

NEWSLETTER of The American Handel Society

Volume XXXVI, Number 2

Summer 2021

BOSTON, BIRMINGHAM, AND THE RECEPTION OF ROBERT FRANZ'S EDITION OF *MESSIAH*

Luke Howard

The 1803 publication of the Wolfgang A. Mozart/Johann A. Hiller edition of Handel's *Messiah* soon led to Mozart's additional accompaniments becoming accepted as standard.¹ The Antient Concerts in London and a smattering of English critics resisted Mozart's additional accompaniments at first, some even questioning their authenticity.² But by 1825, lingering opposition to Mozart's version of Handel had practically faded away in England. A reviewer for the 1827 performance at the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, wrote that *Messiah* was performed there "as we trust it will always be, with Mozart's accompaniments."³ During this time, anyone who longed for the purity of *Messiah* "as Handel wrote it" was branded in the reviews an "austere stickler,"⁴ ignorant dilettante,⁵ or cold and dull hearted.⁶

In the ensuing decades, the Romantics' perpetual aspiration toward novelty inspired more musicians—often lesser known than Mozart or even Hiller—to contribute their own "additional accompaniments" to *Messiah*. The high (or low) point may have been reached with Sir Michael Costa (1808–84), whose immoderate orchestration was performed regularly at Handel Festivals from 1859 on (see below for further discussion). The narrative shifted after 1868. That year, the publication in facsimile of the autograph score of Handel's *Messiah*, preserved in Buckingham Palace at the time, demonstrated clearly how far from the original the current performance practices had drifted. It was around this time that Jenny Lind, who had performed the soprano solos in *Messiah* in England as early as 1850 up to 1867, reportedly declared, "Before you can make the world understand what a beautiful thing the score of the 'Messiah' is, you must wash it clean."⁷

The call for a restoration must have been shocking to many, who either assumed that Handel's *Messiah* as they knew it was unadulterated or believed that Mozart's accompaniments

BIRMINGHAM BAROQUE 2021 CONFERENCE REPORT

Fred Fehleisen

The Birmingham Baroque 2021 (19th Biennial International Conference on Baroque Music) may have been delayed for a year, but it was certainly worth the wait. Over three days, July 15–17, more than 120 presenters had opportunities to share and discuss their pre-recorded video "papers" in more than 30 real-time chaired sessions. Registered participants were able to view presentations online prior to, during, and after the conference. Even after a year of Zoom fatigue, the coming together of such a wide-ranging group of colleagues in real time made the conference a major success. Carrie Churnside, chair of the organizing committee, and her team did an outstanding job. Teamwork, an enormous amount of hard work, often done in isolation, and a strong sense of community made it all possible.

Following the highly successful American Handel Society 2021 Conference online, the experience of this conference leads me to believe that we are all engaged in something new that has set us on the right track. Even the process of compiling this report involved something new: *revisiting* the conference online! Registered attendees can re-view conference videos via links in the program booklet and reprocess the information they contain. A wide variety of techniques and approaches were used by presenters in creating their videos, and all of them are worthy of further consideration.

Handel and his music were well represented in several sessions during the conference. On Thursday, there was an entire session devoted to Handel, chaired by Colin Timms. In a fascinating presentation entitled "Guarini, Tragicomedy, and Rinaldo," **Bill Mann** argued that Handel's *Rinaldo* (1711) and earlier Italian operas staged in London owed much to the influence of the *Il Pastor Fido* tragic-comedic tradition. **David Vickers** explored the idea of delving into Handel's creative process through versions of pieces that he "rejected" prior to performances. He examined alterations ranging from internal compositional choices and revisions to external ones related

continued on p. 5

IN THIS ISSUE

Boston, Birmingham, and the Reception... – Luke Howard
Birmingham Baroque 2021 Conference Report – Fred Fehleisen
From The President's Desk – Graydon Beeks
Competition and Prize Winners
The J. Merrill Knapp Research Fellowship

continued on p. 2

1 F. G. [sic] *Händel's Oratorium Der Messias, nach W. A. Mozart's Bearbeitung* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1803).

2 "Excerpts from Parke's Musical Memoirs," *The Musical World* 62/30 (1884): 469.

