



My reservations about this facsimile are minor. Readers unfamiliar with Mozart's autographs would have benefited from a brief introduction to standard features such as abbreviations, shorthand and the composer's smearing out of mistakes before the ink had dried. It is a pity too that tiny bits of material are lost on the left-hand side of recto folia (most notably the instrumental designations on the first page) and the right-hand side of verso folia, but entirely understandable given the decision not to disturb the high-quality binding during the reproduction process. All in all, this volume is a splendid addition to the ever-increasing number of Mozart's works now available in facsimile form. It is to be hoped that it is not a one-off Henle publication and is followed in due course by high-quality facsimiles of other Mozart piano concertos.

SIMON P. KEEFE



Eighteenth-Century Music 4/1 © 2007 Cambridge University Press
doi:10.1017/S147857060700084X Printed in the United Kingdom

JEAN-PHILIPPE RAMEAU, *PLATÉE*. Opera Omnia: Series 4, volume 10

ED. M. ELIZABETH C. BARTLET

Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2005

pp. 435, ISMN M 006 52787 8

JEAN PHILIPPE RAMEAU, *ANACRÉON*. Opera Omnia: Series 4, volume 25

ED. JONATHAN HUW WILLIAMS (WITH SYLVIE BOUISSOU AND CÉCILE DAVY-RIGAUX)

Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2004

pp. vii + 107, ISMN M 006 52591 1

The latest two volumes in the new Rameau critical edition bring to ten the total number since the series began publication in 1996 – an average of one per year. This admirable rate of production for an enterprise as challenging as editing Rameau may largely be attributed to the energetic leadership of its general editor, Sylvie Bouissou, who has not only overseen the whole operation, but has edited five of the volumes published to date: the 1757 and 1758 version of *Les Surprises de l'amour* (in two volumes, 1996 and 2000), the 1733 version of *Hippolyte et Aricie* (2002), the editorial guidelines (1997) and, with Denis Herlin, the catalogue of librettos and other textual sources for Rameau's stage works (2003). The other five volumes consist of the *Pièces de clavecin en concerts* (1996), *Zoroastre* (1999), *Acanthe et Céphise* (1998) and the two under review here, *Anacréon* and *Platée*. Ultimately the edition will comprise forty-four volumes in its six series. Bouissou is aided by Cécile Davy-Rigaux (whose title has evolved over the years from 'editorial co-ordinator' to 'adjunct general editor') and an editorial board comprising M. Elizabeth C. Bartlet, Denis Herlin, Davitt Moroney, Yvon Repérant and Herbert Schneider. The last two volumes initiated a change in publisher from Gérard Billaudot in Paris to Bärenreiter. The switch is barely visible from the volumes themselves, which maintain the red cloth covers, high-quality paper and sumptuous layout of the original series. Each volume continues to be published along with a separate keyboard-vocal score in paperback. Performing parts for the orchestral musicians are available for hire, both at written pitch and transposed for modern orchestras. Each volume in the series includes an introduction in both French and English, a transcription of the libretto (in French only, with eighteenth-century spelling conventions retained), a substantial critical apparatus (in these two volumes in English only, since both editors are Anglophones), appendices, and facsimiles of sample pages from the major sources for the edition.

The celebrations warranted by the continued publication of this important new edition have unfortunately to be muted on account of the untimely death of Elizabeth Bartlet in September 2005, only days after her edition of *Platée* was released. Her death represents an enormous loss to the community of scholars who



study opera and operatic institutions in Paris, many of whom (myself included) benefited not only from her writings, but also from her generous help and breadth of knowledge of the inner workings of Parisian libraries and archives. Her four-volume edition of *Guillaume Tell* for the Rossini critical edition (Pesaro: Fondazione Rossini, 1992) is a model of scholarly rigour and thoroughness, and she devoted herself to editing Rameau with the same energy and acuity. Her shoes on the Rameau editorial board will be difficult to fill.

