

England and, considering their lackluster support for Hartlib and his associates, he finds merit in this. Finally, he disputes Richard Popkin's association of the Hartlib circle with a "third force" in seventeenth-century thought, neither rational nor empiricist, but combining elements of both, along with theosophy and biblical interpretation. Young argues that such a classification would have made no sense to Hartlib, Comenius and the others.

This work is a learned, valuable study of the world of early modern philosophy, education and, alchemy and I do recommend it.

John Hajdu Heyer, ed. *Lully Studies*. Foreword by James R. Anthony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. xx + 311 pp. Includes b & w illustrations, tables, and musical examples. \$64.95. Review by BRYAN N.S. GOOCH, UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA.

*Lully Studies*, a collection of eleven essays, edited by John Hajdu Heyer, is a welcome contribution to the growing body of research concerning Jean-Baptiste Lully (1632-1687), son of a Florentine miller, who after moving from Italy to France rose to become the dominator of French opera in Paris during the reign of Louis XIV, the premier exponent of baroque style in France, a major figure in the musical politics of his day, and a profound influence on his contemporaries and successors. It is a mark of Lully's centrality that his works were performed not only within but beyond France, often with lasting results on the composition of foreign composers—Henry Purcell, for example, is no exception. One simply cannot study late seventeenth-century music without bumping into Lully. Yet, as James R. Anthony notes in his Foreword, the Italian-born French master is now more honoured in study than in performance. What is particularly surprising about Lully's situation is that it carries on despite the wave of interest, particularly in the last few decades, in ba-

roque music in performance. Anthony's comments about the lack of performing editions—a new *Oeuvres complètes* is finally under way—offer a practical explanation, though one may still find some curiosity in the fact that more has not been done before now: as he notes, Henry Prunières' *Oeuvres complètes*, after nearly seven decades, despite its title, is incomplete. Anthony also offers a brief review of Lully scholarship, provides remarks on the essays in the current volume, and proffers a prescription for further research.

The essays, which follow a short Preface by Heyer containing observations complementing those of Anthony as well as a list of acknowledgements, deal with a wide variety of subjects, from matters biographical and stylistic to reaction and theatre design. The first, by Jérôme de la Grace, throws some remarkable new light on Lully's family and his early life, and is supplemented by a family tree and, as appendices, two Tuscan documents (a notarised deed of 1640 and the first will of the composer's father, Lorenzo [1655]). Lully's attempt to gild his somewhat humble origins is one issue here; others involve Lorenzo's increasing prominence and his son's prolonged time away from home and neglect of his Italian family, which could well explain his absence as a beneficiary in Lorenzo's second will of 1666. This essay, readable and thoroughly documented, reflects first-rate research and nicely declares the standard of the other pieces in the volume. It is followed by Patricia Ranum's elegant and detailed review of the issues leading up to and surrounding Lully's appointment as the court's *surintendant* of music in 1661, his attainment of the opera privilege in 1672 and his struggles with Charpentier and the Orléans faction, and his handling of—and challenges and limitations to—his artistic authority. The rise to power was one effort; maintenance of it was another, as Ranum clearly outlines.

Stylistic concerns are at the centre of the next three essays. Barbara Harris-Warwick's contribution, on phrase structure in the dance music, is generously illustrated with musical illustrations and provides clear evidence that in the thirteen

