, Lord Middlesex of the competing King's Theatre formed a cabal which determined to ruin Handel once and for all. Its members refused to attend his concerts. They held balls and card-parties on "oratorio nights" in order to draw the fashionable from Covent Garden. When this strategem failed, they sought to convince Handel's sympathizers that he was a charlatan, a plagiarist, a long-winded boor whose oratorios were out of date. Nor did it end there. Urged on by their superiors, hoodlums attempted to break up one after another of the composer's performances with catcalls.

Still, amidst this cruel opposition there were signs

of a favourable change in Handel's fortune. It was in the spring of 1743 that George II gave his ostentatious but time-honoured approval of the "Hallelujah Chorus" at one of the first London performances of Messiah. The following winter he again displayed delight with the Te Deum and Anthem which Handel had written to celebrate the English victory over the French at Dettingen. In both instances the dutiful court temporarily abandoned the Middlesex faction and followed the royal cue. But more significant than the approval of courtiers was the awakening of the average Englishman. These nationalistic pieces seemed to rally the spirits of a war-weary people.

Handel had hit upon something new in the Dettingen works. With them he succeeded, perhaps for the first time, in expressing the sentiments of the English nation as a whole. These were not like his unintelligible, hot-house operas which for thirty years had diverted an almost exclusively aristocratic audience. Nor were they like his oratorios, which though thematically sublime, had not yet been thought of as reflecting truly English feelings. It now remained for Handel to bring this fervour to the oratorio-form, to declare in musical terms the newly realized religious solidarity of his adopted country.

Again current warfare inspired him. In 1745, when

the army of the Catholic Pretender was deterred from its march on London, no-one was more jubilant than Handel was. The text of the resultant Occasional Oratorio was more than a collection of pious sentences culled from the Bible. It was the voice of Protestant England -- unmistakable to an ever-increasing multitude of "converts" to evangelicalism. Shortly afterwards, Handel repeated the couplet with Judas Maccabaeus, an oratorio commemorating the victory of the Duke of Cumberland over Prince Charles at Culloden Moor. The analogy between the Jewish patriot's expulsion of the ungodly besiegers and Cumberland's defeat of the Jacobites appealed enormously to the public.

It would be wrong to assume either that all of his subsequent oratorios were as strongly nationalistic as those prompted by the "Forty-Five," or that they were as successful financially. Alexander Balus, Joshua, Susanna, and Theodora all suffered "thin nights." But the emotional response to the "new Handel" augured well. Gradually the haut monde forsook its quadrille parties, rowdies quit their hooting, and the middle class -- so the great John Wesley later informs us -- began to show its grave approval of the "regenerate" composer.^{91.}

Yearly the ranks of Handelians swelled -- and not

always out of reverence for the master's compositions. His association, during the last ten years of his life, with the Foundling Hospital intensified a growing sentimental conception of Handel, the philanthropist. All London turned out for his annual benefit concerts at the hospital as the Handel-fever rose. The new Foundling Anthem found special favour with audiences which were beginning to feel that Handel could do no wrong. Upon revival even his old failures met with success. Indeed, Messiah, which England had neglected for seven years was in 1750 being described by wrought-up idolators as a masterpiece "beyond any human work that ever yet appeared." ^{92.}

Three years later Handel evoked a reverence of a different sort when he was stricken with blindness. His subsequent appearances at Covent Garden where he played his own organ concertos and accompanied oratorio-recitatives at the harpsichord were almost unbearably touching. Especially so was a performance of the oratorio, Samson, which he had fashioned from Milton's tragedy. The triple allusion to heroic blindness brought the audience to tears.

Inevitably, the critics began to change their tune. Among the first of the older critical groups to re-assess

oratorio was that of the ethical philosophers — and philosophers manqués — who for decades had been despising of the "effeminacy" and "Corruption" which seemed to afflict the eighteenth century. For want of a better scapegoat they had long ago placed much of the blame on theatrical entertainments. The number of diversions which could be termed "theatrical" complicated the reformers' task, but so far as plays were concerned some success had been achieved by 1740. The Stage Licensing Act of 1737 curtailed production of the more pernicious stage-pieces. And at least one tragedy was endorsed as an antidote to the evils prevailing among the lower classes. Already wretched apprentices were being packed off by benevolent employers to "holiday performances" of Lillo's George Barnwell.

Attempts to reform the other theatrical blight, the Italian opera, had met with less success. Ethical writers in the middle of the century were still complaining about it. What more conclusive evidence is there for the corruption of "the Ruling Manners and Principles of the Times," asked "Estimate" Brown, than that "low and unmanly Taste in Music" which dotes upon the "insipidity" and "unmeaning Sing-Song" of current operas? ^{93.} The process of moral decay assisted by enervating operas — how persis-

tent the theme was!

Nevertheless, several of Brown's contemporaries considered the relationship of music to the deterioration of manners more optimistically. One of them was "the Female Spectator," Eliza Haywood, for whom it was only a matter of course to turn to the fashionable subject of moral disintegration. Oratorios, she suggests, have of late been exonerated of blasphemy and sacrilege. Their ethical soundness has been tacitly admitted. Why had no-one thought of exploiting them as substitutes for the vile operas? "I cannot help thinking," she confided in her Epistles for the Ladies (1749):

but that Entertainments of this Nature frequently exhibited, would have an Effect over the most obdurate Minds, and go a great Way in reforming an Age, which seems to be degenerating equally into an Irreverence for the Deity, and a Brutality of Behaviour to each other; but as this Depravity of Taste, of Principles, and Manners, has spread itself from London even to the remotest Parts of this Island, I should be glad there were Oratorios established in every City and great Town throughout the Kingdom; but even then, to be of general Service, they ought to be given gratis, and all Degrees of People allowed to partake of them....⁹⁴

An oratorio, then, should be conducted as a sort of musical George Barnwell -- a didactic "drama," not for apprentices alone, but for "all Degrees of People." Shrewdly handled, music could be a panacea instead of a

plague.

Similar suggestions appeared in the mid-century "courtesy books." Designed primarily to instruct young ladies of breeding in manners and religion, these curious works also managed to inculcate a taste for edifying diversions. Oratorio was an inevitable subject, and the utilitarianism of Mr. Haywood was soon amplified. Miss Catherine Talbot, whose education appears to have consisted largely of readings from courtesy books, wrote her opinion in 1756:

The only public place I have been to this winter was last Friday, to hear the Messiah, nor can there be a nobler entertainment. I think it is impossible for the most trifling not to be the better for it. I was wishing all the Jews, Heathens, and Infidels in the world ... to be present. The Morocco ambassador was there, and if his interpreter could do justice to the divine words ... how must he be affected, when in the grand chorus's the whole audience solemnly rose up in joint acknowledgement that He who for our sakes had been despised and rejected of men, was their Creator, Redeemer, King of Kings, Lord of Lords!

Mrs. Haywood would use oratorio as a means of reconciling men to the truth. The more militantly Christian Miss Talbot would use oratorio to convert men to it! "To be sure the playhouse is an unfit place for such a solemn performance," she piously concludes,⁹⁵ But in view of universal conversion, what is this impropriety but a

minor one?

There were still those, of course, who found compromising difficult. Although pantomimes, masquerades, and French farces no longer monopolized the stage, the more rigid of the mid-century moralists discovered few signs of a moral revival in the theatre.⁹⁶ Perhaps no more eloquent proof of their dissatisfaction exists than the titles of a few pamphlets which were printed between 1757 and 1770: The Stage The High Road to Hell; The Players Scourge, or a Detection of the Ranting Profanity and Regnant Impiety of Stage-Plays; The Immorality of Stage-Plays; and The Theatre Licentious and Perverted. Thus even those who had learned to admire oratorio as a form of religious art still objected to a method of presentation in which "sacred truths are exhibited, in their turn, with the other diversions of the town, performed by the same people, with the same intent, in the same place." With ironic gusto an anonymous contributor to The Gospel Magazine writes of "the MESSIAH at the Play-house":

Suppose we see an advertisement worded thus, "On Tuesday next will be exhibited, in St. Paul's church, a comedy called The Relapse, or Virtue in Danger, to which will be added The Rape of Prosperpine, with the Birth and Adventures of Harlequin,

with Dancing and other entertainments, as will be expressed in the Bills of the Day," should not we immediately cry out, Monstrum horrendum! Why so? Such an exhibition at Covent-garden play-house excites no amazement -- It is clear, then, the difference of place is all in this matter. Well then; suppose we say, that "On Friday next will be exhibited, for the Entertainment of the Town, at the Theatre Royal in Covent-garden, the Birth, Life, Miracles, Sufferings, and Death of Jesus the Son of God, set to Music by Mr. Handel, together with a Solo on the Violin by Signor Giardini, and a Concerto on the Organ by Mr. Stanley;" -- an sunt christianis haec auribus consentanea? especially if we add "Orange wenches and whores ready as usual;" which is no more than real fact, at every performance of this sacred piece....⁹⁷

How like Prynne! Indeed, these well-meant, seventeenth-century indictments never completely vanished from musical criticism. As we shall see, there was always a William Cowper or a John Newton to keep them alive. As a rule, however, the more enlightened writer in the last third of the century viewed them as legacies of a narrower age and consequently attached little importance to them. Moreover, they were no longer strictly valid. In the 1770's and 1780's one was as likely to hear these works in concert-halls and churches as at the King's Theatre or Covent Garden. Obsolescent, too, were libelous references to the Italians. Not that misconceptions of their character had entirely died out. In 1767 we still hear whispers of a "shocking vice ... common among

the French figure-dancers and the Italian Singers." But later critics tended to avoid personal vilification. Perhaps the moral delinquency of certain English performers — Mrs. Cibber, for instance — convinced them of the folly of name-calling. In short, the "theatricalism" of oratorio no longer kindled widespread resentment.

Benevolent "feeling," we observed, coloured considerably the remarks of Mrs. Haywood and Miss Talbot on oratorio. But there were also repercussions of sentimentalism among those critics whom we normally regard as being more astute than the "blues." In 1752, Charles Avison had written an objective though somewhat disparaging appraisal of Handel in his Essay on Musical Expression. A year later, after the composer's blindness had been made known to the public, William Hayes published his stinging "reply" to Avison. Among his more notable remarks was that which described the musician as "a moral, good, and charitable Man . . . whose annual Benefaction to an Hospital for the Maintenance of the Fore-saken, the Fatherless, and those who have none to help them, will render HIM and his MESSIAH, truly Immortal and crowned with Glory, by the KING of KINGS and LORD of LORDS." ⁹⁹ The consequence of Hayes's "pathetic"

defense of Handel was fairly predictable. Avison — and others who presumed to question the composer's genius — was cast in the rôle of an insensate bully.

Balanced judgement was further endangered by Handel's death in 1759. Anecdotes -- largely apocryphal -- about his piety, his presentiment of dying on Good Friday, his visions, circulated rapidly. Every would-be poet in the kingdom rushed to the press with "reflexions" on Handel's saintliness. But not only Grub-streeters presented him as a demi-god. John Gregory fell in with sentimentalists by refusing to attribute Handel's abandoning Italian opera to the need for money. To him it indicated nothing less than spiritual conversion.^{100.} Several years later another eminent critic of sensibility, James Beattie, attested to Handel's beneficence by recalling a conversation which had taken place thirty years earlier. Shortly after the first London performance of Messiah, wrote the Scottish poet, Lord Kinnoul complimented the composer on his "noble entertainment." Handel's alleged reply (smacking of Mackenzian "feeling") was: "My lord ... I should be sorry if I only entertained them, I wish to make them better."^{101.}

More classic-minded enthusiasts began to apply bolder

though unprovoked, the danger signal was flying,

passionate, extravagant - 291 - was decidedly critical

strokes to the idealized portrait of the composer. Exhausting their store of commendatory adjectives, they resorted to Greek art and mythology for appropriate similes. John Mainwaring asserted in 1760 that "the harmony of HANDEL may always be compared to the antique figure of HERCULES, which seems to be nothing but muscles and sinews; as his melody may often be likened to the VENUS of MEDICIS, which is all grace and delicacy." On another page, this earliest of Handel's biographers apologizes for the flatness of his epithet, "down-right Prodigy." "I use this expression," he confesses, "because there are no words capable of conveying an idea of his character, unless indeed I was to repeat those which LONGINUS has employed in his description of DEMOSTHENES, every part of which is perfectly applicable to HANDEL."^{102.} Others were fond of drawing an analogy between the composer and the blind Homer. "Mr Handel sleep! Where does he sleep?" demanded the Horatian scholar, the Reverend William Hughes; he is "so far from Sleeping, that he never seems to take a gentle Nod."^{103.} To Mrs. Thrale, the importance of Messiah equalled that of The Iliad.^{104.} And to William Cowper, Handel was
the more than Homer of his age.^{105.}

Though unperceived, the danger signal was flying. Posthumous, extravagant sentiment was deadening critical

objectivity — a tendency, incidentally, which was observable in the "Shakespeare idolatry" of the 1760's.

Indeed there is a curious sameness to the unrestrained "defenses" which emanated from the Handelians and Shakespearean groups. Both artists, it was held, if not superior to the ancients, were at least equal to them.^{106.} Both were venerated as unschooled, "natural" craftsmen.^{107.} Both were granted freedom from the rules.^{108.} And both were honoured as moral philosophers.^{109.}

Dangerous in another way was the emphasis which the critics placed upon Messiah. Even during Handel's lifetime they slighted the superior merits of Israel in Egypt and consigned his other oratorios to comparative obscurity. And inevitably other composers of oratorio felt the pinch.^{110.} Their number was not inconsiderable, but musical critics reserved kudos for Handel, the innovator, the pace-setter — and now the colossus of virtue.

The climax of the Handel idolatry, and the virtual culmination of moral criticism, was reached in 1784 with a series of concerts in commemoration of the composer. The first concert of Handel's works in this "Grand Musical Festival" was given on 26th May at Westminster

Abbey. The response was dumbfoundingly unprecedented. Filled with "impatience and apprehension, lest they should not obtain seats," reported the awed Dr. Burney, a crowd of nearly 4000 assembled at the Abbey doors. Soon they became "very formidable and terrific to each other, particularly the female part of the expectants; for some of these being in full dress, and every instant more and more incommoded and alarmed, by the violence of those who pressed forward, in order to get near the door, screamed; others fainted; and all were dismayed and apprehensive of fatal consequences: as many of the most violent, among the gentlemen, threatened to break open the doors...." ^{111.} Once admitted they quieted, although the concert did not begin until hours later. Their annoyance at being delayed soon vanished and Handel triumphed as he had never done in his lifetime. Some forty years earlier audiences had slept through the choruses of Israel in Egypt. Now, at the Commemoration, Dr. Burney wrote, the same "harmonical combinations affected some to tears, and fainting:"

I had little leisure to contemplate the countenance^s of those around me; but, when I happened to turn my eyes from the performers, I saw nothing but tears of extacy, and looks of wonder and delight. ^{112.}

On the following day, the second concert was given at the Pantheon Theatre in Oxford Street before another adoring and lachrymose multitude. On 29th May thousands again assembled at Westminster Abbey, this time for Messiah. Originally this was to have been the last of the three festival concerts, but Queen Charlotte, responded to the public's wishes and commanded two additional performances for the first week in June. The Grand Musical Festival was indeed the official "canonization" of the composer.^{113.}

All Englishmen were possessed by the spirit of Handel — except for a poetical enthusiast and an evangelical preacher. Like Swift many years earlier in Dublin, William Cowper and John Newton responded to the Handel-worship with denunciation. Cowper, though always an admirer of Handel's artistry, had never lent his voice to the general acclaim over the ethical and devotional values of oratorio. Inheriting the austere tastes of his Calvinistic forebears, he believed that simple Sabbath hymns drew one closer to God than did the grand oratorios which one could hear seven days a week. "Music," he had declared, "always music, music in season and out of season, weakens and destroys the spiritual discernment."^{114.}

That oratorio-fanciers should worship their idol at

Westminster Abbey was to Cowper the most monstrous of ironies. Two weeks after the final concert he wrote to the Reverend John Newton that the festival was "a subject that calls loudly for the animadversions of an enlightened minister; and would be no mean one for a satirist, could a poet of that description be found spiritual enough to feel and resent the profanation."¹¹⁵ Newton, who was apparently preparing a number of sermons on Messiah, incorporated his friend's suggestions into them. In 1784 and 1785 he preached no less than fifty "Expository Discourses on the Series of Scriptural Passages, which form the Subject of the Celebrated Oratorio of Handel." The content is familiar. He scorns the notion that oratorio will move men to repentance, condemns the use of Scripture for vulgar amusement, chastises audiences for emphasizing the musical component of oratorios, and inveighs against Handelians for desecrating the national shrine.¹¹⁶

Impatient for the appearance of a "spiritual" satirist, Cowper himself wrote the appropriate "animadversions" in November, 1784. His attack, in the form of a "short drama," was on a less ambitious scale than Newton's was:

Scene opens, and discovers the Abbey filled with Hearers and Performers. An ANGEL descends into the midst of them.

Angel. What are you about?
Answer. Commemorating Handel.
Angel. What is a commemoration?
Answer. A ceremony instituted in honour of him whom we commemorate.
Angel. But you sing anthems?
Answer. Yes, because he composed them.
Angel. And Italian airs?
Answer. Yes, and for the same reason.
Angel. So then because Handel set anthems to music, you sing them in honour of Handel; and because he composed the music of Italian songs, you sing them in a church. Truly Handel is much obliged to you, but God is greatly dishonoured.
 [Exit ANGEL, and the music proceeds without further impediment.¹¹⁷

Despite these objections, the Grand Musical Festival was repeated with progressive extravagance in 1785, 1786, 1787, 1790, and 1791. In a second effort to discourage Handelians, the indomitable Newton published his sermons in 1786. Cowper, too, attempted once more to bring his "Commemoration-mad" countrymen to their senses. While you praise Handel's "talents" at your annual oratorio-feasts in Westminster Abbey, he writes in The Task,

remember too
 That His most holy book from whom it came
 Was never meant, was never us'd before,
 To buckram out the mem'ry of a man.¹¹⁸

Moralists had once declaimed against Handel's "sacred dramas" being performed in public theatres. They now objected to their performance in church. Doubtless

Cowper was not aware of the irony of his complaint.

Such lampoons were dismissed in the Enlightenment as anachronistic muttering. The traditionalists, those perpetual "villains" of eighteenth-century moral criticism, were a dying cult. The musical pronouncements of their demigods, Plato, Aristotle, and the Church Fathers were now slighted.^{119.} In 1789 it was the fashion to joke about William Fyenne's fanaticism, to mock "the elegance of his style, and candour of his reasoning."^{120.} Dr. Johnson's generation had even less patience with Fyenne's eighteenth-century imitators. Their dictum that music should be suspect because it is ethically non-utilitarian was treated with contempt. Recalling instances in which Handel's benefit performances reaped thousands of pounds for various charitable organisations, Dr. Burney testily asserted that "in England, perhaps more than in any other country, it is easy to point out the humane and important purposes to which [music] has been applied."^{121.} Indeed it would appear in 1785 that performances of Messiah —

which Newton and Cowper's predecessors had fallen upon so heavily fifty years earlier — could alone support the destitute of England.^{122.} Nor were notions of musical benevolence peculiar to the criticism of oratorio. The more facetious of Burney's contemporaries even had a good word to say about that old scapegoat for social evils, The Beggar's Opera. Though Gibbon admitted that the play "may, perhaps, have sometimes increased the number of highwaymen," he insisted that "it has had a beneficial effect in refining that class of men, making them less ferocious, more polite, in short more like gentlemen."^{123.}

Much of this later insistence upon the utilitarian value of music was mere badgering of Augustan skeptics. For the most part, the critical tenets of seventeenth-century musical reformers were paid little heed. The three most persistent abuses they complained of were now either nonexistent or no longer strictly moral issues. Discussions of "lust-provoking Songs," for centuries the province of moralists, had been given over to psychologists. No less alien to the Enlightenment was Arthur Bedford's maxim that since plays and theatrical music were "equally guilty" in spreading evil, "what is spoken against the Stage, may be as truly apply'd against Musick." What,

after all, was there now on the musical stage to speak against? Certainly not the librettos of Italian operas. "Who," asked Burney, "will now say ... that the moral sentiments of Metastasio [whose 'literary' librettos were then the rage] would poison and deprave the mind?"¹²⁴ Other Italian "books," imitative of those which Handel had once set, had become so hackneyed that one ceased to trouble with the words.

A similarly accommodating attitude existed towards English operatic texts. David Garrick's new productions of the once controversial Tempest and Macbeth were welcomed as innocent amusements in the latter half of the century. The inundation of "burlettas," comic operas, and musical afterpieces was equally immune to moral censure. Exclamations such as that which Andrews' "New Musical Interlude," The Election, drew from The Biographia Dramatica ("What nauseous potions will not music wash down the throat of the public!")¹²⁵ were rarities.

Leniency also marked comments upon the embellishment of church-music, a practice which seventeenth and early eighteenth-century divines had imputed to the "light, vaine, madde, fond, foolish and fantastical" modes of playhouse-composers. Tastes in ecclesiastical music had

changed. Organ accompaniment and psalmody, William Mason reports in 1795, have become "despicable," both to the "Village practitioners" and to those of "refined musical taste." Even modest parish churches must not only have "chaunts, services, and Anthems," but must have them accompanied by a variety of instruments. But significantly, despite Mason's displeasure, he attributes the vogue for elaborateness to "the rage of Oratorio" rather than to theatrical influences.¹²⁶ The days were past when the abuses of church and playhouse-music were accounted "homogeniall in their genericall nature." For all his vehemence, even Cowper had skirted around the topic in his "short drama" relative to the Handel Commemoration. Besides, were a moralist of Prynne's stamp still active in 1794 could he discourse coherently on the multiplicity of "abuses" which occurred when the new Drury Lane Theatre, with its stage fitted up as a Gothic cathedral, was¹²⁷ "Opened with a Selection of Sacred Music"?

In consequence of this disintegration of seventeenth-century criteria, the eighteenth-century case against oratorio weakened. Joseph Addison's dream of a semi-devotional "Entertainment" had been more than realized. Ironically espoused by "Minheer Hendel" (whose Italian operas,

Addison complained, had wrested singable, meaningful, simple music from the English Everyman) oratorio gave music back to the people. It was no small gift. "The Oratorios thrive abundantly," wrote Horace Walpole in 1743, giving him "an idea of heaven, where everybody is to sing whether they have voices or not." One had to go back almost to James I's reign to find music which "everybody is to sing."¹²⁸

Handel's was no sophisticated art-form, intelligible only to city-folk. During his lifetime, his "sacred dramas" swelled the repertory of grateful "festival choirs" at Hereford, Worcester, and Gloucester. Gradually his work reached more distant music-lovers. Some thirty years after Handel's death, William Mason (the praecentor of York Minster) noted that "the rage of Oratorio has spread from the Capital to every Market Town in the Kingdom."¹²⁹ The public indifferent to the words? Burney refuted that old libel with his account of "affected" auditors at the great Commemoration of 1784. Moreover, the public had long ago rejected the mid-century designation, "entertainment." Much less did they regard oratorios as "profanations" of Scripture. The gravity and religious intensity which audiences exhibited at the

ever-favourite Messiah belied any such notion. Even today the average Englishman makes a sort of pilgrimage out of his Christmas-time attendance of that work. To him it remains the greatest devotional monument in the history of English music.

