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ABSTRACT.

This thesis recovers the wordbooks for Handel’s oratorios from their neglect in literary and musical history. Taking *Joseph and his Brethren* and *Hercules* as samples, it shows the essential place of wordbooks in the original oratorio experience and challenges an editorial and performance practice which favours music over words. Chapter One presents editions of the wordbooks of *Joseph* and *Hercules* in order to offer a transmissional history, and Chapter Two reclaims the literariness of the librettos and demonstrates their effectiveness. Chapter Three examines the two librettos in the composer’s and copyist’s manuscript musical scores prior to first publication of the wordbooks and reveals verbal changes made during composition of the music. Chapter Four explores the significance of wordbooks for the booksellers of *Joseph* and *Hercules* and reconstructs aspects of wordbook production and consumption. Chapter Five identifies the wordbooks’ printer and places wordbook production in the context of book trade regulation and copyright. Chapter Six discusses the material identity of the wordbooks and the design principles which supported their reception. The thesis concludes that access to printed librettos is essential to redress the verbal-musical imbalance in contemporary performances of Handel’s oratorios.
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PREFACE.

This study of the wordbooks, or printed librettos, for Handel’s dramatic oratorios *Joseph and his Brethren* and *Hercules* reconfigures the field between literary history and musicology by addressing a gap which exists between the two disciplines.¹ Literary history has not traditionally recognized librettos as literary writing, and musicology has generally considered librettos in terms of the quality of the music to which they are set. Both positions deny the creative duality of oratorio as an art form comprising literary and musical elements in asymmetrical relationship. Perhaps because wordbooks were ephemeral literary publications connected with vocal music, they do not feature in book trade history, a gap in knowledge which this thesis also addresses. The thesis thus presents the first bibliographical study of wordbooks and the texts they contain.

The problem of genre identification of librettos, addressed by the thesis, is apparent in some leading cultural histories. Allardyce Nicoll’s study of eighteenth-century drama erroneously directs readers to search for information about Handel’s oratorio *Joseph* in his chapter on ‘Italian Operas’, in which it is not discussed.² John Loftis’s sole reference to Handel’s dramatic oratorios is in the final sentence of his history of early eighteenth-century drama:

Aaron Hill […] made an emotional appeal to Handel, asking him to compose English operas. There was no reply, and the era of dramatic opera had closed. Handel himself

---

¹ The generic term ‘oratorio’ is applied in this thesis to both of these works, because both are unstaged musical dramas with named characters.

was to create a new form with his dramatic oratorios, such as *Semele* and *Hercules*, works which are perhaps better studied in a history of music.³

Loftis assigns dramatic oratorio firmly to the field of musicology, as does his closing footnote:


By directing his reader to Fiske, a musicologist, Loftis is misleading, for Fiske’s book entirely omits dramatic oratorio from discussion of ‘theatre music’. Astonishingly, John Brewer’s *The Pleasures of the Imagination*, an otherwise comprehensive discussion of British eighteenth-century culture, never considers Handel’s oratorios as works created with specific appeal to the imagination, which is in effect their chief characteristic.⁵ A recent survey of Greek tragedy in British theatre by Edith Hall and Fiona Macintosh clearly places Handel’s dramatic oratorio *Hercules* (its librettist is not mentioned) as falling within the province of musicology, this in spite of referring specifically to the libretto. *Hercules* is not discussed as drama for the theatre:

Modern music critics argue that if the choral convention of Greek tragedy emerges […] in the eighteenth century, it is in Handel’s oratorios, especially *Hercules*, advertised as ‘a musical drama’ (1745); its libretto […] gives an essential function to the chorus.⁶

---

The editorial punctiliousness expended on music in printed scores of Handel’s
dramatic oratorios contrasts markedly with the less assiduous approach to librettos. In the
nineteenth century, Friedrich Chrysander, editor of the only full printed scores of *Joseph* and
*Hercules* published since the eighteenth century, based the librettos he printed on the underlay
text in musical manuscripts, thereby presenting versions which differed from those in
wordbooks.\(^7\) Also published in the nineteenth century, the Novello vocal score of *Hercules*,
based on Chrysander’s score, preserved Chrysander’s lexical variants.\(^8\) At the beginning of the
twenty-first century, editorial attitudes to librettos remain inconsistent. Two major publishing
ventures are producing scores for Handel’s dramatic oratorios, though they have yet to include
*Joseph* and *Hercules*. The full music scores published for the Hallische Händel-Ausgabe,
intended on account of their musicological precision to replace those by Chrysander,
evertheless marginalize the librettos by failing to account for variants between Handel’s
underlay and wordbook texts.\(^9\) In contrast, recent vocal scores for three oratorios record
selected verbal discrepancies between wordbooks and the autograph score.\(^10\) Liner notes to
compact disc performances of *Joseph* and *Hercules* include a libretto but do not alert readers
to verbal variants between autograph score and librettos in wordbooks.\(^11\) Lack of recognition
in scores of the joint intellectual force of music and words perpetuates the false impression of
oratorios as entirely musical works, their librettos incidental to the sound.

---


\(^9\) *Hallische Händel-Ausgabe im Auftrage der Georg-Friedrich-Händel-Gesellschaft* (Leipzig and Kassel, 1955–).


\(^11\) *Joseph* was recorded in the 1950s and in 1996. *Hercules* was recorded in 1958, 1984, 2002, and a production was filmed in 2005; *Hercules* has never been recorded in its entirety.
Study of wordbooks is essential in order to understand oratorio librettos and their reception. The main function of a wordbook for an oratorio was to provide a printed libretto which could be read at the same time as it was heard in its musical setting. Henry Fielding, in *Amelia*, alludes to a libretto in a wordbook for a Handel oratorio. He writes of the purchase of a wordbook by a gentleman who ‘procured [Amelia] a Book and Wax-Candle, and held the Candle for her himself during the whole Entertainment’.\(^\text{12}\)

The terms ‘wordbook’ and ‘libretto’ are often used in musicology as synonymous, but in this thesis they have distinct meanings. A wordbook contains, among other printed texts, a libretto, which is a text of the literary work. A libretto, on the other hand, can exist in multiple texts, published or unpublished; and, as the thesis shows, the form of words conventionally associated with the music is not the only form taken by the author’s words. Various material states of the librettos exist which are each significant when considered in the light of Peter Shillingsburg’s bibliographical theory. A text, Shillingsburg writes, is ‘the actual order of words and punctuation as contained in any one physical form’, e.g. in manuscript or book.\(^\text{13}\)

Texts of the two literary works, as ‘authoritative versions of a literary writing’, were carried in wordbooks, as well as in lost manuscripts and in score underlays (p. 176). Thus, bibliographical and material study of wordbooks and librettos in this thesis has entailed looking at the texts as they are presented in wordbooks and other sources. The thesis provides new information about the materiality of the text, wordbook publishing, and the relation between design and purpose in wordbook production.

\(^{12}\) Henry Fielding, *Amelia*, 4 vols (London: Millar, 1751), ii, 80-81. Many references in the thesis to eighteenth-century sources are to publications that Handel’s audiences may have encountered, in preference to modern scholarly versions, because of their availability at *Eighteenth-Century Books Online* (ECCO).

Chapter One presents, for the first time for any Handel oratorio, editions of the texts printed in the earliest wordbooks for Joseph and Hercules. The editions support discussion later in the thesis.\textsuperscript{14} The bibliographical study of the wordbooks, and the texts they contain, also examines the earliest surviving state of the librettos as underlay texts in the composer’s autograph and the fair copy scores and the materialization of the librettos in the several wordbooks produced for sale to Handel’s audiences. The choice of copy-text, the first published text in each case, has been made in relation to Shillingsburg’s editorial theory. Because all authorial manuscripts are lost, there are no authoritative versions of the librettos for either Joseph or Hercules. The earliest extant versions of the librettos exist in the underlays to the manuscript music scores, where they display adjustments made by the composer to the librettos in cancellation or amendment.\textsuperscript{15} These changes make it possible to track Handel’s underlay modifications, those in the fair copy underlay and the three wordbooks published for Joseph and the three wordbooks published for Hercules, to present a record of variants. The libretto-in-underlay is not, however, the copy-text because any authorial involvement has to be inferred from the revisions. A sociological orientation, on the other hand, privileges the first published text of the work as the copy-text, and the first wordbook embodies as closely as possible what Shillingsburg describes as ‘a coherent overall intention’ (p. 44).\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{14} To avoid ambiguity in the thesis, ‘wordbook’ is the preferred term for an edition of the libretto printed in a wordbook; ‘edition’ in the thesis refers to one of the editions in Chapter One.

\textsuperscript{15} According to Hans Dieter Clausen, ‘The Hamburg Collection’, Handel Collections and their History, ed. by Terence Best (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 10-28, the fair copy scores in Hamburg are of two kinds, either conducting scores (‘Direktionspartituren’) or ‘copies at the composer’s hand’ (Handexemplare’); the fair scores of Joseph and Hercules are ‘Direktionspartituren’ (p. 10).

\textsuperscript{16} The copy-texts are: James Miller, Joseph and his Brethren. A Sacred Drama. As it is Perform’d at the Theatre-Royal in Covent-Garden. The Musick by Mr. Handel (London: Watts, 1744); and Thomas Broughton, Hercules. A Musical Drama. As it is Perform’d at the King’s Theatre in the Hay-Market. The Musick by Mr. Handel (London: Tonson and Draper, 1745).
Headnotes to the editions in Chapter One provide bibliographical descriptions to show wordbook construction and evidence of the printer’s involvement. The descriptions of wordbooks observe Philip Gaskell’s guiding principle to editors, to avoid ‘imprecision and ambiguity’ when edition-making.17 An apparatus to the editions presents a comprehensive record of variants, its sources including the underlays in the manuscript musical scores. It notes verbal, orthographical, and typographical deviations published in later wordbooks, to emphasize the materiality of the texts by showing the altered physical forms of the librettos for Joseph and Hercules. Alterations in the librettos’ texts contributed to the history of the social event of wordbook formation, from underlay in music manuscripts to appearance of the librettos in print. The record of variants reveals, in Shillingsburg’s words, ‘where the text has been flawed by accidents, outside pressures, or missed opportunities’, and thus allows the reader to trace the intervention of creative artists and printer in a transmissional history of the text up to Handel’s death in 1759 (p. 38).

Much more is known about Handel’s librettists than about their librettos.18 Chapter Two introduces the Reverend James Miller, whose libretto Joseph was set by Handel in 1743, and the Reverend Thomas Broughton, whose libretto Hercules was set by the composer in 1744. Their librettos were selected for this thesis because they belong to a decisive turning point in Handel’s career, when the composer aborted a plan for an extended repertory of oratorio, similar in pattern to an opera season, an arrangement which is discussed fully in

Burrows’s biography of the composer.\textsuperscript{19} Although Ruth Smith has comprehensively investigated the intellectual contexts of the librettos for Handel’s dramatic oratorios, and others have explored metre and imagery in three librettos, a systematic case has yet to be made to support the librettos as effective literary writing.\textsuperscript{20} The thesis takes a revisionist stance by vindicating the authors’ librettos as efficient literary contributions to the dramatic oratorios \textit{Joseph} and \textit{Hercules}. The libretto for \textit{Joseph} is the basis for a powerful sentimental drama, devoid of scenes of death and destruction, based on episodes in the life of Joseph in Genesis. \textit{Hercules}, in stark contrast, has a libretto which forms an epic tragedy centred on the injurious force of jealousy within a marriage, played out against a background of gods and human war, glory, and love. Yet, in spite of their divergent themes, these librettos share the quintessential traits of effective librettos for Handel, because their words are concise, economical, coherent, establish character and situation in a few bold strokes, and provide rich prospects for dramatic effects in the music. Written within months of each other, these librettos, set to Handel’s music, were an important part of one of Europe’s most significant public artistic events, oratorios in English.

\textsuperscript{19} Donald Burrows, \textit{Handel} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 278-84; for transcriptions of documents concerning oratorios in 1745, see HHb iv, 380-86.

Chapter Three presents the first examination of the underlays in the composer’s oratorio autograph scores and the fair copies.\textsuperscript{21} Comparison of the first wordbook texts with Handel’s underlay makes it possible to discern text that Miller or Broughton may have submitted to the composer but which exists only in these underlays. Lying chronologically between the lost authorial manuscripts and the first published librettos, the underlays are, in Shillingsburg’s words, ‘tentative forms of the work’, in that they contain instantiations of the librettos closest in time to the now-lost original authorial manuscripts (p. 53). This Chapter recovers cancelled literary text from the composer’s ideas in draft.

Chapter Four moves the focus from various physical and aesthetic forms of the librettos to the men who turned them into a commodity. In spite of the wordbooks’ valuable contribution to the experience of oratorio, surprisingly little has been written about those who financed and printed them or about the materiality of their product. These individuals lived remarkably different yet interesting lives. Jacob Tonson and his brother Richard briefly feature in \textit{ODNB}, though their wordbooks are not mentioned. John Watts and others involved in wordbook publication do not feature in \textit{ODNB}. The new biographies provided in this Chapter of the booksellers and printer who were active in publication of the librettos for \textit{Joseph} and \textit{Hercules}, along with information about their part in a little known area of the book trade, add substantively to the Handel literature.\textsuperscript{22}

The tradesmen and print entrepreneurs who published wordbooks for \textit{Joseph} and \textit{Hercules} were engaged in the production of a conventional artefact for audiences of musical

\textsuperscript{21} A recent study of Handel’s underlay to \textit{Rodelinda} (HWV 19), Andrew V. Jones, ‘The Composer as Dramatist: Handel’s Contribution to the libretto of “Rodelinda”’, \textit{ML}, 88 (2007), 49-77, investigates the composer’s dramaturgical alterations and lexical emendations and their meaning in that opera.

works with verbal texts. Ruth Smith explains that wordbooks must have proved especially useful when Handel’s singers had poor English diction (Oratorios, p. 23). Wordbooks allowed librettos to be read before and after performances, and so encouraged contemplation of a work’s ideas and themes. Wordbooks were thus an important constituent of the oratorio experience. Chapter Four therefore attempts to reconstruct the first principles behind wordbook production, costs, and distribution. Wordbook publishers spent time and money to produce artefacts which, though ephemera, accorded with their reputation as publishers of fine literature. In the absence of printers’ ledgers, attention to costs is speculative, but is based on evidence from contemporary printers’ practices and records.

Chapter Five gives new information about the commercial and regulatory framework within which wordbooks were produced, sold, and publishers’ rights protected. Wordbook publication involved arrangements between author and bookseller in what Shillingsburg calls ‘the conventionalizing influence of an authorized publication process’ (p. 81). The nature of ‘authorization’ for Joseph differs from that for Hercules, because Joseph was entered in the Stationers’ Hall register, whereas Hercules was not. John Watts’s registration of Joseph was the first wordbook for an oratorio with music by Handel to be protected by the version of copyright established by Parliament in 1710. Hercules, by contrast, was protected by the reliance of its publishers, the Tonson brothers, on ‘perpetual’ copyright. This Chapter also identifies for the first time the printer of Hercules.

Chapter Six presents a new discussion of paratext in the wordbooks. Paratext was a fundamental part of the complex negotiation between reader, book, author, publisher, and printer. It was the bookseller’s territory, providing space for his advertisements, which could also be used for authorial commentary and dedication. Study of wordbook paratext reveals
social, commercial, and cultural details previously ignored by literary history and musicology, and shows wordbooks as specialized artefacts within an expanding print culture.\textsuperscript{23}

Consideration of the ‘look of the book’ indicates how wordbook design was an integral feature of audience experience of oratorio. High standards of aesthetic presentation were achieved, presumably without compromising booksellers’ profits. Wordbooks exhibit clear print, functional design, and artisanship of high quality. Supplied to a severely restricted market, they were nevertheless endowed with a fine material identity. They display a pleasing house style of bold headings, varied founts, and wide margins, which were facets of their status as, in Shillingsburg’s words, a ‘socialized commodity’, the product of contingent social events (p. 53).

The thesis concludes by challenging Winton Dean’s influential assertion that ‘Staging [of the dramatic oratorios] can be justified on historical and aesthetic grounds [and by] the experience itself’.\textsuperscript{24} Staged dramatic oratorio creates an opera, which in effect is a work quite different from that envisaged by the librettist and Handel. Staging devalues the oratorios’ literary element, and diminishes the imaginative contribution audiences of oratorio are required to make by consulting a printed libretto. Substituting staging for a printed libretto removes a vital link with the original cultural context of this complex art form. Audience re-engagement with the essentially contemplative character of oratorio requires a printed libretto which can be consulted during a performance.

\textsuperscript{23} The view that publishing burgeoned in eighteenth-century London has recently been challenged by William St Clair, \textit{The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) and is discussed in Chapter Four.

Chapter One.

EDITIONS OF JOSEPH AND HERCULES.