*tragédies en musique* written between 1673 and 1683, each containing, on average, fifteen dances (excluding *preludes* and *ritournelles*), only about twenty-five percent of the dances are marked by regular (or balanced) phrases (e.g., four measures followed by four more). Indeed, she argues, irregularity is the norm in the musical structure though not, as she describes in detail, the choreography and visual effect, the dance-designs clearly accommodating the apparent imbalance in the music. The potential effect of text and dramatic issues are also considered, and dances labeled *Air* and *Entrée* receive particular attention in the final part of the essay. Buford Norman's article on Philippe Quinault's libretto for *Isis* (1677) follows, pointing out the uniqueness of the work in view of current norms (the unity residing in the idea of freedom rather than in, say, a story of love or central action [see 62]) and the importance and nature of dances and *divertissements*. Norman offers a clear analysis of the plot and outlines some antecedents. *Isis*, musically and, obviously, visually stunning, just did not fit into the regular *tragédie lyrique* pattern and failed, as an entire work, to win the same measure of revivals as other works, though, as Norman points out, its music—some parts in particular—continued to be much admired. Lois Roscow in "The articulation of Lully's dramatic dialogue" concentrates on the overall structure of Lully's musical dialogue scenes, noting the ways in which he enhances points in the text and the degree of fluidity between declamation and aria, between through-composed and contained ("closed" [73]) sections. The discussion centres first on a detailed discussion of *Armide* (1686), Vi, providing considerable insight into the text (by Quinault), marked by *vers libres*, and the supporting melodic and harmonic structure of the music: Lully clearly aligns words and music as he works with an eye to overall dramatic effect. *Alceste* (1674), II. ii, also provokes enlightening comments, as does *Atys* (1676), II. ii, and Rosow also remarks on eighteenth-century score markings which reveal performance practice. The provision of musical examples and of the text of Vi of *Armide* is of particular assistance.

Carl B. Schmidt's "The Amsterdam editions of Lully's music: a bibliographical scrutiny with commentary" provides a well-placed change of emphasis. With so much detail about Lully's genius and his reputation in France before the mind, given the preceding papers, the reader is well-positioned to consider his stature, reflected here in publication beyond France. Noting the emergence of Amsterdam as a centre for music publication and artistic activity, particularly in the latter part of the seventeenth-century, Schmidt reviews existing scholarship concerning Lully's work and influence (including performance in cities outside France—London could have been mentioned as well) and then goes on to offer comments on the nature of Dutch interest in Lully's music which gave rise to the publication of *livrets* and of many of the compositions, before turning to a review of the relevant work of individual publishers, including Jean Philip Heus (excerpts from *Cadmus et Hermine* [1673], Lully's first real opera in 1682), Antoine Pointel (with substantial list of Lully's works), Pieter and Joan Blaeu (brothers), Amédée Le Chevalier, Estienne Roger, Pierre Mortier, and Michel Charles Le Cène. By 1720 there were some sixty Dutch editions. Along the way Schmidt discusses, for instance, printing processes (moveable type/engraving), details of editions, and the Mortier-Roger conflict. This careful work, as Schmidt suggests, makes possible further research, modern facsimiles, and so on. Appended to the text of the article is a splendidly detailed bibliography of editions, set out by printer, in chronological order, with locations of copies specified. This essay is—on its own—a major piece of fine, thorough scholarship.

The seventh piece, John S. Powell's "Pourquoi toujours des bergers?" Molière, Lully, and the pastoral *divertissement*" describes the role of the pastoral, including its conventions, as a source of comedy, and discusses, for instance *Le Sicilien, ou l'Amour peintre* (1667), a *comédie-ballet* containing a pastoral, *La Princesse d'Elide* (1664), with comic pastoral inserted (in *intermèdes*) in heroic drama, and *Les Amants magnifiques* (1670), with musical/dance *divertissements* (again in *intermèdes*). George

*Dindin* (1668) and *Psyche* (1671) also receive extensive comment, as does Lully's work with Quinault after the parting with Molière in 1672 (see 194 ff.). Indeed, as Powell so clearly outlines, the *divertissements* are not simply separable sections tipped into larger works for contrast or relief of tension but are integral to their enveloping musical and/or textual drama.