Finally, by the end of the century the old Puritanical defamation of Handel, the man, had vanished without leaving a trace. Romantic sentiment had transformed him from a voluptuary and sinister charlatan into "a man of blameless morals," a mystic, and a kind of musical evangelist.^{130.}

The latter half of the eighteenth century, remarks Professor D. Nichol Smith, "could almost lose itself in panegyric of Shakespeare."^{131.} The same may be said of Handel, who almost singlehanded had secured music against the persistent, reactionary forces of seventeenth-century "morality."

Notes to Chapter IV:

1. Henry Home, Lord Kames, Elements of Criticism, I, p. 53; William Prynne, Historio-Mastix, The Players Scourge, London, printed by E. A., 1633, p. 272.
2. Sherard Vines, The Course of English Classicism, London, Hogarth Press, 1930, p. 72.
3. Horace Walpole, Letters, edited by Mrs. Paget Toynbee, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1903-1905, I, p. 339 (14th April 1743 to Horace Mann).
4. James Boswell, The Life of Samuel Johnson, I., p. 489.
5. John Mainwaring, Memoirs of the Life of George Frederic Handel, London, R. and J. Dodsley, 1760, pp. 127-8.
6. "On Music." [G. F. Finny, in "Ecstasy and Music in 17th Century England," Journal of the History of Ideas, VIII, April 1947, pp. 153-86.]
7. E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923, prints extracts from each of these works, pp. 203; 221-25.
8. Prynne, op. cit., preface "To the Christian Reader"
9. Ibid., pp. 272-3.
10. Ibid. pp. 274-5; 276.
11. Ibid., p. 283.
12. Ibid., p. 279.
13. John Milton, Areopagitica, London, n. p., 1644, p. 16.
14. It is interesting to note, however, that authors persistently endeavoured to adapt the Miltonic epic to the musical stage. In 1677 Dryden "refin'd" the "golden Ore" of Paradise Lost with a rhymed libretto, The State of Innocence (see Nathaniel Lee, To Mr Dryden, on his Poem of Paradise prefixed to the printed libretto which appeared in 1677). The opera was never performed during Dryden's lifetime though it may have reached the stage as a puppet-opera in Queen Anne's reign (see W. J. Lawrence, "Marionette Opera," Musical Quarterly, X, 1924, p. 238.) Later, Mrs. Delany "made a drama for an oratorio out of Milton's 'Paradise Lost,' to give Mr. Handel

to compose to." (Mary Delany, The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Granville, Mrs. Delany, edited by Lady Llanover, London, Richard Bentley, 1861, II, p. 280). Handel certainly never set it, though the text of John Christopher Smith's Paradise Lost which Burney (A General History of Music, p. 666) mentions as being performed in 1760, may be Mrs. Delany's in part.

15. Diary, 21st December 1662.
16. Diary, 13th November 1664.
17. Tom Brown, "Letters from the Dead to the Living," Works, London, B. Bragg, 1707, II, p. 164.
18. C. H. H. Parry, "The Music of the 17th Century," Oxford History of Music, III, pp. 257-58.
19. Matthew Locke, Modern Church Musick, Pre-accus'd Censur'd and Obstructed in its performance before his Majesty, April 1 1666, London, 1666.
20. Sir George Etherege, The Man of Mode, I, 1. Sir Walter Scott in his edition of Dryden's works (XV, p. 226, note) reports that the Mock-Tempest was so indecent that the Dublin "ladies and people of rank left the house to the rabble when it was acted."
21. Jeremy Collier, Essays upon Several Moral Subjects, London, R. Sare, 1697, II, 23-25.
22. Ibid., pp. 125-6.
23. Tom Brown, op. cit., p. 163.
24. Jeremy Collier, A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage, London, S. Keble, 1698, pp. 278-80.
25. Tom Brown, op. cit., p. 163.
26. William Congreve, Amendment of Mr. Collier's False and Imperfect Citations, London, J. Tonson, 1698, p. 109.
27. William Congreve, The Way of the World, V, 1.

28. Quoted by New Ward, A Compleat and Humorous Account of all the Remarkable Clubs and Societies in the Cityes of London and Westminster, London, Joseph Collier, 1745, p. 305.
29. Jeremy Collier, Mr. Collier's Dissuasive from the Play-house, London, R. Sare, 1703, p. 10.
30. Ibid., p. 13.
31. Arthur Bedford, The Evil and Danger of Stage-Plays, Bristol, W. Bonny, 1706, p. 4.
32. A Representation of the Impiety and Immorality of the English Stage, London, J. Nutt, 1704, p. 4.
33. G. F. Secretan, The Life and Times of Robert Nelson, London, John Murray, 1860, p. 107.
34. Bedford, op. cit., p. 7.
35. Thomas Tenison, A Letter from Several Members of the Society for Reformation of Manners, London, 1704, p. 4.
36. Arthur Bedford, A Second Advertisement Concerning the Profaneness of the Play-house, Bristol, W. Bonny, 1705, p. 6.
37. Among the dramatis personae are Ormondo, "General of the Queen of Cyprus's Army ... first in love with Dorisbe, and after with Arsinoe"; Feraspe, "Captain of the Queen's Guards, in love with Dorisbe"; Arsinoe, "Queen of Cyprus, in love with Ormondo"; and Dorisbe, "a Princess of the Blood ... in love with Ormondo." Needless to say, this symmetrical eroticism, alone, was offensive to Puritans.
38. John Dennis, "An Essay on the Operas after the Italian Manner," Critical Works, II, p. 383.
39. Arthur Bedford, The Great Abuse of Musick, London, printed by J. H., 1711, p. 176.
40. Ibid., pp. 109-10.
41. Ibid., p. 62.
42. Ibid., pp. 206-7.
43. Ibid., pp. 106-7.

44. Ibid., p. 196.
45. Arthur Bedford, A Serious Remonstrance . . ., London, John Darby, 1719, pp. 17-18.
46. Spectator, 11th March 1712.
47. Spectator, 28th March 1712. The subject of improper epilogues is again taken up in the Spectator for 1st April 1712 and later by Samuel Johnson in his life of Ambrose Philips.
48. Bedford, Great Abuse of Musick, p. 218.
49. The Ladies Library, edited by Sir Richard Steele, London, 1714, I, p. 27.
50. Spectator, 14th June 1712; cf. the number for 8th December 1714.
51. John Gay, Three Hours after Marriage, I, i.
52. We are given an example of Georgian "lasciviousness" in Law's Absolute Unlawfulness of the Stage-Entertainment (London, 1726, p. 24). "Here two Women (whom I suppose to be baptiz'd Christians) represent Venus and Diana in this Language:
 Ven: Am'rous Kisses
 Dian: Nuptial Bliss
Lovers Pleasures
Cupid's Treasures
Are the Sweets that Life improves.
 "Now if a common Prostitute was to come drunk out of a Brandy Shop singing these Words, she would act like herself."
53. James Miller, Harlequin-Horace; or, the Art of Modern Poetry, London, Lawton Gilliver, 1731, p. 31; cf. Steele's Theatre, 12th March 1720, and his Anti-Theatre, 14th March 1720.
54. George Berkeley, An Essay towards Preventing the Ruine of Great Britain, London, J. Roberts, 1721, pp. 15-17. In his curious comedy, The Independent Patriot; or Musical Folly (1737), Francis Lynch echoes Berkeley by coupling political corruption with "false Taste" in music.
55. James Peller Malcolm, Anecdotes of the Manners and Customs in London during the 18th Century, London, Longman, Hurst, 1808, p. 335.
56. See Chapter II, p. 92.

57. The Craftsman, 17th February 1728; Christopher Bullock re-printed this attack in "The Key to The Beggar's Opera," published with Woman's Revenge, London, J. Robb, 1728.
58. See Gay's letter to Swift, 16th May 1728 (Swift, Correspondence, IV, p. 33.)
59. Colley Cibber, Apology, p. 141.
60. A popular verse of the time appeared in The Craftsman (Appendix, IV, pp. 315-16):
 Then let us toast the blooming Lass
 Whose Charms has thus ensnar'd me;
 I'd drink it in a brimming Glass,
 Tho' Parson Herring heard me.
61. Cibber, who was manager of Drury Lane, refused to produce Gay's play which subsequently went to Lincoln's Inn Fields. It is possible that Cibber was responsible for the banning of Gay's Folly in 1729 so that his own Love in a Riddle might have no competition. The rivalry is discussed to some extent by Norman Ault in New Light on Pope, London, Methuen & Company, 1949, pp. 313-15.
62. Daniel Defoe, Augusta Triumphans, or the Way to Make London the most Flourishing City in the Universe, London, J. Roberts, 1729, p. 48. See also Defoe's Street-Robberies, Consider'd, London, J. Roberts, 1728: "... The Beggar's Opera, in my Opinion, has been of Prejudice to the Publick. Roguery there is set in such an amiable Light, that vulgar Minds are dazzled with it; and the Author, I think, is punishable for not punishing the Persons in his Drama according to their Desert. I think the Poeta Licentia very much abused, and, like a bad Statesman, has run too great a Length." (p. 49)
63. Of these Yahoo diversions, Steele writes, "If we are any longer to march on two legs, and not be quite prone, or on all four, like the other animals, let us assume manhood and human indignation against so barbarous an affront." (The Theatre, 12th March 1720)
64. Discussions continued throughout the century. Dr. Johnson asserted in his life of Gay that the efficacy of The Beggar's Opera as an encourager of vice was "surely exaggerated." At another time, however, he declared that there is in the play "such a labefaction of all principles as may be injurious to morality." (Boswell, I, p. 488.) On the other hand, Sir John Hawkins (a professional lawyer as well as a musicologist) spoke for a number of his

contemporaries when he wrote that "the effects of the Beggar's Opera on the minds of the people have fulfilled the prognostications of many that it would prove injurious to society; Rapine and violence have been gradually increasing ever since its first representation: the rights of property, and the obligation of the laws that guard it, are disputed upon principle." (Hawkins, History of Music, V, p. 317.)

65. Patrick Delany, Observations upon Lord Orrery's Remarks, London, W. Reeve, 1754, p. 192; and Swift, Correspondence, III, p. 46 (letter to Edward Harley, 9th February, 1720).
66. As an instance of this, the writer records the Dean's answer to Lady Carteret's request that he advance a friend of hers in his choir: "Upon my conscience, madam, if you applied to me for a Deanery, or a Bishoprick, and it were in my power to give it, you should have it in an instant. Because those are preferments where merit is in no way concerned. But in this, madam, my conscience, and my credit, interpose. For this man's merit is to be brought to the test every day." (Delany, op. cit., pp. 190, 192.)
67. Jonathan Swift, Poems, edited by Harold Williams, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1937, II, p. 521. Swift did not complete the poem. See Mary Delany, Correspondence and Autobiography, I, pp. 313; 316-17; 330 for her account of the celebrations in 1731 at St. Patrick's.
68. See Ault, op. cit., Chapter VIII, "The First Psalm."
69. D'Avenant had accomplished the same thing with his "Moral Representations" during the Interregnum. Cf. Chapter I of this work, pp. 13-14.
70. See and Seem Blind; or a Critical Dissertation on the Publick Diversions, London, 1732.
71. James Bramston, "The Man of Taste," published in A Collection of Several Poems by Several Hands, London, J. Dodsley, 1770, pp. 292-3.
72. The Woman of Taste: Occasion'd by a Late Poem, entitled The Man of Taste, by a Friend of the Authors, London, 1733, p. 9.
73. Spectator, 14th June 1712.
74. Mary Delany, Correspondence, I, p. 450.
75. The notion that sexual perversion, particularly homosexuality, was endemic to Italy is centuries old. Seventeenth-century English Literature, alone, abounds in references to it. (Cf. Donne's Elegy XVI; Swift's Tale of a Tub, preface).

76. In 1706, for instance, John Dennis characterized the imported music-drama as a Trojan Horse, concealing a host of evirati with which the enemy hoped to subvert English manliness. ("Essay on the Operas," Works, II, 382-93; passim.)

77. Jonathan Swift, "Intelligencer" (III), Prose Works, edited by Temple Scott, London, George Bell & Sons, IX. The author of Faustina, or the Roman Songstress (London, J. Roberts, c. 1726) is more direct:

... ah, alas!

Lost is the Noble Race of British Youth,
Whose Ornaments were, Wisdom, Learning, Truth
To Learning and to Manly Arts estrang'd,
(As if with Women Sexes they'd exchang'd)
They look like Females, dress'd in Boys Attire
Or Waxwork Babies, actuated by Wire:
They kiss and slobber in the open Street;
Curs'd on this damn'd, Italian Pathick Mode
To Sodom and to Hell the ready Road:
May they, when next they kiss, together grow,
And never after Separation know.

78. Resentment ran high for years, blinding many to the values of oratorio. As late as 1766, when a more reasonable attitude prevailed, we find John Gregory unmoved by the sublime sentiments of oratorio because "Italian eunuchs" and "gay lively strumpets" stimulated "an unhappy association of ideas." (John Gregory, A Comparative View, pp. 160-61.)

79. Politicians, it is interesting to note, immediately linked Handel's name with Walpole's after the appearance of Deborah. An epigram (probably by Lord Bolingbroke) was printed in The Craftsman for 7th April 1733:

Quoth W----- to H-----, shall We Two agree,
And excise the whole Nation? H. Si, Caro, Si.
Of what Use are Sheen, if the Shepherd can't shear them?
At the Hay-Market I, you at Westminster. W. Hear Him!
Cf. R. A. Streatfeild, "Handel, Rolli, and Italian Opera in London in the Eighteenth Century," Musical Quarterly, III, No. 3 (July 1917) p. 428-445.

80. John Arbuthnot, "Harmony in an Uproar," Miscellaneous Works, Glasgow, James Carlile, 1751, II, pp. 20; 29. In this "epistle," the author records the proceedings of an imaginary "trial" of Handel before his "Betters." Arbuthnot's ironical style may be illustrated by a few of the court's "Charges": "Inprimis, You are

charg'd with having bewitch'd us for the Space of twenty Years past; nor do we know where your Inchantments will end....
Secondly, You have most insolently dared to give us good Musick and sound Harmony, when we wanted and desir'd bad.... Thirdly, You have most feloniously and arrogantly assum'd to yourself an uncontroul'd Property of pleasing us, whether we would or no; and have often been so bold as to charm us, when we were positively resolv'd to be out of Humour...." (p. 26)

81. George Frideric Handel, Letters, edited by Erich H. Muller, London, Cassell & Company, 1935, pp. 41-2.
82. Patrick Delany, Observations on Lord Orrery's Remarks, p. 188.
83. Swift, Correspondence, VI, pp. 220-221.
84. Mary Delany, Autobiography, II, p. 408.
85. Faustina, or the Roman Songstress, p. 9. Cf. note 77 above.
86. William Cowper, "Hope," Poetical Works, London, Oxford University Press, 1913, pp. 564-5.
87. William Cowper, Correspondence, I, pp. 80-1.
88. William Cowper, "The Progress of Error," Poetical Works, p. 20.
89. Letitia Pilkington, Memoirs, London, R. Griffiths, 1754, III, p. 171.
90. Alexander Pope, The Dunciad, Book IV:

Strong in new arms, lo! Giant HANDEL stands,
 Like bold Briareus, with his hundred Hands;
 To stir, to rouse, to shake the soul, he comes,
 And Jove's own Thunders follow Mars's Drums.
 Arrest him Empress or you sleep no more —
 She heard, and drove him to th'Hibernian Shore.
91. John Wesley writing of Messiah at Bristol Cathedral: "I doubt if that Congregation was ever so serious at a Sermon, as they were during this Performance." (John Wesley, Extract of J.W.'s Journal, from 17 June 1758 to 5 May 1760, Bristol, William Pine, 1764, p. 9.
92. Mary Delany, Autobiography, II, p. 623.
93. John Brown, An Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times, London, L. Davis, 1757, pp. 30-31.

94. Eliza Haywood, Epistles for the Ladies, London, T. Garner, 1749, I, p. 80.
95. A Series of Letters between Mrs. Elizabeth Carter and Miss Catherine Talbot, London, J. Rivington, 1808, I, p. 398.
96. The controversy which arose in Edinburgh over John Home's Douglas (1760) gave Scotland a taste of 17th century criticism procedure. With typical irrelevance Adam Gibb maligns Matthew Dysart, one of Home's clerical champions as "being more taken up with fiddling, flinging, dancing and training up his children in those wicked amusements than with preaching." (Adam Gibbs, The Players Scourge, Edinburgh, 1757, p.6.)
97. "A Letter to a Friend, on going to hear the MESSIAH at the Play-house," The Gospel Magazine or Treasury of Divine Knowledge. Designed to promote Experimental Religion. London, 1775, II, p. 70. The letter is dated 13th March 1761. Many years later Charles Lamb carried the irony still farther in his Essay on Ears where he speaks of "Oratoric (that profanation of the purposes of the cheerful playhouse)..."
98. The Stage the High Road to Hell, London, W. Nicoll, 1767, p. 32.
99. William Hayes, Remarks on Mr. Avison's Essay on Musical Expression, London, 1753, p. 18.
100. Gregory, op. cit., p. 152.
101. James Beattie, Letters [printed in British Prose Writers, London, John Sharpe, XXV, pp. 77-78, 25th May 1780.]
102. Mainwaring, Memoirs, pp. 193, 204.
103. William Hughes, Remarks upon Church Musick, Worcester, R. Lewis, 1763, pp. 40-41.
104. Hester Lynch Thrale, Thraliana, edited by Katherine C. Balderston, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1942, I, p. 583.
105. William Cowper, "The Task," Book VI, Poetical Works, p. 233.
106. Robert W. Babcock, The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry, 1766-1799, Chapel Hill, University of N. Carolina Press, 1931, pp. 66-67.
107. Ibid., pp. 123-36. Cf. Arbuthnot's account of Handel's "trial," during the Ancient-Modern Controversy (p. 359-60 of the present work).

108. Babcock, ibid. cit., pp. 68-9; 216. Cf. Arbuthnot, note 107 above.
109. Babcock, op. cit., pp. 130-34; 219.
110. In the 1760's alone were produced Arne's Judith, Stanley's Zimri, Arnold's Abimelech (with a libretto by Christopher Smart), and Resurrection, Smith's Rebecca and Habal, and Worgan's Hannah.
111. Charles Burney, An Account of the Musical Performances in Westminster Abbey, and the Pantheon, May 26th, 27th, 29th, and June the 3d, and 5th, 1784, in Commemoration of Handel, London, T. Payne, 1785, p. 25.
112. Ibid., p. 40.
113. So Cowper called it (Correspondence, 21st June 1784 to Newton).
114. Cowper, Correspondence, I, pp. 351-52. He speaks of the Methodists' immoderate use of music.
115. Ibid., 21st June 1784.
116. John Newton, Fifty Expository Discourses ..., London, 1786, passim.
117. Cowper, Correspondence, 20th November 1784.
118. Cowper, "The Task," Book VI, Poetical Works, p. 233.
119. Sir William Jones, "Essay on the Arts commonly called Imitative," Works, London, IV, 1772. See Chapter III, p. 206 of the present work.
120. Burney, History of Music, III, p. 419.
121. Charles Burney, The Present State of Music in France and Italy, London, T. Becket, 1771, p. 4.
122. Burney, Account of the Musical Performances in Westminster Abbey, p. 27.
123. "Upon this," adds Boswell, "Mr. Courtenay said, 'Gay was the Orpheus of highwaymen.'" (Johnson, I, p. 488, note 8.)

124. Burney, History of Music, IV, p. 228.
125. Biographia Dramatica, II, p. 188. Cf. Allardyce Nicoll, A History of Late 18th Century Drama, Cambridge, University Press, 1927, p. 204 note 3. Nicoll dates the first performance 21st October 1774.
126. William Mason, Essays Historical and Critical on English Church Music, York, W. Blanchard, 1795, pp. 217-18.
127. I have in my possession a print showing the "Interior of the late Theatre Royal Drury Lane; built by Henry Holland Esq., R. A. Opened with a Selection of Sacred Music, 12th March 1794; Destroyed by Fire, 24th February 1809."
128. Walpole, Letters, I, p. 329 (3d March 1743 to Horace Mann).
129. Mason, op. cit., p. 217.
130. Hawkins, History of Music, V, p. 408.
131. D. Nichol Smith, 18th Century Essays on Shakespeare, Glasgow, 1903, xii.

Chapter V.

Music and the Ancient-Modern Controversy

At [Criticism's] right Hand sat Ignorance, her Father and Husband, blind with Age; at her left, Pride her Mother, dressing her up in the Scraps of Paper herself had torn. There, was Opinion her Sister, light of Foot, hoodwinkt, and headstrong, yet giddy and perpetually turning. About her play'd her Children, Noise and Impudence, Dullness and Vanity, Positiveness, Pedantry, and Ill-Manners

- Jonathan Swift, The Battle of the Books

1. Music and the Battle of the Books: 1660-1705

Throughout the seventeenth century there were intimations that ancient science, despite the conventional deference paid it, was inferior to the modern, in both theory and achievement. Everyone is familiar with Bacon's "novum organum" by which he hoped to sever connexions with the scientific method of the ancients whose superstitions, prejudices, and assumptions had for too long impeded the moderns' advance in learning. Many years later Thomas Burnet's similar notions of perfectibility in the sciences inspired readers of his Sacred Theory of the Earth to abandon their undiscerning worship of the ancients. The Royal Society was no less diligent in

promoting the superiority of modern science.

The traditionalists' response to such heresies was an understandably angry one, and when the antagonism between the defenders of the old and the new became more acute in the last quarter of the century, sides were even more vigorously taken. Inevitably, the question of the relative achievements in ancient and modern art was raised. It is at this point that the present discussion begins.

One finds the inception of the musical ancient-modern controversy in France rather than in England. At first, though it was carried on with a certain élan, the thrusting of the moderns and the parrying of the ancients was monotonous and inconclusive. On the one hand, Claude Perrault asserted in his edition of Vitruvius (1673) that the ancients did not know counterpoint. Offended by what he interpreted as disrespect for the ancients, Boileau contradicted Perrault in his edition of Longinus in the following year. In 1680 Perrault reiterated his opinion. And so it went. Neither side could really prove its contentions. Nevertheless, at first the decision was given to the pre-ancient faction, for what chance had the moderns when their opponents invoked such authorities as Plato, Longinus, Aristotle, Quintilian,

and Plutarch?

Not until the moderns "discovered" Jean Baptiste Lully did the squabble over the merits of ancient and modern music attain any real significance. Here was the moderns' long-sought answer to Orpheus and Timotheus. Here was the supreme master whose achievements were unequalled by either his predecessors or his contemporaries. Most important, here was a musician whose proficiency was exhibited daily at the opera-house, play-house, and court. One did not have to rely upon the musty, second-hand accounts of a Plato or a Polybius to appreciate his genius.

One meets with this temporary victory of the moderns in Charles Perrault's colossal tribute to the king, Le Siècle de Louis le Grand (1687). Among the matchless glories of the present reign, of course, is music. But before he expatiates on that art, Perrault reviews the tales of Orpheus and Amphion, concluding patronizingly,

Ces fables, il est vray, sagement inventées,
Par la Grece avec art ont esté racontées,
Mais comment l'écouter quand d'un ton serieux,
Et mettant a l'écart tout sens mystérieux....