1.1. Sources of the two librettos.

In London three wordbooks for Joseph were published before Handel’s death in 1759. The first was published for the first performances in 1744, the second in 1747, and the third in 1757. The libretto of Joseph contained in the 1747 wordbook differs in detail from the libretto in the first wordbook, and the 1757 libretto has some substantial variants from its predecessors. To compile the apparatus to the edition of Joseph in this thesis, all known copies of these wordbooks in the United Kingdom were inspected personally: eleven of 1744, two of 1747, and one of 1757. The Beinecke Rare Books Library, Yale University, answered queries about their 1744 wordbook for Joseph (Ik.M615.+7448). As the English Short Title Catalogue, the compilation made by Dean (p. 635), and an unpublished catalogue compiled by John Greenacombe do not document all of the wordbooks inspected, the catalogue in the headnotes below supplements their records. ¹

In London three wordbooks were published for Hercules, the first for the first performances in 1745, the second in 1749, and the third in 1752. The libretto of Hercules contained in the two later wordbooks differs markedly from that published in the first wordbook. To compile the apparatus to the edition of Hercules in this thesis, all known copies

¹ John Greenacombe, in a private communication, provided locations for many Handel oratorio wordbooks. A list of copies of the first wordbook for Joseph and Hercules inspected personally for this thesis is located at the beginning of each of the editions.
of these wordbooks in the United Kingdom were inspected personally: four of 1745, four of 1749, and two of 1752. The date of a wordbook in the Schoelcher Collection, Bibliothèque Nationale, unrecorded in its online catalogue, is confirmed as 1749 by Richard King. His study of this copy provided information about the authority for a chorus in the libretto in the 1752 wordbook, as explained in the headnotes to the edition below.\(^2\)

Because imprints can prove unreliable, dating wordbooks is not straightforward. Dean’s lists of wordbooks for \textit{Joseph} and \textit{Hercules}, and those compiled by Anthony Hicks, distinguish on musical grounds between wordbooks bearing a similar date. Many libraries, particularly the Bodleian Library in Oxford, have yet to place their entire special collections online, which raises the possibility that further wordbooks may be found. The editions in this thesis, and their headnotes and apparatus, are intended, among other purposes, to assist in the recognition and dating of any hitherto unrecorded wordbooks.

Dating the underlay in Handel’s autograph scores of \textit{Joseph} and \textit{Hercules} is straightforward, for the composer dated most of the acts as he completed them. The copyist, however, applied no dates to his fair copy scores, though the fewer textual changes relative to the composer’s scores means that inability to date them is not problematic. Changes made to the text in hands other than the main copyist are not recorded in the edition notes below. While all wordbooks carry an imprint date, some dates are untrustworthy, because wordbooks bearing the same imprint date reveal minor discrepancies between them. Recorded for the first time in this thesis, typographical details and ornaments allow differentiation between

\(^2\) Richard King, paper on Schoelcher’s Collection, including the copy of \textit{Hercules}, Handel Institute Conference, Foundling Museum, London, 24 November 2007; Xavier Cervantes, in a private communication, confirmed the whereabouts of this copy.
wordbooks sharing the same date. Apart from the vagaries of imprint dates, it is possible nevertheless to place the various versions of the libretto within a dependable sequence.

Unfortunately, the present physical condition of nearly all wordbooks for *Joseph* and *Hercules* is different from the state in which they were first sold. Only one is known to exist with its proportions intact. Most now are bound individually or bound with companion works which rarely have any connection either with the librettist or his libretto for *Joseph* or *Hercules*. For example, in the Founder’s Library at Lampeter, *Joseph* (Tract 559) is bound with wordbooks for vocal works by Handel and other composers. In the libraries of St Andrews, Glasgow, and Edinburgh universities, the copyright wordbook for *Joseph* is bound with publications registered at Stationers’ Hall having been dispatched to Scotland presumably very shortly after registration.

As the editions in this thesis are the first of their kind, the apparatus includes, with a few exceptions explained below, all known textual and typographical variants. It is not possible to establish which variants are attributable to the author, so that the record of variants is comprehensive rather than selective. Typographical variants, however arcane or seemingly trivial, are included for the reason that some variants between wordbooks originated during the printing process and therefore show the involvement of craftsmen in wordbook production.

The number of lexical variants is indicative of collaboration between the librettist and the composer, and perhaps an active involvement by singers. The record of variants shows the historical development of the libretto, from earliest extant form in Handel’s autograph scores to the last published version prior to the composer’s death in 1759. Variants from Handel’s underlay, as the earliest source, are cited first in the notes, followed by variants in the fair copy, and finally by the two later wordbooks. The collations do not include every instance of
variant spelling in the underlay in composer’s and copyist’s manuscript scores, variants within multiple repetitions, or the employment of dashes to signify syllabic extension during musical passagework. Trivial discrepancies in the fair copy score appear because, though their literary meaning may be inconsequential, they may have some degree of bibliographical significance when allocating a wordbook leaf to a specific season or performance.

Personal inspection of the original artefacts has been important in resolving issues raised by paper copies, indistinct microform, or digital images. For example, initial capitalization, though generally applied consistently, is not entirely perfect. Compositorial ‘slips’ like these may have been unintended, and to avoid confusion the use of the term ‘accidentals’ to describe them is avoided in this thesis. Quite apart from the specialized application in music that might therefore confuse readers of the editions, so-called ‘accidentals’ in the bibliographical sense in wordbooks are frequently schematic, carrying literary meaning and assisting distinction between various states of the libretto.

Where there is multiple repetition of a misinscription in the manuscript scores, only the final repetition appears in the notes. Variant stage directions are recorded, even when they do not affect literary meaning. A variant which can be construed as an accident of print technology, perhaps from uneven inking, is excluded from the notes. Collectively, all variants provide fascinating glimpses into the working practices of composer, copyist, and printer.
1.2. \textit{Editorial principles.}

The editions that follow are bibliographically historicist. Eighteenth-century compositors’ choice of type, and other evidence of print technology (e.g. capitals, smalls, italics, and dashes), are intentional encodings of the text and therefore shape its meaning. The editions consistently modernize and transcribe these components. Though they dispense with some features of the original layout and typography, the editions preserve in modern typeface something of the original \textit{mise-en-page} in relation to character cues and indentation of lines in airs and ensembles. There is no modernization of diphthongs. The original pagination and line-endings of the prose paratext are not retained, and an upright divider (|) indicates line-endings. The main text preserves as much as possible of the original disposition of text on the page. To preserve something of their visual impact on the page, commercial advertisements for \textit{The Lady’s Preceptor} in two \textit{Joseph} wordbooks are reduced in size so that each fits on one page of the thesis; variants in the advertisements are recorded in their apparatus (e.g. p. 32 below). There are no known manuscript versions of the wordbooks’ paratextual material.

The siglum letter for the first wordbook for \textit{Joseph} takes the author’s initial, because Miller’s involvement is verifiable. This initial is then followed by the year in which the wordbook was published: M44. For the \textit{Joseph} wordbooks in which Miller had no involvement, the siglum letter is ‘J’, from the title, followed by the year of publication: J47 and J57. Dean infers, on musical grounds, that the wordbooks he saw with ‘1747’ as their imprint date were sold later, possibly for ‘an abortive 1751 revival’ and ‘almost certainly’ for a revival in 1755 (p. 412). Though Bernd Baselt followed this later dating, in view of the
uncertainty over the date of sale and the two versions of this wordbook identified in the thesis, this wordbook’s siglum is ‘J47’.³

For the first wordbook for Hercules, the siglum letter ‘T’ stands for the publisher Tonson, and is followed by the year of publication: T45. The publisher named in the imprints to the two later Hercules wordbooks is ‘Roberts’, and the siglum letter for these wordbooks is therefore ‘R’, followed by the year of publication: R49 and R52. The discussion in Chapter Five, however, discounts Roberts’s unequivocal agency as their publisher. The siglum letter for the printed scores is ‘W’, for Walsh, the publisher, and is followed by the year of publication: for Joseph W44 and W47, and for Hercules W45.

The sigla for the composer’s autograph scores take their initial from Handel’s surname, followed by the year in which he dated them: H43 for Joseph and H44 for Hercules. The sigla for autograph musical manuscript scores which augment Handel’s autograph score of Joseph receive an additional letter, to represent their location: ‘H43/F’, for the autograph fragments in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, ‘H43/PM’ for the fragment in the Pierpoint Morgan Library, New York, ‘H43/Z’ for the single recitative among the Zweig manuscripts in the BL, and ‘H43/DA’ for Handel’s autograph score of the chorus in the Dettingen Anthem, incorporated into Joseph as the final chorus.

The fair copy scores have sigla that begin with ‘C’, to represent their status as the copyist’s scores, and the letter is followed by the year in which the majority of the score was made. Because the copyist numbered the leaves of each Part/Act independently, without a continuous numbering scheme for the whole work, the sigla for these scores specify the

manuscript of the Part (Joseph) and Act (Hercules), e.g. the note ‘C43/2 fol. 42v’ indicates the verso to leaf 42 in the fair copy of Part II of Joseph.

Pinched braces ( { } ) enclose editorial explanation. When a page number is inferred editorially it is enclosed in square brackets ( [ ] ) prefixed by ( p. ) and entered in italics; but when the page number is given as in the copy-text it is placed in square brackets without a prefatory ‘ p.’ and is in roman. All page numbers are placed to the right of the main text, regardless of their position in the copy-text; in the paratext, page numbers are placed within the text to indicate the page turn. Upper case letters, initial capitals, small capitals, and spellings are transcribed as in the original text. Because it is difficult to distinguish between upper- and lower-case letters in the composer’s underlay, the edition in this thesis makes no claim to present a comprehensive account of their incidence in the manuscripts. The editions and discussion in the thesis preserve the different labelling of each Part or Act, which is a curiosity found in the composer’s autograph scores and thus likely to have derived from the librettists. The long ‘s’ is modernized. Cancelled or abandoned literary text in the two manuscript scores which does not appear in the copy-texts is placed within angle brackets (< >) in the notes.

All lemma references to verse and paratext prose give a line number. These numbers are added editorially to the right of the main text. Square bracing, placed editorially to the right of two or more lines, denotes a pentametric unit. Stage directions, divisions, and character cues appear in full because they are without line numbers. A period separates a line number in a lemma from the rest of the note, and a closing square bracket ( ] ) divides the lemma from its variant. Where the descriptor from the main text includes a closing square

---

4 To save words in the thesis, act and scene references are abbreviated, e.g. Act (or Part) I Scene 3 becomes I.3.
bracket, space between it and the editorial closing square bracket is widened in order to maintain visual clarity, as in this example from the underlay to *Hercules* (I.5) in the manuscript scores:

\[ \text{[A March.]} \] Marche H44 fol. 36\textsuperscript{v}, C44/1 fol. 65\textsuperscript{v} 

A variant requiring citation of its main text version appears after the line number location, as in this example from Handel’s underlay to *Joseph*:

37. Smile \[ Shine, \] H43 fol. 61\textsuperscript{v} 

A variant in punctuation appears with the word preceding it in the copy-text, e.g. the variant word and comma in the example above indicates that Handel supplied a different word and added a comma. Spelling is transcribed from the manuscripts and wordbooks. Dash lengths are regularized, except where the printer used dashes noticeably longer than an em dash, and spacing is standardized between letters, words, and punctuation, with the exception of a semi-colon, colon, exclamation and question marks, which, to enhance clarity, are separated from the edition’s main text by an extra space. The editions do not record occasions in the composer’s autograph scores when an end stop was included but appeared nowhere else within the repetitions of words and phrases that ended sentences; the single occurrence may have been intentional. When punctuation, contraction, or capitalization in the musical scores is the same as in the copy-text at least once during repeated phrases, no variant is noted. When a comma separates repeated words or phrases in the underlays and seems employed for that
purpose, it is not regarded as a variant. A variant is recorded, however, when a period is omitted at the final restatement.

A hyphen in a citation indicates series, for example in an unbroken sequence of pages carrying a variant form, as in the copyist’s underlay in *Joseph* (III.2):

42. ] meritt’s past  H43 fol. 100v, C43/3 fols 12v-13f

References to Handel’s autograph score do not follow the composer’s pagination. Handel numbered his pages by gathering, the copyist by leaf. Though numbering by leaf was added to the composer’s autograph scores long after his death, the collations follow this later system, with recto or verso locators added in superscript. References to the copyist’s manuscript follow his numbering of leaves on the recto, with editorial indication of verso where appropriate.

The notes include the position of wordbook signatures to help identify discrepancies between wordbooks and facilitate application of a publication date to any wordbooks added to the list of known copies. Bibliographic description of signature variants follows Gaskell’s advice that ‘The word closest to the signature letter is transcribed, with an indication of the actual letter or space beneath which the signature is placed’ (p. 333). The location of a signature letter occurring beneath a space between words is indicated by a superior caret (^), e.g. in *Joseph*, I.4:

19. mystick^Dreams  B ] mystick  B  J47
Editorial pinched braces enclose an indication that text is obscured by the binding or by cancel slips.

No reference is made to watermarks for any of the six wordbooks examined, evidence being too uneven to make firm conclusions. Only a few wordbooks retain traces of watermarks, and these only in small sections. There is no attempt to represent ornaments, though their presence is recorded in the collations. There is no representation of printer’s rules, although their position also is indicated. A capital letter in factotum or display capital at the beginning of each Part or Act is represented in the main text by a type ornament (dropped capital) extending to approximately the same depth in the type area as the display capital in the original. Description and discussion of the ornaments are in Chapter Five. Though Gaskell recommends that editions should have photographic reproductions of ornaments, on grounds of cost there are none in the thesis (p. 334). Ornament reproductions in Chapter Five, some of which are faint, aid investigation of the printer’s identity.

By recording textual variants in all the texts included in a wordbook, the edition recovers lines of verse not yet published and thereby highlights an aspect of the commercial context within which the copy-texts were published. In the absence of the original authorial manuscripts, all of these scraps of verse, in whichever source they are found, have literary-archaeological significance. They show that Handel, when he transcribed the libretto into his underlay, discarded or had doubts about some verbal text. They offer insights into the text of the libretto as it may have appeared in the lost authorial manuscript.
1.3. *Joseph and his Brethren*.

1.3.1. Sources for the edition of *Joseph and his Brethren*.

Manuscript sources and sigla for the underlay libretto

**a) Handel**

**H43**


**H43/F**

Three fragments from *Joseph and his Brethren* in Detached Movements and Fragments from Oratorios, in Handel’s autograph; inspected personally. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MU MS 259; described in Burrows and Ronish, p. 236.

**H43/PM**

Part III duet in Handel’s hand, *Joseph and his Brethren*. New York, Pierpoint Morgan Library, Cary MS 121; described in Burrows and Ronish, p. 308.

**H43/Z**

Final recitative in Part III *Joseph and his Brethren*, in Handel’s hand; inspected personally. London, BL, Zweig MS 38; described in Burrows and Ronish, p. 302.

**H43/DA**

Final chorus of *Joseph and his Brethren*, in Handel’s autograph score of *Dettingen Anthem* HWV 265; inspected personally. London, BL, Additional MS 30308; described in Burrows and Ronish, p. 288.

**b) Copyist**

**C43/1; C43/2; C43/3**

Wordbooks examined, with shelfmark and state of current binding

M44
Joseph and his Brethren. A Sacred Drama. As it is Perform’d at the Theatre-Royal in Covent-Garden. The Musick by Mr. Handel. London: Printed for John Watts: And Sold by B. Dod at the Bible and Key in Ave-Mary lane near Stationers-Hall. MDCCXLIV. Price One Shilling. [Dedication signed James Miller.] The copy-text. Copies inspected personally:

Deposit library copies: London, BL (from the Royal Library), 841.c.23(4), bound-with; London, Lambeth Palace Library, Sion College Collection, K55.1/+H 19, bound-with; University of Edinburgh, Special Collections, S*.25.1/1, bound-with; University of Glasgow, Special Collections, Bn3-g2, bound-with; University of St Andrews, Special Collections, SAC900.P132, bound-with.5


J47A
Joseph and his Brethren. A Sacred Drama. As it is perform’d at the Theatre-Royal in Covent-Garden. The Musick by Mr. Handel. London: Printed for John Watts: And Sold by B. Dod at the Bible and Key in Ave-Mary Lane near Stationers-Hall. MDCCXLVII. Price One Shilling. [Dedication signed James Miller.] Copy inspected personally:

University of Birmingham, Special Collections, Shaw-Hellier 632, unbound (wrappered).

J47B
Joseph and his Brethren. A Sacred Drama. As it is perform’d at the Theatre-Royal in Covent-Garden. Set to Musick by Mr. Handel. London: Printed for J. Watts: And Sold by B. Dod at the Bible and Key in Ave-Mary Lane near Stationers-Hall. MDCCXLVII. Price One Shilling. [Dedication signed James Miller.] Copy inspected personally:

University of Leeds, Brotherton Collection, Mt MIL, bound.

J57
Joseph and his Brethren. A Sacred Drama. As it is Perform’d at the Theatre-Royal in Covent-Garden. Set to Musick by Mr. Handel. London: Printed for J. Watts: And Sold by B. Dod at the Bible and Key in Ave-Mary-Lane near Stationers-Hall. 1757. Price One Shilling.

Copy inspected personally: London, BL, 162.m.18, bound.