The next essay, by Catherine Cessac, concerns Sébastien de Brossard's presentation of *Alceste* at the Strasbourg Académie de Musique—probably in the mid-1690s (not later than 1698). She outlines Brossard's career: bibliophile, composer, and theorist, he was evidently a strong admirer of Lully—by virtue of his own admission and his copies and arrangements. She then goes on to provide, briefly, details of the emergence of *Alceste* in 1674 and Brossard's association with the Strasbourg Académie before turning to his arrangement of *Alceste*, a comparison between the Lully and Brossard scores (a full outline of Brossard's version is provided in Table 8.1), including comments on form, orchestration, allocation of solos, and the chorus. Once more, musical examples are ample and helpful. As Cessac notes in her conclusion, such treatment of Lully's work made it available for another audience, outside Paris, at least two decades after its première and, as an effort in itself, constitutes evidence of the continuing regard Lully's compositions would continue to sustain in many quarters.

What about the original venue (in Paris) for works like *Alceste*? That is precisely what Barbara Coeyman in the ninth paper, "Walking through Lully's opera theatre in the Palais Royal," seeks to explain. Granted his opera privilege in 1672, Lully in 1673 set about changing, with Carlo Vigarani (designer), the sometime court theatre into an opera house, for public diversion, offering *Alceste* as the opening work on 19 January 1674. The house survived until it burned down in 1763 (a bad year for the French, given the outcome of the Seven Years War). Coeyman gives the reader neatly arranged details of the location from its opening in 1641 as a theatre built for Cardinal Richelieu's Palais Cardinal through its modifications (installa-

tion of stage machinery) by Cardinal Mazarin in 1645 and further redevelopment by Molière in 1660 to Vigarani and Lully's rebuilding of 1673-74 (paid for by the King—see 221). Table 9.1 sets out Lully's premières and revivals in the house from 1674-1687. Architectural drawings by Vigarani (floor plan and site elevation, Plates 9.2 and 9.3) and other sources (including commentaries) offer a substantial basis for Coeyman's reconstruction which deals first with the exterior (see Plate 9.1—Israel Silvestre's front view, from an elevation, of the Palais Royal) and then with the interior, quite literally taking the reader on a guided tour of the building and providing details and relevant figures (measurements, etc.) along the way. The stage, with its flats, drops, machinery, etc., is given special attention, and further plates support the discussion. The result is that the reader gains a remarkable impression of the ambience of the place, the positioning of audience, orchestra, and cast (including singers and dancers), and the process and appearance of a production. A notable contribution to theatre history and to performance practice, Coeyman's essay is a happy blend of meticulous work and felicitous explanation.

The final two contributions take the reader—and Lully—into later centuries. Herbert Schneider's "Gluck and Lully" explores the relationship between the French baroque master and Gluck, the great operatic reformer of the eighteenth century, particularly in terms of the latter's Paris operas. There is, of course, a range of views on this subject, but Schneider is clear in his assertion that in Gluck is to be found, in the Paris period (1774-1779), the blending of Italian opera (*not* the reformation of it) with the traditions of the French *tragédie lyrique*, despite the gnashing of Piccinian teeth. Clearly, Gluck wanted a clear shift which would be sustainable (see 246-47), and the ground was apparently suitable for movement away from the *tragédie lyrique* after the Querelle des Bouffons, especially in the light of comments by the Abbé François Arnaud and Baron Grimm (see 247-48). Schneider records other views of the time and clearly establishes Gluck's position, especially regarding the

avoidance of dance parody and the integration of the chorus into the drama (253). Further, he stresses the blending of text, music, painting, architecture, and dance—it was the whole, as Alexander Pope would remark in another context (*Essay on Criticism*) that must impress. Schneider also gives particular attention to declamation and recitative, again citing critical views of, for instance, Claude-Joseph Dorat and François Arnaud, and arguing, with Patricia Howard, for Gluck's fluidity in moving from air to recitative to dance or chorus and in his balancing of drama and music (see 264). He then turns to Gluck's *Arnide* (1777) as a "paradigm" (264 ff.). With libretto by Quinault and Lullian echoes (especially in *da capo* structures—see 265-66), this work is the subject of some detailed comments which are followed by, for instance, a review of assessments of Gluck by Jacques Martine, Franz Liszt, and Hector Berlioz and of the Lully-Gluck relationship by Reynaldo Hahn. Had the chronological positions and careers of the two men—given their operatic sensitivities—been reversed, might one not have witnessed a similar result?