Historical musicians were another matter. Their works had not survived, but the unimpeachable testimonies of their contemporaries made the moderns wary of disposing of them

too rashly. However, Perrault's wit rescued him. In answer to enquiries about the nature of the Greek masters' songs, he writes gravely, they were

Tels que ceux de Lulli, naturels et touchans.

The ironic simile was certain to nettle his antiquarian opponents. And unable to resist repeating his brother Claude's dictum that the ancients were ignorant of counterpoint, he concludes in the same pejorative vein that the Greeks

... n'ayant point connu la douceur incroyable
Que produit des accords la rencontre agreable,
Malgré tout le grand bruit que la Grece en a fait,
Chez elle ce bel art fut un art imparfait.¹

The following year Perrault poured a second broadside into the antiquarians of Louis XIV's reign. We find, though, something more than a mere amplification of his earlier theme in the new Parallèles des Anciens et des Modernes. If the sciences, Perrault seems to muse, had attained an unparalleled perfection in modern times (as his scientific colleagues insisted they had), did it not suggest that there was order and progress in the growth of all knowledge? Let us then apply the progressivist theory to the fine arts. We may subsequently say that the moderns have outdone the ancients in painting, sculpture, architecture, and music. More reserved in allowing the moderns such honours in oratory and poetry, Perrault none the less concludes that contemporary productions of this

nature are at least not unworthy of comparison with the
ancients'.^{2.}

The assertion was a bold one and failed to meet with universal concurrence in the Paris of 1688. François de Callières, for example, took exception to Perrault's "pompous" encomiums of Lully. In his satirical Histoire Poétique de la Guerre Nouvellement déclarée entre les Anciens et les Modernes, de Callières describes the assembling and alignment of ancient and modern forces which are to oppose each other in battle. Normally complacent, Orpheus, Amphion, and Arion are terrified by the news that Lully is to combat them singlehanded. Had not Perrault informed the world of the wonders which this prodigy worked?

Que pouvons-nous opposer à toutes ces merveilles?
dit Orphée avec un grand soupir; Il est vray, pour-
suivit-il, que je scay me faire suivre par les
bestes des forests; mais Lulli se fait suivre et
admirer par des hommes polis.

But confidence is immediately restored by a modern Italian musician who asks, "Pensez-vous ... que la plupart des hommes qui suivent Lulli avec tant d'empressement se connoissent mieux en Musique que les bestes qui vous accompagnent? Et croyez-vous qu'elles ne soient pas plus bestes qu'elles, de porter sans cesse leur argent à son Opera,

pour y entendre cinquante fois la même chose? consolez-vous, devin Orphée...." ³ A fico for the French moderns and their boasted "progress" in music!

Meanwhile in England, skirmishing between the champions of the old and of the new was not unknown. One of the earliest eulogists of Greek music in this period was the classical scholar, Isaac Vossius (or Voss). Most of the arguments he advanced for the superiority of the ancients were either unrealistic or downright fatuous. With true doctrinaire spirit he would rather risk the charge of gullibility than betray a principle and yield an inch to the moderns. Thus in De Poematum cantu et Viribus Rhythmi (1673), we find Vossius "ready to grant every possible and impossible excellence to the Greek musicians, than, when alive, they could have been to ask. None of the poetical fables, or mythological allegories, relative to the power and efficacy of ^{their} music, put the least violence upon his credulity." ⁴ However, credulousness was not a requisite of seventeenth-century learning. Samuel Butler, whose aversion to modernity equalled Vossius's, was no gull. Unlike the Dutch Latinist he accounted such things as Polybius's history of the Arcadians more a subject for derision than for reverence. ⁵

Another writer was less facetious about the declarations of Vossius. Dr. John Wallis (about whom more will be said later) took exception to some of the statements in De Poematum cantu. Particularly controversial had been Vossius's assertion that the Greeks knew counterpoint. Consequently, in the appendix to his edition of Ptolemy's Harmonics (1682), Wallis broached the subject which had long been argued by the French -- the existence of counterpoint in antiquity.

But in England the opposing parties in the ancient-modern controversy were not always Men of Learning. Nor was the veracity of Greek authors always the casus belli. For some of the English moderns, "conservatism" was just as valid a synonym for "ancient" as Greek "classicism" had been for Vossius and his French colleagues. As a result, the conservatives were held to be just as fatal to progress as the classicists were. An illustration of this may be found in 1672 when Thomas Salmon, a Fellow of the Royal Society, published his Essay to the Advancement of Music. "By casting away the Perplexity of different Cliffs [of which there were above half a dozen then in use], and uniting all Sorts of Music ... in one universal Character," Salmon sought to simplify and popularize a science which he felt had been too

long in the hands of reactionary theorists. His aim was commendable and his plan practicable, but a surcharge of confidence led this amateur to an unfortunate badgering of traditionalists. Anticipating their objections to his project, he writes, "I First of all meet with some peevish piece of Antiquity, that commends only the Golden days of his youth, and is now weary of the world, and the world of him; but if there be any good in it, 'tis that which he received from his fore-fathers, and not what this degenerating age hath corrupted." His publisher, John Birkenshaw, further nettled contemporary musicologists by asserting in the preface that "there is not any Art which at this day is more Rude, Unpolish'd, and Imperfect, in the Writings of most of the Ancient and Modern Authors, than Musick." There are "no Faithful Masters," therefore, "but will rejoyce at" Salmon's improvements.

As the author expected, the Essay failed to gain universal approval. But it was the dilettantism of Salmon and the arrogance of Birkenshaw rather than the unworkability of the scheme that displeased the "Faithful Masters." A few months later, Matthew Locke published his withering "Observations" on Salmon's work. Feeling that he and his fellow-artists had been traduced by this "MUSICAL PHANATICK"

Locke truculently "Taxes the Hide" of these modern "reformers" who set themselves up as musical Solons.⁷ The argument generated considerable heat, John Playford, the music-publisher, giving support to Locke. But the fate of Salmon's system and the injustice of Locke's remarks need not detain us. For our present purpose this set-to is significant both for its curious interpretations of "ancient" and "modern" and as another early instance of the ground-paving which preceded the epic battle of the 1690's.

The schism between the English ancients and moderns became more pronounced in subsequent years. Simultaneously, the definitions of ancient and modern music became more precise. Whereas the Salmon-Locke incident had been a contest merely between innovator and conservative, later writers tended to follow the French by carrying the musical controversy to the extreme. The term, "ancient," we find near the end of the century, pertains almost without exception to the music of classical Greece; "modern," on the other hand, to that of contemporary Europe. Such distinctions are ostensibly practical. Ironically, though, they lent confusion to the issue by forcing the English disputants, like the French, to beat about in a jungle of conjecture for the amount of music which survived Greece and Rome was so minute that it was

negligible. The traditionalists' alternative appeal, therefore, was to "irrefutable" classical commentators. And for a time irrefutable they threatened to be. How paltry the assertions of the moderns that so-and-so's compositions "touch the senses"! Did not Orpheus, replied the ancients, animate the stones and trees of Olympus with his harp? Did not rocks, charmed by Amphion's lyre, move and of their own accord form the Theban Wall? The moderns had no ready answer.

The difficulties and absurdities of this sort of "reasoning" became apparent in the late years of the Restoration when the new-fangled operas were the rage. Charles Saint-Evremond avoided comparing these "modern comedies in music" favourably or otherwise with, say, the "ancient" plays of the Jacobean or Caroline eras. Instead he damned them by contrasting them with the dramas of the true ancients, Sophocles and Euripides. That much of the information we have about the production methods of the Greeks is guesswork and that taste is subject to change were irrelevant facts. The Greeks were superior and there was an end on it.⁸

Naturally this recourse to classical antiquity obliged the moderns, willynilly, to defend their point of view in like terms. The results were not very convincing, least of all to the antiquarians. Dryden tried to preclude unfair

comparisons like Saint-Evremond's by reminding his readers that modern opera is an offspring of the Renaissance, not of the Attic drama. But subsequently even this great experimenter had to admit tacitly that perhaps Saint-Evremond's criticism was just.^{9.}

Elsewhere in his defense of operas one detects Dryden's annoyance at being thus trapped. He echoes, by way of compensation, Salmon's suggestion that despite their highfalutin talk about "purity," traditionalists despise contemporary opera simply because it is contemporary. Therefore, he concludes petulantly of his own Albion and Albanus, "the newness of the undertaking is all the hazard."^{10.} Yet, the victories went to the ancients. Classical authority was still too strong, and the moderns had no champion to set against Orpheus or Amphion. Certainly the French immigrant, Grabut, who collaborated with Dryden on Albion was an unlikely choice.

Then, quite suddenly towards the end of the 1680's, the English moderns discovered their greatest ally and argument for superiority. Just as the French moderns had supported Lully as the Colossus of music, so did the English begin to extol the merits of young Henry Purcell. Optimism increased and the French exponents of progress in music

found disciples in England.

Thomas Salmon, in no way discouraged by disparagers, sounded the new note in 1688. Saluting "the great Genius of the Age we live in," he writes of the Dark Ages which followed the decline of Greece and Rome -- from which period the opposition were fond of tracing the development of late seventeenth-century "Gothick" modes. In rebuttal, Salmon declares that "this Darkness was not perpetual; The Ages at last clear'd up; and from the Ruines of Antiquity, brought forth some broken Pieces, which were by degrees set together; and by this time of day are Arriv'd near their ancient Glory. Guido has been Refining above Six Hundred Years." Though reluctant to scorn the achievements of Greek musicians and theorists, he insists that "There never was such regularity in the designing of Keys, such a pleasing sweetness of Air, such a various Contexture of Chords, as the Practical Musicians are at this day Masters of." //

As if encouraged by Salmon, Dryden reiterated these sentiments in the preface to another of his "dramatick operas," King Arthur. Owing to the death of the Francophil, Charles II, he was free to abandon his eulogies of Orabut's second-rate talents; he could now espouse the cause of

his new collaborator with more facility. "There is nothing better than what I intended," he remarks of King Arthur, "than the music; which has since arrived to a greater perfection in England than ever formerly; especially passing through the artful hands of Mr. Purcell, who has composed it with so great a genius."^{12.} No longer did Dryden have to combat traditionalism with idle theorizing and invective. Even Purcell himself was imbued with enormous self-confidence by these tributes. He too assents to the popular progressivist ideas in his preface to Dicclejian (1690) where he announces diffidently that

Music is but yet in its Nonage, a forward Child, which gives Hope of what it may be hereafter in England, when the Masters of it shall find more Encouragement.

Such was the disposition of ancient and modern forces at the outset of the great Battle of the Books during the last decade of the century. On the one side were the classicists, armed with tradition, "authority," and a belief in decay, as well as with weapons of such doubtful efficacy as Credulity and blind, stubborn faith. Opposing them were the moderns, girded with self-confidence, skepticism, empirical criticism, contempt for ham-stringing doctrines, and an optimistic belief in progress. Not the

least of their possessions was a hero, Henry Purcell --

"Orpheus Britannicus."

Sir William Temple fired the first shot, Part II of his Miscellanea, in 1690. It is still as difficult to deal patiently with his musical pronouncements as it had been in the seventeenth century. Though ignorant of the art he discoursed on, and singularly uncritical of ancient "testimonies" regarding musical "Feats," Temple felt obliged to defend Greek music on principle. However, two passages deserve quotation if for no other reason than that they became for later eighteenth-century moderns statements par excellence of fusty antiquarianism. The first is from the essay, On Ancient and Modern Learning:

What are become of the Charms of Musick, by which Men and Beasts, Fishes, Fowls, and Serpents were so frequently Enchanted, and their very Natures changed; By which the Passions of Men were raised to the greatest height and violence, and then as suddenly appeased, so as they might be justly said to be turned into Lyons or Lambs, into Wolves or into Harts, by the Power and Charms of this admirable Art? 'Tis agreed by the Learned that the Science of Musick, so admired of the Ancients, is wholly lost in the World, and that what we have now is made up out of certain Notes that fell into the Fancy or observation of a poor Fryar in chanting his Mattins.

After this slighting of Guido, whom Salmon considered the first eminent modern, Temple concludes with reference to

another decayed art:

So as these Two Divine Excellencies of Musick and Poetry are grown in a manner to be little more, but the one Fidling, and the other Rhyming; and are indeed very worthy the ignorance of the Fryer and the barbarousness of the Goths that introduced them among us.^{13.}

In the second essay, Of Poetry, his expressions were less severe. "Certain it is," he writes (substituting this phrase for the earlier more dangerous one, "'Tis agreed by the Learned"), "That the great Heights and Excellency both of Poetry and Musick fell with the Roman Learning and Empire, and have never since recovered the Admiration and Applauses that before attended them. Yet such as they are amongst us, they must be confest to be the Softest and Sweetest, the most General and most Innocent Amusements of common Time and Life."^{14.} Still, with this faint praise which he accords the moderns, the damnation was no less thorough than it had been in the first essay.

In 1692, Temple's ally, Thomas Rymer, opened fire on the moderns with his Short View of Tragedy. Here, though, the author's allusions to the music of Lully and to the anti-classical spirit of the French operas made his indictments less offensive to modern Englishmen than did Temple's.^{15.}

The first great offensive move of the moderns was made in 1694 by William Wotton in his Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning. A reply to Sir William Temple's earlier essay, Wotton's book is best known as a criticism of the baronet's scholarship in dealing with the suprious Epistles of Phalaris and the antiquity of Aesop. It is no less significant musically. Wotton, a Cambridge don, was, like most other defenders of modern music, cool, tolerant, and insistent upon unprejudiced examination of facts relative to the subject. He never suggests that Temple makes himself ridiculous by swallowing both the stories of Orpheus and the "Excessive Commendations" of ancient authors. And he prefers (publicly at least) to attribute Sir William's aversion to modern music to something other than a blind adherence to a principle. To the ancient musicians who were ignorant of counterpoint, he writes, "many of our Modern Compositions, where several Parts are sung or played at the same Time, would seem confused, intricate, and unpleasant: Though in such Compositions, the greater this seeming Confusion, the more Pleasure does the skilful Hearer take in unravelling every several Part, and in observing how artfully those seemingly disagreeable Tones joyn, like true-cut Tallies,

one within another, to make up that united Concord, which very often gives little Satisfaction to common Ears; and yet it is in such sort of Compositions, that the Excellency of Modern Musick chiefly consists." Thus to Temple's obviously "common Ears," "What is intricate, appears confused; and therefore he can make no Judgment of the true Excellencies of those Things, which seem fiddling to him only, for want of Skill in Musick." Such was Wotton's forte: patient instruction rather than ridicule.

But if he let Sir William off lightly by this gentlemanlike explanation of his critical deficiencies, he never understated his own convictions. Returning to Temple's first statement, he concludes, "not unreasonably," that "though those Charms of Musick, by which Men and Beasts, Fishes, Fowls and Serpents, were so frequently enchanted, and their very Natures changed, be really and irrevocably lost; yet the Art of Musick ... is ... much a perfecter Thing, though perhaps, not much pleasanter to an unskilful Audience, than it ever was amongst the Ancient Greeks and Romans." ^{16.}

There was yet another aspect of the controversy. In this great age of scientific enquiry it is not surprising to find the moderns opening fire on those ancient musico-

mathematicians whom Temple and his colleagues deified. This skepticism which the New Philosophy nurtured had already been observed in Butler's Elephant in the Moon. Later in the century it became more pronounced. Pythagoras was particularly vulnerable. From France, for example, came Fontenelle's Plurality of Worlds (translated in 1695) with its likening of the Harmony of the Spheres to a "Raree Show."¹⁷ In 1698, George Farquhar gave over a sizeable part of his first play, Love and a Bottle, to similar astronomical satire. "But why," Mockmode asks Rigadoon, the dancing-master who had been teaching him the notes of the scale, "are they only Seven?"

Rig: From a prodigious great Bass-Vial with seven Strings, that play'd a Jig call'd the Musick of the Spheres: The seven Planets were nothing but Fiddle-strings.

Mock: Then your Stars have made you a Dancing-master?

Rig: O Lord, Sir! Pythagoras was a Dancing-master; he shewd the Creation to be a Country-Dance, where after some antick Changes, all the parts fell into their places, and there they stand ready, till the next squeak of a Philosopher's Fiddle sets 'em a Dancing again."¹⁸

But the most authoritative belittling came from Dr. John Wallis at the Royal Society. Wallis, an eminent mathematician and classical scholar, had helped to form this august body in the early years of Charles II's reign. Its motto, nullius in verba, was zealously upheld by musical members from the beginning.

Samuel Pepys's efforts in 1668 "to the inventing a better theory of musique than hath yet been abroad" was doubtless inspired by visits to the Society.¹⁹ The same is true of another fellow, Thomas Salmon. Wallis himself had for long been absorbed in musical problems. His integrity was universally admired (his amicable, "Large Remarks" on Salmon's Proposal to Reform Musick had lent the work a sort of infallibility) and his experiments on musical sounds were much discussed by his contemporaries. His subsequent entrance into the ancient-modern controversy on the side of the moderns, then, excited no little apprehension among Temple's friends.

Wallis's most celebrated statements are found in a lecture which he delivered to the Royal Society in 1698 on "The Strange Effects reported of Music in former Times." He begins by saying, "I take it for granted that much of the Reports concerning the great Effects of Musick in former Times beyond what is to be found in Latter Ages, is highly Hyperbolical and next Door to Fabulous." Here was disparagement on a grand scale. Not only are the exploits of Orpheus and Amphion discredited; the testimonies of some of the most revered writers of antiquity are relegated to mythology. Moreover, Wallis continues, if music at any time did work great miracles it was upon "Rusticks"

who were unaccustomed to musical sounds. Now his assertion that the ancients were ignorant of counterpoint could be dismissed by the opposition as mere modern vanity, but to those who preferred to picture early auditors as polished citizens of the Golden Age, this indeed must have been a bitter pill. Nor did the moderns leave the lecture-room unscathed. Wallis concludes with a slight chastisement. Despite the advantages of knowing counterpoint and possessing superior instruments, the moderns have sacrificed expression and simplicity for sensuous effects and complexity. But the remedy is easily achieved: correct these flaws and "our Musick may be said to do as great Feats as any of theirs" - especially, he adds saucily, if our composers have "the help of such Hyperbole's, as with which the Ancient Musick is wont to be set off." ^{20.}

Wallis's lecture appears to have silenced the opponents. The old man's common sense and profound scholarship -- even Temple's associates "were obliged to allow that he knew more of ancient music than any modern, except Meibomius" -- may have nonplussed the opposition. ^{21.} More probably, the ancients finally realized that they had no new counter-arguments to advance. Temple's subsequent evasions would seem to support the latter explanation. In 1701, two years after his benefactor's death,

Jonathan Swift published Temple's Defense of the Essay upon Antient and Modern Learning. Midway through this elaborate vindication of his earlier work, the author writes:

I shall proceed to examine the Account they [the moderns] give of those Sciences, wherein they affirm the Moderns to excell the Antients; Natural History of Minerals, Plants, and Animals; Astronomy and Opticks; Musick; Physick; Natural Philosophy; Philology, and Theology; Of all which, I shall take a short Survey.

Following this is a lacuna, which Swift fills in by explaining, "Here, it is supposed, the Knowledge of the Antients and the Moderns last mentioned, was to have been compared; But whether the Author designed to have gone through such a Work Himself, or intended these Papers only for Hints to some body else that desired them, is not known. After which the rest was to follow, written in his own Hand as before."^{22.}

For a time the moderns made no reply to this obvious hedging. In 1704, however, the publication of A Tale of a Tub prompted retaliation. Smarting from the insulting allusions in "A Digression concerning Criticks," Wotton aimed at a double target. Temple's dodging and Swift's obsequious editing, and wrote contemptuously:

This Method of answering of Books, and of publishing such Answers, is very dissatisfactory. Just where the Pinch of the Question lay, there the Copy fails.....^{23.}

The moderns interpreted the subsequent silence of Temple's allies as a surrender. With two sentences, Wotton had ended the protracted Battle of the Books as it pertained to music.

ii. Italian Opera and the New Golden Age of Music: 1705-1728

The complicating of the Ancient-Modern Controversy by practising musicians, satirists, new definitions, and the opposing creeds of Decay and Progress.

The year when Wotton's scornful dismissal of Sir William Temple called a halt to the musical Battle of the Books, Arsinoe, the first of the notorious operas "after the Italian Manner" dazzled London audiences. Battle-scarred and weary, the late Sir William's colleagues tried at once to resuscitate the old controversy. Their reasons for doing

so are not difficult to find. Saint-Evremond had attempted, years before, to condemn Shadwell's and Dryden's "dramatick operas" as aberrations of Greek tragedy. His grounds for complaint, we recall, were not really valid. The Restoration play-with-music was no more than a development of the dramma per musica with which the Italians had experimented at the turn of the century. Now, in Queen Anne's reign, Saint-Evremond's criticisms were just, for almost without exception the composers of the new "thorough-sung" operas had taken to describing them as imitations of ancient drama.²⁴

John Dennis was the first of the eighteenth-century critics to revive, in modified form, the French essayist's protests. He makes his position clear in An Essay on the Operas after the Italian Manner (1706). Reversing Saint-Evremond's judgment that the English operas of the Restoration were decadent forms of Greek drama, he writes that his own "small Treatise is only levell'd against those Operas which are entirely Musical; for those which are Dramatical may be partly defended by the Examples of the Antients." The nature of the "defense" is not clear; one suspects that this declaration is only an excuse for his own earlier attempt at "Dramatical" opera, Rinaldo and Armida. Nevertheless, Dennis's remains the most

concisely stated neo-classical opinion on modern operatic
"degeneracy":

If that is truly the most Gothick, which is the most oppos'd to Antique, nothing can be more Gothick than an Opera; since nothing can be more oppos'd to the Antient Tragedy, than the modern Tragedy in Musick; because the one is reasonable, the other ridiculous; the one is artful, the other absurd; the one beneficial, the other pernicious; in short, the one natural, the other monstrous. And the modern Tragedy in Musick is as much oppos'd to the Chorus, which is the musical part of the antient Tragedy, as it is to the Episodick; because in the Chorus the Musick is always great and solemn, in the Opera 'tis often most trifling and most effeminate; in the Chorus the Musick is only for the sake of the Sense, in the Opera the Sense is most apparently for the sake of the Musick.^{25.}

Four years later, Charles Gildon entered the lists with his Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton. His support of Dennis is something of a surprise for in general he sided with the moderns in these perpetual quarrels.^{26.} But owing to his interest in the theatre and to his resentment of the successful new operas (which were sung completely in Italian by 1710), he abandoned the moderns in the dispute pertaining to the musical drama. Saint-Evremond was his model, and though the length of the old French diplomat's essay on operas is disproportionate to that of Gildon's biography, Gildon reprints a great part of it. His own reflexions are for the most part dully

unoriginal -- although his citing of Euripides' Alcestis as proof that the Greeks spoke their tragedy is ingenious.²⁷ There will be opportunity later to examine other aspects of Gildon's work. For the present we may consider the Life simply as another attempt to give new currency to antiquarian judgements of the mid-seventeenth century.