Rameau set the story of the ageing poet Anacreon twice: once in 1754 to a libretto by Louis de Cahusac and a second time in 1757 to a libretto by Pierre-Joseph Bernard as an addition to a revival of his opera-ballet *Les Surprises de l'amour*. It is the first of these two settings that is under review; it has never before been published in a modern edition. (The later *Anacréon* figures among the four entrées in the recent edition of *Les Surprises de l'amour* and is the work recorded by Les Arts Florissants in 1982.) The earlier *Anacréon* was composed for performances at court – at the royal château of Fontainebleau, in this instance – and was not performed at the Opéra until after Rameau's death. In its slender plot over a single act Anacréon leads the young Chloé to think he wants to marry her, but ultimately unites her with her sweetheart; the Greeks and Bacchantes celebrate the glories of Love. *Platée*, on the other hand, is anything but conventional. Called a 'ballet bouffon' by Rameau, the story turns on an elaborate hoax: Mercury suggests to Jupiter that the way to cure Juno's jealousy over her husband's philandering is for him to pretend to fall in love with a completely inappropriate love-object, the ugly nymph Platée, who lives in a swamp with her frog followers. The prologue, subtitled 'The Birth of Comedy', sets the tone for the three acts that follow, which feature, in addition to the mythological characters, the outrageous figure of La Folie. This work has had two major productions in recent years, one led by Marc Minkowski (available on CD and DVD), the other directed by American choreographer Mark Morris. The transgressive features of the work have led many to wonder how it could have possibly been deemed appropriate for the festivities surrounding a royal wedding, the marriage of the Dauphin to the Spanish Infanta Maria Teresa in 1745. Elizabeth Bartlet's introduction explains that *Platée*, which was already partially written, was a last-minute substitution for the tragédie en musique *Pandore*, when the composer, Royer, did not finish his score in time, and that the reaction of the wedding guests to its single performance appears to have been negative. Voltaire, the librettist of the withdrawn *Pandore*, dismissed *Platée* as a 'frogs' ballet' and called it 'the height of indecency, boredom and impertinence' (Introduction, lxi). In 1749, however, when the work was performed at the Opéra, it attracted large audiences, although the critics remained cool. Needless to say, the work's impertinence, set brilliantly to music by Rameau, helps explain its success with audiences today.

Rameau is notorious for having revised many of his stage works in major ways when they were revived. In such cases it is the policy of the new Rameau edition, stated in the General Preface to each volume, to publish the distinct versions separately; the original version of Rameau's first opera, *Hippolyte et Aricie*, for example, was published four years ago, whereas the versions of 1742 and 1757 will appear in Series IV, Volume 6. This decision rectifies a major weakness of the old Rameau edition, under the leadership of Saint-Saëns, which frequently conflated multiple versions of a work into a single score. *Platée* is a case in point: it was created for court performances in 1745, revised for the Paris Opéra in 1749 and revived there in 1750 and 1754. The old Rameau edition (*Œuvres complètes*, volume 12, *Platée*, ed. Georges Marty (Paris: Durand, 1907)) relied on a source that, according to Bartlet, 'is a mongrel of the versions of 1745 and 1749 and even includes some passages revised before the premiere' (Introduction, xlvi). Bartlet's edition separates out the two principal versions but does so within a single volume: the 1749 version for the Opéra appears as the main text (pages 1–257), while pages 258–327, in a series of eight 'compléments', include those passages from the 1745 version either not found in 1749 or different enough to require separate presentation. In order to facilitate use of the score for those interested in the 1745 version, the *compléments* sometimes also repeat passages that are the same in both versions, when they are surrounded by passages that are different. *Complément* 1, for example, extends from the end of Scene 2 in the prologue to the middle of Scene 3, portions of which Rameau did not revise. Those bars that the two versions have in common bear two sets of bar numbers in the *complément*, a subtle method (perhaps too subtle) for distinguishing them from the revised passages. In addition, Table 1 in the Introduction (lii–lv) compares the versions of 1745 and 1749 in parallel columns, with



references to the page numbers and *compléments* in which each passage may be found in this edition. The table also alerts readers to passages where the variants are minor enough to be reportable in the critical notes. Users of this edition thus do have access to both versions, but they would have to do some cutting, pasting and annotating to produce a complete score for the 1745 version. (The half-title page reveals that parts for the *compléments* are also available for hire; having not seen them, I do not know whether or not they would also require cutting and pasting.) This system for presenting two versions in a single volume ultimately becomes clear to a diligent reader, but it would have been helpful if all of its workings had been explained in a single place (as an introduction to the *compléments*, for instance), instead of being scattered between various parts of the introduction and the critical apparatus, including some footnotes. It would also have been helpful if Table 1 had made a typographical distinction between those passages the two versions have in common and those that differ.