The final piece, by Manuel Couvreur—"Jean Ecorcheville's genealogical study of the Lully family and its influence on Marcel Proust"—explores not only the issue highlighted in its title but takes the reader into the rapidly shifting world of early twentieth-century French musicology where the reforming (and young radical) interest, stimulated by, for instance Romain Rolland and developments in German musical study, lay in the direction of old as well as new French music and also the international scene. In particular, Rolland wrote a dissertation on early opera (pre-Lully and Scarlatti), and among his protégées were two men, Ecorcheville and Henry Prunières, both concerned with seventeenth-century studies, the former writing on musical aesthetics from Lully to Rameau (1690-1730) (see 274). *Mercur musical* (founded 1905) offered a forum for fresh commentary about both early and new music, while in 1903 Proust contributed to *La Figaro* "Musique d'aujourd'hui, échos d'autrefois" (274-75). The new group gained ground, and by 1912 Ecorcheville was Presi-

dent of the Société internationale de musique, and the *Bulletin François de la S.I.M.* would last until 1914 (275). Couvreur notes the interest in Lully (for example, research by Prunières and Lionel de la Laurencie), including the hilarious spoof in April, 1912—the stunning news (with documentation to support the joke) in *Revue musicale* ... that Lully was really French; even Prunières joined the fun with the release of “original” Florentine evidence (see 278–79). The first decade had seen performances of some of Lully’s works, and Hahn echoed Lullian style, Couvreur notes, in the choruses for his *Esther* (1905) (279), a work which Proust liked and mentioned in both *Contre Sainte-Beuve* and *A la recherche du temps perdu*, though he used Lully’s name only once in *Un amour de Swann* (280). Jean de La Fontaine’s satiric attack on Lully in *Le Florentin* raised the spectre of Lully as a sodomite, while Rolland (noting Lully’s stinginess and pleasures in shows of wealth), Prunières, and La Laurencie focused on more serious characterisations, not neglecting Lully’s blemishes (281). That Proust would be interested in the social rise of this Florentine miller’s son is, Couvreur suggests, hardly surprising, and Proust’s curiosity many have been further piqued by Ecorcheville’s article on Lully’s descendants and his provision of a family tree. Couvreur goes on to discuss those descendants and the possible ways in which Proust may have been become acquainted with Lully-linked names, also suggesting explanations for Proust’s use of certain names prior to Ecorcheville’s release of his genealogy, noting the author’s dismissal of both Rolland and Prunières (283). What develops is essentially an exploration of Proust’s use of names of people and places; the discussion does not bear, really, on Lully and his work but on the surviving family lines—demonstrating, in a way, a particular kind of interest in Lully, of course, and, in Proust’s case in particular, in social mobility and the consequences of marriages affluent and above rank and otherwise. Couvreur does not assert a clear influence of the Ecorcheville genealogy on Proust but suggests that it is difficult to refute a connection with the issues raised in *A la recherche du temps perdu* (288). This



remarkably thoughtful essay—soundly researched—opens further doors for the inquisitive Lullian scholar and will be of central interest to Proust specialists as well. It is followed by a list of works cited in the volume and by an index.

Offering, then, major essays—all top-flight, superbly documented, and well-written—Heyer's *Lully Studies* stands not only as a superlative addition to existing work on the brilliant if sometimes despotic and always intriguing Caesar of the Palais Royal, but as an invitation to further research and to the encouragement, indeed, of performance of much more of Lully's enormously significant repertoire. It is admirable, certainly, to know about a great composer and to analyse the works, to study technique, style, and influence; ultimately, though, the music must be brought to life in church, opera house, or concert hall. If the genius is there, silence is unjustified.