The majority of the moderns kept silent, notwithstanding the persistence of their opponents. In truth, their defenses were down. Though they disagreed with Dennis and Gildon's reasons for castigating Italian opera, they too felt that these exotic entertainments were a blight. Fontenelle once more raised his authoritative voice in favour of the moderns, but despite the popularity of John Hughes's translation of his Discourse concerning the Antients and Moderns in 1719, Fontenelle's English allies were both embarrassed about and tiring of the old-fashioned, abortive musical haranguing.²⁸

This does not mean, however, that the moderns yielded. Partly to relieve their boredom and partly to cover up their own defenselessness, they began to retaliate by throwing personal ridicule upon musical pedants. This baiting of antiquaries took several forms, the mildest of which is exemplified by Thomas Brown. Unusually serious, he warns

his readers of "those extraordinary Men," the enquirers after ancient learning. As "Torches in the thick Darkness of Antiquity" (and Vossius, the Restoration musicologist, would be accounted one of them), they are admirable. But, Brown adds wisely, "you must not have your Eyes so continually fix'd on them, as not to regard whither they lead you; for they deviate sometimes into Paths, where you cannot safely follow them."²⁹

Other rebukes were less kind. Such was Lewis Theobald's bob at Saint-Evremond, Temple, Dennis, and Gildon -- these pretenders to learning who "cannot eat a Chicken with Parsley and Butter, without recurring to Antiquity to see in what Respect, or Application, Parsley stood at Athens, and Lacedaemon." They are all silly pedants, identical with Sir Tristram Littlewit, and each, like Theobald's virtuoso, is capable of writing "A Modest Enquiry into the Original of Musick: Together with some reasons offer'd why Faith and a Fiddle were express'd by the same Word among the Romans."³⁰

The satires of the "Scriblerus Club" were the most devastating. Gay's scourging of virtuosos in Three Hours after Marriage, Pope's bookworm-baiting in The Dunciad, and Arbuthnot's Harmony in an Uproar (which will be discussed shortly) are each memorable examples of antiquarian-teasing.

More pertinent, for the present, is Swift's guying of stuffy musico-mathematicians in Part III of Gulliver's Travels. Yet as a squib on the musical ancient, even Gulliver takes second place to The Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus. A synthesis of Pope, Swift, Gay, Arbuthnot, and Thomas Parnell's wit, the work relates the education of young Martinus by Cornelius, his "enthusiastick" father. The prototype of Cornelius, the almost hysterical devotee of antiquity, is unmistakable. Whom else but Sir William Temple could the Scriblerians have had in mind? Their debt to his Essay on Ancient and Modern Learning is particularly apparent. When Cornelius is advised to send his son to study under a music-master, "the bare mention of Musick threw [him] into a passion":

How can you dignify (quoth he) this modern fidling with the name of Musick? Will any of your best Hautboys encounter a Wolf now-a-days with no other arms but their instruments, as did that ancient piper Pythocharis? Have ever wild Boars, Elephants, Deer, Dolphins, Whales or Turbets, shew'd the least emotion at the most elaborate strains of your modern Scrapers, all of which have been, as it were, tam'd and humaniz'd by ancient Musicians?

Indeed this bit of raillexy becomes all the more poignant when one recalls that one of the club-members was old Sir William's former secretary. Is this passage perhaps the work of Swift, who, no longer bound to defend all of his

late patron's opinions, was now making merry with his more fatuous ones? The remainder of this chapter is a burlesque of the ancient-modern controversy, Cornelius defending Greek, and Albertus contemporary music. Cornelius's subsequent failure to pacify a threatening mob with his "chromatick and enharmonick" playing ("I have mixed unawares too much of the Phrygian; I might change it to the Lydian") is a riotous parody of almost every myth relative to "the powers of music."^{3/}

Despite the literary men's racy and very readable belittlement, the most significant expression of disparagement at this time came from a musician. For some time, Johann Mattheson, a life-long friend of Handel, had been distinguishing himself on the continent as a composer, musicologist, and critic. Among this versatile German's works were such diverse items as the youthful operas, Die Pleiaden and Cleopatra, a number of critical essays in Critica Musica, and a curiously incongruous treatise on the longitude. In the winter of 1718, he dispatched a letter to London, asking Handel's opinion of his book on the Greek Modes. Handel's reply illustrates the readiness of vital modernes to scorn outmoded conventions which restricted their genius. "As to the Greek Modes," he wrote, "I find, Sir, that you have said all that there is to say. Knowledge

of them is no doubt necessary to those who would practice and execute ancient music that has been composed according to these modes; but since we have freed ourselves from the narrow bounds of ancient music, I do not see of what use the Greek Modes can be for modern music."^{32.} Had the letter been published it would doubtless have occasioned an uproar among Handel's English colleagues, some of whom still preached adherence to antique rules. As it was, similar opinions were already exciting antipathy on the continent. In Italy, for example, the sardonic composer, Benedetto Marcello regaled his countrymen with "instructions" to iconoclastic upstarts. Such a musician, he writes, "if he wants to be modern, must never have read the Greek and Latin classic authors, nor should he do so in the future. After all, the old Greeks and Romans never read the modern writers."^{33.} Parnassus rumbled with a new kind of thunder by 1720.

It was stated at the beginning of this chapter that part of the interest of the ancient-modern controversy derives from the constant modifications of the term, "ancient." Two variants, as we have seen, had currency during the seventeenth century. The first, which was in evidence during the dispute between Thomas Salmon and

Matthew Locke, was comparatively short lived. The second, and more obvious interpretation of the word as classical Greek was, as we have just observed, far from obsolete at the end of the first quarter of the eighteenth century.

During Anne's reign the old controversy became further complicated by the appearance of two more definitions. The first arose near the end of the century when new musical entertainments, both native and foreign, were beginning to attract an alarmingly large portion of theatre-goers. Designating these diversions as "modern," hostile commentators contrasted them with the "ancient" literary genre, poetry, or more particularly with dramatic poetry which they saw suffering from the competition. Today these two theatrical genera would perhaps be denominated "illegitimate" and "legitimate."

The second interpretation appeared about the year 1710, at which time the directors of the new Academy of Ancient Musick offered the most precise definition of "ancient" to yet appear. The former interpretation will be considered first.

Shortly after the Restoration, the success of English operas confirmed the worst fears of competing dramatists. Worse, the coarse operatic parodies of Duffett as well were

luring crowds from the elegant bombast of their pseudo-classical tragedies. Even the bawdy glitter of their comedies, they learned, required the sweetening of a half dozen songs and symphonies to make them "go down." Lamentations were numerous, and many a death knell was sounded for dramatic poetry by pessimistic observers. In France, the situation was the same. Parisians must have their Lully even at the expense of classical correctness. Glancing at the plight of the French academicians whose "Augustan" tragedies he considered exemplary, Thomas Rymer shrugged mournfully, "The Academy Royal may pack up their Modes and Methods, & penses ingeniensis; the Racines and the Corneilles must now all dance to the Tune of Baptista. Here is the Opera; here is Machine and Baptista, farewell Apelle and the Muses." ³⁴

Critics became more melancholy during the theatrical "war" between the Drury Lane and Lincoln's Inn Fields theatres in the 1690's. Each endeavouring to outdo the other, the competing companies either garnished their productions with elaborate incidental music or gave over their stages entirely to rope-dancers, viol-players, and singers. Playwrights who suffered from this cut-throat rivalry responded with a battery of condemnatory prologues, epilogues, dedications,

"epistles," and prefaces, all of which contained the same reproach;

Plain Beauties pleas'd your Sires an Age ago,
Without the Varnish and the Dawb of Show.³⁵

Exponents of the "advancement of modern poetry" were equally disturbed by the public's unwholesome appetite. Their alarm was especially acute at the turn of the century. Instead of ushering in a grand, virile age of poetry, the year 1700, they feared, might mark the beginning of an age in which not only dramatic but all genres of that ancient and noble art withered under the glare of irrational music. John Dennis perceived this danger in 1701. In his peculiarly animated (his enemies called it "frenzied") style, he set about defending the thesis which he was to maintain for the next 25 years: no modern art "provides in such a sovereign Manner as Poetry, for the Satisfaction of the whole Man together.... Nor Corelli's Hand, nor Syphace's [the Italian castrato's] Voice could ever, to a judicious Ear, equal the Virgilian Harmony."³⁶ The time was ripe in 1701 to stamp out the "Gothick" taste for music and to re-cultivate the public's taste for the more glorious but moribund art.

Dennis's ambitious plans were unrealized. A new Virgil failed to appear, and by 1706 the public had so completely succumbed to the allurements of music that they even preferred

the nonsense of the new Italian operas to the edifying dramatic poetry of Bladen's Solon, Cibber's Perolla and Izadora, Mrs. Manley's Almyna, and Mrs. Trotter's Revolution of Sweden. Still, Dennis's disappointment was only temporary. He soon perceived that the triumph of the recently introduced Italian operas gave him unsolicited support. Consequently in 1706 he advanced a more explicit allegation than his earlier one that Augustan drama was being fiddled off the stage by modern music in general. "'Tis undeniable," he now began to declare, "that in whatever Countries Operas have been established after the manner of Italy, they have driven out Poetry from among that People."³⁷ This assertion, which appears as a leit-motif in nearly all of his subsequent critical essays, is certainly disputable, but owing to anti-Italian feelings which were intensified by the War of the Spanish Succession, no-one, however funny Dennis's sputtering appeared to them, questioned this "undeniable" fact. The enemy was, after all, artistically, physically, and spiritually decadent, and wallowed in every unmentionable vice. And the simultaneous rise of opera and fall of poetry in Italy itself made Dennis's statement credible, at least so far as that country was concerned.

In 1710, Joseph Addison's anger was provoked by Giocomo Rossi's overbearing and grandiloquent preface to

his libretto for Handel's Rinaldo, for written "in such a florid Form of Words, and such tedious Circumlocutions, as are used by none but Pedants" in England, it bore out Dennis's contention that modern opera had stifled the once transcendent literary genius of Italy. A further instance of Rossi's depravity was his choice of a tale from Torquato Tasse whom neoclassicists abhorred above all other Renaissance poets. Let the English writer profit from Rossi's example, Addison continued, and beware abandoning their imitation of the "old Italian ... Virgil", one of whose verses "is worth all the Clinquant or Tinsel of Tasse." ^{38.} But two weeks later, Addison worriedly mused on whether or not the public had not already sunk to preferring the "Clinquant" of Italian librettos to the austerity of classical tragedy. With play after play failing, it would seem so. Addison's earlier confidence in his contemporaries waned. Perhaps laws rather than appeals were the only antidote to unhealthy tastes. "I must confess," he concludes, that if the modern opera proves so irresistible "I would allow it no better Quarter than Plato has done, who banishes it out of his Common-wealth." ^{39.}

But from 1711 to 1728 the vogue for operas grew, unchecked. Addison's slurs on their taste certainly had done

little towards coaxing audiences back to the "ancients."
Dennis, unlike The Spectator, never surrendered. Re-affirmations of his old theme appeared in the book-stalls with monotonous regularity. As late as 1726, this tireless old butt of the Wits exhibited his idée fixe that "several Causes may be assigned of the Decay of Dramatick Poetry, as the Italian Opera." ^{40.}

By 1726 this was complaining to the winds. With the foundation of the Royal Academy of Music in 1719 by the most responsible arbiters of English taste, Italian operas had been established -- ostensibly forever -- as the sovereign entertainments of a no longer very "Augustan" England. Happily, though, the reign of opera did not prove to be perpetual. Already dying of its own excesses, it heaved its last great sigh on the opening night of The Beggar's Opera, 29th January 1728. If Gay's text did not satisfy Dennis's and Addison's requirements of dramatic poetry, at least the music was "ancient." The season following, the Italians dispersed, their "Harlot" production yielding to a multitude of ballad operas; Saint-Evremond, Dennis, and Addison's descendents were pacified. Hence, the dissolution of the Royal Academy and of this one particular development of the ancient-modern controversy were simultaneous!

The second attempt to modify the elastic term, "ancient," was made about the year 1710, with the founding of the Academy of Ancient Musick. John Christopher Pepusch, its first director, had been familiar to musical Londoners ever since his arrival from Germany at the turn of the century. His music for Thomyris (Motteux's Italian-style opera) was an exceptional success with the public in 1707. He enjoyed an even greater name among his colleagues. His studies in ancient Greek music, with the assistance of Abraham de Moivre, the mathematician, early attracted the attention of professional musicians. His researches into medieval and Renaissance music was equally esteemed by them. However, besides earning for him the reputation for being "the most learned musician of his time," his studies produced "a spirit so truly antiquarian, that he allowed no composition to be Music but what was old and obscure."⁴¹ Of contemporary musicians, only Arcangelo Corelli received his approval.

With friends of similar tastes, Pepusch established the Academy of Ancient Musick. The group, made up of amateur and professional musicians together with the choirs of St. Paul's and the Chapel Royal, met at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the Strand. As its name implies, the society was anti-modern.

Their use of the phrase, "Ancient Musick," however, requires clarification. To the Academy, it referred to that specific musical era of roughly 100 years, extending from Palestrina to the end of the sixteenth century. Two things are immediately evident: a) that in the analytical, codifying spirit of the age, eighteenth-century musicians were advancing more precise definitions relative to their art, and b) that since 1600 was settled upon as the year which divided ancient from modern music, the choice of sides in any subsequent "controversy" would not be conditioned by one's allegiance or antipathy to Greek antiquity.

A literary dispute over the Academy's arbitrariness did not at once arise. However, almost immediately Handel set foot in England in 1710 there were indications of an imminent feud between his supporters and those of the Academy. Pepusch scorned Handel's music from the beginning as being typical of modern barbarism -- though he was once heard to exclaim begrudgingly that Handel was "a good practical musician." As the years passed there were further reasons for animosity. First of all, Pepusch's Utrecht Ode, played at Oxford in 1713 on the occasion of his receiving the degree of Doctor of Music, never achieved

ne popularity of Handel's Te Deum on the same theme. Secondly, after spending several years at Cannons as Kapellmeister, Pepusch was suddenly discharged in 1718 by the Duke of Chandos in favour of Handel. It is no wonder that he sought revenge in 1728 by stealing airs from his adversary and debasing them in his score for The Beggar's Opera. The affair did not end there, but the repercussions of this new estrangement between the ancients and moderns will be reviewed in the next section of this chapter.

Independent of each other as all these quarrels were, they involved a common, secondary dispute. Indications of it had been apparent in the later years of the seventeenth century. The pro-modern Salmon, we recall, had expressed the belief that since Guido's day music "has been Refining." Purcell and Dryden were later also convinced that contemporary musicians were achieving an unprecedented excellence in their art. Opposing this optimism were the antiquarians whose conviction that music had undergone a "Declension" in the seventeenth century was just as strong. At the beginning of the eighteenth century these antagonistic views played an even more prominent role in the ancient-modern controversies, the idea of decline being expounded by the pro-ancients

and that of progress by the moderns.

Now although the germ of progressivist thought -- "the belief that man's knowledge was continually improving both in accuracy and extent" -- was gaining increased support during the reigns of Queen Anne and George I, writers hesitated to endorse its equally optimistic corollary that artistic productions were also continually improving in quality.⁴² Regarding music, Arthur Bedford's declaration that "he who views the Score" of operatic music "may observe an Improvement hardly known in the last Century among those eminent Masters" was almost unique.⁴³ There was too much contradictory evidence. How, for one thing, could it be possible for music -- particularly operatic music -- to improve when the "Depravity of Taste" was so marked in England? An adherence to progressivism certainly did not characterize John Gay's complaint that

People have now forgot Homer, and Virgil, and Caesar, or at least, they have lost their ranks; for, in London and Westminster, in all polite conversations, Senesino is daily voted to be the greatest man that ever lived.⁴⁴

The same is true of Dennis's essays, Dr. Trapp's Oxford lectures, and Aaron Hill's musical criticism in the Plain Dealer.⁴⁵

Still, although these prophets of decay united on principle, they disagreed as to the period from which it dated. Gay's choice of 1706, when Italian opera first appeared, was the most common. Bishop Berkeley fixed it at the accession of Charles II.^{46.} Others fixed it at the death of "The Orpheus Britannicus," Henry Purcell, in 1695 -- a choice not without irony, for those who had depreciated or ignored him during his lifetime now pictured Purcell as a venerable master who "verifies all that is said of Timotheus." His "MUSIC," Gildon wrote in 1710, "as known as it is, and so often repeated as it has been, has to this Day the very same Effect ... but those foreign Whims," the Italian operas, "are lost before the Castratos have spent the Money they brought them in." Let no-one say, then, "that our Taste is improv'd, much amended since the Time of Henry Purcell, and that we should not now relish any of his Things."^{47.} Other commentators dated the decline of music from the death of "Amphion Anglicus," John Blow,^{48.} in 1708.

But the fact remains, that whatever their differences were on points of history, by 1728 English writers were almost unanimously concurring in the gloomy maxim of the Benedictine, Augustin Calmet: "C'est ... une fausse idée de croire que la

Musique soit un invention nouvelle, qui tende à sa perfection, et qui se forme, et se perfectionne en effet de siècles en siècles." ^{49.}

iiii. The Accentuated Tendency towards Modernism: 1728 - 1776

The scandal over the Academy of Ancient Musick; further changes of definitions; the vanishing of the true-blue antiquarian; the influence of Handel, the modern; primitivism and modified definitions of "Progress"; the triumph of the Idea of Decline.

The number of musical academies which were established in London during the first third of the eighteenth century was unprecedented. Unhappily, on each occasion a new quarrel developed. The Royal Academy's sponsorship of a brilliant succession of Italian operas had intensified the enmity of classicists in 1720. However, except for a few isolated thrusts at the "modern" plague of operas such as we find in Francis Lynch's Independent Patriot, the débâcle of that society in 1728 ended the dispute. Other institutions were

not so fragile. The earlier Academy of Ancient Musick, for instance, continued to thrive in spite of the perpetual attacks of the moderns.

The foundation, in January, 1726, of the new Academy of Vocal Music proved to be no exception. Meeting twice monthly at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the Strand, its policy was essentially the same as that of the older Academy of Ancient Musick. That is, its members preferred to present "ancient" music, which, by their definition meant music composed before the end of the sixteenth century. Its roll of members included the names of nearly every eminent musician who was then in London, among whom were Pepusch, Giovanni Bononcini, Maurice Greene, Nicola Haym, and Charles Dieupart. Handel's name was conspicuously absent.

Now each of these men in one way or another vowed allegiance to "antique" music whether to spite the arch-modern, Handel, or because they genuinely preferred ^{it.} Of Dr. Pepusch there is not much to add to what has been related. His antiquarianism had already become something of a legend, though not until after The Beggar's Opera did he devote himself exclusively to the studies of early music. Nicola Haym had a similar reputation for pedantry and anti-modernism. His and Dieupart's attempts in 1711 at "reviving an Art, which runs to Ruin by the utmost

Barbarism" -- a "Ruin," incidentally, which they themselves contributed to by introducing Italian operas to England in 1705 -- are familiar to all readers of The Spectator.^{50.} Unsuccessful in his musical project despite Steele's patronage, Haym turned to "GREEK and ROMAN Antiquaries of all Sorts," his subsequent publication of The British Treasury in 1719 and 1720 bringing him distinction as a numismatist.^{51.} During the next decade he suspended his anti-modernism to the extent of supplying Handel with nine librettos, but by 1730 there was no mistaking where his true sympathies lay. Soon after his election to the Academy of Vocal Music he solicited subscriptions to his history of music which "includes a curious enquiry into ancient music in the several periods of time, with its excellency; wherein the ancient musicians excelled the moderns; and also those particulars in which the latter surpassed them; and concludes with judging the palm to the ancient music."^{52.}

Onlookers were disgusted. The contemptuous clannishness of Academy members and their pretensions to "learning" were insupportable. "What profit is there in finding out ye formes of urnes & antique drinking potts?" asked Roger North. The pursuits of the more literate academicians insulted common sense; Pepusch and Haym's barren researches were waste of

paper. "Grant a man read all ye books of musick that ever were wrote," continues the practical North, "I shall not allow that musick is or can be understood out of them, no more than the tast of meats out of cookish receipt books."^{53.}

Although the Academy was thus in disrepute with the moderns, it was Bononcini who brought true disgrace upon that society. This Italian composer had been since his arrival in London in 1720 Handel's most formidable rival. Never before had the public so avidly partaken of a musical feud -- at the height of which Bononcini courted the favour of the anti-modern Academy. First, he attacked Handel in a pamphlet, Advice to Composers and Performers of Italian Music. Then, in 1728, with the aid of Maurice Greene, he submitted to them what was ostensibly one of his own madrigals. It gained him new laurels, and strengthened the support of traditionalists. However, in 1731, after the two aforementioned academies had apparently merged, the truth was discovered. A member received from Venice a collection of compositions by Antonio Lotti, the celebrated organist of St. Mark's. One of the pieces, a five-part madrigal, In una siepe ombrosa, somehow sounded familiar. Upon examination it was revealed to be the same one which Bononcini had passed off as his own. The charge of

plagiarism was immediately brought against him. Defenseless, Bononcini tacitly admitted his guilt by leaving England.

The Academy was astonished at his duplicity, though Greene (who had just been granted the degree of Doctor of Music at Cambridge) was never convinced of Bononcini's dishonesty. The resultant publicity was calamitous. Whereas the moderns had always derided them as a band of pedants, they now had reason to attack the academicians as charletans. Consequently the baiting of antiquarians became again a popular sport of the Wits - an activity, incidentally, which a growing sentiment in favour of Handel made the more palatable. No criticism, though, was more pungent than John Arbuthnot's.

ccc. Having for years watched the jealousy which musicians exhibited towards his friend, Handel, Arbuthnot could no longer restrain his anger. In his Harmony in an Uprax, where Handel is made to stand a mock-trial before his enemies, the prosecution asks,

Have you taken your Degrees? Boh! ha, ha, ha!
Are you a Doctor, Sir? ah, ah! A fine Composer indeed, and not a Graduate; fie, fie, you might as well pretend to be a Judge, without having been ever call'd to the Bar; or pretend to be a Bishop and not a Christian. Why Doctor Pushpin [Pepusch] and Doctor Blue [Greene] laugh at you, and scorn to keep you Company; and they have vow'd to me, that it is scarcely possible to imagine how much better they compos'd after the

Commencement Gown was thrown over their Shoulders than before; it was as if a musical ----- had laid Hands upon them, and inspired them with the Enthusiasm of Harmony.... I understand you have never read Euclid, are a declar'd Foe to all the proper Modes, and Forms, and Tones of Musick, and scorn to be subservient to, or ty'd up by Rules, or have your Genius cramp'd: Thou Goth and Vandal to just Sounds ... thou finish'd Irregularity.

"The whole musical World is united against you," continues the prosecutor: One "swears you want Softness," another "finds you deficient in Roughness," another "vows you produce no pretty Thing," and another "affirms you are no Mathematician."