3 "The Oratorios," *The Harmonicon* 5/4 (1827): 78.

4 "York," *The Quarterly Musical Magazine and Review* 7/28 (1825): 437.

5 "Miscellaneous: Critical Acumen," *The Musical Journal* 2/43 (1840): 270.

6 "York," 422.

7 William H. Cummings, "The Mutilation of a Masterpiece," *Proceedings of the Musical Association*, 30th session (1903–04): 117. Rockstro and others had reported the quote, only without the attribution to Lind, as early as 1883. Bridge also attributed this quote to "a deceased singer" in 1899. It wasn't until 1903 that Cummings identified Lind as the source of the quote.

completed and perfected the work. So, what did the call to “wash it clean” really mean? Any effort to replicate the performance practices of 1742 would have been hampered by countless practical obstacles, the lack of a functioning harpsichord being simply the most obvious. A large portion of the music world wasn’t willing to admit that 19th-century accretions had “dirtied” Handel’s score. Any substantial alteration to what had become a “tradition” was likely to meet strong opposition—there were simply too much history and too many stakeholders and performance conventions to grapple with. Many critics were willing to admit that Costa’s version of *Messiah* had crossed a line, but they couldn’t agree on what to do about it. Crossing back to the other side of that line seemed inconceivable.

One German composer thought differently, however, and was willing to take on the challenge. Sometime in the early 1870s, Robert Franz (1815–92), who had already edited various baroque compositions including Handel’s *L’Allegro, il Penseroso ed il Moderato*,⁸ decided to edit the *Messiah* score. In 1874 he discussed at length with an American friend his plans to revise *Messiah*,⁹ and the following summer (1875), Boston’s Handel and Haydn Society (henceforth, H&H) engaged Franz to prepare “some additional orchestral accompaniments for certain numbers of *Messiah* which had been left uncompleted by Mozart.”¹⁰ The H&H was familiar with Franz from having performed a number of his editions of other baroque music with apparent success. Franz was paid a small gratuity of \$100 for his work on *Messiah* and was made an honorary member of the Society.

The Boston intermediary here was Otto Dresel (1826–90), a German-born musician, student of Liszt, Mendelssohn, Schumann, and a friend of Robert Franz. Dresel moved from Leipzig to New York in 1848, then to Boston in 1852. His personal connection with Franz was crucial to this new project. Dresel had returned to Germany for three years in the early 1870s, so it was likely that he encouraged Franz regarding this editorial undertaking, and was, therefore, in a position to help the H&H secure Franz’s services in 1875.

As early as 1867, Boston critics had lamented that it would take “a miracle, at least a new inspiration, to lift the chorus out of the old unconscious habits” in singing such familiar music as *Messiah*.¹¹ So the Franz commission was both an attempt to clean up the score itself and to revitalize the H&H performance conventions. Advance notices of this work included high praise for Franz’s genius and knowledge, and the assurance that Franz “has worked in the spirit of Handel, and has added only that which will enhance the beauties of his most sublime creation.”¹² The first performance in 1876 during the Christmas season drew only praise from the Boston critics, who lauded Franz’s “singular fitness for the task, and the rare and complete musical culture that Franz has shown in his difficult work.”¹³ “A better man than Dr. Franz could not have been found,” another wrote, describing him as “a musical antiquary

if ever one existed” and eminently qualified to “re-construct” Handel and Bach.¹⁴ In 1884, Franz produced a corrected and thoroughly-revised edition, published by Kistner in Leipzig.¹⁵



While the consensus in Boston was that Franz's work was a success on many fronts, the 1876 H&H performance struck English critics quite differently. Not all the criticism was directed initially at Franz—that would come later. At first, it was the H&H conductor, Carl Zerrahn (1826–1909), who was singled out for his “impudence” in interfering, via Franz, with Handel's score.¹⁷ The attempt to restore some historical integrity to Handel's music was characterized as “grave-raking,” perpetuated by “musical ghouls,” or perhaps the work of an “archæological extremist,” or a “necrologist.”¹⁸ These might seem like odd reproaches to level at a conductor or an arranger, but they reveal how powerfully the modernist London critics resisted Franz's revision of *Messiah* based on historical and musical knowledge.

