

the letters of Federico Pendasio (1525–1603) to Giovanni Francesco Arrivabene (b. 1515) and of Alfonso Chacón (1530–1599) to Camillo Paleotti, both translated by Sylvia Gaspari. A Spanish Dominican scholar in Rome and Greco-Roman classicist, Chacón relates the grotesques to the exotic art brought by the military campaigns of the Roman empire: "... when [the Romans] returned victorious from various ventures on land and sea, they also liked to paint their residences with fantastical animals and monsters that were found in the conquered countries, that in Rome were new ... and enticed by the desire of this variety, the painters began (with their freedom and that of the poets) to add falsity to the truth, painting various fantasies, such as men with serpents for arms and other limbs, and fantastical acts" (574).

Enhanced by impeccable illustrations and abounding in intriguing research, *Paradigms of Renaissance Grotesques* is a noteworthy contribution to the study of Renaissance culture in the aftermath of the Reformation. Though inevitably part of a particular intellectual configuration, this edited collection owes more to Italian Renaissance experts than to the heterogenous group who studied the grotesques, for instance, in Renaissance Spain. Yet the goals, ambitions, and standards so eloquently outlined in this edited collection will unquestionably spur other scholars on to develop the topic of *grotesche*.

Stephen Rose. *Musical Authorship from Schütz to Bach*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019. xvi + 243 pp. + 14 b/w illus. with 2 tables and 12 music examples. \$99.99. Review by TIM CARTER, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL.

Who is the "author" of a musical work? It will seem an odd question for those accustomed to listening to "Beethoven's" Fifth Symphony or "Verdi's" *La traviata*, although anyone following Roland Barthes' notion of the "death of the author" (or Foucault's nuancing of it) will be aware of its undertones. As so often happens, music is also a special case given that for the most part it lives and dies in the moment of performance. So one might better modify the question: What constitutes a musical work? Or perhaps better: What work is

required to produce something that might or might not come to be called a musical work?

Stephen Rose focuses on a period when these issues came to a head in particularly intriguing ways. He is concerned with the efforts of “German” Kapellmeisters from Heinrich Schütz (1585–1672) to Johann Sebastian Bach (1685–1750) to establish their position as music-makers in artistic rather than artisanal terms—an issue that will be familiar to art historians, although Rose hardly pursues the comparison—and as the creators of something more than just singular musical events involving the performance forces under their charge. They did so by way of changing concepts of creativity (the subject of Rose’s Chapter 1); by inserting themselves within—but distinguishing themselves from—emerging notions of a musical canon (Chapters 2–3); by adopting various strategies to claim ownership of their work(s) (Chapter 4); by seeking to steer the course of artistic fashion (Chapter 5); and by asserting some manner of control over performers whose own musical egos might otherwise hold sway (Chapter 6). Inevitably, Rose’s arguments turn on the developing nature of the musical marketplace in German-speaking lands. And no less inevitably, the issues tend to hinge on so-called print culture and its various strengths, weaknesses, threats, and opportunities in particular, but not only, so far as music was concerned.

Rose is on familiar ground here given his prior distinguished work in the field, and he navigates it with great aplomb. He is particularly strong on how composers sought to control the market for their wares by way of printing and publishing. He is concerned less with the musical content of their editions than with their so-called paratexts: elaborate title pages, engraved portraits of the “author,” dedications and encomia, and the like. He also discusses how composers and their printers sought to assure consumers of the authority and authenticity of these editions—even down to Schütz’s use of paper with a monogrammed watermark—and to protect their profits by way of privileges. Like many of us, however, he falls at the hurdle of the economics of printing, given how little information seems to survive in the archives. In 1598, Johann Steuerlein claimed that printers typically charged one thaler for each sheet of music (139), which for a standard set of five quarto partbooks would amount to 15 or 30 thalers (22½ or 45

florins) depending on whether the “sheet” was counted as both sides or just one. How this might square with the 600 florins that Andreas Hammerschmidt claimed as his expenses for printing his *Kirchen- und Tafelmusik* in 1662 (138)—even granting that this was a more complex edition—is anyone’s guess.

Rose tries to view these issues in the context of what he calls “early capitalism” (12), although the general lack of information in his book about the economics of the marketplace (even just concerning musicians’ salaries and the like) tends to weaken his case for a term that is itself somewhat problematic. Nor does he fully explain why music printing declined precipitously in the latter part of his period, reverting to a manuscript subculture, as it were, that had always operated for certain repertoires. It is clear from his discussion, however, that whatever system was in play, it generated significant anxieties. Composers feared for the fate of their music in terms of the threats of dissemination, criticism, plagiarism, and piracy to their professional standing and financial wellbeing. Patrons placed restrictions on the circulation of musical works created under their aegis and which they therefore felt they somehow owned. Institutions were apprehensive over the loss of musical traditions that granted some sense of permanence to an otherwise unstable social and political world. Consumers who browsed the music shelves of their local booksellers were often left alienated from works they could not possibly perform in any credible way. And two more fundamental anxieties undermined this neurotic musical world; first, musicians could too easily be accused of quackery (the subject of composer Johann Kuhnau’s satirical novel *Der musicalische Quack-Salber* published in 1700), and second, whether one read Plato or the Church Fathers it was clear that music was a dangerous art. How could one distinguish good works from bad? And to confront the elephant in the room in ways in which Rose does not—although it was acknowledged by many of his subjects—how could one assert the value of German music in the face of the Italian composers and performers who dominated significant parts of the market at the time? Not for nothing was the anti-hero of Kuhnau’s novel a German charlatan posing as an Italian virtuoso.