5 The library staff of the Bodleian, Oxford, University of Cambridge, and the University of Aberdeen, confirm that they have no record of a copy of Joseph in their deposit collections. Chapter Five discusses wordbook copyrights.
Printed music

W44
Copies inspected personally:

W47
Copies inspected personally:

1.3.2. Headnotes to the edition of *Joseph and his Brethren*.
M44 collates as 4to: A—D⁴ [$2 (-A1 signed)] 1-6 prelims, 7 8-32 text; type area 120 x 217.
Measurements in collation formulae are in millimetres and are approximate. Type area is cited, in preference to page-size, because no type area appears shortened in the copies consulted, whereas in the majority of copies the ravages of later binding have prevented reliable calculation of original page dimensions. There are no half-title leaves and no press figures. Prior to sale of the wordbook in 1744, a printed slip was pasted over the whole of the abandoned text for a duet on outer sheet D, page 32, and replaced with text for an air. Because
this cancel slip has become unglued and detached in the Lampeter copy, the hidden text is revealed.

Personal consultation of the two copies of J47 available in Britain discloses minor discrepancies, and so the Birmingham wordbook dated 1747 is given the siglum J47A and the Leeds copy, also dated 1747, the siglum J47B to signify that there are variants between them. J47A is 4to: A—D⁴ [S2 (-A1 signed)] I-6 prelims, 7 8-32 text; type area 125 x 215; J47B is 4to: A—D⁴ [S2 (-A1; additional A2 on 5 signed)] I-6 prelims, 7 8-32 text; type area 125 x 215. The two wordbooks also have different ornaments on page 3 [A2]. Both versions of J47 lack a half-title, and A1⁵ is blank; sheet A was reset. On sheet B the two copies have similar tipped-in printed slips, area pasted over, typeface, and typographical imperfections. Layout of the text in J47A and J47B follows M44 closely; minor differences are explained below.

J47A appears to have the dimensions in which it left the printer in 1747, and therefore offers a sound guide to the leaf dimensions handled by audiences. Trimming by binders over the years has rendered almost impossible a reliable description of sheet dimensions for any wordbook, with the exception of J47A. The sheet dimensions, inferred from J47A, suggest that it was folded from Demy. Description of the wordbooks as quarto is confirmed by the fact that all wordbooks for Joseph have horizontal chain-lines approximately 26 mm apart. According to Law 3 set down by William Blades, ‘If the chain-marks are across, and the watermark is found in the middle of the back of the book, that book must be quarto’. Gaskell’s warning that it is ‘normally impossible to tell whether 4º in 2s was printed by whole sheets with two signatures, or by half-sheet imposition’ underlines the speculative nature of determining wordbook construction (p. 106).

---

J47A survives unbound and with endpapers intact. Janine Barchas notes that because owners rebound their books, ‘copies of eighteenth-century books in their original wrappers or trade bindings are, today, a rare find’. J47A is thread-sewn, side-stitched, and without binding and has a handwritten note on its front blue wrapper cover, ‘Wednesday February 29th. 1768’. As there were no performances of Joseph at this time, and the bookseller, Watts, had died in 1763, J47A probably belonged to another bookseller’s stock and perhaps represents the purchase of a wordbook for purposes other than attendance at a performance of the oratorio.

Because Handel made cuts for revivals, the length of the libretto in 1757, at 573 lines of verse, differs markedly from M44, J47A, and J47B, which have 715 lines. After typographical resetting, J57 required twenty-three pages for the libretto compared with twenty-six pages for M44 and both versions of J47, the omission of Miller’s dedication saving another leaf. The most severe cuts to the text are in Part III of J57. There is no appreciable difference in fount size or line spacing between all three editions.

J57 is 4to: A¹ B—C⁴ D² [$2 (-A1, A2 signed)] I-4 prelims, 6 7-27 text, 28 end-matter; type area 122 x 205; sheet D was probably printed with another text to make up a full sheet and then the sheet was cut in two. There is no half-title leaf and ‘A2’ is missing because of insufficient room in the type area. The title page of J57 has an ornament occupying the position for the date in J47. J57’s imprint incorporates the date. Substantial variants in the text and typography of J57 show that it is certainly the third and final wordbook before Handel’s death. John Watts, named as the bookseller for all three Joseph wordbooks, commissioned amendment slips to adapt the text to match what was performed. In J57 an unprinted slip was

---

pasted over text on the outer sheet B, page 10. Catchwords and running headers are regular in all three wordbooks, and there are no discrepancies between catchword and the first word on the succeeding page.

The underlay in the composer’s autograph score, given the siglum H43 in this thesis, is no longer contained within a single volume. Handel composed the music as far as the final recitative and duet before deciding to conclude *Joseph* with the newly composed final anthem to the recently performed *Dettingen Anthem*. The autograph score to *Joseph* therefore ends without its concluding items, Handel relying on his copyist to provide the verbal text, instrumental, and vocal parts from the *Anthem*. The sources point to some confusion over the state of the performing version. The final recitative is in the Zweig Collection in the BL. Other variants in Handel’s hand are in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, and the final duet (a version not corroborated by the text on the pasted cancel) is in the Pierpoint-Morgan Collection in New York.

Handel’s late decisions over the final form of *Joseph* did no harm to the success of the oratorio. During the composer’s lifetime it proved one of his more popular oratorios, being performed on 2, 7, 9, and 14 March 1744 at Covent Garden theatre; 15 and 22 March 1745 at the King’s Theatre; 20 and 25 November 1747 at Covent Garden theatre; 28 February 1755 at Covent Garden theatre; and 9 March 1757 also at Covent Garden theatre. Wordbooks survive from the seasons of 1744, 1755 (i.e. with 1747 in the imprint), and 1757, but not from those of 1745 and 1747. Wordbooks sold during the 1745 season may have come from unsold 1744 stock.

Produced by bookseller-printer John Watts, the three wordbooks for *Joseph* observe a similar typographical scheme, a key feature of which was Watts’s ‘definite preference for old-
fashioned capitalization’, which he applied almost uniformly to substantive as well as proper
nouns, and which was characteristic of his printing. Italics denoting descriptive phrases and
stage directions are prominent in the three wordbooks. All lyric verse, i.e. verse to formal units
of music (air, chorus, and duet), is in italics to distinguish it from blank verse recitative, a
contrast further enhanced by various patterns of indentation from the left-hand margin to
highlight rhyming schemes. Generally, in later editions these patterns replicate those in M44.
An exception is the layout to ‘The People’s Favour’ (III.2), which has four indentations in M44
but three in the later versions. Another example is the ‘Duetto’ (III.6), which has three
indentations in M44, two in J47A and J47B, and one in J57.

Watts imposed a complex system of punctuation on the libretto in his three wordbooks,
shown in the variety of single and multiple dashes and the many clause-endings marked by
colons and semi-colons. Multiple dashes and em dashes punctuate some interrogatives, a
typographical feature that provides by far the greatest number of variants between wordbooks.
M44 punctuates pauses with multiple dashes throughout, but later wordbooks do not rigidly
observe M44’s evenness of spacing on either side of these dashes, showing that all sheets were
reset for J47. A notable feature of J57 appears in Part III where, from Scene 2 through to the
end, single dashes replace nearly all of the multiple dashes of earlier wordbooks.

Some errors attributable to the printer register legitimate points in mapping disparities
between wordbooks. An example occurs in M44 (III.3), where an inverted question mark end-
stops an enquiry: ‘Where can we find | A Man like thee, in whom God’s Spirit dwells¿’. Succeeding wordbooks display the correct mark. The St Andrews copy of M44 has a

---

superscript ‘e’ careted in handwriting, to correct the typo ‘Exunt’ (1.4), which is not in the same ink tone as inscriptions at the front of this copy made by an eighteenth-century student at that university. Carefully written in dark ink, the careted ‘e’ is perhaps a printer’s correction. However, unlike printer’s errors, a few textual variants remain unattributable. In the concluding chorus to Part I, ‘Since the Race of Time begun’, M44’s ‘matchless Wisdom’ becomes ‘matchless Lustre’ in J47 and J57, and the beginning of Phanor’s air in II.1, ‘Our Fruits, whilst yet in Blossom’ in M44 and J47, becomes ‘Our Fruits, while yet in Blossom’ in J57. J57 has a variant because of a cut made by the composer: the agency which bridged the textual ‘gap’ with a new vocative phrase cannot now be determined, but as a practical in-filler the phrase ‘O Asenath’, prefacing ‘my dear old Father lives’ (III.2), seems commonsense invention in context.

Further alteration by Handel to the libretto before a revival forced the printer to make expedient amendments to his reset sheets. A printed slip in J47, pasted and hinged next to the chorus ‘Immortal Pleasures’ (1.8), indicates interpolation of an air, with new verse, for the High Priest. In J57, resetting integrates this ‘foreign’ verse into the body of the text. Prior to sale of J57, a slip was pasted to cancel the concealed air, though sufficient text remains exposed to identify that what was covered belongs to the same air introduced into J47. In the final scene, before the concluding chorus, M44 announces a ‘Duetto’, but the character cue names only one participant, Asenath. A pasted cancel slip conceals the last four lines of this duet, with the lines originally allocated to Joseph now given to Asenath. In J47, the whole air, though entitled ‘Duetto’, was reset to incorporate the lines within the text body. Of this item, still marked ‘Duetto’, J57 includes the opening lines only.
Parts of the libretto appear in editions of the music published by John Walsh, who announced publication of the music for *Joseph* in *The General Advertiser*, 4 May 1744 (‘The First Act’), and in *The Daily Advertiser* of 19 May 1744 (‘The Second and Third Act’) and 24 May 1744 (‘in Score’, i.e. without secco recitatives and choruses but including major accompanied recitatives). The edition of *Joseph* in this thesis includes verbal and typographical variants between the underlay in Walsh’s printed scores and M44 and shows Walsh’s occasionally inconsistent spelling and end-stopping of phrases. Walsh’s printed scores include ‘What’s sweeter’ as a duet, signalling that there was some confusion between the printers of the wordbook and Handel over what was performed. Because Walsh printed his score after the first performance, this inclusion by Walsh of Asenath’s final air as a duet suggests that Handel performed the movement in that form. It is anomalous, therefore, that J47 and J57 continued to present the duet as an air entitled ‘Duetto’, even though half-sheet D was reset.
1.3.3. Edition of *Joseph and his Brethren*.

p. [I.] JOSEPH | AND HIS | BRETHREN. | A | SACRED DRAMA. | As it is Perform’d at the | THEATRE-ROYAL *in* Covent-Garden. | [rule] | The MUSICK by Mr. HANDEL. | [rule] | [printer’s ornament] | [two rules] | LONDON : | Printed for JOHN WATTS: And Sold by B. DOD at the | Bible and *Key* in *Ave-Mary Lane* near *Stationers-Hall*. | [short rule] | M DCC XL IV. | [Price One Shilling.]
Just Publish’d, (Price One Shilling.)
The Second Edition, with large Alterations and
Additions, beautifully printed.
Dedicated to Her Highness the LADY AUGUSTA.
* * * The LADY’s PRECEPTOR: Or, A Letter to a
Young Lady of Distinction upon POLITENESS. Taken
from the French of the Abbé D’Ancourt, and adapted to the
Religion, Customs, and Manners of the English Nation. By
a Gentleman of Cambridge.

With all that Earth or Heav’n could bestow,
To make her amiable: —— On she came,
Grace was in all her Steps, Heav’n in her Eye,
In every Gesture Dignity and Love.

Milton.

The Contents.

Of Politeness in general.
Of Politeness in Religion, and
against Superstition.
Of Devotion.
Of Behaviour at Church.
Of the Duties and Decorums
of Civil Life.
Of Behaviour to our Superiors.
Of Conversation.
Of Complaisance.
Of Flattery and Servility.
Of Appearing Absent in Com-
pany.
Of Contradiction.
Of Calumny and Detraction.
Of Vain Glory. Of Prejudice.
Of being too Inquisitive.
Of Whispering and Laughing
in Company.
Of applauding and Censuring
People rashly.
Of Mimicking others.
Of being blind to what gives
us Offence.
Of Gallantry from the Men.
Of Friendship with Men.
Of Love. Of Matrimony.
Of Duty to Parents.
Of Pride and Condescension.
Of True and False Nobility.
Of Self-Conceit and Love of
Vanity.
Of Humility and Pride.
Of Affection.
Of Going to Court, and Cour-
Of Insincerity.
Of Friendship.
Of Doing Good Offices.
Of Anger and Resentment.
Of Gentleness and Modesty.
Of Keeping and Imparting
Secrets.
Of Receiving and Paying Visits.
Of Egotism.
Of the Imitation of others.
Of Compliments and Cer-
mony.
Of Asking Questions.
Of Talking before Servants.
Of Behaviour towards rude
young Fellows.
Of Ridicule. Of Politicks.
Of Trusting to Appearances
and Reports.
Of Hope and Belief.
Of Idleness. [Places.
Of appearing often in Publick
Of Houswifry. [ness.
Of Frugality and Covetous-
Of the Learning proper to a
young Lady.
Of Letter-Writing.
Of the Choice and Entertain-
ment of Books. Of Dress.
Of Behaviour at Table.
Of Behaviour at Assemblies,
Operas, and Plays.
Of Gaming.
Of Self Conversation.
Of Good nature and Charity.
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{Notes on next page of the thesis.}
To His GRACE the DUKE of MONTAGUE.

May it please your GRACE,

I HAVE no other Apology to make for presuming to lay the following Performance at Your Grace’s Feet, than the Countenance you are pleased to give the Refined and Sublime Entertainments of this Kind, and the generous Patronage you manifest towards the Great Master, by whose Divine Harmony they are supported. A Master meritorious of such a Patron, as he may be said, without the least Adulation, to have shewn a higher degree of Excellence in each of the various kinds of Composition, than any one who has ever arrived at in a single Branch of it; and to have so peculiar a Felicity in always making his Strain the Tongue of his Subject, that his Music is sure to talk to the Purpose, whether the Words it is set to do so, or not. 'Tis a pity however, My LORD, that such a Genius should be put to the Drudgery of hammering for Fire where there is no Flint, and of giving a Sentiment to the Poet’s Metre before he can give one to his own Melody.

Your GRACE need not be informed, that the Time allotted for the Representation of this kind of Drama deprives the Writer of sufficient Room for the gradual and artful Unravelling of his Subject, as well as the clear and full Explication of his Character. These Defects, which are unavoidable, I need not request one of Your Grace’s Penetration to pardon: Those owing to the Author, as too many I fear there are in this short Poem, I rely on your boundless Candor and Humanity to overlook, as I likewise do for your Pardon of this Intrusion.

To render the latter as little impertinent as possible, I shall not shape it in the usual Mode of Epistles Dedicatory, but, without attempting to inform Your Grace any thing about Yourself, as if you had never put in practice the Nosce Teipsum, shall humbly take my Leave by assuring Your Grace that I am, with the highest Sincerity, Your Grace’s most obedient, and most humble Servant, JAMES MILLER.
JACOB had Twelve Children, whereof Joseph and Benjamin were the two youngest, and were born to him of Rachel. The superior Affection which Jacob shewed towards Joseph, and the Account which the latter gave his Brethren of some of his Dreams denoting his own future Grandeur and their Subjection to him, raised their Jealousy and Hatred against him. Hereupon they take an Opportunity, when they were one Day in the Field together, to throw him first into a Pit, and afterwards to draw him out again, and sell him to a Company of mercantile Ishmaelites who were going down to Egypt, persuading their Father Jacob, by the Stratagem of dipping a Coat which they had strip’d him of, in Blood, that he was devoured by a wild Beast.

The Ishmaelites being arrived with Joseph in Egypt, sold him to Potiphar, a principal Officer in Pharaoh’s Court, with whom he lived in high Favour, a considerable time, ’till at length, upon the false Accusation of Potiphar’s Wife, he was disgraced and cast into Prison. During his Confinement, the chief Butler, and chief Baker of Pharaoh’s Court, were thrown into the same Place by the King’s Order, both of whom having a Dream in the same Night, receiv’d an Interpretation of them from Joseph, which proved true, the chief Baker being within three Days hanged on a Tree, and the chief Butler restored to his Employment as was foretold; but being taken into Favour again thought no more of his Interpreter, as he had promised to do.

Here then our Drama finds Joseph, two Years after this Incident had hapen. At this Time, Pharaoh himself having had two Dreams in the same Night, the First, of Seven fat Kine coming out of the River, which were devoured by Seven other lean Kine which came up after them; and the Second, of Seven full Ears of Corn devoured by Seven thin ones, the Wisemen of Egypt could not interpret them. The chief Butler calling Joseph to Remembrance upon this Occasion, spoke of him to the King, who immediately order’d that he should be brought before him; of whom having...
received a satisfactory Explication of his Dreams, as that they were both of the same Purport, and pointed out Seven Years of Plenty, and Seven of Famine to succeed them, Pharaoh appointed him Ruler over the Land of Egypt, to lay up in the Years of Plenty a Store for a Supply in those of Dearth; at the same time giving him to Wife Asenath the Daughter of Potiphera, High-Priest of On, by whom, during the Years of Plenty, he had two Sons.