Much of the criticism centered on the very idea of Franz's project, not necessarily the work itself. That Franz had dared to change the accepted *Messiah* score in any way was almost blasphemous, regardless of what the end result sounded like (of which, naturally, the English critics were entirely ignorant). In truth, almost nobody in the audience could hear the difference in actual performance, and only a very few critics and scholars would have noticed most of the changes. One Boston critic said that Franz's new orchestral parts, whatever editorial practice they might have represented, were only a partial success, because the orchestra was too small to be heard “against so vast a chorus in so large a hall.”¹⁹ Still, Boston continued to laud Franz and performed his arrangements with enthusiasm up through at least the 1890s.²⁰

Even in England, some critics had begun paying more careful attention to the weaknesses in the published Mozart version. At the Gloucester Festival in 1877, the year following Franz's first experiment in Boston, there was some notable prevarication regarding additional accompaniments; Mozart's arrangements were now characterized as merely “the most to be commended, or at any rate the least to be discountenanced.”²¹ The effect of the published lithograph of Handel's autograph was gaining traction, and Mozart's previously unassailable position was beginning to slip.

The English response bifurcated into two extreme positions. One claimed a “better the devil you know . . .” attitude, stating that the hybrid “English consolidated” version—a combination of Handel, Mozart, others, and accreted traditions over time—might not be historically accurate, but at least it's “English”; It “received the approval of a noble army of musicians,” and “the English people will refuse to sacrifice the form and fashion of what they have received and conserved.”²² The other group went to the opposite extreme, calling for an abandonment of all additional accompaniments entirely and playing the skeleton score “as Handel wrote it,” although very few in England would have understood the performance ramifications of that position at the time.

The insistence on reproducing only the literal notes and instruments indicated in Handel's sketch-like score was, of course, neither possible, nor particularly Handelian. Already in 1878, the Boston critic William Apthorp had called that skeleton approach to the original parts “the greatest conceivable act of stupid unfaithfulness.”²³ And he was correct. After a December 1880 performance in Boston using Franz's score, another American critic, John S. Dwight, directed some furrowed brows at this English camp: “In spite of the John Bull critics, who would hold us to the letter of the hasty sketches which Handel left us in his scores, we doubt not that, could the old giant have been present, his big wig would have vibrated with true satisfaction at finding his hints so finely apprehended and carried out.”²⁴ From the Boston perspective, then, both of the English responses were nonsensical and hypocritical. On the one hand, Franz's reverence for history made him a grave-raking musical “ghoul,” yet others dismissed his edition as insufficiently reverential toward Handel's original manuscript.

Messiah had been performed at every Birmingham Festival since 1768—an impressive legacy.²⁵ In addition to his London engagements, Sir Michael Costa served as the regular conductor at Birmingham since 1849, and so the appointment of a new conductor for the 1885 Festival (after Costa's death the previous year) attracted more critical attention than usual. The position was given to the eminent Austrian conductor, Hans Richter (1843–1916). Among other changes implemented at his first Birmingham Festival, Richter chose to replace the traditional Costa accompaniments for *Messiah* with Franz's newly-minted edition.

The English critics were quick to respond to the Birmingham announcement. They were led by Joseph Bennet, a legendary music critic for London's *Daily Telegraph*. Twenty years earlier, Bennet had pointed out the numerous inconsistencies between Handel's autograph and current practices. But now, faced directly with Franz's edition, he was compelled to judge, and state whether Franz's attempt at “cleaning up” was a good thing or not. In the end, Bennet hedged, admitting that Franz was a “clever man and a judicious ‘tinker,’ wherefore it may probably be that his edition of *The Messiah* is the best available, if we needs must have a new one at all.” But regarding the switch from Costa's edition to Franz's, Bennet claimed that, “Poor Handel might well say, ‘A plague on both your houses,’ since neither of the emendators seems to have taken much care to think out what he himself would have done.”²⁶ The glaring irony here is that Bennet had little scholarly knowledge regarding what, indeed, Handel “would have done.” He knew less than Franz did about Handel's music and baroque performance practice. Bennet, who could be accused of talking out of both sides of his mouth on this issue, at first sided with those who claimed publicly that a skeleton-score of *Messiah* was preferable to the Costa/Franz imbroglio.²⁷

