



Antonella D'Ovidio's take on *Astianatte* shows more assurance in indicating the 'dramaturgy of interior conflict' that defines the musical portrayal of the male and female protagonists in this (compelling) opera. However, her conclusions, too, are teleological in naming 'stylistic prototypes' for later Jommellian operas, while rehearsing earlier observations made by Marita McClymonds and Daniel Hertz as regards, for instance, the role of the orchestra and the ruptures in the lyrical fabric through declamatory interjections. On the other hand, D'Ovidio unveils a fresh archival source from the criminal tribunal of the Roman governor, which details the fees of all personnel involved in the Teatro Argentina's 1740–1741 season, including Jommelli's.

The final contribution, by Francesca Menchelli-Buttini, refines earlier research on the connections between *Cajo Mario* and *Ifgenia* (see my article "Am I in Rome, or in Aulis?": Jommelli's *Cajo Mario* (1746) as Operatic *Capriccio*', *Eighteenth-Century Music* 13/1 (2016), 35–50). A comparative analysis of selected scenes helps the author shed light on subtle variations in the music-textual discourse of both operas, testifying to Jommelli's 'fantasy in reacting with great efficacy to commonplaces' (164). The author digs deep into the intertextual trove of Jommellian opera, discovering precedents for Marzia's address to the Roman Senate in *Cajo Mario* in Pradon's tragedy *Regulus* (1688) and that tragedy's earliest operatic adaptations, but I do not understand why Jommelli's *Attilio Regolo* (also for Rome, 1753) is omitted from the discussion. In addition, it is a pity that the recent literature on topics and *partimenti* is left untouched in these and previous analyses.

*Jommelliana* offers scholarly spectacle in the guise of primary-source discoveries, but the theatrical curtain on Jommelli's Roman playground remains half-closed, so to speak. The volume's sharp temporal-geographical focus should have inspired more adventurous forays into Roman cultural history, encompassing issues such as spectatorship, civic self-representation, the Grand Tour, antiquarian culture and mid-century neoclassicism (in which Alessandro Albani and his famous librarian-antiquarian, Johann Joachim Winckelmann, played no mean part), the agency of singers and impresarios (Giuseppe Polvini Faliconi is cited on page 25 as instigator of Jommelli's arrival in Rome, and that is about it) and so on. The volume's modest dimensions have precluded discussion of every opera Jommelli composed for Rome (though a complete list in table form would have been useful), but the omission of Jommelli's popular comic intermezzi – *Don Chicchibbio* (1741), *La cantata, e disfida di Don Trastullo* (1749) and *I rivali delusi* (1752) – is regrettable, given their later role in the *querelle des bouffons*, as is that of the enigmatic cantata *Armida* (1746), and of the operas *Cesare in Egitto* (1751) and *Talestri* (1751). May the story continue.

BRUNO FORMENT

[bruno.forment@hogent.be](mailto:bruno.forment@hogent.be)


*Eighteenth-Century Music* © Cambridge University Press, 2019  
doi:10.1017/S1478570618000374

EMILY H. GREEN AND CATHERINE MAYES, EDS

*CONSUMING MUSIC: INDIVIDUALS, INSTITUTIONS, COMMUNITIES, 1730–1830*

Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2017

pp. vii + 255, ISBN 978 1 580 46577 9

With a book that invites its reader to look beyond the content of printed artefacts and appreciate their paratexts, packaging and allure as desirable commodities, it seems only appropriate to start by perusing the volume's attractive cover. We are treated to a coloured reproduction of a print from 1786, showing a crowd outside the shop of the publisher and art dealer Artaria in Vienna. The portion of the image shown here is magnified to occupy the full front cover, but is only a detail of the original print, which is some twenty times bigger and boasts a panoramic view of the whole street. This zooming-in on the people flocking to Artaria's shop and gazing intently at the display (one impatient onlooker at the back, too far away to browse



comfortably, resorts to his opera glass) illustrates the editors' intended focus for the book. Both the short Introduction (only seven pages of text) and the volume's online supplement (an interview with co-editor Catherine Mayes, available at [consumingmusic.lib.utah.edu](http://consumingmusic.lib.utah.edu)) posit that this spectacle of window shopping and other practices to do with selling and publicizing music in this period have a story to tell about the consumers. Bringing to mind James H. Johnson's *Listening in Paris: A Cultural History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), which features on its cover Eugène Lami's drawing of a group of listeners, the cover of *Consuming Music* advertises this edited collection as proposing a similar shift of perspective: from a traditional musicological focus on music's production to a focus on its clientele.