The Famine having at length spread itself into all Countries, Jacob hearing there was Corn in Egypt, sent his ten elder Sons thither to purchase some, keeping Benjamin the youngest with him for fear some Accident should befall him. Joseph immediately knew his Brethren, and seeing them at his Feet, he remembred his former Dreams, but did not make himself known to them, speaking roughly, treating them as Spies, and ordering them to return and bring down their younger Brother whom they spoke of, as a Proof of their Veracity. Having detained one of them in Prison, by way of a Hostage, he commanded his Officers privately, to restore every one of the others his Money into his Sack, and to send them away with their Corn, for the Land of Canaan. Having, after a long time, prevailed on Jacob to let Benjamin go with them, they returned to Egypt and presented him before Joseph, who tenderly embraced him, and was so sensibly affected by the Interview, that, not being able to refrain from Tears, he was obliged to leave the Room. After this he made a grand Entertainment for them, giving at the same time a secret Order to his Officers to put his Silver Cup into Benjamin’s Sack.

They had no sooner left the Town the next Morning but they were sent after, brought before Joseph again, and charged with stealing this Cup, when, their Sacks being examined, and the Cup found in that belonging to Benjamin, he was doom’d to continue a Slave to Joseph.

The rest of the Brethren refusing to return to their Father without Benjamin, and one of them passionately requesting to become a Bondman in his stead, Joseph could refrain no longer, but with Tears gushing from his Eyes, discovered himself to them. This News coming soon to Pharaoh, he order’d Joseph to send immediately, and bring down his Father and whole Family into Egypt, appointing one of the most fruitful Parts of the Country for their Habitation.
DRAMATIS PERSONÆ.

MEN.

PHARAOH, King of Egypt.
JOSEPH, An Hebrew.
REUBEN,
SIMEON, {Brethren to Joseph.
JUDAH,
BENJAMIN,
POTIPHERA, High-Priest of On.
PHANOR, Chief Butler to Pharaoh, afterward Joseph’s Steward.

WOMEN.

ASENATH, Daughter to the High-Priest.
Chorus of Egyptians, Hebrews, &c.

SCENE, MEMPHIS.

[rule]

N.B. The Lines marked thus “are omitted in the Representation, on account of the Length of the Piece.
JOSEPH AND HIS BRETHREN. [rule] [p. 7.]

PART 1. SCENE 1.

SCENE, a PRISON.

JOSEPH reclining in a melancholy Posture.

AIR.

Be firm, my Soul, nor faint beneath
Affliction’s galling Chains;
When crown’d with conscious Virtue’s Wreath,
The shackled Captive reigns. [Starting up.

RECITATIVE accompany’d.

Jos. But wherefore thus? Whence, Heav’n, these bitter Bonds?
Are these the just Rewards of stubborn Virtue?
Is this contagious Cell the due Abode
Of too much Innocence? --- Down, down, proud Heart,
Nor blindly question the Behest of Heaven!
These Chastisements are just --- for some wise End
Are all the partial Ills allotted Man.

AIR repeated.

Be firm, my Soul, nor faint beneath
Affliction’s galling Chains;
When crown’d with conscious Virtue’s Wreath,
The shackled Captive reigns.
SCENE II.

To JOSEPH, PHANOR.

*Phan.* Joseph, thy Fame has reach’d great Pharaoh’s Ear;
Who late in Dreams perturb’d, and taught by me
The wond’rous Power of thy experience’d Art,
Demands thy instant Presence to unfold
Their mystick Purport.

Jos. Blest Vicissitude!

Jehovah, whom I serve, bears witness to me;
And from the Horrors of the Pit, once more,
Will deign Deliverance to his Servant’s Soul.

AIR.

*Come, divine Inspirer, come,*

*Make my humble Breast thy Home,*

*Draw the Curtain from mine Eye,*

*And present place Futurity.*

*Thus, whilst I o’er Pharaoh’s Dream,*

*Bright Interpretation beam,*

*Pharaoh’s Self shall Temples raise,*

*And Egypt Incense to thy Praise.*

[Da Capo.]
Phan. Pardon that I so long forgot thee, Joseph;  
My Heart upbraids me with Ingratitude.
Jos. Pardon thyself--- Ingratitude's a Vice
That bears its Scorpions with it --- The dire Mildew
Which makes a Desert of the human Mind,
And merits more of Pity than Resentment ---
But instant I'll with duteous Step attend
My Lord the King, and bow myself before him. [Exit Jos.
SCENE III.

PHANOR.
Fell Monster! base Ingratitude! avaunt;
No longer in this Breast I’ll give thee Harbour.

AIR. [9.]

**Ingratitude’s the Queen of Crimes,**
*For all the rest are of her Train,*
**Her sure Attendants at all Times,**
*The great Supporters of her Reign:*
**If One you then ungrateful call,**
*You crown him Monarch of them all.*

SCENE IV. *A Room of State in Pharaoh’s Palace.*

PHARAOH, High-Priest of On; ASENATH, Chorus of Egyptians, &c.

**Phar.** Thus, Stranger! I have laid my troubled Thoughts,
The midnight Visions of my Bed before thee,
Which all the Skill of Egypt can’t unfold ----
Come then, interpret to the King his Dreams.

Jos. O mighty Pharaoh, it is not in me;
Interpretation does belong to Heav’n;
And may the Lord Jehovah give the King
A gracious Answer!

[INVOCATION.]
“By that O’erflowing of the Nile,
Which makes the careful Tiller smile;
By those glad Rays that swell the Grain,
And pay with Sheaves the Reaper’s Pain;
By all the Blessings ev’ry Day,
Which Egypt tastes from Pharaoh’s Sway,
Thy dark Resolves, kind Heav’n! display.

Chorus of Egyptians.
O God of Joseph, gracious, shed
Thy Spirit on thy Servant’s Head;
That to the King he may reveal
The Truths his Mystick Dreams conceal.

Jos. Pharaoh, thy Dreams are one --- the Lord Jehovah
In Vision shews what he’s about to do.
The Seven fat Cattle, and full Ears of Corn,
Denote Seven Years of Plenty --- The like Seven
Of meagre Kine, and unreplenish’d Grain,
Mark the same Years of Famine to succeed.
Embrace this Warning, and with studious Search
Look out a Man of Providence and Wisdom,
To garner up in the redundant Years,
A Store for Comfort in the Days of Dearth.

Phar. Divine Interpreter! What Oracle
Could thus have solv’d my Doubts? --- Where can we find
A Man like thee, in whom God’s Spirit dwells;
Be this Day Ruler o’er my House and People,
And by thy Word let all the Land be govern’d;
But only in the Throne will I be greater.

Jos. These are thy Workings, Infinite Jehovah!

9-15. [not in H43, C43; omitted J57.]
Egyptians. Ægyptians. H43 fol. 11r, C43/1 fol. 27r
16. Joseph! H43 fol. 11r, C43/1 fol. 27r
19. mystick’ Dreams B ] mystick B J47 conceal H43 fol. 32r; conceal, C43/1 fol. 31v
20. Pharaoh, ] Pharoh H43 fol. 14r, C43/1 fol. 32r
20. one --- the ] one - - the H43 fol. 14r; one, the C43/1 fol. 32r; one---the J47; one---the J57
21. ] Visions J47, J57 shew’s H43 fol. 14r, C43/1 fol. 32v do H43 fol. 14r, C43/1 fol. 32r
22. ] fatt H43 fol. 14r, C43/1 fol. 32r 23. ] Plenty the H43 fol. 14r, C43/1 fol. 32r; Plenty---The J57
24. Kine ] Kind, H43 fol. 14r, C43/1 fol. 32v 26. ] studious Search } {obsured H43 fol. 14r}
29. store for ] store of H43 fol. 14r, C43/1 fol. 33r
30. Phar. ] Pharoh H43 fol. 15r 31. ] doubts? Where H43 fol. 15r, C43/1 fol. 34r; Doubts---Where J57
32. ] dwells. H43 fol. 15r, C43/1 fol. 34r; dwells? J47, J57
34. ] lett H43 fol. 15r govern’d, H43 fol. 15r, govern’d C43/1 fol. 34r
35. ] greater; C43/1 fol. 34r 36. These ] Those C43/1 fol. 34r. thy ] the C43/1 fol. 34r
36. Workings, ] <Workings> <Doings> Workings H43 fol. 15r; Workings C43/1 fol. 34r
AIR.

Asen. [Aside.] O lovely Youth, with Wisdom crown’d,
Where ev’ry Charm has Place!
What Breast so firm was ever found,
As could resist such Grace?
If thou hast stoln my Virgin Heart,
To me in change thy own impart.

[Pharaoh putting his Ring on Joseph’s Finger.]

Phar. Wear, worthy Man! this Royal Signet wear,
Pledge of thy boundless Dignity and Power;
Whilst in our Second Chariot thou shalt ride,
And Heralds cry before thee, Bow the Knee:
Then henceforth, as the Saviour of the World,
Let *Zaphnath-Paaneah* be thy Name.

* Zaphnath-Paaneah signifies Saviour of the World.

CHORUS. [11.]

_Joyful sounds! melodious Strains!_

_Health to Egypt is the Theme!_

_Zaphnath rules, and Pharaoh reigns——_

_Happy Nation! Bliss supreme!_

[Exeunt.]
SCENE V.

ASENATH alone.

Whence this unwonted Ardour in my Breast?
These new-born Sighs — 'Tis true that he is Wise —
Majestick — graceful — Ah! I fear this Stranger
Has trespass’d on my unsuspecting Bosom.

AIR.

*I feel a spreading Flame within my Veins,*
Which all my Arts will not avail to quench;
With fruitless Toil from Place to Place I range,
No Toil, no Place gives Respite to my Pains.

SCENE VI.

To ASENATH, JOSEPH.

Jos. Struck, beauteous Damsel, with thy modest Charms,
I’ve ask’d thee of thy Father and the King,
To help allay the anxious Toils of Grandeur,
And smooth the rugged Brow of Publick Care.
Yet, authoris’d by both, I dread my Fate,
'Till thy own Voice has fix’d my Destiny.
SCENE VII.

*To them Pharaoh and Potiphera.*

*Phar.* Zaphnath, I grant thy Suit --- Behold thy Bride!

*Potiph.* Approach, my *Asenath* --- Behold thy Husband!

**DUET.**

Jos. O! canst thou, Fair Perfection! say?
   O! canst thou bless me with thy Love?

Asen. My Father's Will I must obey; 5
   My Monarch’s Pleasure must approve.

Jos. Celestial Virgin!

Asen. - - - - - - - Godlike Youth!

Both. Renown’d for Innocence and Truth;
   Propitious Heav’n has thus in Thee
   Compleated my Felicity.

---

SCENE VII. | *To them Pharaoh and Potiphera.* | Scene 5th to Asenath, Pharoh, Joseph, and Potiphera. H43 fol. 25v; Scen: 5th to Asenath, Pharoh, Joseph, and Potiphera C43/1 fol. 51v
1. ] Zaphna H43 fol. 25v, C43/1 fol. 51v Suit --- behold thy Bride H43 fol. 25v; suit --- Behold the Bride C43/1 fol. 51v; Suit---Behold J47; Suit---Behold J57
2. ] Potiph. ] Poti-pha H43 fol. 25v
2. ] Asenath – behold H43 fol. 25v, C43/1 fol. 51v; Asenath--- Behold J47; Asenath---Behold J57
2. ] Husband H43 fol. 25v, C43/1 fol. 51v
2. my Asenath B2; ] my Asenath J47; Asenath B J57
3.-6. ] {recitative in H43 fol. 25v, C43/1 fol. 51v} DUET. J57
3. ] O canst thou fair Perfection! say, H43 fol. 25v, C43/1 fol. 51v
4. ] O H43 fol. 25v, C43/1 fol. 51v
4. ] Love! H43 fol. 25v
5. ] obey H43 fol. 25v, C43/1 fol. 51v
6. ] approve C43/1 fol. 51v
7. ] Celestial Virgin <heavily> charming maid! H43 fol. 26v; celestial virgin charming maid! C43/1 fol. 52v Virgin, W44 - - - - - - - Godlike Youth! J57 Youth, W44
8. ] renown H43 fol. 26v, C43/1 fol. 52v
8. ] Truth, H43 fol. 26v; Truth C43/1 fol. 52v; truth, W44
10. ] felicity H43 fol. 26v, C43/1 fol. 52v
Jos. "O Pharaoh! all the Dignity and Splendor,
Which thou hast deign'd to robe thy Servant in,
Are nothing to the Gift of this fair Jewel.
Phar. "Long mayst thou live to wear her at thy Heart.

Now, Potiphera, instant to the Temple
In joyous Pomp, and whilst the Rite's perform'd,
Let our loud Clarions tell it to the Skies. [Exeunt]

A Grand March during the Procession.
SCENE VIII.  A TEMPLE.

The High-Priest joining the Hands of JOSEPH and ASENATH at the Altar, PHARAOH, Attendants, and Chorus of Egyptians.

High-Priest. 'Tis done --- the sacred Knot is ty’d, Which Death alone can e’er divide.

CHORUS.

Immortal Pleasures crown the Pair, Who thus by Heav’n high-favour’d are, Joys ever round them wait; May these below, like those above, Contend who most and longest love, And be as Blest, as Great.
Phar. Glorious and happy is thy Lot, O Zaphnath,
Join’d to such Sweetness, Dignity, and Virtue.

AIR.
Since the Race of Time begun,
Since the Birth-Day of the Sun,
Ne’er was so much Wisdom found,
With such matchless Wisdom crown’d.

CHORUS.
Swift our Numbers, swiftly roll,
Waft the News from Pole to Pole;
Asenath with Zaphnath’s join’d,
Joy and Peace to all Mankind!

[Ornament]
PART II. SCENE 1.

ASENATH, PHANOR, and Chorus of Egyptians.

CHORUS.

AIL, thou Youth by Heav’n belov’d!
Now thy wond’rous Wisdom’s prov’d!
Zaphnath Egypt’s Fate foresaw,
And snatch’d her from the Famine’s Jaw.

Pha. How vast a Theme has Egypt for Applause!
O Asenath, behold thy mighty Lord!
High on his gilded Car triumphant ride,
Whilst prostrate Multitudes that do him Honours,
Obstruct his Passage through the Streets of Memphis.
The raptur’d Virgins hail him in their Lays,
And gazing Matrons lift their grateful Hands,
Whilst hoary Sages rise, and bow the Head,
And Infants half articulate his Name.
Asen. These Honours flow not from the Flatterers Lips, 
Like those that lavish Stream in Fortune’s Lap; 
But from Sincere Benevolence, and Love, 
And Bosoms glowing with a grateful Transport.

AIR.

Phan. Our Fruits, whilst yet in Blossom, die, 
Our Harvest’s in the new-sown Seed, 
Barren the mournful Ridges lie, 
Undeck’d the once enamell’d Mead.

But Zaphnath’s Providential Care 
Retaliates for the niggard Soil; 
Through him in Dearth we Plenty share, 
Nor heed th’ inexorable Nile.

14. ] flow^not B2 J57
15. ] Fortunes Lap. H43 fol. 48v; fortunes lap, C43/2 fol. 14v
16. ] Benevolence and Love H43 fol. 49r, C43/2 fol. 14v
17. ] gratefull Transport. H43 fol. 49r; gratefull Transport C43/2 fol. 14v
18. Phan. ] <Ramsey> Phanor H43 fol. 49r
18. ] Fruits H43 fol. 49r, H43/F fol. 25r
18. ] while J57
18. ] Blossom die, H43 fol. 49r; Blossom, die H43/F fol. 25r, C43/2 fol. 15r
19. ] Harvests H43 fol. 49r; Harvest in C43/2 fol. 15r
19. ] newson Seed H43 fol. 49r, C43/2 fol. 15r; new sown seed H43/F fol. 25r; new-sown Seed; J47, J57
20. ] mournfull H43 fol. 49r, C43/2 fol. 25r, C43/2 fol. 15r
20. ] lie H43 fol. 49r, H43/F fol. 25r, C43/2 fol. 15r
21. ] enamall’d C43/2 fol. 16r
21. ] mead H43 fol. 49r, H43/F fol. 25r, C43/2 fol. 16r
22. ] Zaphnath’s H43 fol. 52r, H43/F fol. 25r, C43/2 fol. 19r
22. ] Care C43/2 fol. 52r; Care, W44
23. ] Soyl H43 fol. 49r, H43/F fol. 27r, C43/2 fol. 19r; Soil, W44
24. ] Trough H43 fol. 49r
24. ] in plenty share H43 fol. 49r, H43/F fol. 27r; we plenty share C43/2 fol. 15r
25. ] Nile H43 fol. 54r, H43/F fol. 27r, C43/2 fol. 22r
He’s Egypt’s common Parent, gives her Bread;
He’s Egypt’s only Safety, only Hope;
Whilst Egypt’s Welfare is his only Care.

CHORUS.

Blest be the Man by Pow’r unstain’d,
Virtue there itself rewarding!
Blest be the Man to Wealth unchain’d,
Treasure for the Publick hoarding!