Franz found an unlikely ally in this dispute in an English music theorist, teacher, and composer, Ebenezer Prout (1835–1909). Unlikely, not because Prout believed Franz's score had, in fact, “cleaned up” Mozart, but because Prout considered the new edition a sincere move in the right direction, expunging some of the “merciless hacking about” by modern editors

17 Zerrahn made some “improvements” of his own to the performance score. See F. H. J., “The *Messiah*: Franz's Additions to Its Orchestral Accompaniments,” *Dwight's Journal of Music* 36/19 (1876): 356.

18 Ibid. It was the critic William Apthorp who used the terms “necrologist” and “archæological extremist” hoping to prove that Franz didn't actually deserve those labels. See William Apthorp, “Bach's and Händel's Scores” in *Musicians and Music Lovers, and Other Essays* (New York, 1894), 109 and 114.

19 Perkins and Dwight, *Handel and Haydn Society*, 394.

20 The H&H continued to use Franz's edition and Prout's orchestration until the mid-20th century. See <https://handelandhaydn.org/about/history/beyond-messiah>.

21 “Gloucester Musical Festival,” *The Musical World* 55/37 (1877): 615.

22 Alfred Deakin, “Robert Franz's Edition of the *Messiah*,” *The Monthly Musical Record* 21/247 (1891): 147.

23 See Apthorp, “Bach's and Händel's Scores,” 122.

24 Perkins and Dwight, *Handel and Haydn Society*, 420.

25 Stephen S. Stratton, “The Birmingham Musical Festival,” *The Monthly Musical Record* (1888): 219. The Birmingham Festival was staged triennially from 1784 until its close in 1912.

26 J[oseph] B[ennet], “Birmingham Musical Festival (from *The Daily Telegraph*),” *The Musical World* 63/36 (1885): 555.

27 Ibid.

that Bennet had railed against. Prout and Bennet had found themselves on opposite sides of musical disagreements before. Each had their own intellectual strengths, and their own print platforms for publishing their opinions. Bennet was closely attuned to audience expectation and current fashion. Prout, the scholar, understood Handel's aesthetic and baroque practices, independent of popular preferences. At the time, Prout knew Handel's music better than anyone else in England, and quite possibly the continent as well.

After the 1885 Birmingham performance of Franz's edition, Prout and Bennet engaged in another months-long, very public spat in the pages of *The Monthly Musical Record*.²⁸ There was never a meeting of the minds. They continued to quibble back and forth over small details such as which instruments should play the continuo, the legitimacy of the organ accompanying recitative, whether a piano (upright or grand) was desirable, and so on. Prout usually persisted, terrier-like, until Bennet gave up, either fatigued or bowed by Prout's admittedly superior knowledge of Handel's music. Bennet eventually switched camps, conceding that without access to a harpsichord, some kind of additional accompaniment was necessary, and that the Costa version at least benefited from widespread popularity.

Prout later confessed that he considered Franz's version "just as full of inaccuracies as Mozart's."²⁹ He couldn't even bring himself to regard it as a "satisfactory" performance edition.³⁰ But, he sincerely believed that Franz's completion of Mozart's edition was, with all its shortcomings, far nearer to the ideal than any other, and "a far more faithful presentation of Handel's original intentions than the score known as Mozart's."³¹

One of Prout's principal gripes against the anti-Franz critics was that not one of them had actually attended the Birmingham performance in 1885, nor even examined Franz's score.³² As in Boston, ten years earlier, the English critics had lined up against the very premise of Franz's edition, not necessarily the editorial work itself or its efficacy. Prout added that not one of those critics now clamoring for the "purity of Handel's text" had "uttered a word of protest against the atrocious distortions of Handel's music which Costa used to perpetrate at every Handel Festival . . . none of these gentlemen ever lifted his voice in indignant protest."³³ Prout later asserted, "Surely if Franz is to be chastised with whips, Costa should be chastised with scorpions!"³⁴

The argument about additional accompaniments to *Messiah* was far from over, even though Prout seemed to have won that Birmingham battle on behalf of Franz. At the end of that year, a Boston critic wrote, "it seems to be practically settled that here, at least, however it may be in England, Franz's is accepted as the standard, the only practicable, truly Handelian score of the *Messiah*."³⁵ It might have been only a pyrrhic victory

for Franz and Prout in England though, since Bennet was mostly correct that popular opinion still favored the old Costa version.