As for that indefatigable Society, the Gropers into Antique Musick, and Hummers of Madrigals, they swoon at the Sight of any Piece modern, particularly of your Composition, excepting the Performances of their venerable President, whose Works bear such vast Resemblance to the regular Gravity of the Antients, that when dress'd up in Cobwebs, and powdered with Dust, the Philarmonick Spiders could dwell on them, and in them, to Eternity. ⁵⁴

Thereafter, few moderns were ruffled by the activities of the Academy. Indeed by the middle of the century attacks on all kinds of musical antiquarianism were becoming less severe. The mid-century opponents of neoclassical authoritarianism, of course, kept the controversy alive to some degree by asserting that the traditionalists' insistence upon musicians imitating antique models was a transparent seducing of artists

to "meanly give up the great Prerogative of thinking and judging for themselves." ^{55.} The exponents of romantic "originality" would have none of it.

The pedant's natural attraction for satirists also sustained the dispute. The efforts of fusty cranks at forcing their esoteric "researches" upon the public would always be funny. The fact that owing to the loss of all Greek music their studies could never progress beyond conjecture added to the merriment of enlightened scoffers. In offering his New Estimate of Manners and Principles, John Gordon reviews all the learned treatises on music, concluding that "if all the music in this Island, musical instruments, and musicians too, were sent in cargoes, like the Jesuits, to his holiness the Pope; excepting only Mr. Parry and his welch harp; we should have almost as much music left, as Rome or Athens ever knew." ^{56.} The time was over-ripe for someone to explode the myth of antique prodigiousness.

It is obvious that in one way all of these attacks were unfair. As we see, detractors habitually dwelled upon the deficiencies of ancient Greek and Roman music despite the fact that great changes were being made in defining the line of demarcation between what was "ancient" and what was "modern." The Academy of Ancient Musick had upset the traditional concept

by choosing the year 1600. Gordon's contemporaries, however, by implication constantly advanced the date. Popularly, it was set at 1705, the year which divided "the good old days" from the effete reign of Italian opera. Many a nostalgic versifier recalled that in "antient" times

when Englishmen were Men,
Their Musick like themselves, was grave, and plain...
Sung by themselves their homely Cheer to crown,
In Tunes from Sire to Son deliver'd down.⁵⁷

The learned were more precise. Charles Avison in 1752 speaks of Alessandro Scarlatti (d. 1725) and Marcello (d. 1739) as "Old Masters;" Archangelo Corelli (d. 1713), indeed, he refers to as a "classical Composer."⁵⁸ In his Estimate of 1757, John Brown speaks similarly of Corelli, Bononcini, Marcello, Caldara, Geminiani, and Handel -- the last two of whom were still living.⁵⁹ Later, Charles Burney refers to the period between 1725 and 1773 as "the Augustan Age of Music."⁶⁰

Another recent development which made the moderns' indictments anachronistic was the mid-century antiquarian's tendency to decry or to modify the extreme views of his predecessors, Vossius, Temple, and Pepusch. Dr. John Jortin's declaration in his Letter concerning the Music of the Ancients that "some of the Modern Writers upon Ancient Music are deficient in point of perspicuity, and seldom give the attentive Reader

instruction, without giving him the head-ach along with it" illustrates their desire to rid historical studies of cant and obscurantism. One now tempered one's pro-ancient sentiments. None continued to assert categorically that Greek and Roman music was superior in every respect to the modern. So far did William Mason reduce the extravagant claims of Temple that in 1752 he would allow only that music which was an "Adjunct of Poetry" to have reached its highest point in Greece. As an independent science, he admits, music had achieved perfection only in the hands of the moderns. Avison likewise narrowed the compass of Greek superiority. A "true Simplicity of Melody, with, perhaps, some Mixture of plain unperplexed Harmony," he declares, is all that they could lay claim to. Furthermore, compromise was in the air. By granting to ancient and modern music their respective merits, Mason "endeavoured to cut the Gordian Knot, which it has not been in the power of the profoundest Musical Critics to unravel." The equity of his collaborator's judgements was a step in the same direction.

In short, the moderns' attempts to provoke their opponents into another Battle of the Books were abortive. After Pepusch's death in 1752 there were few dyed-in-the-wool classicists left. The general repudiation of Augustanism gave impetus to an already perceptible move towards stressing

the music of the present day, and, more particularly, of the future. So did the evolution of disinterested, matter-of-fact methods of historical research. Yet perhaps the strongest stimulus to prospective thinking was the almost universal approbation that the aging Handel was receiving. No matter how fervid their antiquarianism was, few critics denied that Handel was a match for Orpheus and Amphion,¹^{for} the Renaissance Italians, or for any seventeenth-century English composer. So rapidly, indeed, did the modernistic outlook develop in these middle decades that by the 1770's it was almost impossible to give the slightest recognition to ancient music -- whatever the interpretation of "ancient" was -- without being accused of advancing reactionary views. An amusing indication of the intensifying pro-modern climate is found in a copy of Sir John Hawkins's Account of the Institution and Progress of the Academy of Ancient Music (1770) in the British Museum. Attempting to eradicate a sixty-year-old prejudice against the society, Hawkins insists that "an unwarranted fondness for antiquity" was not their "motive" in cultivating ancient music.^{65.} They aimed at the restoration of neglected masterpieces. They desired to promote the study of musical productions of an earlier age -- surely an activity, he adds,

which is no more censurable than the study of Virgil, Raphael, or Shakespeare. All fair-minded, objective readers must concede that the Academy in no way intended to inhibit progress in the art. Besides, he asks, is their sponsorship of old music any more destructive than the current maxim is that "nothing in music is estimable, that is not new. No music tolerable, which has been heard before"? But placid objectivity was futile. Mistaking Hawkins's slur on novelty-lovers as an attack on all moderns, an irate but anonymous contemporary scribbled in the margin,

and will the author venture to assert that the reverse of wrong is right? & that no Music is estimable w^{ch} is not old nor tolerable till it has at least the Cobwebs of 20 years upon it?"

The prevailing spirit of these later decades, then, was modernistic. None the less, upon examining another aspect of the still vital ancient-modern controversy one discovers a paradox. The New Science of the seventeenth century had done much to instill into men's minds the optimistic notion of progress. Between 1728 and 1775, however, the idea as applied to music had not made much headway. Handel of course had his champions. The facts that he had achieved perfection in his own compositions and that he had enriched England's musical repertory were undeniable. It was not uncommon,

during Handel's forty-year residence in London, for writers to exclaim that he "has long since prov'd himself the most perfect Master of Harmony that any Age ever produc'd." ^{67.} After his death in 1759, pessimism began to outweigh such joyous acclamation. Faced with the subsequent dearth of musical genius, commentators found it less easy than it had been to say with confidence that the moderns had so far surpassed the ancients "that they may be said, in some Measure, to be the Inventors" of music. ^{68.}

Still, the mid-century was not completely devoid of progressivist thought. "Progress," however, was not an absolute term. Like "ancient," "modern," "imitation," "nature," and a multitude of other words, it was accomodatingly elastic for the eighteenth-century littérateur. Thus, during the second third of the century we find some of the most inveterate classicists extolling the "advance" of modern music. This was not capricious self-contradiction. It was the culmination of the age-old wrangling concerning the Separation of the Arts. So long (the ancients had lamented) as pre-Hellenic poetry and music had remained on an equal footing and their joint objective had remained moral, mankind was virtuous and virile. But as sophistication spread, the two arts "separated." Music, deprived of "meaning," degenerated into an irrational, therefore treacherous entertainment. Poetry, deprived of the

inexplicable support of music, withered into an idle diversion. At a comparatively early date distressed philosophers drew attention to this concurrence of social demoralization and the Separation. Plato mentioned it in his Republic -- which was written at a time when musical abuses were particularly virulent. Two centuries later Polybius discussed it in some detail in his history of the Arcadians. In the Christian era the theme survived in the writings of the early Church Fathers, and, centuries later, in the treatises of Prynne and Collier. But whether it was offered in ancient Greece, Christian Rome, or seventeenth-century England the counsel was invariable: restore the ethical foundation either to art or to behaviour, for one reformed the other will right itself.

It is in the middle of the eighteenth century that the theme of the Separation made what was to be its last significant appearance. In the works of Avison, Brown, Kames, and Gregory references to Plato and Polybius are numerous. In many cases the two ancients are lavishly quoted. Avison, for example, devotes nine pages of his short Essay on Musical Expression to a translation of Polybius and another five to Montesquieu's explanation of it. ^{69.} A quarrel ensued, but among enlightened authors it was nothing more serious than a squabble over the historical sequence of abuses. ^{70.} The truth was that in the 1760's

the problem, while arresting, was no longer a vital one; indeed, if one examined facts, it no longer existed. Oratorio had solved the two-thousand-year-old dilemma. Handel, the dictator of musical trends, had, "far advanced in life," turned to religion, a subject which "opens the amplest fields for musical as well as poetical Genius," which "affords almost all the variety of subjects, which Music can express, the sublime, the joyous, the chearful, the serene, the devout, the plaintive, the sorrowful," which "warms the heart with that enthusiasm so peculiarly necessary in all works of Genius."^{71.} To those who scoffed at the potency of oratorio, one needed only to point to the concurrent reformation of English manners which though sluggish was already in evidence. For John Gregory and his contemporaries, modern oratorio had not only ended the Separation. It had re-established morality as the basis of art. It had proved that "progress," which for a number of men consisted in the revitalizing of classical ideals, was a reality.^{72.}

The Opposition, composed of more influential writers, credited no such logic-chopping. The steady decline of music and the other arts was to them patently obvious. However, it was not a question of a continued "Separation" that oppressed them. The stimulus was more substantial. "The Bulk of Mankind," wrote Henry Fielding in 1752, "are clearly void of any Degree

of Taste. It is a Quality in which they advance very little beyond a State of Infancy." ⁷³ Confronted with such a palpable want -- or at least decline -- of public taste, how could a rational critic contend that music had risen to new heights in the eighteenth century? Most musical critics concurred with Fielding; the absence of aesthetic perception was the underlying evil.

The current "depravity" was generally attributed to the loss of the classical ideal in art. Indications of corruption had been observed as early as 1728 when The Beggar's Opera first took the town. The grand, Roman sentiments of an Addison or a Philips then counted as nothing. Yet, asked Colley Cibber, grieving over the defeat of classical tragedy, though Gay had "gratify'd the publick Taste" who would not rather be the author of one Cato than of a half-dozen Beggar's Operas? ⁷⁴ The theatre-goers predilection for Polly Peachum was the shame of England, but that, alas, was only the first sign of contaminated taste. Subsequently, the decay of aesthetic discernment was hastened by a succession of "villanous Gothick" ⁷⁵ ballad operas. Thereafter, and especially in the middle of the century, the plaintive refrain où sont les neiges d'antan? recurs frequently. Where are the artists of yesterday? Schemes to re-unite poetry, music, dancing, painting, and architecture

in a chastened operatic form were air-built. "Who shall realise these delightful visions?" sighed Thomas Gray. "There is, I own, one Prince in Europe [Frederick the Great], that wants neither the will, the spirit, nor the ability; but can he call up Milton from his grave, can he re-animate Marcello, or bid the Barberina or the Sallé move again?"^{76.}

Still, this sentimentalism of Cibber and Gray was almost optimistic when compared with the mid-century theory of "inevitable" decline" in the arts. The theory, first postulated by Velleius Paterculus in the first century, was given new currency in 1742 by David Hume. Briefly, the notion was that "a high level of artistic achievement in one generation operates to discourage the endeavour of succeeding generations."^{77.} The pessimism was soon reflected in musical criticism. By defining the first half of the eighteenth century as the ne plus ultra of "ancient" music, critics implied that the decay of genius in the second half, however lamentable, was unavoidable.

Co-existent with Hume's melancholy theory was another no less discouraging one. Its genesis is found in Joseph Warton's Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope (1756) and in Alexander Gerard's Essay on Taste (1759). "When poetry and eloquence," writes the latter,

are brought to perfection, the next generation, desiring to excell their predecessors, and unable to

reach their end by keeping in the road of truth and nature, are tempted to turn aside into unbeaten tracks of nicety and affectation. The novelty catches and infects the general taste.^{78.}

As with Hume's idea of "unavoidable decline," Gerard's theory of inevitable trifling attracted the support of musicians. Corroborating evidence of the truth of Gerard's statement, however, was infinitely more prominent. Mid-century music seemed to be given over entirely to meaningless virtuosity in performance and to a "Deluge of unbounded Extravaganz, which the unskilful call Invention."^{79.} The truth and simplicity of the first half of the century had been lost; the love of novelty had already seized the public.

Perhaps the only suggestion of hope to be found among these dark predictions is in Charles Avison's Essay on Musical Expression. Yet even here pessimism is dominant. Though an admirer of both Hume and Gerard, Avison sees still another cause of musical decadence -- a decadence, moreover, which he insists is not universal. Composers of some European countries, he writes, have somehow managed to emulate and sustain the genius of their immediate predecessors, or, as one now calls them, the "ancients." The modern Italians "seem particularly indebted to the Variety and Invention of SCARLATTI; and France has produced a RAMEAU, equal, if not superior to LULLY." But "the English, as yet, indeed, have not been so

successful." The difficulty lay in their choice of Handel as a model. If one followed Hume, of course, one could attribute the current poverty of musical thought to the dampening effect which Handel's almost continuous flow of masterpieces had on his successors. Or, if one followed Warton and Gerard, one could attribute the prevailing mode of rococo to misguided talent. But, Avison adds, is it now possible that the mid-century English composers' failure is due to an "Inferiority in the Original they have chose to imitate" -- or at least "to a want of Genius, in those that are his Imitators (in distinguishing, perhaps, not the most excellent of his works)"^{80.} Thus Avison's theory -- one which understandably infuriated Handelians. But while it was less fatalistic than those of his contemporaries it was fundamentally as hopeless so far as English music was concerned. His failure to suggest a remedy robs the Essay of any real value.

One must not conclude, however, that all English musical critics of this period were so submissive. To aggressive minds such passive despair was more appalling than the "decline" was. Hence the attraction of Primitivism which was based upon "the belief that the earliest condition of man and of human society, l'homme tel qu'il a dû sortir des mains de la Nature, was the best condition."^{81.} John Gregory's manifesto is typical. Only, he declares, by re-establishing the Golden-Age rapport between

art and philosophy, by rescuing music, painting, and sculpture from "the hands of ignorant artists unassisted by philosophy," can the prevailing "false taste" be eradicated. "It is the business of philosophy," he continues, "to analyse and ascertain the principles of every art where Taste is concerned.... [The philosopher's] business is to direct the exertion of Genius in such a manner that its productions may attain to the utmost possible perfection." ^{82.} In theory this form of "cultural primitivism" was laudable -- if one were a philosopher. But in 1766 the establishing of an intellectual dictatorship was as repugnant to artists as it is today. Denied support, primitivists of Gregory's sort succumbed to the pessimism of their contemporaries.

Thus between 1728 and 1775 the idea of decline in music triumphed. One searches in vain for a re-affirmation of what John Frederick Lampe had observed as "manifest" in 1740 --

that Musick has from Time to Time been improved, augmented, and enriched, brought to greater Perfection than it was by any of those Ancients, and even their musical Instruments can bear no Comparison with those in Use at this Day; how much so ever in those early Times they might be charmed with the little Knowledge of Musick they had. ^{83.}

iv. "The Age of Burney" and the Triumph of Modernism: 1776-1789

The Musical Histories of Sir John Hawkins and Dr. Charles Burney. The Evolution of Optimism, and the Resolution of the Ancient-Modern Controversy. The Significance of Burney's Maxim: "respect for the dead should not annihilate all kindness for the living, who are in much greater want of patronage. The artist who is suffered to linger in want and obscurity, is made but small amends by posthumous honours and commemorations." 84.

During the course of this chapter it has been shown that periodically the boundary dividing ancient music from modern shifted. In the first half of the eighteenth century alone we have observed several mutations in the meaning of the word, "ancient." At one time we find that it referred to the musical productions of the Renaissance; at another time to those of the Restoration; and at another time to the era of Scarlatti.

As the century drew to an end the distinction became even finer. Occasionally the ever-changing conception of "antique" music provides amusement to the historian. There were, for example, the two curious and significant policies of the still active Academy of Ancient Musick and of the new Concerts of Ancient Music. The former society, we recall, was organized in 1710 partly to counteract the taste for the then "modern"

Handel. The bulk of the music which they performed was of sixteenth and seventeenth-century origin. However, we discover even this austere body gradually acquiescing to demands for modification. During the final quarter of the eighteenth century the new greatest of "Old Masters," Handel, is represented many times on their programmes! The change in attitude was conspicuous in 1776. No-one that year was puzzled by the title which a group of pro-Handelian musicians chose for themselves -- the Concerts of Ancient Music. Endeavouring to keep alive the works of Handel and his contemporaries, they refused to perform compositions which were less than twenty years old. Now only two decades separated the ancients from the moderns!

Such nice definitions would at one time have irritated the opposition. Nowadays, antiquarian societies (if indeed they can be called that) no longer attracted a barrage of abuse. There was, after all, a sufficient number of new concert rooms, academies, and salons for furthering modern music to counterbalance conservative tastes. The concerts of Johann Christian Bach and Karl Friedrich Abel at Hanover Square Rooms; the entertainments at the new Pantheon in Oxford Street; the Mozart-Haydn programmes of the Professional Concerts; and the musical soirées of Mrs. Cornelys at Carlisle

House competed successfully with what Dr. Arbuthnot had once called "The Philharmonick Spiders." Thus practicing musicians avoided what appeared to be inevitable -- the extension of the once grand ancient-modern controversy into a series of petty quarrels over the musical merits of successive generations. Instead, adopting the motto, de gustibus non est disputandum, they turned to more fruitful pursuits.

Unfortunately a great number of literary men did not share this breadth of view. Classicists, though less punctilious in Burney's day, were still ardent enough to resent even the most reasonable criticism of the Greeks. The Annual Register, for instance, took exception to the historian's suggestion that the exploits of Orpheus and Timotheus were questionable.⁸⁵ On the other hand, the same dimness of vision characterized many writers who were busily protracting the revolt against formalism. Indeed some of the prejudices of the so-called "enlightenment" against Augustan authority were more violent than ever. Men not only boasted of never having read Aristotle; they declared that "two modern critics," Beattie and Blair, taught more than he could ever have done.⁸⁶ Such intolerance bred contempt for Greek and Roman music, thereby creating as ironical a condition as one finds in eighteenth-

century musical criticism: the moderns were behind the times. The fact that music which was composed as recently as 1760 was now accounted ancient made their anti-Greek sputterings ludicrous. Nevertheless in this period we continually find such musically ill-informed moderns as Adam Smith dealing gravely with an ^{87.} obsolete issue.

Nor was the recent vogue of primitivism immune to the rebukes of the paradoxically old-fashioned moderns. Thomas Robertson, a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, castigated John Gregory and other "unthinking men" who have "talked of recalling Ancient Music, where Poetry was united to song." If they would do this, he declares,

let them bring back also Lyncurgus, Solon, Numa, the Greeks and Romans from the tomb; and retire themselves from the scene. On no other condition can Ancient Music be restored. It belongs not to the new world: is perfectly heterogenous to every thing modern. ^{88.}

In a dissertation delivered to the Society of Arts and Sciences on 29th May 1787, the reader echoes Robertson by taking "some little notice of those would-be philosophers" like Gregory. Their "savage delicacy" was a delusion; "they themselves become the best comment on the absurdity of their own text." ^{89.} To give further examples of the moderns' flaying of the Greeks and their champions would be tedious. Whether written in the

reign of Charles II or of George III, such abuse was fairly well stereotyped. Only the stimulus varied.

It is noteworthy, too, that eighteenth-century readers were becoming bored. Even Robertson felt the futility of constant denunciation. "We can hardly open an English book, he complains, "but we fear that we shall meet something that is at least without meaning upon this subject."^{90.} Thus leaving this purely negative aspect of modernism we turn to more meaningful inquiries. Whose music did these critics defend? We should indeed be surprised -- and appalled -- after glancing over the names of contemporary English composers, to find critics commending the modest talents of, say, Shield, Hook, Arnold, or Dibdin. Other questions arise. In view of the growing demand for accuracy and open-mindedness in historical studies, how did the new musical historian treat the compositions of his ancestors? Similarly, did his pro-modernism prevent him from judging his contemporaries fairly? What effect did the continental moderns - Gluck, Haydn, Mozart, and the prodigious Bach family -- have on English criticism? How did a modern reconcile his avowed faith in progress with his pessimistic observation that one cannot remember "the music that pleased him last year"^{91.} In short, to what extent,

if any, did the ancient-modern controversy survive among the "emancipated" intellectuals of the Enlightenment?

A new form of musical criticism which appeared in 1776 facilitates our research. In the second half of the century, interest had revived in the long neglected field of history. The celebrated works of William Robertson, Hume, Gibbon, and Goldsmith all reflect the new and vital concern with the political, social, and religious environments of the past. Such publications as Warton's History of English Poetry and Benjamin Victor's account of the London and Dublin theatres reveal a similar curiosity about the course of artistic achievements. Inevitably, the urge was felt to present what no English writer had yet attempted -- a history of music. This need was partly satisfied in 1776 with the appearance of the first volume of Dr. Charles Burney's history and the complete history of music in five volumes of Sir John Hawkins.

It is in these works that we seek the answers to the above questions. Often marred by prejudice, inaccuracy, and too hasty judgements, they nevertheless represent the concensus gentium of the English Enlightenment as regards the music of the ancients and moderns. The remainder of

this chapter, therefore, will be given over to an examination of these two men, particularly of Burney. Because his second volume did not appear until 1782 and his two final volumes until 1789, his history is a true chronicle of musical thought during the seventeen years under discussion.

Neither writer minces words on his opening pages. Theirs are to be histories, not polemical tracts. To clarify their intentions they both launch into preliminary accounts of ancient music with comments on "that famous controversy set on foot by Sir William Temple."^{92.} The old baronet had always been a scapegoat, but for Burney and Hawkins his continued influence on English writers was the gravest of all impediments to honest investigation. Those seventeenth-century critical methods with which Swift had associated "Ignorance," "Pride," "Opinion," "Noise and Impudence, Dullness and Vanity, Positiveness, Pedantry, and Ill-Manners" had too long survived. Thus, after delineating Temple's "utter incapacity to judge," each historian declares his policy: he is

not to follow the example of an author, whose zeal for a favourite hypothesis had led him to write on a subject he did not understand.^{93.}

Further protestations of impartiality and independence of controversy follow, after which each historian begins his account of ancient music. Their interpretation of "ancient" in 1776 is interesting. Having begun their researches in the 1760's and earlier, they decline to adopt more recent conceptions and therefore limit their studies to Egyptian, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman cultures. The reports are as factual as possible, but after reading the first fifty pages or so of both works, we detect the primary difference between Hawkins and Burney. The former examines ancient notation, genera, modes, and musical instruments with admirable detachment. Burney, despite his determination to remain disinterested, lapses. The difficulties are too great. Exasperated, he echoes the century-old complaint which the Royal Society had made against the ancients: "Words only are come down to us without things." ^{94.}

We find expressions of his frustration again and again. It is particularly noticeable in his digression on the seventeenth-century dispute over Greek counterpoint. Both the French and English defenders of antiquity, we remember, had based their proofs upon myth, legend, philo-

sophical theory, and spurious history. How difficult it was to keep one's temper with the stupid credulousness of men like Isaac Vossius! Counterpoint, Burney explodes, is as much "a modern invention, as gunpowder, printing, the use of the compass, or circulation of the blood." ^{95.} Gone was the historian's impartiality. Willynilly, the ancient-modern controversy had reared its head.