Asen. Phanor, we mention not his highest Glory,
Mark midst his Grandeur what Humility,
The Gift of that great God whom he adores.
Yet something seems of late to bear upon him,
And cloud his wonted Smile; not all his Splendor,
Th’ Applause of Millions, or my studious Love,
Can yield him Comfort, or asswage his Grief.
Phan. Perchance he wants to view his native Land,
Whose God and Laws are the Reverse of Egypt’s.
Asen. Phanor, ’tis true, he calls it oft’ to mind,
And oft’ in Silence sighs, and mourns his Absence;
Nor finds he Peace, save when his smiling Infants,
The Pledges of our Love, are in his Arms:
There will he grasp them --- there, with ardent Look,
He eyes them --- while, from ’midst his struggling Sighs,
Words burst like these ----

AIR.
Together, lovely Innocents, grow up,
Link’d in eternal Chains of Brother-Love;
For you mayn’t Envy bear her pois’nous Cup,
Nor Hate her unrelenting Armour prove.

He then is silent, then again exclaims ----
Inhuman Brethren! O unhappy Father!
What Anguish too much Love for me has cost thee!
Such are his Cares, nor have I yet discover’d
The fatal Cause --- But once more I’ll attempt it.
Phan. “These Men of Canaan too, pretended Brethren,
“Who come to purchase Corn, give him Disquiet:
“One of them he detain’d in Bonds as Hostage
“For their Return with Proof they were not Spies;
“But their long Absence makes him doubt their Faith.
“I’ll to my Lord, and learn this Prisoner’s Fate.

[Exeunt severally.

SCENE II.

SIMEON in Prison.

RECITATIVE accompany’d.
Where are these Brethren — Why this base Delay!
To let me languish a whole Year in Dungeons!
But are not Brethren base? O Joseph! Joseph!
That Thought is Hell — Remembrance scorches with it!
But was it I alone? --- O no! --- Then Heav’n
Has been at ‘compt perchance with my Confederates,
Whilst the wild Beast, false-tax’d with Joseph’s Death,
Has met ’em on the way, and ta’en his Vengeance.
AIR.

Remorse, Confusion, Horror, Fear,
Ye Vultures of the guilty Breast !

Now, Furies ! now she feels you here,
Who gnaw her most, when most distrest. [Exit.

SCENE III.

JOSEPH and PHANOR.

Phan. This Hebrew Prisoner ----
Jos Hither bring him, Phanor. [Exit Phanor.

The wide Circumference of Egypt's Regions,
The vast Extent between the Nile and Ocean
Given me to rule, is Slav'ry, not an Honour;
Not Rest, but Travel ----

—— —— —— “ Ye departed Hours,

“ What happier Moments have I seen ! --- O Hebron !

“ What Peace enjoy’d amidst thy smiling Valleys !

“ Might I review thee ! might I careles tend

“ Thy fleecy Herd ; might I once more embrace

“ My good old Sire ; list to his sacred Lessons

“ Of God’s Creation, of Man’s fatal Fall,

“ The Race-preserving Ark, the Heaven-hung Bow,

“ And Hope Divine of Abraham and his Seed ---

“ It cannot be --- Tyrant, enslaving Greatness !

“ Who’d languish in thy gilded Chains an Hour,

“ That in the Courts of Quietness could dwell ?
AIR.

The Peasant tastes the Sweets of Life,
Unwounded by its Cares;
No courtly Craft, no publick Strife
His humble Soul insnares.

But Grandeur's bulky noisy Joys
No true Contentment give;
Whilst Fancy craves Possession cloys,
We die thus whilst we live.

But Simeon comes, Treach'rous, blood-thirsty Brother!

Fain wouldst thou had my Life! Cruel! but hold---
I fear, O Heav'n! that some disastrous Death
Has snatch'd the other from me, and perhaps
Simeon's the only Brother left me now;
I'll touch thee not---the Image of our Father
Sits on thy Brow---nor shall thy Perfidy
Dissolve the sacred Ties of Love and Nature.
But I will speak such Daggers to thy Soul!---

18. ] Cares H43 fol. 70', C43/2 fol. 46'; Cares, W44
19. ] Craft C43/2 fol. 47'; Craft; J57
19. ] Strife, W44
20. ] ensnares H43 fol. 70', C43/2 fol. 47'; ensnares. W44
21. ] Gradeurs H43 fol. 72'; gradeurs C43/2 fol. 49'
21. ] bulky, noisy W44
22. ] give, H43 fol. 72'; C43/2 fol. 50', W44
23. ] graves possession C43/2 fol. 50'; craves, Possession cloys, W44
24. ] live H43 fol. 73', C43/2 fol. 51'
25. ] comes – treacherous, H43 fol. 73'; comes – treacherous, C43/2 fol. 52'; Treach’rous J47, J57
26. had ] have C43/2 fol. 52'
26. ] Life! – Cruel! but H43 fol. 73'; Life! Cruel! – but C43/2 fol. 52'
26. ] hold H43 fol. 73', C43/2 fol. 52'; hold--- J47
27. ] Heav’n C43/2 fol. 52'; Heaven J47
27.-29. ] {omitted J57,}
28. ] others H43 fol. 73', C43/2 fol. 52'
29. ] now. H43 fol. 73', C43/2 fol. 52'
30. ] not – the H43 fol. 73', C43/2 fol. 52'; not— J57 {rest of line omitted J57,}
31.-32. ] {omitted J57,}
31. ] sitt’s H43 fol. 73', C43/2 fol. 52'
31. ] Brow — nor H43 fol. 73', C43/2 fol. 52'.
31. ] Perfidy {obscured H43 fol. 73', C43/2 fol. 52'}
32. ] Ties, H43 fol. 73', C43/2 fol. 52'
32. sacred ] {obscured H43 fol. 73'} Nature, H43 fol. 73' {obscured C43 fol. 52'}
33. ] Soul H43 fol. 73', C43/2 fol. 52'; Soul!--- J47, J57
SCENE IV.

To JOSEPH, SIMEON.

*Sim.* I tremble at his Presence.

*Jos.* Thou Impostor!

Com’st thou before me, but to dare my Fury?

Where are thy Brethren --- Brother-Traitors? Ha!

Did not I say it? Did not I foresee it?

Ye Serpent-Spies! under Pretext of Famine

Ye came to see the Nakedness of Egypt.

One Year has run its Course --- not yet return’d!

Where is their Faith? Impostor, thou shalt pay

The Forfeit of their Guilt.

*Sim.* My gracious Lord,

Our Testimony’s true --- By Famine driv’n,

We hither fled for Succour --- We’re Twelve Brethren,

Sons of one Father in the Land of Canaan.

Ten thou hast seen, and one is not; the youngest

Was to the Care of his old Father left.

*Jos.* The Sight of him might dissipate my Doubts --

But where’s your Promise? --- Why is he not come?
Sim. Paternal Love, my Lord, alone detains him. What Anguish must it give the good old Sire, To have this only Hope torn from his Bosom, The Prop and Comfort of his falling Years? How would it shake his poor old tottering Frame? How wring his bleeding Heart!


Sim. Grief for the Loss of his beloved Joseph, Already reigns too cruel in his Heart; No Sun or sets, or rises on the Earth, That doth not find, and leave him too in Tears.

Jos. [Aside.] Great God sustain my Fortitude! ------ [To Sim.] This Joseph,

How died he?

Sim. A wild Beast, my Lord, devour’d him.

Jos. Devour’d by a wild Beast! Have, have a care! Didst thou then see his bleeding Arteries? His mangled Limbs? Now, by the Life of Pharaoh, I spy some Treachery—There are Men on Earth More cruel, Simeon, than the wildest Beast.

17. ] retains him. H43 fol. 74v; retains him, C43/2 fol. 53v
20. ] prop, H43 fol. 74v, C43/2 fol. 54v
20. ] Years; H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 54v
21. poor ‘old C poor old C J47
21. ] Frame! H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 54v
23. ] (Peace, Nature! Peace!) H43 fol. 75v; (peace Nature! Peace!) C43/2 fol. 54v
23. Aside ] {omitted C43}
26. ] sett’s H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 54v
26. ] Earth H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 54v
27. ] find C43/2 fol. 54v
28. ] (Great God! sustain my fortitude) H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 54v; Great God sustain my Fortitude! ------ J47; Great God, sustain my Fortitude!--- J57
29. ] Joseph! H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 54v
30. ] wild Beast my Lord H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 54v
33. ] now H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 54v
34. ] Treachery—there H43 fol. 75v; Treachery there C43/2 fol. 54v; Treachery---There J57
34. ] Earth, H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 54v
35. ] cruel Simeon H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 54v
35. than ] then C43/2 fol. 54v
35. ] fiercest Beast H43 fol. 75v; fiercest Beast! C43/2 fol. 54v
Sim. Dreadful Discourse!

Jos. He trembles!

Sim. Thy Suspicion ---

Jos. --- Is just --- know you not yet I can divine,
And view the dark Recesses of the Soul?
In vain from me you’d hide the Truth, Impostor!

[Ex. Jos.

AIR.

Sim. Impostor! Ah! my foul Offence,
Wrote in my Face,
O dire Disgrace!

Admits, admits of no Defence.

Tho’ treach’rous Hearts from mortal Sight
May veil a while
Their impious Guile,
Heav’n sees, and brings dark Deeds to Light. [Exit.

36. (Dreadfull Discourse!) H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 54r
36. (He trembles! H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 54r-55r
36. Suspicion – H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 54r; Suspicion--- J47, J57
37. is just – know H43 fol. 75v; is just – know C43/2 fol. 54r; --- Is just--- know J47; ---Is just---know J57
37. ye not H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 55r
37. divine, H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 55r
38. Soul, H43 fol. 75v, C43/2 fol. 55r
39. Truth – Impostor! H43 fol. 75v; Truth – Impostor. C43/2 fol. 55r
40. Impostor? W44
40. offence H43 fol. 76r, C43/2 fol. 55r, W44
41. face H43 fol. 76r, C43/2 fol. 55r, W44
42. disgrace H43 fol. 76r, C43/2 fol. 55r, W44
43. admits admits H43 fol. 76r, C43/2 fol. 56r; Admits Admits W44
44. Though H43 fol. 77r, C43/2 fol. 57r
44. sight, W44
46. guile H43 fol. 77r, C43/2 fol. 57r, W44
47. sees H43 fol. 77r, C43/2 fol. 57r
47. bring C43/2 fol. 57r
47. light W44
47. [Exit. ] <Joseph Begone – away – thou’rt baneful to my Eye, thy Crimes go with thee (Aside (Tears betray me now!) Exit Simeon> H43 fol. 78r {not in C43.}
SCENE V.

JOSEPH, ASENATH.

Jos. Whence, Asenath, this Grief that hangs upon thee,
And like a Morning Mist which hovers o’er
The Violet’s Bed, bedews thy lovely Cheeks?       [19.]

Asen. Life of my Life, and Source of all my Bliss,
It is but to resemble thee the more.
When Zaphnath sighs can Asenath be gay?
Can Asenath enjoy, when Zaphnath suffers?

AIR.

The silver Stream, that all its way
Transparent to the Ocean flows,
Mix’d with the turbid Surges grows
As ruffled and impure as they.

Thus glided I through Life’s serene,
But now dire Griefs thy Breast inflame,
My mingling Bosom Shares the same,
And I, like thee, am wretched seen.               Da Capo.  15

RECITATIVE.

Tell me, O tell me thy Heart’s Malady,
That I may steal it from thee if I can.

Jos. A slight Disorder --- publick Cares ---
Enter PHANOR.

Phan. My Lord,
The long-expected Strangers are arriv’d,
And with them comes a Youth of matchless Beauty. 20
Jos. [Aside.] My Benjamin! Thanks Heav’n!  [To Phan.
Straight make them enter.
My Love, retire a while --- Soon thou shalt know
The Business of my Heart --- Permit me only
Some Moments more ---
Asen. Your Will, my Lord, is mine.  [Exit.
SCENE VI.

PHANOR and JOSEPH’s Brethren.

Phan. Fear not — Peace be unto you — ’twas your God,
That gave you Treasure in your Sacks, for me
I had your Money, and declare you Guiltless,
As to condemn you wrongfully — nor one
Nor think that Zaphnath bears so base a Soul
So cruel to refuse you farther Succour.

Judah. Thy gracious Words revive my drooping Spirits;
And kindly Hope of being guiltless thought
Glows in my Heart, and kindles Life anew.
AIR.

To keep afar from all Offence,
And conscious of its Innocence,

Is not enough for the Defence
Of an unspotted Heart.

A light Suspicion oftentimes
Of uncommitted unthought Crimes
Its Purity with Slander limes,
And gives it the Delinquent’s Part.

Chorus of the Brethren.
Thus one with ev’ry Virtue crown’d,
For ev’ry Vice may be renown’d.

10. ] offence  H43 fol. 81v
11. ] its Innocence  H43 fol. 81v; its Innocence  C43/2 fol. 64v
12. ] Defence  C J57
13. ] unblemish’d Heart  H43 fol. 82v, C43/2 fol. 64v, W44
14. ] slight Suspicion  H43 fol. 82v, C43/2 fol 65v; slight suspition  W44
15. uncommitted] uncomittett  H43 fol. 83v
15. ] Crimes,  H43 fol. 82v
16. ] it’s  H43 fol. 82v, C43/2 fol. 65v
16. ] limes  C43/2 fol. 65v, W44
17. ] give’s  H43 fol. 82v; giv’s  C43/2 fol. 66v
17. ] Delinquents part  H43 fol. 83v, C43/2 fol. 66v
Chorus of the Brethren. ] Chorus of Brethren.  H43 fol. 83v, C43/2 fol. 67v
18. ] crown’d  H43 fol. 83v, C43/2 fol. 67v; crownd C43/2 fol. 67v; crow’d C43/2 fol. 67v
SCENE VII.

To them, JOSEPH, and Attendants.

Reuben. Once more, O pious Zaphnath! At thy Feet
We pay due Homage, and implore thy Succour.

Judah. Our Reverend Sire intreats thee to accept
A humble Offering of our Country’s Fruits;
Not such as with thy Grandeur suits, but what
Our present wretched State hath left --- O Zaphnath!
Our Fields lie desolate, and cover’d o’er
With naught but Horror, Barrenness and Drought,
Menacing the distress’d Inhabitant
With Death inevitable, whose pale Herald
Sits on his pining Cheeks --- O Pity, Pity!
Our good old Father sues for Pity from thee;
For Pity we implore thee, and for Pity
Our youngest Brother lowly bows to kiss
Thy bounteous Hand.

_Benj._ This Kiss, my gracious Lord,
Comes wash’d with Tears --- O save my Country, save
My dear, dear Father --- and may Abraham’s God
For ever save my Lord.

_Jos._ [Aside.] How his Discourse
Melts down my Soul --- Rise --- is your Father well ?
[Aside.] I had almost said Mine --- The good old Man
Of whom ye spake --- say, is he living still ?

_Judah._ My Lord, thy Servant lives, and lives in Health.

_Jos._ And this his youngest Son ?

_Benj._ It is, my Lord,
My name is Benjamin.

_Jos._ Let me embrace thee ---
And may that God, my Son, whom thou invok’st,
Watch o’er, and ever shed his Blessings on thee !

13. ] conjure thee, H43 fol. 86v; conjure thee C43/2 fol. 76r
13. ] Pity, H43 fol. 86v
16. ] Tears – O H43 fol. 86v, C43/2 fol. 76v, J57; Tears---O J47
16. ] Country – H43 fol. 86v, C43/2 fol. 76v
17. ] Father – and H43 fol. 86v, C43/2 fol. 76v, J57; Father---and J47
18. ] forever H43 fol. 86v
18. ] Lord C43/2 fol. 76v
19. ] Soul – to Benj rise – is H43 fol. 86v; Soul – to Benjamin rise – is C43/2 fol. 71a';
Soul---Rise---is J47; Soul – Rise – is J57
20. ] (I had almost said mine – ) To the Brethern The good H43 fol. 87v, C43/2 fol. 71a'
Mine---The J47; Mine – The J57
21. ] spake – say, H43 fol. 87v; J57; spake say C43/2 fol. 71a'; spake---say, J47
22. ] Lord H43 fol. 87v, C43/2 fol. 74a'.
22. ] lives, and live’s in Health. H43 fol. 87v; lives and live’s in Health C43/2 fol. 71a'
23. ] Son?– H43 fol. 87v
23. ] It is my Lord, H43 fol. 87v, C43/2 fol. 71a'
24. ] Benjamin H43 fol. 87v
24. ] thee; H43 fol. 87v; thee C43/2 fol. 71a'; thee-- J47; thee – J57
25. ] may my Son, that God whom H43 fol. 87v, C43/2 fol. 71a'
AIR.

Benj.  *Thou deignʼst to call thy Servant, Son,*  
*And O, methinks, my Lord, I see,*  
*With an amazing Semblance shown,*  
*My Fatherʼs Image stampʼd on thee:*

*Thee, therefore, would I Father call;*  
*But the Similitude of Face*  
*Is not enough — the Soul is all —*  
*O may his Soul thy Bosom grace!*

Jos. [Aside.]  *Sweet Innocence! Divine Simplicity!*
*Tears, by your Leave —*  
*[To Servants.] Attend, prepare*  
*our Table ——*  
*—— Instant —— These Men shall eat with me to-day.*

Benj. Let not thy Mercy linger —— Grief and Famine  
Oppress our aged Father —— Aught Delay  
May fatal prove —— We left him desolate.  