A few years later, in 1891, Sir Charles Villiers Stanford made another plug for a bare-bones *Messiah* because, he claimed, Mozart's version of *Messiah* was itself a complete mistake: a mistake "so magnificent that it blinded the eyes of the best conductors of the century—and Franz's."³⁶ Prout almost agreed, noting that the weaknesses in Franz's edition were nearly always due to Franz's abounding reverence for Mozart. But, almost alone in England as an ally with Franz, Prout continued to contend that both the "all" and "nothing" approaches to additional accompaniments for *Messiah* were eminently un-Handelian in practice, and that Franz had added nothing that Handel didn't do himself. That belief would, a few years later, be fully vindicated with the discovery of the Foundling Hospital parts, which showed that Handel's *Messiah* orchestra included winds—oboes, bassoons, and horns—that misguided purists in the 19th century had insisted did not belong in *Messiah*.

In response, and perhaps seeing where Prout was inevitably headed, the former choirmaster and organist at the Birmingham Festival, Andrew Deakin, informed Prout in no uncertain terms that any move by Prout to "clean up" the score of *Messiah* would certainly be met with fierce opposition.³⁷ It was a prescient threat—Prout was still a decade away from producing his own edition of *Messiah*—and for the time being Prout had no plans to "clean it up" at all, having offered to do so for the Handel Festival in 1891 only to be turned down.

With the benefit of hindsight, we know now that trying to fix the weaknesses in Mozart's edition of *Messiah* was akin to polishing the brasses on the *Titanic*. Franz was going to go down with the Mozart *Messiah* ship either way. Different solutions to the question of historical authenticity in Handel's *Messiah* would emerge in the 20th century. But Franz's edition of *Messiah* was one of the first to look back for historical authority and cut away rather than simply add more.³⁸ Franz was the first editor in the 19th century to consciously consider if not exactly "What might Handel have done?" then at least "What might Mozart have done?" It's not a stretch to claim that Franz's *Messiah* is the first historically-informed published edition of that work. It may not have succeeded, but it was a gallant attempt, and for the rest of his life Franz considered his Handel editions, including *Messiah*, among his most significant contributions to music, more so than even his own compositions.

In the aftermath of the contested rollout of his edition, Franz thanked Prout privately for offering a public defense of his musical integrity in general, and his edition of *Messiah* specifically.³⁹ He acknowledged the impossible situation in which he found himself when he decided to tidy up Mozart's arrangements first in Boston, and then with the premiere of his published edition at Birmingham. In describing that irreconcilable position, wedged between historical validity and current performance practice, Franz resorted to the old proverb of being caught "between two stools."⁴⁰ He must have felt, however unfairly, that the edition's failure was inevitable.

28 Prout served as editor of *The Monthly Musical Record* from 1871–74 and was likely given a privileged voice in its pages in subsequent years.

29 Ebenezer Prout, "Handel's *Messiah*: Preface to the New Edition," *The Musical Times* 43/711 (1902): 313.

30 Ebenezer Prout, "Robert Franz's Edition of the *Messiah*," *The Monthly Musical Record* 21/44 (1891): 77. Prout wrote, "a perfectly satisfactory score of the *Messiah* still remains a desideratum."

31 Ibid.

32 Ebenezer Prout, "Mr. Joseph Bennet Versus Robert Franz," *The Monthly Musical Record* 21/246 (1891): 122.

33 Prout, "Robert Franz's Edition," 77.

34 Prout, "Mr. Joseph Bennet," 122.

35 Perkins and Dwight, *Handel and Haydn Society*, 468. This comment was made when Franz's 1884 published edition of *Messiah* was premiered in Boston, the same year as at Birmingham.