There is a difference, too, between their attitudes towards progress. Burney declares on the very first page of his work that "the feeble beginnings of whatever afterwards becomes great, are interesting to mankind." The statement may, it is true, be interpreted as an apology for the inordinate length of his study of the Greeks and Romans. However, if we accept it as a definite assertion of progressivism, several questions arise. We recall the obstructive paradox of mid-century musical criticism: though the moderns insisted upon the superiority of their contemporaries, they nevertheless subscribed to the theory of unavoidable decline in the arts. What was the source of Burney's optimism? Had he detected the absurdity of the old paradox? Or had historical research taught him that progress was the inevitable result of prolonged

artistic endeavour? Or was his statement an idle one, grounded less upon conviction than upon a plenary faith in all things modern? At this stage of his work it is hard to say. Because he is dealing only with classical antiquity, it is as yet too early for him to prove that a continuous advance towards perfection had always existed.

We have a clearer, though not altogether satisfactory picture of this sudden rebellion against mid-century pessimism in Hawkins. His completed account of ancient and modern music gave him the perspective which Burney lacked in 1776. He had before him facts which confuted the axiom of Hume, Warton, and Gerard that the arts had undergone "a general and perpetual declination" since "the transgression of our first parents." It is possible, Hawkins admits, "that men are neither so virtuous, so wise, so ingenious, so active, so strong, so big in stature, or so long lived" as they were originally. But, he adds, "no one has ever yet insinuated that the vocal organs have participated in this general calamity; or that those mechanic arts to which we owe the invention and perfection of the various kinds of musical instruments, are in a less

flourishing state than heretofore." Reminding his readers that no disputant in the ancient-modern controversy had ever denied that the present age possessed "a more enlarged theory" than that of antiquity, Hawkins concludes

that we should excel them in our practice seems to be but a necessary consequence; at least the order and course of things, which are ever towards perfection, warrant us in thinking so.^{96.}

Even so, there is inconsistency in Hawkins. He is unable to reconcile what he and most of his contemporaries deplored as "the uniform disposition of mankind in favour of novelty" with his bold views on progress.^{97.} Worse, he shakes his readers' faith by making the contradictory statement that this perpetual inhibiting force is only "accidental and temporary."^{98.} One wonders whether he is genuinely optimistic or whether he merely wants to be so. Thus although in Burney and Hawkins we have found two temperate expositors of progress and perfectibility, we have discovered no true zealots in 1776.

Except for this spirited attack on the adherents of "declination," Hawkins ends his history as dispassionately as he had begun it. Burney, on the other hand, like many of his contemporaries, had not yet achieved a state of neutrality. We detect at the end of his first volume

an impatience to proceed to "the History of such Music as more modern times have been delighted with." And his concluding words which advertise his second and final volume once again reveal an unintentional bias towards the moderns and a merely implicit belief in progress:

it is hoped that the narrative will become more interesting to the reader in proportion as he advances towards Certainty, and the account of things that we are not only sure have existed, but of many, though of ancient origin, which still exist; including whatever the moderns have retained, improved, or invented, relative to the ART and SCIENCE of MUSIC. ^{99.}

Burney had originally intended to compress the entire history of modern music into a second volume which corresponded in size to the first. Hence in 1782 readers were startled to find that at the end of his promised second volume he had progressed no further than the reign of Henry VIII. The author apologizes to subscribers. But, he confesses, after completing the history of Greek and Roman music, "I saw 'Alps on Alps arise.'" For one thing, his sense of proportion interposed. Had he carried out his initial plan, it "would be like allowing one volume, in a History of England, to the Heptarchy, and only one to all subsequent times." ^{100.} His chronicle, then, will fill not only this second book, but a third and fourth as well.

However, there was a second "Alp." Despite his advertisement, it is evident that Burney did not consider the contents of this second volume "modern." His conception of antique music had changed since his survey of Greece and Rome in 1776. Now, the music composed roughly between the era of Christian Rome and 1550 was also designated as "ancient." In addition, he had become more temperate. He was, of course, on more familiar ground than he had been in 1776. "Things" as well as "Words" had survived these particular ancients; the conjecturing which he loathed was unnecessary. Important, too, was the fact that the music of this thousand-year period had not played a part in the despised Temple controversy. There were, consequently, no dogmatic champions of medieval antiquity to excite the spiteful ultra-modernism which Burney displayed in 1776.

There was another reason for his mildness. By 1782 he had developed a more mature outlook on history. He was beginning to think of his subject more in terms of evolution than as a series of pretty well independent "ancient" and "modern" epochs. The mutability of taste, experience had taught him, was more to be respected than lamented. What the "Goths" esteemed displeases us. But that the converse of this would be equally true was indeed a daring admission for an eighteenth-century man of refine-

ment. Besides, if these ancients were guilty of certain barbarisms, so, too, are the moderns with their passion for embellishment and dextrous execution.

Other of Burney's opinions invite attention. His adopting the neoclassical dictum, "Study the ancients," is particularly interesting. He insists that however difficult and obscure were the solutions to some of their musical "riddles and rebusses" (such as one finds in the extremely complicated medieval canon) the modern student of music should master them. Musical omniscience is the modern's goal; "those who despise this seeming Gothic pedantry too much, resemble such half-bred scholars, as have expected to arrive at a consummate knowledge of the Roman Classics, without submitting to the drudgery of Grammar and Syntax."¹⁰¹

One must beware, nevertheless, of overestimating Burney's sudden reverence for the ancients. Tolerance may mark this second volume, but never once does he renounce his faith in the moderns. At no time does he commend medieval music (such as that composed "at the Courts of the Roman Pontiffs") per se. Its primary value was as a fountainhead which furnished "modern music ... its Scale, its Counterpoint, its best Melodies,

its religious and secular Dramas, and with the chief part
of its Grace and Elegance." ^{102.} His implications of modern
perfection are more pronounced than they had been in 1776;
still, his endorsement of the doctrine of perfectibility
is a guarded one. We do not yet find a fervour comparable
to Hawkins's.

Seven years later, in 1789, Burney's history was completed with the printing of the third and fourth volumes. Once again subscribers were baffled. Led by the author to expect a two-volume history of modern music which was to balance the two earlier publications on the ancients, they discovered that Burney had once more modified his definitions. Though the third volume covers European music of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (except for the more comprehensive concluding chapter, entitled "The Progress of Church Music in ENGLAND from the death of Purcell to the Present Time"), Burney indicates clearly that he is still dealing with the ancients. The author, in agreement with more "advanced" notions of antiquity, will allow the epithet, "modern," to no music which was composed before 1700.

Yet despite this fruitless hair-splitting, Burney is more conscientious than ever in maintaining open-

mindedness. His review of Tudor English and sixteenth and seventeenth-century Italian, French, German, and Spanish compositions and theories is straightforward and amply documented. Neither the religious nor the moral scruples which so often governed the judgements of his fellow-critics causes Burney to waver. The compositions of Catholic Rome and those of Protestant Germany are presented without bias. In discussing their works, Burney is as unconcerned with Lully's profligacy as he is with Purcell's rectitude. Moreover, he re-asserts in nearly every section of the third volume his opinion of 1782 that ancient music, however primitive, deserves preservation and careful study.

But even at this late date the historian's restraint is twice impaired. The first occasion arises at this tribute to his contemporary, "the divine" Franz Josef Haydn. The remarks that Haydn has "produced such quartets for number and excellence, as have never been equalled in any species of composition at any other period of time" is unexpected.^{103.} One shares Burney's enthusiasm and hesitates to contradict this judgement of 1789. But his failure to reserve such comments for their chronological place in the history indicates an impatience with the subject immediately at hand and an ill-disguised bias towards the moderns. A more serious departure from his professed neutrality is his treatment of seventeenth-century England. Nowhere, he

exclaims, has he discovered so much "dulness and insipidity" and so "little meaning and animation" in music as in that which was composed under the Stuarts. From the reign of James I to the "chief part of Charles II" it appears to Burney "as if the art had been carried on by Somnambuli."¹⁰⁴ The language of bigotry occurs elsewhere in an attack on John Blow whose work he characterizes as "barbarous," "crude," "unequal," "unhappy," and crowded with "unaccounted millions" of contrapuntal errors.¹⁰⁵ (These same "crudities," it is interesting to note, are nowadays admired as the "harmonic experiments and adventurous modulations" of a "ruggedly unconventional composer"!)¹⁰⁶ We find it again in his reproof of those who opposed Thomas Salmon's projected musical reforms of 1672.¹⁰⁷

These unseemly outbursts violate an historiographical principle which was endorsed in the Enlightenment. Burney himself had early recognized the folly of judging past artistic achievements by current standards of taste. But for the purposes of the present discussion we may dismiss his prejudice against the seventeenth century as a peccadillo. It was not, after all, easy to write sympathetically about a century which produced such wranglers as Matthew Locke, or such insolent thunder-stealers as Blow

(whose epitaph, "Master to the famous Mr. Henry Purcell,"
Burney censures as "petit-larceny."^{108.}) It is possible, too,
that Burney depreciated seventeenth-century musicians in
order to throw into relief the work of Purcell. Indeed,
the author is so anxious to dissociate Purcell from
the seventeenth century and to claim him as a modern that
he asserts that the composer "had devancé son siècle."^{109.}

Nevertheless in spite of all the criticism which
Burney's aversion to the seventeenth century draws from
present-day musicologists, these flaws are minor ones.
They occupy not more than a dozen of the 622 pages in the
third volume. All in all his judgements are consistent
with the prefatory essay on musical criticism:

I can readily forgive the man who admires a dif-
ferent Music from that which pleases me, provid-
ed he does not extend his hatred or contempt of
my favourite Music to myself, and imagine that
on the exclusive admiration of any one style of
Music, and a close adherence to it, all wisdom
taste, and virtue depend.^{110.}

It is the content of the fourth volume, however, which
most impressively reflects the opinions of the late eighteenth
century regarding the music of the ancients and moderns.
This final installment of the history is concerned almost
exclusively with dramatic music, with emphasis upon the

progress of Italian opera in England since 1705. Burney's joy at finally reaching home ground is at once apparent. Peremptoriness has given way to a style which is chatty, informal, and agreeably spiced with green-room gossip and personal reminiscences. Indeed his affection for his own century nearly leads him to new excesses. Many times he is too leisurely, too uncritical. But although later critics have reprimanded Burney for devoting page after page to obscure composers and to minute examinations of ephemeral operas, it is rather with his unrestrained delight in his own age than with his lack of discrimination that we are at present concerned.

This delight is manifested in several ways. We first find it in Burney's response to the eighteenth-century insistence upon preserving "ancient" and "modern" as terms of critical reference. When contrasting the music of Attic Greece with that of the Christian era, critics had found it easy to define the point at which the former ended and the latter began. When critics felt obliged, in writing of a hundred-year period, to identify the precise date at which "modern" music commenced, the absurdity of the custom was all too apparent. Burney, however, surmounts this difficulty by following the lead of the

Concerts of Ancient Music and fixing the date at 1759, the year of Handel's death. Thereupon, Purcell, Bononcini, and Handel acquired the rank of "venerable old masters," and works such as Pepusch's Treatise on Harmony (1731) and Geminiani's Treatise on Good Taste (1749) were sentenced to the limbo of "exploded doctrines." Nevertheless, the historian displays neither condescension nor ill-humour in treating of these "ancients." Here there was no tedious separating of fact from myth as there had been with the Greeks, no apologizing for an excess of barbarisms as there had been with the medieval "Goths," no displaying of "crudities" as there had been with the seventeenth-century Europeans. The first half of the eighteenth-century, Burney had written earlier, was the "Augustan Age of Music." As such, its productions were "solid" and virile, not mere museum-pieces, valuable only to the musical scholar. Moreover, their perfection made them impervious to the disparagement of moderns; their universal and perpetual appeal prevented zealous antiquarians from claiming them as their exclusive property.

Apart from these pronouncements, Burney's examination of the ancients is necessarily cursory. This final volume was, after all, concerned with the music of the moderns,

who, by his definition, were the post-Handelians. The amount of information which he had acquired about German music since 1776, he complains, would require an entire volume in itself. However it was not simply from want of space that Burney skims over the older masterpieces and avoids the familiar controversial issues. "New ideas and new events," he tells us, had arisen since he began his history in 1776.^{112.} Both operated to discourage the old habit of pitting the ancients against the moderns. Among the "new ideas" were those expressed by Thomas Robertson and Joseph Priestly. The former's widely-read indictment of Sir William Temple's successors as immature triflers and the latter's doctrine that history "teaches us to see the past and present as stages in a glorious scheme of amelioration" both accentuated the pettiness of the ancient-modern controversy.^{113.} In addition, the possibility that modern exponents of moral, social, and political perfectibility, like Hartley and Godwin, had instilled a similar optimism into Burney is not inadmissible in explaining his change of policy. Again, without doubt, new aesthetic conceptions affected Burney's creed. A concern with the future, not with the past, was inherent in certain criteria, such as "originality" and "invention," which had already found favour among younger

critics.

But Burney's perceptible move towards prospective criticism in his final volume received more tangible encouragement from the "new events," particularly those pertaining to the musical renaissance which Europe was experiencing in the last quarter of the century. At first he was cautious. He had visited the musical centres of Europe early in the 1770's in order to give his readers a first-hand account of those new compositions which were known to England only by reputation. His observations were subsequently recorded in two volumes, The Present State of Music in France and Italy (1771), and The Present State of Music in Germany, the Netherlands and United Provinces (1773). In nearly every country the fecundity of musical invention impressed him. Still, he was somewhat chary of suggesting that the birth of a grand new era was imminent. Since then, a galaxy of composers, even more lustrous than the Augustans were, had convinced Burney and his English colleagues that they were living in an age of unprecedented glory. Now, in 1789, he could approve categorically of the superiority of such men as Cherubini, who "is now travelling fast to the temple of Fame," and

disavow an earlier opinion that Germany was deficient in musical genius.¹¹⁴ He could now lend support to "the almost universal cry at Paris" that Gluck "had recovered the dramatic Music of the ancient Greeks; that there was no other worth hearing; that he was the only musician in Europe who knew how to express the passions."¹¹⁵ He could now salute Mozart as "the wonder of the musical world" without fearing either contradiction or censure for impetuosity.¹¹⁶ But perhaps no instance of his joyous approbation is more poignant than the announcement in his fourth volume: "I am now happily arrived at that part of my narrative where it is necessary to speak of HAYDN! the admirable and matchless HAYDN!"¹¹⁷

It mattered little that there had been an obvious decline in English musical productivity after Handel's death in 1759. Burney is certainly unembarrassed. An increased intercourse with foreign musicians who were settling in London as well as frequent excursions to the Continent had nurtured in him an internationalism hitherto unknown in musical criticism. England was no longer musically isolated; petty quarrels, the concomitants of insularity, were despised. However humiliating, Britain

must resign herself to her temporary barrenness and yield to the new glories of Vienna and Mannheim.

Not that the gesture was without compensation. If the new era was being enriched with the symphonies, quartets, and sonatas of continental composers, England would be honoured forever for bequeathing Purcell to the musical literature of the world. Moreover, the current sterility of her composers was counterbalanced by progress in other spheres. The Grand Musical Festival of 1787, in commemoration of Handel, had revealed that in respect to direction, and vocal and instrumental performance "a certain road to full perfection in every department seems to have been attained."¹¹⁸ But even more significant than the attainment of perfection in execution was the English audience's achieving maturity of judgement. It may be true, as Hawkins had stated in 1776, that love of novelty constantly threatened to pervert taste, but that this disposition is "uniform" and incorrigible is balderdash. "It may be with truth and certainty affirmed," the historian of 1789 beams, "that our taste and judgment in both composition and performance, even at the play-houses, differ as much from those of twenty or thirty years ago, as the manners of a civilised people from those of savages."¹¹⁹

"Perfectibility," William Godwin was soon to declare, "is one of the most unequivocal characteristics of the human species." ^{120.} In amplifying this maxim to include artistic creativeness and public taste, musical criticism had shown not only that it was in tune with the Enlightenment but that it had at last come of age. The ancient-modern controversy? Burney, who had once shared the guilt of his predecessors in perpetuating it, surveyed his entire account of music from Orpheus to Haydn. Imbued with the tolerance and ^{the} hatred of tyranny which the revolutionary spirit was engendering in all men's minds, he put a period to all such vain and debasing contentions by exclaiming,

Happy the people, however, imperfect their Music, if it gives them pleasure! But when it is an eternal object of dispute; when each man, like Nebuchadnezzar, sets up his own peculiar idol, which every individual is to fall down and worship, or be thrown into the fiery furnace of his hatred and contempt, the blessing is converted into a curse. ^{121.}

Notes to Chapter V:

1. Charles Perrault, Le Siècle de Louis le Grand printed with Parallèles des Anciens et des Modernes, Paris, 1688, pp. 16-17, 19.
2. Charles Perrault, Parallèles des Anciens et des Modernes, see note 1, passim.
3. François de Callières, Histoire Poétique de la Guerre Nouvellement déclarée entre les Anciens et les Modernes, Paris, 1688, pp. 262-3.
4. Charles Burney, A General History of Music, I pp. 117-18 (1776).
5. Samuel Butler, "The Elephant in the Moon," Satires and Miscellaneous Poetry and Prose, edited by Rene Lamar, Cambridge, University Press, 1928, p. 5. Butler had as little respect for the tales of Orpheus; see "A Fidler," Characters, edited by A. R. Waller, Cambridge, University Press, 1908, p. 222.
6. Thomas Salmon, An Essay to the Advancement of Musick London, J. Macock, 1672, p. 71.
7. Matthew Locke, Observations upon an Essay to the Advancement of Musick, London, W. G., 1672, prefatory poem by J. Philips, and passim.
8. Charles de Saint-Evremond, "Upon Opera's," Mixt Essays, London, T. Goodwin, 1685. The author here is speaking only of music. In the dispute over ancient and modern learning in general, he gave the palm to the moderns. It should be mentioned, too, that Saint-Evremond's recourse to the Greeks might have been justifiable had he been writing at the beginning of the century. The Italian "inventors" of opera, we recall, had at that time advertised their works as resuscitations of Greek drama. By 1685, however, opera-composers had largely forgotten the noble aspirations of their predecessors, a fact which invalidated much of Saint-Evremond's "comparison."

9. He remarks in his preface to "Albion and Albanus" (Works, VII, p. 240) that modern opera may be the result of the Renaissance Italians "gathering up the shipwrecks of the Athenian and Roman theatres, which we know were adorned with scenes, music, dances, and machines, especially the Grecian."
10. Ibid., p. 239
11. Thomas Salmon, A Proposal to Reform Musick, London John Lawrence, 1688, pp. 2-3.
12. Dryden, Works, VIII, p. 135.
13. Sir William Temple, "An Essay on Ancient and Modern Learning" and "On Poetry," edited by J. E. Spingarn, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1909, p. 26.
14. Ibid., p. 78
15. Thomas Rymer, A Short View of Tragedy, London, Richard Baldwin; all such innovations, he writes, are a "Sacrifice" to "the Grand Monarch." See p. 345 for an extract from The Short View.
16. William Wotton, Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning, London, J. Leake, 1694, pp. 286-89.
17. Bernard le Bovier de Fontenelle, A Plurality of Worlds, translated into English by Mr. Glanvil, London, 1695, p. 84.
18. George Farquhar, Love and a Bottle, V, ii.
19. Samuel Pepys, Diary, March 20th 1668.
20. John Wallis, "The Strange Effects reported of Music in former Times," The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, to the End of the Year 1700, abridged and edited by John Lowthorp, London, Bennett, Knaplock, and Wilkin, 1705, I, pp. 706-707.
21. Burney, op. cit., I, p. 131.

22. Sir William Temple, A Defense of the Essay upon Antient and Modern Learning, (Miscellanea, Part III) edited by Jonathan Swift, Benjamin Tooke, 1701, pp. 230-31.
23. William Wotton, A Defense of the Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning, T. Goodwin, 1705, p. 46.
24. See Chapter on Imitation, pp. 161-163.
25. John Dennis, "An Essay on the Operas after the Italian Manner," Works, II, pp. 391-92.
26. Cf. J. C. Maxwell, "Charles Gildon and the Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns," Review of English Studies, New Series, Vol. I, No. 1, January, 1950, pp. 55-57.
27. Charles Gildon, The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton, London, Robert Gosling, 1710. The scene in Alcestis "where the Servants of Admetus are scandaliz'd at the Singing of Hercules, when Alcestis lay dead in the Palace ... is a plain Argument, that the rest of the Play was spoken and not Sung." p. 159.
28. In his Discourse (London, J. Darby, 1719, p. 208) Fontenelle asserts that "Letters of Love and Gallantry, Tales, Opera's, and the Like," all examples "of the new Kinds of Writing," have each "furnished us with some excellent Author, to whom Antiquity has nothing to set in opposition."
29. Thomas Brown, "Essay on the Satire of the Ancients," Works, London, Samuel Briscoe, 1719-1720, I, p. 15.
30. Lewis Theobald, The Censor, London, Jonas Brown, 1717, No. 91 for 21st May 1717, III, pp. 208-9. Cf. the issue for 5th January of the same year, III, p. 60.
31. Alexander Pope, Memoirs of the Extraordinary Life, Works, and Discoveries of Martinus Scriblerus, Dublin, George Faulkner, 1741, pp. 44, 48.
32. George Frideric Handel, Letters and Writing, 1935, p. 81.

33. Benedetto Marcello, "Il Teatro alla Moda," 1720, translated by Reinhard G. Pauly for The Musical Quarterly. Part I: July, 1948, XXXIV, No. 3, pp. 371-403; Part II, January, 1949, XXXV, No. 1, pp. 85-105.
34. Rymer, op. cit., p. 10.
35. George Granville, epilogue to The Jew of Venice, 1701. Cf. epilogue to Smith's Princess of Parma, 1699, prologue to John Dennis's Iphigenia, 1700, and epilogue to Boyle's As You Find It, 1703.
36. John Dennis, "The Advancement and Reformation of Modern Poetry," Works, I, pp. 263-4.
37. John Dennis, "Essay on Operas," Works, II, p. 385.
38. Spectator for 6th March 1711; cf. Boileau's Tenth Satire -- which Addison quotes -- for the French appraisal of Tasso.
39. Spectator for 21st March 1711.
40. John Dennis, "The Stage Defended," Works, II, p. 304. See also his "Reflections upon an Essay upon Criticism," 1711, Works, I; and Pope's "Narrative of Dr. Robert Norris," [1713] Prose Works, edited by Norman Ault, Oxford, Shakespeares Head Press, 1936.
41. Burney, op. cit., IV, p. 638.
42. John D. Scheffer, "The Idea of Decline in Literature and the Fine Arts in Eighteenth-century England," Modern Philology, XXXIV, No. 2, November 1936, p. 155.
43. Arthur Bedford, The Great Abuse of Musick, London, J. H., 1711, pp. 104-5.
44. Letter to Johathan Swift, February 3d, 1723, (Swift, Correspondence, III, p. 155.)
45. Dennis's anti-progressivism requires no further delineation. Joseph Trapp, Praelectiones Poeticae, a

series of lectures, given at Oxford in 1711 and 1715, translated as "Lectures on Poetry," London, C. Hitch, 1742, pp. 240 ff; and Aaron Hill, The Plain Dealer, particularly No. 94 for 12th February 1725: "All our boasted Additions to this heavenly Art, are rather Enlargements than Improvements."