27. ] Servant Son  H43 fol. 87\(v\), C43/2 fol. 71a\(v\); servant Son  W44  
28. ] O methinks, my Lord, I see  H43 fol. 87\(v\); O me thinks, my Lord I see  C43/2 fol. 71a\(v\);  
o me thinks, my Lord I see  W44  
29. ] shewn,  H43 fol. 87\(v\); shewn  H43 fol. 85\(v\), C43/2 fol. 71a\(v\)  
30. ] thee,  H43 fol. 87\(v\); thee  C43/2 fol. 72\(r\), W44  
31. ] Thee therefore I would Father call.  H43 fol. 88\(r\);  
Thee therefore I would Father call  C43/2 fol. 72\(r\), W44  
32. ] is not enough — the Soul is all —  H43 fol. 88\(r\); is not enough the Soul is all  C43/2 fol. 73\(r\);  
*Is not enough — the Soul is all — —*  
J47, J57  
33. ] grace  H43 fol. 88\(r\), C43/2 fol. 73\(r\); grace.  W44  
34. ] (Sweet  H43 fol. 89\(r\), C43/2 fol. 74a  
35. ] (Tears  H43 fol. 89\(r\), C43/2 fol. 74a  
36. ] (To Servants) to Attendents  H43 fol. 89\(r\), C43/2 fol. 74a  
37. ] (Table,  H43 fol. 89\(r\), C43/2 fol. 74a; Table—  J47, J57  
38. ] Instant — these  H43 fol. 89\(r\), C43/2 fol. 74a; — Instant——These J47; — Instant——These J57  
39. ] today.  H43 fol. 89\(r\); to Day.  C43/2 fol. 74\(r\)  
40. ] linger — grief  H43 fol. 89\(r\), C43/2 fol. 74a; linger——Grief J47; linger——Grief J57  
41. ] Father — ought  H43 fol. 89\(r\), C43/2 fol. 74a; Father——Aught J47, J57  
42. ] prove — we  H43 fol. 89\(r\), C43/2 fol. 74a; prove——We J47, J57  
43. ] desolate  H43 fol. 89\(r\), C43/2 fol. 74a
Jos. [Weeping.] Nature will through the Vail ---- Anguish and Joy
Jointly demand my Tears. [Exeunt Jos. Phan. and Attendants.]

Reuben. Didst thou observe him, Judah? --- Mark his Looks!
Judah. I did --- canst thou interpret them?
Reuben. I cannot.

Profound and inaccessible, O Judah,
Are all the inward Movements of the Great,
And never by the Countenance are known.
Judah. May great Jehovah turn his Heart to Pity!

CHORUS.

O God, who in thy heav’nly Hand
Dost hold the Hearts of mighty Kings,
O take thy Jacob, and his Land,
Beneath the Shadow of thy Wings.

Thou know’st our Wants before our Pray’r,
Then let us not confounded be;
Thy tender Mercies let us share,
O Lord, we trust alone in thee!

[Ornament]
PART III. SCENE 1.

ASENATH, PHANOR.

Asen. What say'st thou, Phanor! Prove these Strangers then
Such base Ingrates? Bore off the silver Cup,
That's sacred to my Lord's peculiar Use!

Phan. They have --- but shall not long enjoy their Rapine;
Already they are taken, and in Bonds
Await their Doom.

Asen. Ungrateful impious Men!

"What Gifts, what Favours did the gen'rous Zaphnath
Show'r down upon them; Honours so unwonted,
You'd thought this Hebrew Family his own.

Phan. "At his chief Table I beheld them plac'd,
Exalted above all the Lords of Egypt;
Whilst from the richest Viands his own Hand
Dealt Delicacies to them.

Asen. ——— ——— "Often, Phanor,
The Bounties and Indulgence of the Great
Fall from their Hands by Chance, and, falling, light
As oft' on the Desertless --- Why then wonder
To find them with Ingratitude repaid?

{different ornaments J47, J57.}
PART III. SCENE I. | ASENATH, PHANOR. } Part. 3d. Scene. 1. Asenath and <Ramse> Phanor. H43 fol. 94°; Part
y² 3² Scened: 1² Asenath and Phanor. C43/3 fol. 4'
1. Asen. Wihat } {W in factotum; initial J57.}
1. ] sayst thou <Ramse> Phanor? H43 fol. 94°; sayst thou Phanor? C43/3 fol. 4'
2. ] Cup H43 fol. 94°, C43/3 fol. 4'
3. ] Lords H43 fol. 94°, C43/3 fol. 4'
4. ] have – but H43 fol. 94°, C43/3 fol. 4°; have---but J47, J57
4. ] Rapine. J57
5. ] they are taken, and ] they're retaken and H43 fol. 94°, C43/3 fol. 4'
6.-17 ] [not in H43, C43; omitted J57.]
6. ] Doom – H43 fol. 94°.
6. ] Ungrateful, H43 fol. 94°, C43/3 fol. 4'
16. ] Desertless---Why J47
A I R.

Phan. The wanton Favours of the Great,

Are like the scatter’d Seed when sown;

A grateful Harvest they create,

Whene’er on gen’rous Acres thrown.

But, if, as O! too oft’, they fall,

Where Weeds and Briers the Soil profane:

Or lost, they bear no Fruit at all,

Or, bearing, yield a worthless Grain.

20

SCENE II.

To them, JOSEPH.

Asen. Whence so disturb’d, my Lord---Let not the Crime

Of others be inflicted on thyself.

Jos. My Sorrows have a deeper, deadlier Root.

Asen. Why dost thou hide them then from me?--O Zaphnath,

This Diffidence does wrong to faithful Love.

Wherefore that Look? Those Sighs? --- Much, much I fear

That Asenath’s the Source of this Disquiet ---

Why from her else conceal’d --- Dire Jealousy,

That baneful Viper, rankles in thy Breast.

25
AIR.

Ah Jealousy, thou Pelican,
That prey'st upon thy Parent's bleeding Heart;
Though born of Love, Love's greatest Bane,
Still cruel! wounding her with her own Dart.

Jos. O wrong me not, thy Zaphnath never harbour'd
A Thought that way --- Each Hour I gaze upon thee
I view some new Perfections in thy Soul,
And find with Transport something more to love.
One Moment longer, and I'll lay before thee
This only Secret of my anxious Bosom.
At present know, my dear old Father lives,
Still lives, but inconsolable and wretched.

Asen. Whence springs his Misery?
Jos. From this cruel Famine,
E'en griping Penury, my Love, has seiz'd him;
No Succour left --- whilst, for his dire Affliction,
I only shed unprofitable Tears.

Asen. But why, my Lord, hast thou not Egypt's Stores,
The Wealth of Nations? ---
Jos. Pharaoh made me not Dispenser, only Keeper of his Treasures;
Nor should Corruption cleave unto these Hands,
Or would I touch what's sacred to the Publick,
To save myself and Race from instant Ruin.
Asen. Then call them into Egypt! --- Whence, my Lord, this criminal Delay?
Jos. I fear the King ---
Asen. Fear Egypt too.
Asen. Such Fears are but ungen'rous;
You've all the Hearts of Pharaoh and his People.

AIR.
Jos. The People’s Favour, and the Smiles of Pow’r,
Are no more than the Sun-shine of an Hour;
There Envy, with her Snakes, assails,
Here cank’ring Slander still prevails,
’Till Love begins to wain;
Oblivion then envelopes all,
Our Merits past, and straight our Fall
Is stil’d the Publick Gain.

[Da Capo.

Asen. Art thou not Zaphnath? Is not Egypt sav’d
All thy own Work? And won’t her Sons with Transport
Give a new Life to him who gave thee Life?
Jos. “How could his pious Zeal endure in Egypt
“The impious Adoration paid to Idols,
“And ev’ry Monster bred beneath the Sky?
“When all this fair and ample Universe
“Has one sole Cause, sole Mover, and sole Good,
“The Source of Truth, Felicity, and Virtue,
“Worthy alone to be ador’d and lov’d.

32. Then call them ] Call them J57
32. ] Egypt – whence my Lord H43 fol. 98v; C43/3 fol. 10f; Egypt! ---Whence, my Lord, J47; Egypt! – Whence, my Lord, J57
32. ] Delay! H43 fol. 98v, C43/3 fol. 10f
33. ] King, H43 fol. 98v, C43/3 fol. 10f; King— J47; King— J57
34. ] Egypt H43 fol. 98v, C43/3 fol. 10f ungen’rous. H43 fol. 98v, C43/3 fol. 10f
35. ] people C43/3 fol. 10f; {obscured H43.} 36. ] Pow’r H43 fol. 99v, C43/3 fol. 11f
37. ] sunshine of an Hour H43 fol. 99v, C43/3 fol. 11f, W44
38. ] their C43/3 fol. 11f Envy with her snakes assail H43 fol. 99v, C43/3 fol. 11f; Snakes assail, W44
39. ] cank’ring C43/3 fol. 11f prevails H43 fol. 99v, C43/3 fol. 11f
40. ] till H43 fol. 99v, C43/3 fol. 11f; Till W44 wain H43 fol. 99v, C43/3 fol. 11f; wain. W44
41. ] envelopes all H43 fol. 100f, C43/3 fol. 12f, W44
42. ] meritt’s past H43 fol. 100f, C43/3 fols 12v-13 past and W44
44. ] Zaphna? H43 fol. 101f, C43/3 fol. 14f. Egypt C43/3 fol. 14f
45. ] wont H43 fol. 101f, C43/3 fol. 14f
46. ] Life C43/3 fol. 10f
47.-58. ] {not in H43, C43; omitted J57.}
Asen. “That awful Being, whose sacred Praises
I’ve heard thy grateful Lips so oft resound,
I likewise sing! --- Here then, secure with us,
Thy pious Sire may mingle in the Concert,
Nor hear of Egypt’s visionary Gods ---
I’ll instant to the King, and supplicate
With Laud for Bounties past, this farther Boon.

A I R.

Prophetick Raptures swell my Breast,
And whisper we shall still be blest;
That this black Gloom shall break away,
And leave more heav’nly bright the Day.

Da Capo. [Exit Asen.

Jos. “Now for these Brethren---Will their smother’d Envy
Break out anew on the peculiar Favours
I deign’d the Youth? --- Will they, with brutal Gripe,
Seize on his seeming Guilt to work his Ruin?
Perfidious Men! I’ll prove ye ere I trust ye.
This Cup shall, like the gen’rous Juice it serves,
Lay ope’ the Mark, and Bias of your Hearts. ---
They come --- and Indignation in their Looks ---
My Bosom beats with an unusual Pulse.
SCENE III.

To JOSEPH, PHANOR with the Brethren in Chains.

Sim. Whence this vile Treatment! these injurious Chains?
For what Transgression are we shackle’d thus,
Like Thieves and Traitors?

Phan. That’s like what ye are.
You’ve stol’n the sacred Cup that’s set apart,
For my Lord’s Use. ---

Why have ye thus rewarded Ill for good? [Exit.]

Sim. Imposture! --- Fury! --- If the Sacred Vessel
Be found with us, rain Vengeance on our Heads.

Jos. Straight we shall see --- and then let the Delinquent
Alone receive the Wages of his Guilt.

Sim. “In one we all are guilty --- with him join’d
“By Blood and Country, with him we’ll divide
“Grief, Infamy, and Death.

Jos. “Ah! had you always but pursu’d the Steps
“Of pious Jacob, you’d had nought to fear:
“But I can read a Story in your Hearts
“That Time cannot obliterate --- a Youth
“Most barbarously betray’d! --- an Innocent
“To Strangers sold! --- Hah! are ye struck! --- Enough!
Heav’n may delay to punish guilty Men,
But won’t forget them.

Reuben.]

Simeon.} [Aside.]“Ah! he surely knows

Judah.}“Our Perfidy.

———
SCENE IV.

To them PHANOR.

Phan. At length the Cup is found.
Jos. Where ?
Phan. Hid, my Lord, amidst thy gen’rous Presents.
Benjamin had it.
Jos. Benjamin !
Benj. I had it !
Phan. Behold his Sack, and in it view the Theft.
Benj. Am I a Robber ? Shield me, righteous Heav’n !
Jos. Seize him.
Benj. O Heav’n ! thou know’st my Innocence !
Jos. No more ---
Leave him alone to suffer --- As for you,
Go, get you up in Peace unto your Father.

RECI TATIVE accompany’d.

Benj. What! without me ? Ah! how return in Peace !
What can you say ? What Comfort can you yield
To the distracted Parent ? O unhappy !
Unhappy Benjamin! Thou at thy Birth
Gav’st Death unto thy Mother --- and now dying,
Thou likewise tak’st thy tender Father’s Life.
ARIOSO.

Benj.  

Jos. [Aside.] —— Ah! I must not hear.  

Benj.  

Jos. [Aside.] —— Be blind, my Eyes.  

Benj.  

Jos. [Aside.] —— Trait’rous Tear!  

Benj.  

Jos. [Aside.] —— Be still, ye Sighs.

20. ] O Pity!  

20. ] (Ah! I must not hear  

21. ] myself  

21. ] be blind, my Eyes.)  

22. ] father! –  

22. ] Trait’rous Tear  

23. ] O pity him!  

23. ] (Be still ye Sighs)  

23. Be’s till, D2 ] Be’s till! 
AIR.  [28.]

Benj.  *Remember, at the first Embrace*  
*You call’d me Son --- O view this Face ;*  
*I still as much deserve the Name ;*  
*Thy Heart alone is not the same.*

Jos.  To Prison with him.

Sim.  *O illustrious Zaphnath,*

Give room to Pity ; thou who rulest Kingdoms,
Rule, to thy greater Glory, thy own Spirit :
Or to his Father render back the Youth,
Or Death to us.

Jos.  [*Roughly.*]  On whom the Cup was found, him I retain.

[Exit.]

Sim.  What, gone ! not hear us !

Judah.  ——— ——— ——— Yet methoughts I saw

Some Marks of Pity on his Face ---

Sim.  What Pity !
RECI TATIVE  accompany’d.
The Man who flies the Wretched, nor will hear them,
For fear of yielding to their piercing Cries,
Has only Pity for himself.

RECI TATIVE  accompany’d.

Judah. Peace, Simeon;
 Remember Dothan’s Fields, the horrid Pit!
And Joseph’s Cries! --- Were we not deaf to them?
Then we’d not hear --- and now we are not heard.

Reuben. What Counsel can we take? --- If we return,
Our Father dies with Grief --- If here we stay,
With Famine --- Death is either way his Lot ---
And black Despair is ours ---

RECI TATIVE  accompany’d.

Sim. O gracious God,
 We merit well this Scourge, but thou art He,
 Whose Property is ever to have Mercy.

36. ] wretched  H43 fol. 110r, C43/3 fol. 27v
36. ] them  C43/3 fol. 27v
37. ] Cries  C43/3 fol. 27v
38. ] himself  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 27v
38. ] Peace Simeon  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 27v
39. ] Pitt  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 27v
40. ] Josephs Cries – were  H43 fol. 110v; Cries were C43/3 fol. 27v; Cries !---Were – J47;
 Cries ! – were  J57
40. ] not we deaf  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 27v
40. ] them  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 27v
41. ] hear and  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 27v; here---and  J47; hear – and  J57
41. ] heard  C43/3 fol. 27v
42. ] take – if  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 27v; take ?---If  J47; take ?– If  J57
42. ] return  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 27v
43. ] Grief --- If  J47; Grief---If  J47; Grief---If  J57
43. ] stay  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 27v
44. ] Famine, Death  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 27v; Famine---Death  J47; Famine--Death  J57
44. ] Lot –  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 27v; Lot---  J47; Lot–  J57
45. ] ours –  H43 fol. 110v, J57; ours.  C43/3 fol. 27v; ours---  J47; ours–  J57
45. ] God!  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 29v, W44
46. ] Scourge: but  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 29v, W44
46. ] He –  H43 fol. 110v, C43/3 fol. 29v; He:  W44
47. ] mercy  W44
Chorus of the Brethren.

_Eternal Monarch of the Sky,
Our cruel Crime thou didst descry,
O! with the same all-piercing Eye_}

_Our melting Penitence observe._

_Thou, the Beginning and the End!
Creator! Father! Guardian! Friend!
Returning Prodigals attend,_

_And grant us Aid we don’t deserve._

_Sim. But Peace, Zaphnath returns ---_

---

48. ] Skie, H43 fol. 111v; Skie C43/3 fol. 30v
49. ] descry H43 fol. 111v, C43/3 fol. 30v
50. ] O H43 fol. 111v, C43/3 fol. 30v
50. ] all piercing H43 fol. 111v, C43/3 fol. 30v
52. ] Thou C43/3 fol. 31v
53. ] friend H43 fol. 112v, C43/3 fol. 31v
54. ] attend H43 fol. 112v, C43/3 fol. 31v
55. ] don’t deserve H43 fol. 112v
56. ] peace Zaphna H43 fol. 114v, C43/3 fol. 35v
56. ] returns H43 fol. 114v, C43/3 fol. 35v; returns--- J47; returns J57
SCENE V.

To them JOSEPH.