Plato’s ambivalence over the benefits of music for the well-ordered republic was extended by Augustine and Thomas Aquinas into no less

ambivalent arguments concerning the pleasures and perils of music for the Christian soul. The church ordinance issued in 1580 by Augustus, Elector of Saxony, sought to negotiate this minefield by setting strict limits on what those in charge of music in worship might do (164; with my editorial insertions):

They should diligently pay attention to the pastors, and earnestly ensure that they do not perform any of their own songs (should they be composers) or other new things. Instead, they should use pieces by old, outstanding composers who are experienced in this art, such as Josquin [des Prez; d. 1521], Clemens non Papa [d. 1555 or 1556] and Orlande de Lassus [d. 1594]. In particular, they should avoid songs that are based on dances or shameful tunes; instead they should use pieces that are dignified, stately and strong, and that will move the people to Christian devotion when sung in church.

Rose reads this as a statement of “Lutheran orthodoxy,” which is true, although in the face of the well-known pressures from the (Crypto-) Calvinists that Augustus was seeking to negate, one might construe it as a somewhat moderate position. That ordinance remained in notional force through much of the seventeenth century despite the efforts of composers to bring arguments against its utility and propriety, such as Christoph Schultze’s defense of musical innovation in 1643, and Kuhnau’s advocacy of flexibility in his *De juribus circa musicos ecclesiasticos* (1688).

Of course, both Augustine and Aquinas knew full well that to place any significant limits on music in church would force overcoming the wealth of Biblical and other statements in its favor. As Rose notes (181), Andreas Werkmeister was one of several composers who made the theological argument for musical innovation as a divine gift (in his case, in 1691):

Our dear forefathers exerted themselves to sing and play new songs to dear God. So we must not avoid this, especially as we see that God has given each and every musician always good and new inventions and ornaments. Who would be reluctant to use such good gifts to the glory of God?

The exhortation in the psalms that we should “sing unto the Lord a new song” was clear enough, although it could also be a convenient

excuse. Thus, when Adam Krieger applied for the position of *Kantor* at the Thomaskirche in Leipzig in 1657, he sought exemption from its typical teaching duties because his time would be better spent composing (45–46). Krieger's application failed, but later holders of that position were better able to navigate the change in status. As Kuhnau wrote in 1709, there were also civic benefits to take into account: it was important that “especially on feast days and during trade fairs, foreign visitors and distinguished men judge there is something good to hear in the main churches” (181). However, given that the “old” music advocated in the 1580 ordinance was purely vocal, the increasing presence of instrumentalists in the main Lutheran churches had already made the acceptance of “new” music a *fait accompli*. Kuhnau's successor, Johann Sebastian Bach, took full advantage of the situation precisely because, he wrote in 1730, “The state of music is quite different from what it was, since our artistry has increased very much, and the taste has changed astonishingly, and accordingly the former style of music no longer seems to please our ears” (loc. cit.).

Hence Rose is entirely correct to argue that the notion of what it meant to “make,” “create,” or “compose” music changed significantly during his period. But these issues probably played out differently across the various confessional divides in the German-speaking lands. The fact that his index has no entry for Calvinism on the one hand, and Catholicism on the other, seems to reflect a rather unusual blind spot in his coverage of a narrower topic than his title might suggest; in his Conclusion, he claims to have “exposed the rich complexities of Lutheran musical life between Schütz and Bach” (215)—as indeed he has—but Leipzig and Dresden were not Munich or, for that matter, Vienna. This is important not just because of the principle of *cuius regio, eius religio* and its institutional and devotional consequences, but also given the ways in which some music—and the attitudes associated with it—could cross boundaries that might otherwise seem less permeable. Rose observes (78–80) that the composer Johann Caspar Kerll (1627–1693) had a significant influence on composers up to Bach and even beyond, but does not engage with how his training and employment in a wholly Catholic environment might have affected matters.

Kerll is relatively unknown today—in part because a large number of his works have been lost—but his example reveals one last subtext that Rose could have brought more to the fore. He had a decent, though not stellar, musical career; however, he seems to have been a musicians' musician, often sought out as a teacher and as a source of musical models (so Pachelbel's and even Handel's music also make clear). Musical "authorship" was obviously a matter of public acknowledgment that would have a significant impact on a composer's career, income, and reputation. However, musicians then, as now, also operated within a relatively closed world with its own rules of association and behavior that might, in the end, be quite different from what was projected to patrons, employers, or even just society at large. Rose certainly does an outstanding job of identifying their performances—as it were—of identity in such broader spheres. But how Schütz, Bach, and others in between viewed these issues within their own particular domains may well be another story.

The Complete Works of John Milton. Volume XI: Manuscript Writings. William Poole, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. xiv + 473 pp. + 23 illus. \$175.00. Review by P.G. STANWOOD, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

This volume, the most recent addition to the Oxford University Press edition of John Milton's complete works in a proposed thirteen volumes, offers freshly transcribed and copiously annotated texts of two autograph manuscripts: "The Commonplace Book" (BL Add. MS 36354), and "Ideas for Dramas" (aka "Outlines for Tragedies") in the Trinity College, Cambridge manuscript (James R.3.4) [pp. 35–41]—well known also for the revised versions of *Lycidas* and other poems by Milton. The edition includes as well Milton's presentation inscriptions to Patrick Young, Royal Librarian, and to John Rouse, Bodley's Librarian. William Poole, the indefatigable and immensely scrupulous editor, provides as well an appendix descriptive of the lost Index Theologicus, supposed a part of the Commonplace Book, while another appendix illustrates the scribal characteristics of Milton's amanuenses. There is, finally, the single leaf of text on the theme of