46. George Berkeley, An Essay towards Preventing the Ruine of Great Britain, London, J. Roberts, 1721, p. 17.
47. Charles Gildon, op. cit., pp. 168-9. Cf his remarks in "The Complete Art of Poetry, Dialogue II," reprinted in Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century edited by Willard Higley, Durham, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1915, p. 31, which are substantially the same.
48. Arthur Bedford, op. cit., p. 196. Bedford is not contradicting himself here. He refers to the "corrupt uses" to which music has been put since Blow's death, that is, of playhouse-songs, ballads, etc.
49. Augustin Calmet, Dissertation sur la Poesie et la Musique des Anciens, Amsterdam, David Paul Marret, 1723, p. 51.
50. Spectator for 26th December 1711 and for 18th January 1712.
51. Nicola Haym, The British Treasury, being Cabinet the First of our GREEK and ROMAN Antiquities of all Sorts, London, 1719-1720.
52. Sir John Hawkins, History of Music, II, p. 168. Maym's book was never published.
53. Roger North, The Musically Gramarian, pp. 1, 3.
54. John Arbuthnot, "Harmony in an Uproar," Miscellaneous Works, 1751, III, pp. 28, 34-5.
55. John Frederick Lampe, The Art of Music, p. 3.

56. John Gordon, A New Estimate of Manners and Principles Cambridge, J. Bentham, 1760, pp. 22-3.
57. James Miller, Harlequin-Horace; or the Art of Modern Poetry, London, Lawton Gilliver, 1731, p. 28.
58. Charles Avison, An Essay on Musical Expression, 1st edition, [1752] p. 136.
59. John Brown, An Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times, p. 31.
60. Charles Burney, The Present State of Music in Germany, The Netherlands, and United Provinces, London, T. Becket, 1773, I, p. 151.
61. John Jortin, A Letter concerning the Music of the Ancients, printed with the 2nd edition of Avison's Essay on Musical Expression, London, C. Davis, 1753, p. 14. The name of the author, one of the most learned men of his day, was not known until the 3rd edition of Avison's Essay appeared in 1775.
62. Avison, op. cit., 1st edition, 1752, p. 65. Mason revealed in 1795 that he had contributed this statement to Avison anonymously in 1752 (William Mason, Essays, Historical and Critical, York, W. Blanchard, 1795, p. 235.)
63. Avison, op. cit., 2nd edition, 1753, p. 46.
64. Mason, op. cit., p. 235. He is referring to his statement which appeared in Avison's Essay in 1752. Cf. note 62, above.
65. Sir John Hawkins, An Account of the Institution and Progress of the Academy of Ancient Music, London, 1770, p. 23.
66. Ibid., p. 13.
67. William Hughes, The Efficacy and Importance of Musick, London, Samuel Mountfort, 1749, p. 10.
68. Hildebrand Jacob, Of the Sister Arts, London, William Lewis, 1734, p. 14.

69. Avison, op. cit., 1st edition, 1752, pp. 8-22.
70. One group subscribed to Lord Kames's theory: in Athens when music and poetry lost their moral purpose, social corruption followed; in modern times, as the breach between the arts widens and they more completely lose their moral objective, English manners degenerate to a degree hitherto unknown. (Henry Home, Lord Kames, Elements of Criticism, I, p. 152.) Others contended that this was putting the cart before the horse. It was manners which debased the arts -- especially music -- "which, when corrupted, become principal instruments in completing the destruction of religion and virtue." (John Gregory, A Comparative View, p. 120.)
71. Gregory, op. cit., p. 152.
72. In passing, it might be pointed out that the new champions of oratorio were not all pedantic theorists who, after giving the nod to composers, dropped the matter. There was a pragmatist or two among them. Richard Jago, for example, felt that poets were obliged to re-inforce the new "unity" by creating librettos of high literary as well as ethical standards. With this aim in mind, he publicly offered his Adam, or the Fatal Disobedience (adapted from Paradise Lost) to any like-minded musician who wished to set it. Similarly "Estimate" Brown, whose Rise, Union, and Power, the Progressions, Separations, and Corruption of Music and Poetry had created a stir in 1763, offered his Cure of Saul. Jago's libretto, written in strict accordance with those "rules" of Gregory which I have quoted, is found in the posthumous publication of his Poems, Moral and Descriptive. The poet, who was rector of Snittersfield, Warwickshire, wrote little of any significance. Other than Shenstone's, he seems to have attracted no contemporary admiration. Adam, of course, was not the first adaptation of Milton's epic; see Chapter on Music and Morals, note 14, p. 304.
73. Henry Fielding, Covent Garden Journal for 4th February 1752.

74. Colley Cibber, Apology, p. 142.
75. James Ralph, The Fashionable Lady; or Harlequin's Opera, London, J. Watts, 1730, I, xvii.
76. Thomas Gray, letter to Count Algarotti, 9th September 1763. Cf. Brown, Estimate, p. 31.
77. David Hume, Of the Rise and Progress of the Arts, quoted by J. D. Scheffer, op. cit., p. 159.
78. Alexander Gerard, Essay on Taste, London, A. Millar, 1759, p. 130; Cf. Joseph Warton, Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope, London, 1756, p. 163. (Both authors are quoted by Scheffer, op. cit.)
79. Avison, op. cit., 1st edition, p. 35; cf. John Brown, Essays on the Characteristicks, p. 390, where the author, who is quoted by Avison, sees "a like Catastrophe in the Art of Painting." See also Chapter II of the present work for a fuller account of mid-century virtuosity and over-elaboration in music.
80. Avison, op. cit., 1st edition, pp. 54-55.
81. A. O. Lovejoy, foreword to Lois Whitney's Primitivism and the Idea of Progress, Baltimore, John Hopkins Press, 1934, xi.
82. Gregory, op. cit., p. 106.
83. Lampe, op. cit., p. 13.
84. Burney, History, IV, p. 685.
85. The Annual Register, Vol. 31, 1739, p. 183ff.
86. William Cowper, Correspondence, edited by Thomas Wright, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1904, II, p. 196, letter to John Newton, 26th April 1784.
87. Adam Smith, The Wealth of Nations, London, W. Strahan, 1776, II, p. 359 (Book V, Chapter I, Part III, Article ii).

88. Thomas Robertson, An Inquiry into the Fine Arts, p. 446.
89. Quoted in The Gentleman's Magazine, Vol. 58, July 1788, p. 579.
90. Robertson, op. cit., p. 28.
91. Hawkins, op. cit., V. p. 431.
92. Ibid., I, p. 2. Cf. Burney, Dissertation on the Music of the Ancients, prefixed to his History, I, passim.
93. Hawkins, op. cit., I, pp. 2-3.
94. Burney, History, I. p. 3.
95. Ibid., p. 150.
96. Hawkins, op. cit., V. pp. 426, 427.
97. Thirty-five years before Hawkins's History appeared, The Daily Gazetteer (25th September 1741) made a similar reflexion: "It is natural for our Contemporaries to be pleased with anything that is tolerable if it be new, rather than a better Thing if it be evidently an Imitation." The mid-century preoccupation with novelty and "imitation" has been dealt with at length in the chapter on morals of the present work.
98. Hawkins, op. cit., V, p. 426.
99. Burney, History, I, p. 495.
100. Ibid., II, p. 585.
101. Ibid., pp. 508-9.
102. Ibid., p. 71.
103. Ibid., III, p. 10 of preface, "Essay on Musical Criticism."
104. Ibid., p. 485.

105. Ibid., p. 448.
106. A. K. Holland, Henry Purcell, London, G. Bell and Sons, 1932, p. 66.
107. Burney, History, III, pp. 473-4.
108. Ibid., p. 478.
109. Ibid., p. 492.
110. Ibid., v.
111. Burney, History, IV, pp. 636, 642, 685.
112. Ibid., p. 684.
113. Priestley's conception is thus described by Basil Willey, The Eighteenth-century Background, 3rd impression, London, Chatto and Windus, 1949, p. 200.
114. Burney, History, IV, pp. 527, 606.
115. Ibid., p. 619.
116. Ibid., p. 602.
117. Ibid., p. 599.
118. Ibid., p. 685.
119. Ibid., p. 676.
120. William Godwin, An Enquiry concerning Political Justice, London, G. Robinson, 1793, I, Book I, Chapter II, p. 11.
121. Burney, History, IV, p. 630.

Conclusion

The aptitude of the early eighteenth-century musical critic for observing the externals of music provides the modern reader with endless amusement. It also exasperates him. We laugh at the report of Senesino, the male soprano, who while singing the title-rôle of Handel's Giulio Cesare was so badly frightened by the sudden, noisy collapse of a piece of scenery that he burst into tears in full view of a gleeful audience. Yet seldom in such commentaries do we find even the most cursory remarks about Handel's score. The startling effect of Purcell's music for "The Genius of the North" in King Arthur was discussed by rapturous critics for years on end. Yet rare was the man who attempted to explain how Purcell achieved such an effect. Frustrated, we seize upon Gildon's ascribing such enchantment to "the admirable Conjunction of Sharps and Flats" as a masterpiece of musical analysis. Later in the century, when castratos and semiquaver-blizzards were forgotten by introspective theorists, our search for contemporary examinations of eighteenth-century music is little more rewarded. Philosophers, psychologists, and arbiters of Georgian taste wrote lengthily on the mystical powers and unique aesthetics

of music but they rarely refer us to particular compositions.

Clearly, as the following recapitulation reveals, the value of eighteenth-century musical criticism lies not in what it tells us about the music of that time, but rather in what it tells us about the English critic -- his ideas, his procedure, and most of all his rôle in the development of modern critical theories.

During the second half of the seventeenth century when the "Nuove Musiche" from the continent, with its habit of violating one after the other of England's traditionally held moral and aesthetic precepts, began to enthrall thousands of unsuspecting Englishmen, responsible men felt it to be their duty to curb its perniciousness with rules consistent with their own vision of things. Unhappily, this "vision" was conditioned by Reason and Common Sense. Despite the fact that the employment of these two faculties of the intellect resulted in the glories of seventeenth and eighteenth-century science, philosophy, and literature, they were inadequate instruments for assessing the value of music, the most irrational of the arts.

The new, self-appointed critic's opinion that since music exists for man's pleasure its rules should be made intelligible to all men was commendable. The difficulty,

however, lay not in his clarifying these rules but in discovering what they were to begin with. He had no technical knowledge of music and dismissed its peculiar terminology as the gibberish of obscurantists. He entertained no notion of the artist as a responsible, intelligent being; hence he scorned the artist as a source of enlightenment. No less restrictive was this matter-of-fact rationalist's inability to deal with abstract music. Accordingly he centered his enquiries on the "outward and visible" aspects of music -- the words of a song, the mien of a singer, the décor of the operatic stage, the pictorial effects of imitative music.

The seventeenth-century man of letters thereupon proceeded to draw up his ars musica, deriving his rules not from a practical knowledge of music but from the common-sense precepts of the ancients -- for although his vision was narrow it was long-ranged. The strategem was a neat one. Horace, Aristotle, and the post-Nicene Church Fathers not only supplied the critic with ready-made rules -- many of which, like Plato's, that instrumental music is meaningless and worthless, excused his neglect of such music. They also lent irrefutable authority to the new criticism.

Thus it was that the rational judge, demanding that music like the other arts give him back the image of his mind, imposed a series of preposterously foreign laws upon that hitherto unrestrained art. Nor did he lack the approval of his equally reasonable successors in the early years of the eighteenth century. "Musick, Architecture and Painting," explained the assenting Addison to a new generation, "as well as Poetry and Oratory, are to deduce their Laws and Rules from the general Sense and Taste of Mankind, and not from the Principles of those Arts themselves; or in other Words, the Taste is not to conform to the Art, but the Art to the Taste." ¹

The tide began to turn in the second decade of the eighteenth century when new writers recognized the inadequacies of the Addisonian critic. His censure of immoral musical plays, nonsensical Italian operas, and sense-destroying composers, though unquestionably just was ineffectual. The musician showed no indication of changing his technique, and the public, despite the rational critic's efforts to mend their taste, were in Swift's words now "nine times madder after operas than ever." And satirists perceived the truth: the only follies exposed by these judges were their own, and the only real abuses which the onlooker

can discern in musical commentaries are those perpetrated against the art of criticism. The good intentions of the critic did not compensate for his pedantry, evasiveness, prejudices, punctiliousness, and genius for devising laws incongruent with the subject.

Heeding these rebukes, the critic, while continuing to uphold Reason as the touchstone of musical values, attempted to adjust his method to the intellectual climate of the times. But it was too late; that climate was tempered by a new element which was ultimately to undermine rationalistic criticism -- feeling. Observable in the benevolism of Lord Shaftesbury, in the utilitarian ethics of Steele, and in the less exalted idealism of sentimental dramatists, its influence was soon felt in musical thought. Thus, while puritanical divines warned the devout that church-music (with its -- alas -- too-common "horrid Blasphemies" and indecorous rhythms) discouraged meditation, clergymen like Swift were gratifying their congregations' desire to sustain their religious emotions by a more extensive use of music during services. While traditionalists continued to revile Handel the musician as an enemy of reason and corrupter of taste, Dr. Arbuthnot

gave the cue to a host of sentimentalists by extolling Handel the man as a creator of taste, as a "natural genius" exempted from mere rules of reason, and as a sensitive artist persecuted by unfeeling critics and jealous rivals. While Aristoteleans modified their rules concerning the representation of external nature by musical imitation, more up-to-date critics endorsed the new ideal -- the representation of internal nature by musical expression.

Mid-century commentators accelerated the decline of the "A. B. C." methods of the Augustans. Exponents of anti-classicism, of the evangelical revival, and of "sensibility" added innumerable highlights to Arbuthnot's portrait of Handel. Now endowed with superhuman insight and profound spirituality, the composer gradually displaced Aristotle and Plato as the ultimate source of musical laws. Inward-turning psychologists and aestheticians of the last quarter of the century produced even more startling conceptions of the artist and his work. Their recognition and exalting of "enthusiasm" and "natural genius" which together, cried the rejoicing Burney, defy every tenet of "cold criticism" illustrate clearly the rapid trend towards the subjective judgement of art. Equally significant was the widely heard appeal to abandon Aristotelean Imitation for

the new desideratum of art, Originality.

Men gradually assented to the apotheosis of the "original genius" with his transcendental vision and to the conception of the composer (since he created something from nothing) as the original genius par excellence. They perceived as well the necessity of forsaking common-sense criteria in judging his work. Abstract music was accordingly admitted as a subject of serious enquiry for the first time in English musical criticism. Symphonies and sonatas were no longer dismissed as meaningless. Men of "sensibility" revered them as the supreme achievements of creative genius, as expressions of the ineffable, and (with a triumphant glance at antiquaries) as indisputable evidence for the moderns' superiority over the ancients.

By the end of the century the creed of enlightened critics was well defined. In judging music one suspends his intellect and exercises his subtler faculty of intuition. The true critic does not guard himself against the emotional content of music which the Augustans had so greatly distrusted. He submits himself to it, believing that the evocation of feeling is the end of that art. He does not presume to teach genius; he is content to learn

from it. The metamorphosis of the critic from the Man of Reason to the Man of Feeling was complete.

The eminent philosopher M. Jacques Maritain, recently declared in his essay, On Artistic Judgement,

If we believe that art is merely an exercise of skill intended to give pleasure or to distract us momentarily or to figure forth for us in easy and agreeable fashion some likeness of ideas which we already bear within ourselves, what we shall demand of a painting or of a symphony is that they confirm us in our own vision of things.... We shall judge the work of art as an article subject to our whim, an article the measure of which is our own bent of mind. Under such circumstances, to tell the truth, we do not judge the work of art; rather, it is we who are judged by it.

In contrast with this conception of art is a second one which arises.

the moment we think that art is a creative effort of which the wellsprings lie in the spirit, and which brings us at once the most intimate self of the artist and the secret concurrences which he has perceived in things by means of a vision or intuition all his own, and not to be expressed in ideas and in words -- expressible only in the work of art.... We shall judge the work of art as the living vehicle of a hidden truth to which both the work and we ourselves are together subject, and which is the measure at once of the work and of our mind. Under such circumstances we truly judge be-

cause we do not set ourselves up as judges but strive to be obedient to that which the work may teach us.²

The musical criticism of eighteenth-century England, controlled as it was at different times by both of these conceptions, does more than prove the validity of M. Maritain's remarks by displaying the limitations of the first and the boundlessness of the second -- the modern -- notion of what art is. It sets before us the steps in the evolution of that critical theory from which were to spring the most profound of nineteenth and twentieth-century observations on the nature and purpose of musical art.

Notes:

1. Spectator for April 3, 1711
2. Jacques Maritain, The Range of Reason, London, Geoffrey
Eles, 1953, p. 19.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Addison, Joseph, Works, London, Jacob Tonson, 1721, 4 Vols.
- Advice to the Composers and Performers of Vocal Musick, London, T. Edlin, 1727.
- Algarotti, Count Francesco, An Essay on the Opera, London, L. Davis and C. Reymers, 1767.
- Almahide, London, J. Tonson, 1710.
- d'Arblay, Frances Burney, Mme., The Early Diary, 1768-1778, edited by Annie Raine Ellis, London, George Bell and Sons, 1889, 2 Vols.
- d'Arblay, Frances Burney, Mme., Memoir of Dr. Burney, London, Edward Moxon, 1832, 3 Vols.
- Arbuthnot, John, Miscellaneous Works, Glasgow, James Carlile, 1751, 2 Vols.
- Aubert, Mrs., Harlequin-Hydaspes; or, The Greshamite, London, J. Roberts, 1719.
- Ault, Norman, New Light on Pope, London, Methuen and Company, 1949.
- Avison, Charles, An Essay on Musical Expression, London, C. Davis, 1752. [2nd edition, 1753; 3rd edition, 1775.]
- Babcock, Robert W., The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry, 1766-1799, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1931.
- Baker, David Erskine, Biographia Dramatica; or, a Companion to the Playhouse, London, C. Rivington, 1782, 2 Vols.
- Baker, Thomas, Tunbridge-Walks; or, The Yeoman of Kent, London, B. Lintott, 1703.
- Barclay, Robert, An Apology for the True Christian Divinity, London, 1678.
- Beattie, James, Essays, 3rd edition, London, S. and C. Dilly, 1779.

- Beattie, James, Letters, [printed in British Prose Writers, London, John Sharpe, 1819-1820,] 25 Vols. Volume XXV.
- Bedford, Arthur, The Evil and Danger of Stage-Plays, Bristol, W. Bonny, 1706.
- Bedford, Arthur, The Great Abuse of Musick, London, printed by J.H., 1711.
- Bedford, Arthur, A Second Advertisement Concerning the Profaneness of the Play-house, Bristol, W. Bonny, 1706.
- Bedford, Arthur, A Serious Remonstrance, London, John Darby, 1719.
- Bedford, Arthur, The Temple Musick, London, H. Mortlock, 1706.
- Berger, Arthur V., "The Beggar's Opera, the Burlesque, and Italian Opera," Music and Letters, XVII, No. 2, April, 1936, pp. 93-105.
- Berkeley, George, An Essay towards Preventing the Ruine of Great Britain, London, J. Roberts, 1721.
- Betz, Siegmund A.E., "The Operatic Criticisms of the Tatler and Spectator," Musical Quarterly, XXXI, No. 31, July, 1945, pp. 318-330.
- Bladen, Martin, Solon; or Philosophy no Defence against Love, London, R. Smith, 1705.
- Blunderella: or, The Impertinent, London, A. Dodd, 1730.
- Bosanquet, Bernard, A History of Aesthetic, 2nd edition, London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1949.
- Bosanquet, Bernard, Three Lectures on Aesthetic, London, Macmillan and Co., 1915.
- Boswell, James, The Life of Samuel Johnson, London, Henry Baldwin, 1791, 2 Vols.
- Boyle, Roger, Dramatick Works, London, R. Dodsley, 1739, 2 Vols.

- Brome, Richard, Dramatic Works, London, John Pearson, 1873, 3 Vols.
- Brown, John, A Dissertation on the Rise, Union, and Power of Poetry and Music, London, L. Davis and C. Reymers, 1763.
- Brown, John, Essays on the Characteristicks, London, C. Davis, 1751.
- Brown, John, An Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times, London, L. Davis, 1757.
- Brown, John, Letters upon the Poetry and Music of Italian Opera, Edinburgh, Bell and Bradfute, 1789.
- Brown, Thomas, Works, London, B. Bragg, 1707, 3 Vols; another edition, London, Samuel Briscoe, 1719-1720, 5 Vols.
- Browne, Moses, Polidus; or, Distress'd Love, London, 1723.
- Bukhofzer, Manfred F., Music in the Baroque Era, London J. M. Dent, 1948.
- Bullock, Christopher, Woman's Revenge; or, A Match in Newgate, ("To which is added, A Compleat Key to the Beggar's Opera, by Peter Padwell of Paddington, Esq.") London, J. Robb, 1728.
- Burlingame, Anne Elizabeth, The Battle of the Books in its Historical Setting, New York, B. W. Huebsch, 1920.
- Burney, Charles, An Account of the Musical Performances in Westminster-Abbey, and the Pantheon, May 26th, 27th, 29th; and June the 3d, and 5th, 1784, in Commemoration of Handel, London, T. Payne, 1785.
- Burney, Charles, A General History of Music from the Earliest Ages to the Present Period, London, T. Becket, 1776-1789, 4 Vols.
- Burney, Charles, The Present State of Music in France and Italy, London, T. Becket, 1771.
- Burney, Charles, The Present State of Music in Germany, the Netherlands, and United Provinces, London, T. Becket, 1773, 2 Vols.

- Butcher, S. H., Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, London, 1902.
- Butler, Samuel, Characters, edited by A. R. Waller, Cambridge, University Press, 1908.
- Butler, Samuel, Miscellaneous Poetry and Prose, edited by Rene Lamar, Cambridge, University Press, 1928.
- Callières, François de, Histoire Poétique de la Guerre Nouvellement déclarée entre les Anciens et les Modernes, Paris, 1688.
- Calmet, Augustin, Dissertation sur la Poesie et la Musique des Anciens, Amsterdam, David Paul Marret, 1723.
- Carey, Henry, The Honest Yorkshire-Man, Dublin, Thomas Wilkinson, 1736.
- Carey, Henry, Poems, edited by Frederick T. Wood, London, The Scholartis Press, 1930.
- Carter, Elizabeth, A Series of Letters between Mrs. Elizabeth Carter and Miss Catherine Talbot from the Year 1741 to 1770, London, J. Rivington, 1808, 2 Vols.
- Chambers, E. K., The Elizabethan Stage, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923, 4 Vols.
- Cibber, Colley, An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber, Comedian, London, J. Watts, 1740.
- Cibber, Colley, The Double Gallant: or, The Sick Lady's Cure, London, B. Lintott, 1707.
- Clinton-Baddeley, V. C., Words for Music, Cambridge, University Press, 1941.
- A Collection of Several Poems by Several Hands, London, J. Dodsley, 1770, 6 Vols.
- Collier, Jeremy, Essays upon Several Moral Subjects, London, R. Saire, 1697.
- Collier, Jeremy, Mr. Collier's Dissuasive from the Playhouse; in a Letter to a Person of Quality, London, R. Saire, 1703.
- Collier, Jeremy, A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage, together with the Sense of Antiquity upon this Argument, London, S. Keble, 1698.