Jos. How! not departed!
Ye insolent! away! What foolish Hope? ---

Judah. Though Fear, my Lord, and Anguish
Have nigh lock’d up our Lips, yet would I crave
To offer one Word more --- and O! my Lord,
Let not thine Anger burn against thy Servant.
When drove by dire Necessity to wrest
From the reluctant Bosom of our Father,
(Ah! with what Force! but such was thy Command)
His youngest, dearest Son, his Heart’s first Joy!
He weeping, thus bespake us --- Well you know,
This Child’s the Prop and Succour of my Age,
The only Relick of my Rachel’s Bed;
Joseph, alas! my much lamented Joseph,
In a sad Hour went out, and fell a Prey,
As oft’ you’ve told me, to the Tiger’s Rage;
If then you tear this also from my Arms,
And Mischief shall befal him --- my gray Hairs
Ye will bring down with Sorrow to the Grave.
Jos. [Aside.] My Soul itself now weeps.

10. ] youngest dearest H43 fol. 115v, C43/3 fol. 36v
10. ] Hearts first Joy, H43 fol. 115v, C43/3 fol. 36v
11. ] weeping thus H43 fol. 115v, C43/3 fol. 36v
11. ] us – Well H43 fol. 115v, C43/3 fol. 36v; us--- Well J47; us---Well J57
11. ] know H43 fol. 115v
12. ] Age H43 fol. 115v
13. Relick ] reliet H43 fol. 115v, C43/3 fol. 36v
14. ] Joseph H43 fol. 115v, C43/3 fol. 36v
15. ] went out C43/3 fol. 36v
16. oft’ you’ve ] oft you H43 fol. 115v, C43/3 fol. 36v
16. ] me C43/3 fol. 36v
16. ] Tyger’s H43 fol. 115v, C43/3 fol. 36v
16. ] rage, C43/3 fol. 36v
18. ] befall H43 fol. 115v, C43/3 fol. 36v, J47, J57
18. ] him – my H43 fol. 115v, C43/3 fol. 36v; him--- my J47; him---my J57
20. [Aside. ] } not in C43.
20. ] (My Soul it Self now weeps –) -- H43 fol. 115v; (My Soul itself now weeps) C43/3 fol. 36v
AIR.

Sim.    Thou hadst, my Lord,
A Father once --- perhaps hast now --- O feel,
Feel then for us --- as thou didst love thy own,
O pity ours --- Feel then our Anguish, feel.

Give, give him up the Lad       25
In whom his Life is bound ---
O let me suffer,
Whatever Punishment is doom’d for him ;
He is too young for Slavery or Stripes ;
Labour and Years have render’d me more hardy.
RECI TATIVE accompany’d.

Lay all on me, Imprisonment, Chains, Scourges, All, all I can endure --- But to my Father, To be the Messenger of Death I cannot.

Jos. [Aside.] I can no longer---Phanor, bring the Youth---[Exit Phanor, and returns with Benjamin.

Far off, ye Guards and Servants --- from my Presence
Let ev’ry Man depart--- [To the Brethren.] Know, I am Joseph.

Doth my dear Father live ? --- I am your Brother ; Your long-lost Brother --- I am Joseph.

The Brethren. Joseph !

Sim. O Heav’n!

Judah. Joseph !

Sim. Wretched We ! [Aside.

Jos. Arise:

And banish Fear --- my Benjamin, come hither ;
And let me press thee to my yearning Bosom.

Brethren, receive and give a kind Embrace.

30. ] me C43/3 fol. 39r
31. ] all H43 fol. 117r, C43/3 fol. 39r
31. ] endure – but H43 fol. 117r, C43/3 fol. 39r; endure---But J47; endure---But J57
31. ] Father H43 fol. 117r, C43/3 fol. 39r
33. ] Youth – <Ramse> Phanor H43 fol. 117v; longer – Phanor C43/3 fol. 39r; longer–Phanor J57
33. ] Youth – H43 fol. 117r; youth C43/3 fol. 39r; Youth--- J47; Youth-- J57
[Exit Phanor, and returns with Benjamin. ] {not in H43, C43}
34. ] farr off H43 fol. 117r, C43/3 fol. 39r
34. ] Servants – from H43 fol. 117r; servants from C43/3 fol. 39r; Servants – from J57
35. Let ev’ry Man depart ] Let every one go forth – H43 fol. 117r; let every one go forth C43/3 fol. 36r; Let ev’ry Man depart-- J47; Let ev’ry Man depart – J57
35. To the Brethren. ] {not in H43, C43}
35. ] Know I am Joseph H43 fol. 117r, C43/3 fol. 39r
36. ] Brother H43 fol. 117r, C43/3 fol. 40r
37. ] long lost Brother I H43 fol. 117r, C43/3 fol. 40r; Brother – I J57
37. ] Joseph C43/3 fol. 40r
38. The Brethren. ] {not in H43, C43} Joseph H43 fol. 117r, C43/3 fol. 40r
38. ] Heav’n H43 fol. 117r, C43/3 fol. 40r
39. ] fear my Benjamin H43 fol. 117r, C43/3 fol. 40r; Fear – my J57
40. ] Bosom – – H43 fol. 118r, C43/3 fol. 40r
41. ] Brether’n receive, H43 fol. 118r; Brether’n receive C43/3 fol. 40r
41. ] Embrace H43 fol. 118r
Benj. “My Brother Joseph living! Ah! my Father!
“What Floods of joyous Tears at this glad Tale,
“Will wash the Furrows of thy hoary Cheeks?
Jos. [To Benj.] Forgive this harmless Stratagem. [To the Brethren.] and ye,
Pardon my groundless Jealousy --- I fear’d
You now to Benjamin might prove perfidious,
As erst to me --- But I have try’d your Faith.
“Virtue’s your Guide, Fraternal Love unites ye,
“And Joseph was your last Offence ---
Sim. O Joseph!
Just, yet mysterious, are the Ways of Heav’n.
Jos. “So now, it was not you that sent me hither,
“But God; to be a Father unto Pharoah,
“And Ruler of his Land; your Envy thus
“Converting to my Grandeur, and the Good
“Of half Mankind ---
“But haste ye to our Father, and relieve
“His anxious Spirits.

42.-44. ] {omitted J57.}
45. To Benj. ] {not in H43, C43.}
45. ] Stratagem H43 fol. 118; Stratagem, C43/3 fol. 40°
45. To the Brethren. ] {not in H43, C43.}
45. ] ye H43 fol. 118, C43/3 fol. 40°
46. ] feared C43/3 fol. 40°
47. prove perfidious, ] be perfidious H43 fol. 119, C43/3 fol. 40°
48. ] me, but H43 fol. 119°; me but C43/3 fol. 40°; me – But J57
48. ] try’d } prov’d H43 fol. 119, C43/3 fol. 40°
49.-50. ] {omitted J57; not in C43/3 except O Joseph!}
51. ] just yet mysterious are H43 fol. 118°, C43/3 fol. 40°
52.-58. ] {not in C43/3; omitted J57.}
52. ] now it H43 fol. 118°
52. ] hither H43 fol. 118°
53. ] God, H43 fol. 118°
53. ] Pharaoh H43 fol. 118°
54. ] Land your error thus H43 fol. 118°
56. Of half Mankind --- ] of more than half Mankind, H43 fol. 118°
SCENE the LAST.

To them, ASENATH.

Asen. --- Whilst the Nile and Memphis,
To him and his are destin’d for a Country;
Thus Pharaoh has ordain’d --- [To Jos.] Now, my dear Lord,
Cast Sorrow from thy Breast.
Jos. And thou, my Fair,
Disclaim thy Doubts, and no more breathe Suspicion.

Asen. Trust me, O Zaphnath, ’twas the Breath of Love.
Zaph. Mine too, O Asenath, was still the same.
DUETTO.

Asen. What’s sweeter than the new-blown Rose,  
Or Breezes from the new-mown Close?  
What’s sweeter than an April-Morn,  
Or May-Day’s silver fragrant Thorn?  
What than Arabia’s spicy Grove ---  
---O sweeter far the Breath of Love. 
Hence, Gen’rous Lovers! scorn Alarm,  
Away Suspicion cast;  
Beauty and Wit begin the Charm ---  
--- But Kindness makes it last. Da Capo.

8. than the ] than ye W44
8. ] new blown Rose? H43/PM fol. 1r; C43/3 fol. 50v
9. ] new mown C43/3 fol. 50v
10. ] April-Morn? H43/PM fol. 1r; April Morn? C43/3 fol. 50v; April Morn, W44
11. ] May Days C43/3 fol. 50v
12. ] Arabia’s C43/3 fol. 50v
12. ] Grove H43/PM fol. 1r; Grove? C43/3 fol. 50v; Grove, W44; Grove--- J47, J57
13. ] O H43/PM fol. 1r, C43/3 fol. 50v, W44; --- O J57
13. ] Love C43/3 fol. 50v
14.-17. ] {omitted J57.}
12.-17. } All copies of M44 personally inspected, and the Yale University copy, consulted in private communication, have a slip pasted over these lines, allocating the verse to Asenath alone. Detachment of the pasted slip from Lampeter T559 has revealed the cancelled text for the duet: What than Arabia’s spicy Grove --- | Jos O sweeter far the Breath of Love. | Both. What than Arabia’s spicy Grove --- | O sweeter far the Breath of Love.}
14.-17. ] {not in H43, H43/PM.}
14. ] Hence C43/3 fol. 52v
14. ] alarm C43/3 fol. 53v
15. ] cast C43/3 fol. 53v
16.-17. Charm --- | --- But } charm but C43/3 fols 53v-54v
17. ] last C43/3 fol. 53v

"Jos. " My Bliss is now at full, and swells a Tide
" Of multiply’d Delights; Wife, Father, Brethren!
" And thou, my Benjamin! all, all partake
" The glowing fond Affections of my Soul.
" Soon we’ll resort, and pay our due Obeisance
" At gracious Pharaoh’s Feet --- But first of all,
With Songs of ardent Gratitude and Praise,
Let us approach the high Eternal’s Throne,
The Fountain of all Joy, all Peace, all Honour.

CHORUS.
" Jehovah, Lord, who from thy Mercy-Seat
" Dost mark the Movements of this lower World;
" The Virtuous still at last thy Bounties meet,
" Whilst from her Pinnacle proud Vice is hurl’d.

" Therefore with Angels, and the heav’nly Throng,
" Let Man give Laud to thy tremendous Name;
" Thee seek in ev’ry Prayer — in ev’ry Song,
" Thy Justice, as thy Goodness, still proclaim.

ANTHEM.
We will rejoice in thy Salvation, and triumph in the Name of the Lord our God. Hallelujah!

FINIS.
Lately Publish'd, (Price One Shilling.)
The FOURTH EDITION, Beautifully printed in Octavo.

Dedicated to Her Highness the LADY AUGUSTA.
The LADY's PRECEPTOR: Or, A Letter to a Young Lady of Distinction upon
POLITENESS. Taken from the French of the Abbé D'Ancourt, and adapted to the
Religion, Customs, and Manners of the English Nation. By a Gentleman of Cambridge.

—— ——— Adorn'd
With all that Earth or Heav'n could bestow,
To make her amiable: —— On she came,
Grace was in all her Steps, Heav'n in her Eye,
In every Gesture Dignity and Love.

MILTON.

The CONTENTS.

Of Politeness in general. Of In sinceri ty.
Of Politeness in Religion, and against Supersti tion. Of Friendship.
Of Devotion. Of Doing Good Offices.
Of Behaviour at Church. Of Anger and Resentment.
Of the Duties and Decorums of Civil Life. Of Gentleness and Modesty.
Of Behaviour to our Superiors. Of Keeping and Imparting Secrets.
Of Conversation. Of Receiving and Paying Visits.
Of Complaisance. Of Egotism.
Of Flattery and Servility. Of the Imitation of others.
Of Appearing Absent in Company. Of Compliments and Ceremony.
Of Contradiction. Of Asking Questions.
Of Calumny and Detraction. Of Talking before Servants.
Of Vain Glory. Of Behaviour towards rude young Fellows.
Of Prejudice. Of Ridicule.
Of being too Inquisitive. Of Politicks.
Of Whispersing and Laughing in Company. Of Trusting to Appearances and Reports.
Of Applauding and Censuring People rashly. Of Hope and Belief.
Of Mimicking others. Of Idleness.
Of being Blind to what gives us Offence. Of Appearing often in Publick Places.
Of Gallantry from the Men. Of Frugality and Covetousness.
Of Friendship with Men. Of the Learning proper to a young Lady.
Of Love. Of Letter-Writing.
Of Duty to Parents. Of the Choice and Entertainment of Books.
Of Pride and Condescension. Of Dress.
Of True and False Nobility. Of Behaviour at Table.
Of Self-Conceit and Love of Vanity. Of Behaviour at Assemblies, Operas, and
Of Humility and Pride. Plays.
Of Affectation. Of Gaming.
Of Going to Court, and Courtiers. Of Self Conversation.

Of Good nature and Charity.
1.4. Hercules.

1.4.1. Sources for the edition of Hercules.

Manuscript sources and sigla for the underlay libretto.

H44

C44/1, C44/2, C44/3

Wordbooks examined, with shelfmark and state of current binding

T45

R49
1.4.2. Headnotes to the edition of Hercules.

The first wordbook for Hercules is different from the three quarto wordbooks for Joseph because it is octavo. This octavo Hercules (T45) elicits a response from Dean which suggests why octavo was adopted:

The small octavo format is exceptional in the librettos [i.e. wordbooks] of Handel’s performances; it was used for Acis and Galatea in 1732, but never for the oratorios proper, nor for Semele or the later editions of Hercules. It was associated with operas and may have been deliberately (and appropriately chosen) here. (p. 433.)

Dean’s parenthetical ‘appropriately’ clinches his assertion that Hercules is an opera in all but name, a claim challenged in this thesis in Chapter Six. Todd Gilman is less cautious than Dean and constructs a false relationship between composer and wordbook, arguing without evidence that to reinforce audience expectation of an oratorio rather than an opera it was the composer who determined that wordbooks would be quarto for revivals of Hercules.\(^9\) Possible reasons for the single appearance of octavo for an oratorio wordbook are given in the thesis, but none supports the notion that the composer dealt directly with a wordbook printer, with the exception of George Faulkner in connection with the premiere of Messiah in Dublin in 1742.

The copy-text T45 is 8vo: A—B\(^8\) C\(^4\) [S2 (-A1 signed)] I–6 prelims, 7 8–40 text; type area 91 x 162. The leaf dimension suggests a Demy sheet. T45 complies with Law 4, as set

down by Blades, that ‘If the chain-marks are down, and the watermark is found at the top edge of a book, that book must be 8vo’ (p. 221). There is no half-title, and A is blank (A2 is missing). Page numbering suggests the possible loss, on all copies personally inspected, of a half-title leaf in the process of subsequent binding. In addition to its unusual octavo format, T45 displays numerous interesting features. Most noticeable among these is a freehand printer’s mark signalling to readers which printed verse they would not hear in performance. The printer applied freehand marks to cancel text on pages 19, 20, 25, 26, and 27. Most of these marks appear identical, and how they were conveyed to paper requires further research. This prominent intervention by the printer enabled the wordbook to comply more fully with the performed version of the libretto at the point of sale. The BL copy of T45 has a unique press correction on p. 19, where underlining on ‘force’ seems to denote recognition of a misprinted substantive noun lacking its initial capital. No such proof mark underlines the lower-case initial letter in ‘bar’ in ‘Since Jove has every bar removed’ in the final scene of Act III of the same copy, or in R49.

R49 is not octavo but collates as 4to: A—C⁺⁴ [$2 (-A1 signed)] 1-4 prelims, 5 6-18 19 20-24 text; type area 126 x 198. There is no half-title, and A is blank. Both of the ‘Roberts’ wordbooks, R49 and R52, have horizontal chain-lines approximately 26 mm apart, similar to all three wordbooks for Joseph. An estimate of sheet size, based on leaf dimensions, suggests Demy as the sheet used for all wordbooks for Joseph and Hercules, whether folded octavo or quarto.

The final wordbook for Hercules is R52. It is 4to: A—C⁺⁴ [$2 (-A1 signed)] 1-4 prelims 5 6-18 19 20-24 text; type area 125 x 197. As in all other wordbooks, title-pages, catchwords and running headers are regular; none is missing and there are no discrepancies between
catchword and the first word on the next page. R52 is dated 1749 in the imprint, but musical
evidence ties it to the 1752 season. A chorus, ‘Still caressing, and caress’d’ (II.8) was reset in
type to replace the chorus in T45 and R49, ‘Love and Hymen’. This choral interloper,
according to Dean, was composed for Alcestes, ‘a work not begun till 27 December 1749’, so
that it ‘can only have been issued for the single performance in 1752’ (p. 433). Hence this
wordbook receives a siglum that does not relate to the date in its imprint. The printer,
presumably for reasons of economy, chose not to reset sheet A and thereby apply an accurate
year of publication to R52.