36 Charles Villiers Stanford, "Correspondence," *The Monthly Musical Record* 21/247 (1891): 156.

37 Deakin, "Robert Franz's Edition," 147.

38 See Graydon Beeks, "Sir George Smart's Performances of *Messiah*," *Händel Jahrbuch* 65 (2019): 121–32, for further details on Smart's earlier "tying up" of Mozart's orchestration.

39 Prout, "Mr. Joseph Bennet," 123.

40 Ibid.

to individual singers and seasonal adaptations associated with revivals. **Cathal Twomey** focused on the use of rhetorical parallelism as a means of treating scriptural prose texts as poetry. The result of such treatment has important implications for understanding Handel's libretti and his musical settings. **Matthew Gardner** considered the efforts of Smith Jr. and John Stanley in maintaining Handel's public image in the 1750s and 60s by supervising and continuing seasonal performances of his works. Gardner's discussion covered both seasonal repertoire and published accounts and reminiscences of Handel and his art. **Fred Fehleisen** examined thematic interactions involving chorale tune phrases between the *Messiah* Overture fugue and "Hallelujah." His study suggested that musical and scriptural memories from his youth may have played a significant role in his creative process in this particular work. It is interesting to note that each of the video presentations for the Handel session was viewed more than 70 times, and the real-time session video was viewed 17 times. These figures indicate an above-average interest in this particular session within the conference postings!

In another real-time session on Friday, **Graydon Beeks's** presentation on source materials for Attilio Ariosti's *Coriolano* led to a lively discussion with David Vickers on compositional revisions for particular singers. The possibility of fleshing out collections of arias drawn from works such as *Coriolano*, and fashioning more complete performing versions of them, led to further questions about creative process, the practicalities of working with particular singers, and current understandings about Handel's own adaptations. On Saturday, in a presentation entitled "Handel Uncaged: Defragmenting Handel's Cantatas," **Lawrence Zazzo** advocated for further exploration of these works by scholars and performers. He argued that various Handel's cantatas can be combined in performance—as he showed in his own reconstructions—and can be mined for materials well-suited for embellishment and improvisation.

This year's conference was both a rewarding scholarly gathering and community building event that will hopefully lead to a greater interest in Handel's music and the ongoing work of the American Handel Society and its members.

FROM THE PRESIDENT'S DESK

As we are now more than half way through 2021, it seems appropriate to survey some of the events that have already occurred as well as those yet to take place. The year promised to be a busy one, with three major Handel conferences and as many Handel festivals scheduled. The continuing battle with the COVID-19 virus has made it a complicated one as well. It began in an unpromising way, as the Karlsruhe Handel Festival was forced to postpone its activities for a year; it will now take place from February 18–March 2, 2022. In the months that followed, other events were forced to alter their plans as well.

The American Handel Society Conference, which was reviewed by Minji Kim in the last issue of the *Newsletter*, was the first major Handel event to be held online. Taking place from March 11 to 14, the papers and lectures were delivered live, while two splendid concerts were prerecorded. It is entirely appropriate to again extend congratulations and thanks to all those who made this event such a success.

The annual Handel Festival in Halle was cancelled again this year, but the organizers offered instead a series of free concerts and opera performances which were streamed online between May 28 and June 13—the original dates of the festival. The program included a number of works that would have been performed live in Halle during the Festival but were performed and recorded elsewhere earlier in May. Among these were a fully-staged production of *Ariodante* featuring the Marionettistica Carlo Colla & Figli of Milan and the Lautten Compagnie Berlin, under the musical direction of Wolfgang Katschner, and a concert performance of the 1725 version of *Giulio Cesare* in the Hallische Händel-Ausgabe (HHA) edition by Hans Dieter Clausen, under the musical direction of Andrea Marcon who also led a concert by La Cetra Barockorchester Basel in honor of his receipt of the 2021 Händel Preis. There were also concerts featuring Lucy Crowe, Margriet Buchberger, Andreas Scholl, and Dorothee Oberlinger, as well as a performance of music by Friedrich Wilhelm Zachow and a concert performance of Handel's pasticcio *Lucio Papirio dittatore*.