Yet although the same broad questions about the clientele resound emphatically in the Introduction and back-cover blurb – who bought music? how did consumers' tastes take shape and how did those, in turn, shape the composition of music? (1) – the approaches surveyed in this book address them somewhat obliquely. Across the nine chapters, the consumer of music is almost never placed centre stage. There is no contribution dedicated, say, to an eighteenth-century collector of engraved portraits of musicians, to a depiction of concert-goers in literature of the time, or to the members of an institution such as the Viennese Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde. This is already evident from the book's four parts, all titled with verbs suggesting the agency and perspective of someone on the side of production rather than consumption, strictly speaking: *Selling Variety*, *Edifying Readers*, *Marketing the Mundane* and *Cultivating Communities*. The mismatch between the viewpoint implied in these headings and the verb chosen as the book's title is perhaps a residue of the conference at which most of the contributions collected here were first presented (*Consuming Music, Commodifying Sound, 1750–1850*, Yale University, 5–6 October 2012, organized by Emily H. Green and Erin Johnson-Williams). The conference, however, also gave space to histories told explicitly from the perspective of collectors, readers, performers and listeners (for a summary of the papers read there see the report by Catherine Mayes in this journal, 10/2 (2013), 314–316). In the book, the editors have evidently chosen to narrow the original focus, but this is not apparent from the volume's paratexts and packaging.

What is inside the package, then? Green's chapter, the first, sets the agenda. The perspective she proposes is a systemic blurring of boundaries between producers and consumers. Following this blueprint, the book explores music publishing and publicity c1730–1830, disrupting traditional distinctions between authors, publishers and purchasers of 'musical wares', from sheet music and theory books to celebrity singers and operatic experiences. For instance, Green discusses publishers as music's most conspicuous consumers in the late eighteenth century. Aside from practical advertising purposes, their catalogues could be read as displaying the publishers' own tastes as highly educated individuals selecting which music to buy (and resell), thus functioning as a model for customers with limited musical abilities or interests. Via these endless lists of printed music for sale, publishers portrayed themselves as – and encouraged others to be – consumers who 'are never finished buying music' (22). Further addressing the agency of music publishers, Steven Zohn uses the case of Germany's first journal of sheet music (issued by Telemann in 1728–1729) to highlight the close interdependence between producers and consumers in shaping the latter's musical experiences. Telemann's selection of pieces that aimed to balance agreeable instruction and diversion is a case in point, and consumers were encouraged to become part of the community of musicians featured in the miscellany. The journal called on subscribers to contribute their own compositions, and the less experienced were assisted in their first steps as musical authors with dedicated contrapuntal exercises. The overlap of producers and consumers was mostly aspirational, Zohn admits. But its promotion was an essential drive for early musical consumerism, one still evident today, say, in the urge YouTube users experience to upload their own musical efforts (however premature).

The Introduction makes an appeal for focusing on the widening market for arts and leisure between 1730 and 1830. Increased access to music practices for a growing pool of customers dictated new directions in the creation, packaging and distribution of musical goods, well before the age of mass consumption. An exploration of these makeovers can yield fresh perspectives on those consumers' experiences traditionally associated with the later nineteenth century and beyond. In one of the book's standout essays, Roger Mathew Grant recasts the invention of the metronome (patented in 1815) as the ultimate failure of a previous system



of deducing musical tempos from time signatures and note values. Examining how musical examples were included and glossed in books about music, Grant traces the increasing anxieties of eighteenth-century theorists in assuming a shared level of know-how from their readers. The later wide implementation of metronome markings, in this light, seems less a sudden statement of the composer's controlling authority (over the performer's shrinking freedom of interpretation), and more an 'event in the history of mediation' (102): the end of a century-long struggle to overcome the limits of a notation that relied heavily on previously acquired musical competencies. While other authors in the volume lament the paucity of documentary evidence available to track processes of consumption during this period, Grant's chapter suffers no such disadvantage. His subtle application of a media-studies approach to music's material cultures in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries proves that it is ultimately a matter of choosing sources wisely and finding creative ways to interrogate them.

A less successfully developed theme in the book is the attempt to map the interdependence of consumers and producers in shaping a 'mundane' musical style, by which the editors mean 'a simplification of music destined for a wide market' (5). Both Marie Sumner Lott and Catherine Mayes tackle repertoires that flooded publishers' catalogues in the early nineteenth century: collection of dances, popular tunes and chamber music designed to appeal to the performers themselves more than concert-hall listeners (hardly the majority of music's consumers in this period). Yet to generalize about consumers' musical abilities and infer what they may have found pleasant to play may be asking too much from score analysis. According to Lott, middle-class men valuing self-improvement saw string chamber music as an ideal leisure activity. It may be more problematic, however, to intimate that they shared the same level of technical proficiency or the taste for a stylistic 'middle ground [between the familiar and the progressive] during the early decades of musical Romanticism' (150; Lott's use of the term 'Romantic' is ambivalent, at times simply standing for 'early nineteenth century'). To explain commercial success as merely a result of this music's apparent lack of sophistication may also be voicing an anachronistic viewpoint. As Matthew Head reminds us in *Sovereign Feminine: Music and Gender in Eighteenth-Century Germany* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013), aesthetic hierarchies based on the notion of compositional progress began devaluing amateur-driven repertoires on a large scale only from later in the nineteenth century. Chopin's 1831 complaint that in Vienna 'only waltzes get printed' (quoted in Mayes's title), just as Schumann's 1834 opposition to inartistic creations or Liszt's 1835 condemnation of musicians as entertainers, belonged to an ongoing debate on the nature of the musical profession. The voices of these canonical composers have surely shaped traditional narratives of the history of music, but it would be misleading to read them as representing general attitudes on the part of consumers. Ease and musical repetitions by themselves were not necessarily experienced as a separate category from high art. (Lott's suggestive claim that – just as readers of novels – amateur quartet players were after the repeated pleasure of recurring structures could have benefited from an actual comparison of narrative strategies between the genres.) Trying a different approach, Glenda Goodman offers a rich and convincing contextual study of the musically unexceptional and its market in this period. Very much in the spirit of challenging artificial divisions, Goodman considers the consummate professional singer together with the amateur purchasing her songs, and shows how the former's celebrity became entangled with mundaneness in the attempt to engage effectively with a diverse pool of potential consumers.