The source study lying behind this edition represents a model of thoroughness. A large number of musical sources survive for the opera, but Bartlet's study revealed that there are three principal ones: the engraved score (as was the norm at the time, this was a reduced score that lacks most of the inner parts), a copy of the engraved score marked up for performances and a set of manuscript vocal and instrumental parts. Rameau published the score of *Platée* just before performances at the Opéra began. One might assume, therefore (as did the editor of the old Rameau edition), that this score represents the version performed there in 1749. However, Bartlet was able to demonstrate that the engraving began in 1744, that at least three different engravers worked on it, and that the musical content includes material from both the 1745 and 1749 versions, plus passages revised before the opera was ever performed. A copy of this score, now housed in the Bibliothèque de l'Opéra, is heavily annotated for performances at the Opéra in 1749 and the 1754 revival, and even includes a few annotations in Rameau's own hand. These annotations and revisions all had to be sorted out and dated: Table 3 in the critical apparatus compares the contents of the engraved score in its ur-state with the annotated one. The extent of the handwritten changes can be measured by the fact that this table extends across nine pages of the folio-sized volume. (Facsimiles of several pages from this score are reproduced in an appendix.) The third major source is an extensive set of parts (almost complete for the orchestra, less so for the singers) that was used for performances both at court and at the Opéra. Given that many of these parts were revised multiple times between 1744 and 1773, Bartlet had to date their layers before using them to make editorial decisions. This she did not only by comparing their readings to the other principal sources, but by identifying all the individual scribes, many of them by name; by examining the paper of the parts and the collettes; by tracking down the performing careers of the musicians whose names are on many of the parts; and by hunting through archival documents that pertain to the workings of the copy shops. Table 4 (340–351) lays out her findings for each of the 147 surviving parts, and the accompanying text discusses the evidence in considerable detail. All of this painstaking work not only underlies her edition, but will be of huge benefit to other scholars – not only subsequent Rameau editors, but anyone who works on mid-eighteenth-century French opera.

So how different is this score of the opera from the one published in 1907? In presentation, very different, in that the new Rameau edition has chosen to maintain eighteenth-century score layout, many notational conventions (for example, the way that repeats are notated) and spelling, and eschews providing a continuo realization. It does modernize the clefs, number the bars across each act and provide convenient rehearsal numbers. The inner string parts, often assigned to second violins in the old edition, are restored to their original assignment to *haute-contre* and *taille de violon* (different sizes of viola), and Bartlet was able to locate others that the old edition lacked. In terms of content, the progression of numbers is largely the same, but there are numerous differences, both large and small, in the musical text. In the scenes involving La Folie, for instance, these concern the music for her arrival in Act 2 Scene 5, the tambourin for the *fous gais* and *fous tristes*, the text and melody in some of her recitatives and instrumentation in some of the dances (for example, *petites flûtes* that are lacking in the old edition). Clarine's ariette in Act 1 Scene 6, 'Soleil, fuis de ces lieux', marked 'Modéré' in the old edition (and interpreted by Minkowski as slow and dreamy), is marked 'Vif' in the new edition. In many cases, the differences arise from Bartlet's separation of the two versions;



passages that once were in the main score now appear in one of the *compléments*, or even an appendix, if they were revised before the 1745 performance.

Anacréon also presented formidable editorial problems. From its two performances at Fontainebleau in 1754, only the libretto and an incomplete set of vocal parts survive. Rameau revised the work thereafter (when is not known), but it was not performed at the Opéra until 1766, two years after Rameau's death, and again in 1771. The later sources that survive (none of them autographs) reveal 'that large sections of the revised version of *Anacréon* were cut during the 1766 run' (Critical Apparatus, 92). Jonathan Huw Williams has thus aimed to reconstruct the score as it was revised (even though he admits he cannot be sure that all the revisions were made by Rameau himself), but before it was cut for its performances at the Opéra; in other words, this edition presents the score in a state that was never performed. This decision has the advantage of preserving more music in the score proper, rather than relegating some of it to an appendix, but it seems unfortunate that the edition does not make the 1766 version readily apparent on the pages of the score, by indicating which pieces were cut or shortened for those performances. This information is presented instead in a table in the Introduction (lii), and, partially, in the critical notes as well.

Incomplete instrumentation in the surviving sources is one of the issues Williams had to face in preparing his edition. Given the thorniness of the problems, it is surprising that the discussion of 'Instrumental Issues' in the Introduction is so skimpy (less than a page, with half devoted to the figured bass). Williams does not mention the inner string parts – or rather the lack thereof, as only a handful of pieces in this work have lines dedicated to either *parties* or *haute-contre et taille de violon*. The absence is a systematic problem in the sources for Rameau's works in general (the sources for *Platée* are exceptionally full in this regard), but one wonders whether or not those few *parties* that do appear in this edition are likely to represent all those that Rameau composed for *Anacréon*. In other words, might there have been grounds for reconstructing inner parts in some movements of this work, as Graham Sadler did for the edition of *Zoroastre*? Another disappointment is Williams's lack of attention to the intriguing annotations regarding percussion. The last scene brings on stage, according to the libretto, a troupe of 'noisy' Egipans and Bacchantes, who proceed to celebrate the glories of both Cupid and Bacchus in several dances and a chorus. Their entrance music, 'Air pour les Bacchantes', is sprinkled with annotations of 'avec tambourins' and 'sans tambourins', and according to the critical notes, two of the manuscript scores bear the annotation 'Bacchanales avec tambours de basque et tambourins pour les Bacchantes'. Williams, however, neither attempted to reconstruct the percussion parts nor even mentioned their existence in the section of the Introduction about instruments. These annotations, however, beg several questions. Should only *tambourins* (a type of drum) or also *tambours de Basque* (tambourines) be used here? Would they have been played from the pit or from the stage? (The iconography of Bacchantes frequently depicts them with tambourines in their hands.) What kinds of rhythms might these instruments play? What principles govern where the annotations calling for them are located in the score? (The rationale is not readily apparent.) Would percussion have been limited to this one piece, or might it have been extended to others within the same *divertissement*? (The Bacchantes are on stage throughout and they are assigned dances such as *tambourins* where percussion is often to be found in other opera scores.) The chorus near the end of this work has musical affinities to the scene's entrance music; might percussion be appropriate for it as well?