The accompanying International Academic Conference sponsored by the G. F. Händel Gesellschaft was successfully presented online from May 31 to June 2 in the manner of the AHS Conference. It began with the presentation of the Handel Research Prize to Teresa Ramer-Wünsche in recognition of her HHA edition of *Parnasso in festa*, followed by a paper from the prizewinner herself. The theme of the conference was "Redemption and the Modern Age—Handel's *Messiah* between the late 18th and the 21st Century." Papers by AHS members included Stephen Nissenbaum's "Rejoicing against Whom? Charles Jennens, Michael Marissen, *Zadok the Priest*, and the Hallelujah Chorus"; David Vickers's "Their Sound is gone out into all Lands': period-instrument recordings of *Messiah*, 1980–2020"; Colin Timms's "Words, Music and Irony in Handel"; Luke Howard's "Handel's *Messiah* in London and the Provinces, 1840–1857: Setting the Stage for the Handel Festivals"; and my own "Sir George Smart's Advice to Jenny Lind on Performing *Messiah*."

The 19th Biennial International Conference on Baroque Music, which had been postponed from last year, took place online July 15–17, hosted by the Royal Birmingham Conservatoire. It is reviewed elsewhere in this issue of the *Newsletter* by Fred Fehleisen, with special attention paid to Handel and related topics.

There are more events still to come in 2021. The Göttingen Handel Festival, originally scheduled to take place in May, has been postponed until September 9–19, and as this issue of the *Newsletter* goes to press, there is still hope of it being presented live. The Annual Meeting of the American Musicological Society will take place online in November and will include papers by AHS members Minji Kim and Regina Compton. Finally, a conference on "Handel: Interactions and Influences" sponsored by the Handel Institute is scheduled to take place on November 20–21 at the Foundling Museum in London.

This has been and will continue to be a remarkable year in ways both positive and negative. Scholars, performers, and music lovers have been resilient, creative, and adaptable. Let us congratulate them all on their achievements and fervently hope that 2022 is less dangerous and chaotic than 2021.

— Graydon Beeks

COMPETITION AND PRIZE WINNERS

The International Handel Research Prize 2021 is awarded to **Teresa Ramer-Wünsche**, Halle (Saale), for her dissertation: "Georg Friedrich Händels *Parnasso in festa*. Historisch-kritische Edition und Einzelstudien zur Werkgenese."



The Handel Prize 2021 is awarded to the Italian conductor, harpsichordist, and organist **Andrea Marcon**.



The 8th Annual Handel Aria Competition winners are countertenor **Kyle Tingzon** (first prize), mezzo soprano **Sophie Michaux** (second prize), and soprano **Maya Kherani** (third prize).



THE J. MERRILL KNAPP RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP

The Board of Directors of The American Handel Society invites applications for the J. Merrill Knapp Research Fellowship to support scholarly projects related to Handel and his world. One or more fellowships may be awarded in a calendar year up to a total of \$2,000. Requests for funding may include, but not limited to, purchase of microfilms, travel for research, and production expenses for publications. This fellowship may be used on its own or to augment other grants or fellowships.

In awarding the Knapp Fellowship, preference will be given to graduate students, scholars in the early stages of their careers, and independent scholars with no source of institutional support.

The deadline for applications will be March 1, 2022. There is no application form. Each applicant should submit an outline of the project, a budget showing how and when the funds will be used, and a description of other funding for the same project applied for and/or received. In addition, applicants should have two letters of recommendation sent directly to the Knapp Fellowship Committee. Electronic submissions are preferred; letters of recommendation and the application can be emailed to **Professor Wendy Heller** at wbheller@princeton.edu. Paper submissions can be mailed to Professor Wendy Heller, Princeton University, Woolworth Center 316, Princeton, NJ 08544. All applications must arrive by March 1, 2022.