If the book's thought-provoking stance is to look for the consumer in sources traditionally held to pertain to the producer, the closing chapter brings this approach further into focus. Retracing the commodification of opera c1830, Peter Mondelli depicts market trends as being shaped not by consumers' preferences, but by 'a capitalist dialectic of taste in which nobody really knew what anybody else wanted' (235). While Paris-based publisher Maurice Schlesinger strove 'to make the public want what he was selling', on the consumer's side, knowing what one ought to buy was a statement of status, of belonging to an imaginary community sharing similar values. No single agent could control, create or ultimately own such complex and highly networked 'expectations defined and redefined en masse' (235–236). This final point, towering from the volume's last page, invites reflections on what is likely to be our next scholarly challenge. I read it as an invitation to avoid organizing individuals according to typologies (or degrees) of control over musical commodities, as if these



historical agents deserved separate histories. Before the age of mass consumption, after all, categories such as that of composer, performer, publisher, promoter, spectator, listener or subscriber to music journals could easily overlap in the same individual. Even when they did not, their different interests and agendas intersected via the musical commodity. And it is in an archaeology of these encounters that musicologists may find an opportunity to retrace what Mondelli calls the ‘relational’ values of musical commodities (235) and the vicarious experiences of enjoying them.

FABIO MORABITO

[fabio.morabito@lincoln.ox.ac.uk](mailto:fabio.morabito@lincoln.ox.ac.uk)



*Eighteenth-Century Music* © Cambridge University Press, 2019  
doi:10.1017/S1478570618000386

ELLEN LOCKHART

*ANIMATION, PLASTICITY, AND MUSIC IN ITALY, 1770–1830*

Oakland: University of California Press, 2017

pp. xi + 218, ISBN 978 0 520 28443 2

About two-thirds of the way through Ellen Lockhart’s ambitious book, *Animation, Plasticity, and Music in Italy, 1770–1830*, appears an engraving depicting a blind youth bent over two geometric solids, his left hand touching a cube, his right grasping a sphere. The plate, taken from Cristofano Sarti’s 1799 treatise *L’Ottica della natura e dell’educazione* (Vision in Nature and in Education), illustrates one stage in an imaginary experiment designed to test what philosophers refer to as ‘the Molyneux problem’. Named for William Molyneux, who framed the question in a letter to John Locke in 1688, the problem posits a person who was born blind and has learned to distinguish between different forms through touch alone. If this person suddenly regained the ability to see, it asks, would he be able to recognize the cube and the sphere by sight? Following George Berkeley and others, Sarti answered in the negative, arguing that senses such as touch and vision created impressions (or ‘primary ideas’) that were completely distinct, not connected by a common sensorium or by shared abstractions of the objects being perceived. A subject could *learn* to associate the feel of the solids with their visual manifestations, but would not be able to do so instinctually.

Recent research suggests that Berkeley and Sarti were correct; but this we do not learn from Lockhart. For her purposes what matters is less how perception actually works than that eighteenth-century Italian thinkers wondered about the interdependence of the senses – and that their investigations sometimes led them into thinking about musical experience. The range of examples Lockhart has gathered, drawing on fictional, scientific and philosophical sources, indicates that late eighteenth-century readers and writers were fascinated with the idea that extreme development of one sense could compensate for the loss of another, and that they invested music with a special power to animate and enliven the body and the soul in cases when one sense or physical attribute was deficient. In Gaspare Spontini’s opéra-comique *Milton* (1804), for example, the blind poet’s daughter plays the harp for her father and surrounds him with flowers, sparking his creativity by stimulating the senses of smell and hearing in the absence of sight. And in Camillo Federici’s 1799 play *La cieca nata* (The Girl Blind from Birth), a sightless young woman learns to perceive colour through playing the harpsichord, perceiving vivid tints in the various pitches and feeling that she has ‘eyes at the ends of her fingers’ (quoted in Lockhart, 126). When her cataracts are surgically removed in the play’s *dénouement*, the acquisition of sight brings a surge of transformative energy that Lockhart sees as akin to the animation of a marble statue.

It is through Lockhart’s analyses of obscure texts such as these that the book’s central arguments and the import of its title are gradually revealed. While the first of the abstract nouns in the book’s title is in play in