Williams does discuss the horn and bassoon parts, which are lacking in his principal source (a set of vocal and instrumental parts) and which he has taken, when possible, from one of the late manuscript scores; however, since other movements, lacking in this score, would also seem to lend themselves to a fuller orchestration, he has sometimes supplied editorial parts for these instruments. In the score, such additions are clearly indicated in small notes, but nowhere – either in the introduction or in the critical notes – does Williams explain his criteria for what movements warrant such treatment or what models he used for his reconstructions. In fact, the critical notes even confuse the issue. On pages 53–58, where three dances in a row have received editorial bassoon and/or horn parts (whereas dances earlier in the scene for some of the same characters and in the same key do not), a note on the bottom of the page calls these 'editorial parts which may be omitted', while the critical notes suggest these additions are essential: 'editorial parts have been added in



order that these movements might be performed'. Given that Rameau's orchestration practices have already drawn a fair amount of scholarly interest and that the volumes of the new Rameau edition are certain to form the primary basis for future studies, a thorough airing of what can and cannot be established regarding instrumentation from the sources for each work should appear in every volume, not just some of them.

One general area for the series overall that could benefit from improvement is the way the workings of the critical apparatus are introduced and explained. Some kind of overview is needed, particularly of the critical notes, because there turn out to be subunits within them – separate lists of critical notes for the music and for the libretto, and, for *Platée*, two additional lists that pertain to the *compléments*. This becomes an issue when an asterisk or a footnote in the score refers a reader to the critical notes; one needs to know where to look. It would be very helpful if the Guide to the Critical Notes (a standard text that is the same in all volumes) would at least mention the existence of the two separate lists, and even better if it explained which type of notes get included where, since the two volumes under review, at least, do not fully agree on this point. On the other hand, one extremely helpful innovation in Bartlet's edition is that for every single *didascalie* (stage direction, scene indication or other verbal annotation) the critical notes for the libretto identify its source. It is thus possible to see whether a given marking, such as the one in Act 1 Scene 4 instructing Platée to exaggerate her pronunciation of the letter T, comes from the libretto, or was printed into the score, or is an annotation in a score or part, or often (because Bartlet's notes are so thorough) who the annotator was. Such information is crucial for anyone studying staging or performing practices, who needs to know whether the location of such indications is identified in the primary sources or is an inference on the part of the editor. (Since most *didascalies* come from the libretto, deciding where to locate them in the score is not always straightforward.) Earlier volumes, including *Anacréon*, offer some information about the *didascalies*, but are nowhere near as comprehensive as Bartlet's edition. I ardently hope that the systematic approach she developed will be adopted for all subsequent volumes.

One of the choices the new Rameau editorial board made from the start was not to try to duplicate the rich historical introductions, mostly written by Charles Malherbe, of the old edition. Users of the new edition should thus continue to mine the old introductions for the enormous amount of useful information they contain about the origins, context and performance history of each work. That said, the new introductions present important new material deriving both from each editor's own work and from the Rameau scholarship that has emerged over the last century. (The one thing that the most recent volumes in the new edition omit is a list of all the members of the chorus and dance troupe, since this information is included in the catalogue of all the Rameau librettos that was published as part of the series in 2003.) Williams's introduction fruitfully mines the documents surrounding the creation and subsequent performance history of this heretofore little known *Anacréon*, and Bartlet's has many new perspectives to offer on *Platée*, including a bold hypothesis regarding the division of labour among the three men credited with working on its libretto. Drawing upon her immense knowledge of French operatic history, she also provided a fascinating discussion of how *Platée* was seen in some quarters during the *guerre des bouffons* as a work that beat the Italian composers at their own game, and sprinkled her introduction with insightful remarks on topics as disparate as French musical journalism and vocal practices at the Opéra. One senses while reading that she chafed at the limitations inherent in the genre of the introduction, and could have written at article-length on all of the topics it touches upon. It is a tragedy for all of us that she never got the opportunity to do so.

Bartlet's edition of *Platée* nonetheless remains a testimony to the high scholarly standards not only of her own work but of the Rameau edition in general. All of us may be grateful that the works of Rameau are finally receiving publication in editions commensurate with the quality of the music.

REBECCA HARRIS-WARRICK