The American Handel Society

School of Music, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742
Telephone: (909) 607-3568 Email: americanhandelsociety@gmail.com
<https://www.americanhandelsociety.org>

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

Graydon Beeks, *President*, Pomona College
Nathan Link, *Vice President*, Centre College
Minji Kim, *Newsletter Editor*, Andover, MA

Ileri E. Chávez-Bárcenas, Bowdoin College
Norbert Dubowy, Mozarteum, Salzburg
Fredric Fehleisen, The Juilliard School
Roger Freitas, Eastman School of Music
William D. Gudger, Honorary Director, The College of Charleston
Ellen T. Harris, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Wendy Heller, Princeton University
David Hurley, Pittsburg State University, Kansas

Regina Compton, *Web Designer*, Chicago, IL
Marjorie Pomeroy Kelly, *Secretary/Treasurer*, Sandwich, MA

Robert Ketterer, University of Iowa
Richard G. King, Honorary Director, University of Maryland
Nicholas McGegan, Honorary Director, Berkeley, CA
Kenneth Nott, Hartt School of Music
John Roberts, University of California, Berkeley
Marty Ronish, Honorary Director, Edmonds, WA
Ellen Rosand, Yale University
Ayana Smith, Indiana University

THE AMERICAN HANDEL SOCIETY MEMBERSHIP FORM

Please mail the completed form and appropriate membership dues as instructed below:

Name _____ Date _____

Address _____

City _____ State/Country _____ Postal code _____

E-mail address _____ Phone _____

I agree to have the following listed in a printed Directory of AHS Members (check as appropriate): ☐ Address ☐ Phone ☐ Email

I would like my copy of the Newsletter delivered: ☐ electronically ☐ by mail

Class of Membership — Circle applicable cell(s) (for current calendar year, unless otherwise specified)	\$	£	€
Regular	35	28	30
Joint (one set of publications)	42	34	38
Donor	56	45	50
Student or Retired	20	15	18
Sponsor	100	80	90
Patron	200	145	160
Life	500	400	450
Subscriber (Institutions Only)	42	34	40
Donation – Travel Grant, Serwer Lecture, Knapp Fellowship, Traver Concert, ongoing activities (please specify intent)			
Friends of the Handel Institute, London*			
Regular	30	20	-
Student	15	10	-
Membership in the Georg-Friedrich-Händel-Gesellschaft*			
Regular	45	-	40
Student*	20	-	15
Dual Membership – Georg-Friedrich-Händel-Gesellschaft / Göttinger-Händel-Gesellschaft*†			
Regular	75	-	65
Regular (with <i>Göttinger Händel Beiträge</i>)	115	-	95
Student	27	-	21
Student (with <i>Göttinger Händel Beiträge</i>)	56	-	46
Dual Membership – Georg-Friedrich-Händel-Gesellschaft / Händel-Gesellschaft Karlsruhe*			
Regular	63	-	55
Student*	23	-	17.5
Triple Membership – Georg-Friedrich-Händel-Gesellschaft / Göttinger-Händel-Gesellschaft / Händel-Gesellschaft Karlsruhe			
Regular	93	-	80
Regular (with <i>Göttinger Händel Beiträge</i>)	125	-	105
Student	30	-	24
Student (with <i>Göttinger Händel Beiträge</i>)	60	-	48.5
TOTAL REMITTANCE			

* This organization does not have a reduced rate for retirees.

† This organization has additional categories of Regular Membership that require a higher membership fee but provide additional benefits (see its website). Arrangements for these other categories may be made directly with Mrs. Pomeroy Kelly (see below).

Those paying in dollars should make their checks payable to THE AMERICAN HANDEL SOCIETY and mail them to Marjorie Pomeroy Kelly, Secretary/Treasurer, THE AMERICAN HANDEL SOCIETY, 49 Christopher Hollow Road, Sandwich, MA 02563. Those wishing to pay in Euros should remit to Stephan Blaut, Treasurer, Georg-Friedrich-Händel-Gesellschaft, Gr. Nikolaistrasse 5, 06108 Halle (Saale), Federal Republic of Germany, and indicate that the payment is for the account of the AHS. Friends of the Handel Institute, London may also pay their AHS dues in sterling by making their checks payable to THE HANDEL INSTITUTE and mailing them to Ms. Sylvia Levi, Hon. Treasurer, The Handel Institute, 254A Kew Road, Richmond TW9 3EG, United Kingdom, with the appropriate annotation. Please do not send checks in Euros or sterling directly to the AHS as we are no longer able to process them.

Online payment options are available at <https://www.americanhandelsociety.org/join>

Payments in dollars for GFH or HI memberships must be received before June 1.

The American Handel Society

100 Brookside Drive Unit B
Andover, MA 01810

ISSN 0888-8701
xxxvi/2