- Congreve, William, Amendment of Mr. Collier's False and Imperfect Citations, London, J. Tonson, 1698.
- Congreve, William, Works, London, J. Tonson, 1710, 3 Vols.
- Cooper, Anthony Ashley, 3rd Lord Shaftesbury, Characteristics, 4th edition, London, 1727, 3 Vols.
- Cooper, John Gilbert, The Power of Harmony: a Poem, London, 1745.
- Cowper, William, Correspondence, edited by Thomas Wright, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1904, 4 Vols.
- Cowper, William, Poetical Works, edited by H. S. Milford, London, Oxford University Press, 1934.
- Coxe, William, Anecdotes of George Frederick Handel, London, J. Bulmer, 1799.
- Cumberland, Richard, The West Indian, London, W. Griffin, 1771.
- Cunningham, Robert, N., Peter Anthony Motteux, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1933.
- Dacier, Mme., Aristotle's Art of Poetry, [translated from the French] London, Daniel Brown, 1705.
- D'Anvers, Caleb, The Craftsman, London, 1726-1750.
- D'Avenant, Sir William, Dramatic Works, Edinburgh, William Paterson, 1873, 6 Vols.
- Defoe, Daniel, Augusta Triumphans, or the Way to make London the most Flourishing City in the Universe, London, J. Roberts, 1729.
- Defoe, Daniel, Street-Robberies Consider'd, London, J. Roberts, 1728.
- Delany, Patrick, Observations upon Lord Orrery's Remarks, London, W. Reeve, 1754.
- Delany, Mary, The Autobiography and Correspondence, edited by Lady Llanover, London, Richard Bentley, 1861, 3 Vols.
- Dennis, John, The Comical Gallant: or, The Amours of Sir John Falstaffe, London, A. Baldwin, 1702.
- Dennis, John, Critical Works, edited by Edward Niles Hooker, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1939, 2 Vols.

- Dennis, John, Gibraltar: or, The Spanish Adventure, London, William Turner, 1705.
- Dennis, John, Iphigenia. A Tragedy, London, Richard Parker, 1700.
- Dennis, John, Rinaldo and Armida, London, Jacob Tonson, 1699.
- Dent, Edward J., Foundations of English Opera, Cambridge, University Press, 1928.
- Draper, John W., "Aristotelian 'Mimesis' in Eighteenth-century England," Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XXXVI, No. 3, September 1920, pp. 372-400.
- Draper, John W., Eighteenth-Century Aesthetics, Heidelberg, Carl Winters, 1931.
- Draper, John W., "Poetry and Music in Eighteenth-Century Aesthetics," Englische Studien, LXVII, 1932, pp. 70-85.
- Dryden, John, Works, edited by Sir Walter Scott, revised George Saintsbury, Edinburgh, William Paterson, 1883, 18 Vols.
- Dubos, L'Abbé, Critical Reflexions on Poetry, Painting, and Music [1719] translated by Thomas Nugent, London, John Nourse, 1748, 3 Vols.
- Duffet, Thomas, Psyche Debauch'd, London, John Smith, 1678.
- D'Urfey, Thomas, The Campaigners, London, A. Baldwin, 1698.
- D'Urfey, Thomas, The English Stage Italianiz'd, in a New Dramatic Entertainment, called Dido and Aeneas: or Harlequin, A Butler, A Pimp, A Minister of State, Generalissimo, and Lord High Admiral, dead and alive again, and at last crown'd King of Carthage, by Dido, London, A. Moore, 1727.
- D'Urfey, Thomas, The Two Queens of Brentford: or, Bayes no Poetaster, London, William Chetwood, 1721.
- D'Urfey, Thomas, Wit and Mirth: or, Pills to Purge Melancholy, London, J. Tonson, 1719-1720, 6 Vols.
- Estcourt, Richard, Prunella, an Interlude Perform'd in The Rehearsal, London, Bernard Lintott, [1708].

- Etherege, George, The Man of Mode; or, S^r Fopling Flutter, London, 1676.
- Evelyn, John, Diary, edited by Austin Dobson, London, Macmillan and Co., 1906, 3 Vols.
- Farquhar, George, Love and a Bottle, London, Richard Standfast, 1699.
- Faustina; or, The Roman Songstress, London, J. Roberts, [1726.]
- Feign'd Friendship; or, The Mad Reformer, London, Daniel Brown, [1699.]
- Field, Nathaniel, Amends for Ladies: a Comedie, London, 1618.
- Fielding, Henry, The Author's Farce, and the Pleasures of the Town, London, 1730.
- Fielding, Henry, The Covent-Garden Journal, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1915, 2 Vols.
- Fielding, Henry, Pasquin. A Dramatick Satire on the Times, London, J. Watts, 1736.
- Finny, G. F., "Ecstasy and Music in Seventeenth-Century England," Journal of the History of Ideas, VIII, April 1947, pp. 153-186.
- Flood, W. H. Grattan, "The Beggar's Opera and Its Composers," Music and Letters, III, No. 4, October 1922, pp. 402-406.
- Flower, Sir Newman, Georg Frideric Handel, revised edition, London, Cassell and Co., 1947.
- Fontenelle, Bernard le Bovier de, A Discourse concerning the Antients and Moderns, translated by John Hughes, London, J. Darby, 1719.
- Fontenelle, Bernard le Bovier de, A Plurality of Worlds, translated into English by Mr. Glanvil, London, 1695.
- Fox, George, Journal, revised edition by John L Nickalls, Cambridge, University Press, 1952.
- Garrick, David, The Clan destine Marriage, London, T. Becket, 1766.

- Gay, John, The Beggar's Opera, London, John Watts, 1728.
- Gay, John, Three Hours after Marriage, London, 1717.
- Gay, John, Trivia, or the Art of Walking the Streets of London, London, Bernard Lintott, 1716.
- Gay, John, The What d'ye Call It, London, Bernard Lintott, 1715.
- Gerard, Alexander, An Essay on Taste, London, A. Millar, 1759.
- Gibbs, Adam, The Players Scourge, or a Detection of the Ranting Profanity and Regnant Impiety of Stage-Plays, Edinburgh, 1757.
- Gildon, Charles, The Complete Art of Poetry, Dialogue II, [1718], reprinted in Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century, edited by William Higley Durham, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1915.
- Gildon, Charles, The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton, London, Robert Gosling, 1710.
- Gladding, Bessie A., "Music as a Social Force during the English Commonwealth and Restoration (1649-1700)," Musical Quarterly, XV, No. 4, October 1929, pp. 506-521.
- Godwin, William, An Enquiry concerning Political Justice, London, G. Robinson, 1793, 2 Vols.
- Gordon, John, A New Estimate of Manners and Principles, Cambridge, J. Bentham, 1760.
- The Gospel Magazine, or Treasury of Divine Knowledge: designed to promote Experimental Religion, edited by A. M. Toplady, London, 1774-1783.
- Granville, George, Lord Lansdowne, Works in Verse and Prose, London, J. Tonson, 1732, 2 Vols.
- Gregory, John, A Comparative View of the State and Faculties of Man with those of the Animal World, London, J. Dodsley, 1766.
- The Guardian, London, J. Nichols, 1789, 2 Vols.
- Hamilton, Anthony, Memoirs of Count Grammont, edited by Sir Walter Scott, London, Chatto and Windus, 1876.

- Handel, George Frideric, Letters, edited by Erich H. Muller, London, Cassell and Company, 1935.
- Harris, James, Miscellanies, 4th edition, London, C. Nourse, 1783, 4 Vols.
- Harris, James, Three Treatises, 4th edition, London, John Nourse, 1765.
- Hawkins, Sir John, An Account of the Institution and Progress of the Academy of Ancient Music, London, 1770.
- Hawkins, Sir John, A General History of the Science and Practice of Music, London, T. Payne, 1776, 5 Vols.
- Hayes, William, Remarks on Mr. Avison's Essay on Musical Expression, London, 1753.
- Haym, Nicola, The British Treasury, being Cabinet the First of our GREEK and ROMAN Antiquities of all Sorts, London, 1719-1720, 2 Vols.
- Haywood, Eliza, Epistles for the Ladies, London, T. Gardiner, 1749-1750, 2 Vols.
- Hill, Aaron, The Plain Dealer, London, A Bettesworth, 1730, 2 Vols.
- Hill, Aaron, The Prompter, London, J. Peele, 1734-1736.
- Hill, Aaron, Rinaldo, London, Thomas Howlatt, 1711.
- Holland, A. K., Henry Purcell, London, George Bell and Sons, 1932.
- Home, Henry, Lord Kames, Elements of Criticism, Edinburgh, A. Kincaid, 1774, 2 Vols.
- Hooker, Edward Niles, "The Discussion of Taste, from 1750 to 1770, and the New Trends in Literary Criticism," Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XLIX, No. 2, June 1934, pp. 577-592.
- Hughes, John, Poems on Several Occasions, London, J. Tonson, 1735, 2 Vols.

- Hughes, William, The Efficacy and Importance of Musick, London, Samuel Mountfort, 1749.
- Hughes, William, Remarks upon Church Musick, Worcester, R. Lewis, 1763.
- Hume, David, Essays, Literary, Moral and Political, London, Alexander Murray and Son, 1870.
- Hutcheson, Francis, An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue, London, J. Darby, 1725.
- Jacob, Hildebrand, Of the Sister Arts, London, William Lewis, 1734.
- Jago, Richard, Poems, Moral and Descriptive, London, 1784.
- Johnson, Samuel (of Cheshire), Hurlothrumbo; or, The Super-Natural, London, J. Jones, 1729.
- Johnson, Dr. Samuel, Lives of the English Poets, London, Oxford University Press, 1946, 2 Vols.
- Johnson, Dr. Samuel, The Rambler, London, J. Payne, 1752, 6 Vols.
- Johnson, Dr. Samuel, Rasselas, The Prince of Abissinia, London, W. Johnston, 1759, 2 Vols.
- Jones, Sir William, Works, London, J. Robinson, 1799, 6 Vols.
- Jortin, John, A Letter concerning the Music of the Ancients, printed with the 2nd edition of Charles Avison's Essay on Musical Expression, London, C. Davis, 1753.
- The Ladies Library, edited by Richard Steele, London, 1714.
- Lampe, John Frederick, The Art of Musick, London, C. Corbett, 1740.
- Lang, Paul Henry, Music in Western Civilization, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941.
- Law, William, The Absolute Unlawfulness of the Stage-Entertainment, London, 1726.
- Lawrence, W. J., "Marionette Operas," Musical Quarterly, X, 1924, pp. 236-243.

- Lawrence, W. J., "Music and Song in the Eighteenth-Century Theatre," Musical Quarterly, 11, 1, January 1916, pp. 67-75.
- Locke, John, Some Thoughts concerning Education, London, A. and J. Churchill, 1693.
- Locke, Matthew, Observations upon an Essay to the Advancement of Musick, London, W. G., 1672.
- Locke, Matthew, Modern Church Musick, Pre-accus'd Censur'd and Obstructed in its Performance before His Majesty, London, 1666.
- Lockman, John, A Discourse on Operas, London, G. Woodfall, 1747.
- Lockman, John, Rosalinda: A Musical Drama ... to which is prefixed, An Inquiry into the Rise and Progress of OPERAS and ORATORIOS, with some Reflections on Lyric Poetry and Music, London, W. Strahan, 1740.
- Lovejoy, A. O., "'Nature' as an Aesthetic Norm," Modern Language Notes, XLII, 1927, pp. 444-450.
- Lovejoy, A. O., "'Pride' in Eighteenth-Century Thought," Modern Language Notes, XXXVI, 1921, pp. 31-37.
- Lynch, Francis, The Independent Patriot: or, Musical Folly, London, J. Watts, 1737.
- Maclean, Kenneth, John Locke and English Literature of the Eighteenth Century, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1936.
- Mainwaring, John, Memoirs of the Life of the Late George Frederic Handel, London, J. Dodsley, 1760.
- Malcolm, Alexander, A Treatise of Musick, Edinburgh, 1721.
- Malcolm, James Peller, Anecdotes of the Manners and Customs in London, during the Eighteenth Century, London, Longman, Hurst, 1808.
- Marcello, Benedetto, "Il Teatro alla Moda," 1720, translated by Reinhard G. Pauly for The Musical Quarterly. Part I: XXXIV, July 1948, pp. 371-403. Part II: XXXV, January 1949, pp. 85-105.
- Maritain, Jacques, The Range of Reason, London, Geoffrey Bles, 1953, p. 19.

- Mason, William, Essays Historical and Critical on English Church Music, York, W. Blanchard, 1795.
- Maxwell, J. C., "Charles Gildon and the Quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns," Review of English Studies, New Series, I, No.1, January 1950, pp. 55-57.
- Miller, James, Harlequin-Horace: or, The Art of Modern Poetry, London, Lawton Gilliver, 1731.
- Milton, John, Areopagitica, London, 1644.
- Milton, John, English Poems, London, Oxford University Press, 1948.
- Morley, Thomas, A Plaine and easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke, Shakespeare Association Facsimile No. 14, London, Oxford University Press, 1937.
- Motteux, Peter Anthony, Arsinoe, Queen of Cyprus, London, J. Tonson, 1705.
- Motteux, Peter Anthony, Love's Triumph, London, J. Tonson, 1708.
- Motteux, Peter Anthony, The Temple of Love, London, J. Tonson, 1706.
- Motteux, Peter Anthony, Thomyris, Queen of Scythia, London, J. Tonson, 1707.
- Myers, Robert Manson, Early Moral Criticism of Handelian Oratorio, Williamsburg, Manson Park Press, 1947.
- Newton, John, Messiah: Fifty Expository Discourses on the Series of Scriptural Passages, which form the Subject of the Celebrated Oratorio of Handel, London, 1786, 2 Vols.
- Nicoll, Allardyce, Eighteenth-Century Drama, Cambridge, University Press, 1927, 2 Vols.
- North, Roger, Memoirs of Musick, edited by Edward F. Rimbault, London, George Bell, 1846.
- North, Roger, The Musicall Grammarian, edited by Hilda Andrews, London, Humphrey Milford, 1925.

- Farry, C. Hubert H., "The Music of the Seventeenth Century,"
The Oxford History of Music, (Vol. III), London, Oxford
University Press, 1938.
- Pepusch, J.C., A Short Treatise on Harmony, London, J.
Watts, 1730.
- Pepys, Samuel, Diary, edited by H. B. Wheatley, London,
George Bell and Sons, 1904-1905, 8 Vols.
- Ferrault, Charles, Parallèles des Anciens et des Modernes,
Paris, 1688.
- Ferrault, Charles, Le Siècle de Louis le Grand, Paris, 1688.
- Philips, Ambrose, The Distress'd Mother, London, S. Buckley,
1712.
- Pilkington, Letitia, Memoirs, London, R. Griffiths, 1748-1750,
3 Vols.
- Pope, Alexander, An Essay on Criticism, London, 1711.
- Pope, Alexander, Memoirs of the Extraordinary Life, Works,
and Discoveries of Martinus Scriblerus, Dublin, George
Faulkner, 1741.
- Pope, Alexander, The New Dunciad: as it was found in the
Year 1741, London, T. Cooper, 1742.
- Pope, Alexander, Prose Works, edited by Norman Ault, Oxford,
Shakespeare Head Press, 1936.
- Prynne, William, Histrio-Mastix, The Players Scourge, London,
printed by A. E., 1633.
- Purcell, Henry, Ode Composed for the Anniversary of St.
Cecilia's Day, 1692, edited by Edward Rimbault, London,
1848.
- Raguenet, L'Abbé, A Comparison between the French and Ital-
ian Musick and Opera's, London, William Lewis, 1709.
- Ralph, James, The Fashionable Lady; or, Harlequin's Opera,
London, J. Watts, 1730.
- A Representation of the Impiety and Immorality of the English
Stage, London, J. Nutt, 1704.

- Robertson, Thomas, An Inquiry into the Fine Arts, London, W. Strahan, 1784.
- Rosenfeld, Sybil, "The Restoration Stage in Newspapers and Journals, 1660-1700," Modern Language Review, XXX, October, 1935, pp. 445-459.
- Rowe, Nicholas, The Tragedy of Jane Shore, London, B. Lintott, 1714.
- Rymer, Thomas, A Short View of Tragedy, London, Richard Baldwin, 1693.
- Saint-Evremond, Charles de Saint Denis, Seigneur de, Mixt Essays, London, Timothy Goodwin, 1685.
- Saintsbury, George, A History of English Criticism, London, Thomas Blackwood, 1911.
- Saintsbury, George, Loci Critici, London, Ginn and Co., 1903.
- Salmon, Thomas, An Essay to the Advancement of Musick, London, J. Macock, 1672.
- Salmon, Thomas, A Proposal to Reform Musick, in Perfect and Mathematical Proportions, London, John Lawrence, 1688.
- Scheffer, John D., "The Idea of Decline in Literature and the Fine Arts in Eighteenth-century England," Modern Philology, XXXIV, No. 2, November 1936, pp. 155-178.
- Scholes, Percy A., The Oxford Companion to Music, 7th edition, London, Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Schueler, Herbert M., "'Imitation' and 'Expression' in British Music Criticism in the Eighteenth Century," Musical Quarterly, XXXIV, No. 4, October 1948, pp. 544-566.
- Sécretan, C. F., The Life and Times of Robert Nelson, London, John Murray, 1860.
- See and Seem Blind; or, a Critical Dissertation on the Publick Diversions, London, 1732.
- Shadwell, Thomas, Works, edited by Montague Summers, London, The Fortune Press, 1927, 5 Vols.
- Smith, Adam, Essays on Philosophical Subjects, London, T. Cadell, 1795.

- Smith, Adam, The Wealth of Nations, London, W. Strahan, 1776,
2 Vols.
- Smith, D. Nichol, Eighteenth-Century Essays on Shakespeare,
Glasgow, 1903.
- Smith, Edmund, Phaedra and Hippolitus, London, Bernard Lintott,
1707.
- Smith, Henry, The Princess of Parma, London, Joseph Wilde, 1699.
- Smith, Leo, Music of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,
London, J. Dent, 1931.
- Smollett, Tobias, The Expedition of Humphry Clinker, London,
W. Johnson, 1771, 3 Vols.
- Southerne, Thomas, Works, London, J. Tonson, 1713.
- The Spectator, edited by G. Gregory Smith, London, J. M.
Dent, 1897-98, 8 Vols.
- The Stage the High Road to Hell, London, W. Nicoll, 1767.
- Stanhope, Philip Dormer, 4th Lord Chesterfield, Letters to
his Son, London, J. Dodsley, 1774, 2 Vols.
- Steele, Richard, The Funeral: or, Grief a-la-Mode, London,
T. Johnson, 1721.
- Steele, Richard, Poetical Miscellanies, second edition,
London, Jacob Tonson, 1727.
- Steele, Richard, The Tender Husband: or, The Accomplish'd
Fools, London, Jacob Tonson, 1705.
- Steele, Richard, The Theatre and The Anti-Theatre, edited
by John Nichols, London, J. Nichols, 1791.
- Streatfeild, R. A., "Handel, Rolli, and Italian Opera in
London in the Eighteenth Century," Musical Quarterly,
III, No. 3, July 1917, pp. 428-445.
- Swift, Jonathan, Correspondence, edited by F. Elrington
Ball, London, George Bell and Sons, 1910-1914, 6 Vols.
- Swift, Jonathan, Journal to Stella, edited by George A.
Aitken, London, Methuen and Co., 1901.

- Swift, Jonathan, Poems, edited by Harold Williams, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1937, 3 Vols.
- Swift, Jonathan, Prose Works, edited by Temple Scott, London, George Bell and Co., 1897-1908, 12 Vols.
- Swift, Jonathan, A Tale of a Tub and The Battle of the Books, London, John Nutt, 1704.
- Swift, Jonathan, Works, edited by Sir Walter Scott, Edinburgh, Archibald Constable and Co., 1814, 19 Vols.
- Swiney, Owen, Camilla, London, Jacob Tonson, 1709.
- Swiney, Owen, Pyrrhus and Demetrius, London, Jacob Tonson, 1709.
- The Tatler, London, Rivington, Marshall, and Bye, 1789, 4 Vols.
- Temple, Sir William, An Essay on Ancient and Modern Learning, and On Poetry, edited by J. E. Spingarn, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1909.
- Temple, Sir William, Miscellanea, Part III, edited by Jonathan Swift, London, Benjamin Tooke, 1701.
- Tenison, Thomas, A Letter from Several Members of the Society for Reformation of Manners, London, 1704.
- Theobald, Lewis, The Censor, London, Jonas Brown, 1717.
- Thornton, Bonnell, An Ode on St. Caecilia's Day, London, T. Becket, 1763.
- Thrale, Hester Lynch, Thraliana: the Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale, later Mrs. Piozzi, edited by Katherine C. Balderston, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1742, 2 Vols.
- Trapp, Joseph, Lectures on Poetry, translated from the Latin, London, C. Hitch, 1742.
- Turner, William, Sound Anatomiz'd ... to which is added A Discourse, concerning the Abuse of Musick, London, William Pearson, 1724.
- Twining, Thomas, Aristotle's Treatise on Poetry ... and Two Dissertations, on Poetical, and Musical Imitation, London, Payne and Son, 1789.
- Villiers, George, Duke of Buckingham, The Rehearsal, edited by Montague Summers, Stratford-upon-Avon, Shakespeare Head Press, 1914.

- Vines, Sherard, The Course of English Classicism, London, The Hogarth Press, 1930.
- Wallis, Dr. John, "The Strange Effects reported of Music in former Times," The Philosophical Transactions to the End of the Year 1700, abridged by John Lowthorpe, London, 1705, 3 Vols.
- Walpole, Horace, Letters, edited by Mrs. Paget Toynbee, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1903-1905, 16 Vols.
- Ward, Edward, A Compleat and Humorous Account of all the Remarkable Societies and Clubs in the Cities of London and Westminster, London, Joseph Collier, 1745.
- Ward, Edward, A Seasonable Reproof, Dublin, George Faulkner, 1736.
- Warton, Joseph, On the Genius and Writings of Pope, London, 1756.
- Webb, Daniel, Observations on the Correspondence between Poetry and Music, London, J. Dodsley, 1769.
- Wellek, Rene, "The Parallelism between Literature and the Arts," English Institute Annual, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942.
- Wesley, John, Extract of John Wesley's Journal from 17 June 1758 to 5 May 1760, Bristol, William Pine, 1764.
- Whitney, Lois, Primitivism and the Idea of Progress, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1934.
- Willey, Basil, The Eighteenth-Century Background, 3rd impression, London, Chatto and Windus, 1949.
- The Woman of Taste: Occasion'd by a Late Poem, entitled The Man of Taste, London, 1733.
- Works of the English Poets, edited by Samuel Johnson and Alexander Chalmers, London, J. Johnson, 1810, 21 Vols.
- Wotton, William, A Defense of the Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning, London, T. Goodwin, 1705.
- Wotton, William, Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning, London, J. Leake, 1694.