A freehand correction in a copy of R52 in the BL differs only slightly from the same
modification in the National Library of Scotland’s copy of R52. It is a variation in the shape of
an ink cancellation of the announcement ‘March’ (i.5) on page 10, but is insufficient evidence
to substantiate there being two states of this wordbook. R52 in the National Library of
Scotland has an ink cancellation of the label ‘Air’ above ‘My Father!’ (i.5), with ‘Recitative
accomp’d’ written alongside it. As none of the three wordbooks for Hercules uses the term
‘Recitative accompanied’, this amendment was most likely made by someone familiar with
wordbooks for earlier works by Handel who entered the conventional musical term on his or
her own account. R52 shares with R49 a non-capitalized substantive for ‘hero’ in ‘My hero
found’ in Dejanira’s air, ‘Be gone, my Fears’ (i.3). This kind of irregularity is rare, which
reflects well on the accuracy of printing for an occasional publication, and one probably
produced at short notice.

Cuts made by Handel account for a difference between the number of pages forming
the first wordbook and those in R49 and R52. The later two occupy fewer pages. T45 has forty
pages, of which the main text occupies the final thirty-four. R49 and R52 in quarto received a
larger page-size than T45 but these were shorter publications of twenty-four pages, the main
text occupying the final twenty pages. T45 had almost one-fifth more verse to accommodate
than R52. Yet no appreciable difference in line spacing is noticeable between the three
wordbooks. All three have brief front matter, and no end matter. The shorter libretto in R52
entailed type resetting from p. 25 (i.e. ‘B2’) onwards. It is on page 18 that the most extended
variant occurs. Replacing the end-of-Act chorus ‘Love and Hymen’ (II.8) is the text for a
different chorus, ‘Still caressing, and caress’d’, reset with minor alterations from a chorus in
Alceste, which Handel had completed in January 1750. In a handwritten note on the title-page
verso of the Paris copy of R49, Thomas Morell claimed authorship of these lines:

This chorus is taken from a
[musica]l Entertainment, intended by Mr Rich,
[call’]d Alcestis; The Song Part by T. M.
[the Music]k by Mr Handel; But Mr R---
[rejecte]d it, as being too good for
[his] Performers.10

The three wordbooks share a similar typographical scheme, or house style, of old-
fashioned initial capitalization of substantive proper nouns, and an elaborate system of
punctuation. Interrogative phrases and some imperatives are end-stopped by dashes or a series
of dashes; most imperative phrases conclude with an exclamation mark. T45 uses dashes for
nearly all pauses and breaks in the syntax. Its only instances of dash series appear in Act III,
whereas R49 and R52 use dash series throughout. R52 differs from R49 in its use of longer

10 Richard King’s study of the Paris copy of R49 (Hercules: F-Pc: Rés. V. S. 843) yielded this information. In a
private communication, King added that Schoelcher, the nineteenth-century owner of this copy, ‘had to provide
the missing portions of Morell’s notes (indicated above by square brackets) because those parts of the text had
been “cut by the binding of the book”. It must be said that his additions are logical’: Schoelcher’s claim is in
dashes in series. Punctuation differences occur in T45 (II.7) and the ‘Roberts’ wordbooks (I.6).

At the phrase, ‘Pledge of Reconcilement’, T45 follows this phrase with a recitative for Lichas, and places a period after ‘Reconcilement’, whereas R49 and R52 break off the phrase, as though interrupted, and punctuate it with a series of dashes.

A major difference between the page layout of T45 and R49 and R52 can be seen in the placement of characters’ names in relation to their speeches. T45 has centred speech headings, citing the name of the character, while in R49 and R52 the name appears at the head of the first line of speech, as in the wordbooks for *Joseph*. In T45, small capitals grace characters’ names in the Dramatis Personae and in the centred character cues, whereas in R49 and R52 characters’ names, when announced in scene directions, appear in small capitals.

Deployment of italics generally follows wordbooks produced before *Hercules*. The body of the Advertisement is in italics, except for proper nouns, which remain in roman. In all three versions, ‘Dramatis Personae’ is in italics, as are descriptors, such as ‘his Wife’ or ‘Chorus of’. Italics are deployed uniformly to names in the body of the main text, to lyric (or rhymed) verse, and to passages of reported speech in recitatives, e.g. Hyllus’s arioso ‘*I feel, I feel the God*’ (I.2); proper nouns stand out in roman in italicized lines. Patterns of indentation from the left-hand margin in lyric verse are identical in all three wordbooks, suggesting a typographical unity attributable to one printer, whose identity is discussed in Chapter Five.

John Walsh advertised his first publication of the airs and duets in *Hercules* in the *Daily Advertiser*, 8 January 1745. His edition does not include the secco recitatives, though it includes some accompanied recitatives. He advertised again on 9 February 1745 in the *General Evening Post* and on 24 February 1749 in *The General Advertiser* (‘in Score as it is to be performed this Evening’) (*HHb* iv, 383, 385, 420). The collations include verbal variants in
these Walsh printed scores. Their close correlation to the underlay text in the musical manuscripts suggests that these were the sources from which Walsh obtained his own underlay copy. An example of this verbal link can be seen in Walsh’s preference for the sanguinary epithet over the euphemistic ‘crimson’ in the wordbooks: ‘Dying he bites the bloody Ground’ (I.5), which appears in both manuscript sources as well as in Walsh’s score, which offers no stage directions and which exhibits inconsistencies in spelling and in application of full stops.

The composer’s autograph score of *Hercules* shows that, unlike *Joseph*, the score was composed continuously, an aesthetic unity which however failed to carry the oratorio to commercial success. During Handel’s lifetime *Hercules* was one of the least performed of his oratorios. It was presented at the King’s Theatre on 5, 12 January 1745; on 24 February and 1 March 1749 at Covent Garden theatre; and on 21 February 1752, also at Covent Garden theatre.
1.4.3. Edition of Hercules.

pp. [1.-2.] {half-title leaf missing?}

p. [3.] HERCULES. | A | MUSICAL DRAMA. | As it is Perform’d at the | KING’s THEATRE | IN THE | HAY-MARKET. | [rule] | The MUSICK by Mr. HANDEL. | [rule] | [Ornament] | [two rules] | LONDON : | Printed for J. and R. TONSON and S. DRAPER | in the Strand. 1745. | [Price One Shilling.]

{different ornament R49, R52.}
MUSICAL DRAMA.  | MUSICAL DRAMA.  R49, R52
KING’s THEATRE  | THEATRE-ROYAL  R49, R52
IN THE  | IN  R49, R52
HAY-MARKET.  | COVENT-GARDEN. R49, R52
[Price One Shilling. ] ] [Price One Shilling.] ] And no more. R49, R52

p. [4.] {unprinted.}

p. [5.] [Ornament] | [ADVERTISEMENT. | The following Drama is founded on the | Story of Hercules and Dejanira, as it is | related by Ovid in the Ninth Book of | his Metamorphoses ; and the same Sub- | ject, as it is treated by Sophocles in his | Tragedy call’d The Trachinians. |
[Ornament] |

{different ornament R49, R52.}
The following Drama is founded on the | Story of Hercules and Dejanira, as it is | related by Ovid in the Ninth Book of | his Metamorphoses ; and the same Sub- | ject, as it is treated by Sophocles in his | Tragedy call’d The Trachinians. |
{different ornament R49, R52.}
Metamorphoses :  R49
The Trachinians  A3 | Trachinians  A2  R49, R52
{different ornament R49, R52.}


{different ornament R49, R52.}
HERCULES [catchword].  } HERCULES. R49, R52
{ornament omitted R49, R52.}
ACT 1. SCENE 1.

SCENE, A Royal Apartment.

DEJANIRA and TRACHINIANS.

I TRACHINIAN.

SEE, with what sad Dejection in her
Looks,
Indulging Grief, the mournful Princess
sits!
She weeps from Morning’s Dawn to Shades of
Night,
From Gloom of Night to red’ning Blush of Morn.
Uncertain of Alcides’ Destiny,
Disconsolate, his Absence she laments.
AIR. [8.]

No longer, Fate, relentless frown!
Preserve, Great Jove, the Heroe’s Life!
With Glory’s Wreath his Actions crown;
And, O! restore him to his weeping Wife!

DEJANIRA.

O Hercules! why art thou absent from me!
Return, return, my Heroe, to my Arms—
O Gods! how racking are the Pains of Absence
To one who loves, who fondly loves, like me!

AIR.

The World, when Day’s Career is run,
In Darkness mourns the absent Sun:
So I, depriv’d of that dear Light,
That warm’d my Breast, and cheer’d my Sight,
Deplore, in thickest Gloom of Grief,
The Absence of the valiant Chief.

I TRACHINIAN.

Princess, be comforted, and hope the best:
A few revolving Hours may bring him back,
Once more to bless your longing Arms—

7.-10. ] {omitted R49, R52.}
7. ] <on great Alcides, Jove, look down> no longer Fate, relentless frown  H44 fols 6r-7r
7. ]  frown C44/1 fol. 9r; longer C44/1 fol. 9r; no longer fate relentless frown, W45
8. ]  preserve great Jove  H44 fols 6r-7r, C44/1 fol. 9r  Life  H44 fol. 7r; Life. C44/1 fol. 9r
8. ]  <preserve the gallant Heroe’s Life>  H44 fols 6r-7r  preserve C44/1 fol. 9r; preserve great Jove the Heroe’s life, W45
9. ]  crown, H44 fol. 7r; crown C44/1 fol. 11v, W45
10. ]  and O! C44/1 fol. 11v, W45  Wife.  H44 fol. 8v; Wife C44/1 fol. 11v, W45
11. ]  {O in factotum R49, R52.} O HERCULES  /  R49, R52  me? H44 fol. 4r, C44/1 fol. 7r
12. ]  return  C44/1 fol. 7r  Hero, H44 fol. 4r; Heroe C44/1 fol. 7r
12. ]  Arms! — H44 fol. 4r; Arms! C44/1 fol. 7r; Arms ---- R49, R52
13. ]  racking, C44/1 fol. 13r  Absence, H44 fol. 4r
14. ]  one, who H44 fol. 4r, C44/1 fol. 13r
15.-26. ] {omitted R49, R52.}
15. ]  world when W45 run H44 fol. 9r, C44/1 fol. 15r
16. ]  Sun C44/1 fol. 16r; Sun, W45
17. ]  I depriv’d H44 fol. 9r, C44/1 fol. 17r; I deprived W44  Light C44/1 fol. 17r
18. ]  Breast C44/1 fol. 17r  Sight C44/1 fol. 17r
19. ]  deplore in H44 fol. 10r, C44/1 fol. 17r, W45  grief C44/1 fol. 17r, W45
20. ]  Chief C44/1 fol. 18r
1 TrACHINIAN. ] 1 Tr.> Lychas H44 fol. 10v
21. ]  Princess! H44 fol. 10v, C44/1 fol. 18v
DEJANIRA.

Ah! no!
Impossible! — He never will return —

TRACHINIAN.

Forbid it, Heav’n, and all ye Guardian Pow’rs, That watch o’er Virtue, Innocence, and Love!

SCENE II. [9.]

To them HYLLUS.

DEJANIRA.

My Son! dear Image of thy absent Sire!
What Comfort bring’st thou to thy Mother’s Ear?
HYLLUS.

Eager to know my Father’s Destiny,
I bade the Priests, with solemn Sacrifice,
Explore the Will of Heav’n—the Altar smoak’d—
The slaughter’d Victim bled — when, lo! around
The hallow’d Walls a sudden Glory blaz’d.
The Priest acknowledg’d the auspicious Omen,
And own’d the present God——when, in a Mo-
ment,
The Temple shook — the Glory disappear’d ;
And more than midnight Darkness veil’d the Place.

I TRACHINIAN.

'Twas dreadful all.

HYLLUS.

At length the reverend Flamen,
Full of the Deity, prophetic spoke :

ARIOSO.

“I feel, I feel the God— he swells my Breast—
“Before my Eyes the Future stands confest —

3. ] Fathers Destiny  H44 fol. 11r
5. ] Heav’n --- the  R49, R52
5. ] smoak’d — H44 fol. 11r, C44/1 fol. 19v; smoak’d ---  R49, R52
6. ] bled --- when,  R49, R52
6. ] around,  H44 fol. 11r, C44/1 fol. 19v
7. ] blaz’d — H44 fol. 11r, C44/1 fol. 19v
8. ] acknowledg’d,  C44/1 fol. 19v
8. ] Omen  H44 fol. 11r
9. ] God --- when,  R49, R52; when  C44/1 fol. 19v
9. ] moment  H44 fol. 11r, C44/1 fol. 19v
9. Mo- [ ment, ] Moment,  R49, R52
10. ] shook --- the  R49, R52
10. ] disappear’d — H44 fol. 11r, C44/1 fol. 19v
11. ] veild the Place  H44 fol. 11r, C44/1 fol. 19v
12. ] <1 Tr> Lychas  H44 fol. 11r; First Trachinian <Ly> {obscured C44/1 fol. 19v}
12. ’Twas dreadful all!  H44 fol. 11r; {obscured C44/1 fol. 19v}
12. ] leght the Reverend Flamen  H44 fol. 11r, C44/1 fol. 19v
13. ] spoke  H44 fol. 11r; spoke,  C44/1 fol. 19v
14. ] God he  H44 fol. 11r, C44/1 fol. 20r  God --- he  R49, R52
14. ] Breast,  H44 fol. 11r, C44/1 fol. 20r; Breast ---  R49, R52
15. ] confest :  H44 fol. 12r; confest  C44/1 fol. 20r; confest --- R49, R52
14.-17. ] {quotation marks not in H44, C44/1.}
“I see the valiant Chief in Death laid low,
And Flames aspire from Oeta’s lofty Brow.”

He said: the sacred Fury left his Breast,
And on the Ground the fainting Prophet fell.

DEJANIRA.
Then I am lost —— O dreadful Oracle!
My Griefs hang heavy on my lab’ring Soul,
And soon will sink me to the Realms of Night.
There once again I shall behold my Hercules
Or whirl the Lance, or bend the stubborn Bow,
Or to the list’ning Ghosts his Toils recount.

AIR.
There, in Myrtle Shades reclin’d,
By Streams that thro’ Elysium wind,
In sweetest Union, we shall prove
Eternity of Bliss and Love.

HYLLUS.
Despair not; but let rising Hope suspend
Excess of Grief, ’till I have learnt the Certainty
Of my dear Father’s Fate —— To-morrow’s Sun
Shall see your Hyllus bend his pious Steps,
To seek the Heroe thro’ the travel’d Globe.
If yet he lives, I will restore him to you,
Or perish in the Search.
AIR.

Where congeal’d the Northern Streams,
    Bound in icy Fetters, stand;
Where the Sun’s intenser Beams
    Scorch the burning Libyan Sand;
By Honour, Love, and Duty led,
With advent’rous Steps I’ll tread.

CHORUS.

O filial Piety! O gen’rous Love!
Go, Youth inspired, thy Virtue prove:
    Immortal Fame attends thee,
    And pitying Heav’n befriends thee:
O filial Piety! O gen’rous Love!
Go, Youth inspired, thy Virtue prove.

37. ° Streams ; C44/1 fol. 25°
38. ° fetters stand H44 fol. 15°, C44 fol. 25°; Stand, W45
39. ° intenser C44/1 fol. 25°
40. ° Lybian C44/1 fol. 27°
41. ° sand, W45
42. ° Duty, H44 fol. 15°, C44/1 fol. 25°
43. ° Honour love and Duty led W45
42. ° adventurous Steps H44 fol. 15°, C44/1 fol. 25°
42. ° tread H44 fol. 16°, C44/1 fol. 28°
43. ° generous Love! H44 fol. 17°; Love C44/1 fol. 28°
44. ° go C44/1 fol. 28° prove C44/1 fol. 30°
45. ° thee H44 fol. 19°, C44/1 fol. 32°
46. ° thee H44 fol. 23°, C44/1 fol. 40°
47. ° Filial Piety. O generous H44 fol. 23°; Filial piety o generous C44/1 fol. 40°
48. ° prove {obscured H44 fol. 23°;} C44/1 fol. 40°
48. prove. ] prove. [Exeunt. R49, R52
SCENE III.

To them LICHAS.

LICHAS.
Banish your Fears —— Alcmena’s godlike Son
Lives — and from sack’d Oechalia, which his Arms
Have levell’d with the Ground, returns a Conqueror.

DEJANIRA.
O joyful News! welcome as rising Day
To the benighted World, or falling Show’rs
To the parch’d Earth! — Ye lying Omens, hence!
Hence, ev’ry anxious Thought!

AIR.

Be gone, my Fears, fly, hence, away,
Like Clouds before the Morning Ray!
My Heroe found,
With Laurels crown’d,
Heav’n relenting,
Fate consenting,
Springing Joys my Griefs controll,
And rising Transports swell my Soul.
LICHAS.

A Train of Captives, red with honest Wounds,
And low'ring on their Chains, attend the Conqueror:
But, more to grace the Pomp of Victory,
The lovely Iöle, Oechalia's Princess,
With Captive Beauty swells the joyful Triumph.

HYLLUS.

My Soul is mov'd for the unhappy Princess,
And fain, methinks, I wou'd unbind her Chains.
——— But, say — her Father, haughty Eurytus —

LICHAS.

He fell in single Combat, by the Sword
Of Hercules ———

LICHAS. ] Hyllus. R49, R52
16. ] Captives C44 fol. 44'
16. ] Wounds : C44/1 fol. 44'
17. ] lowring H44 fol. 28', C44/1 fol. 44'
17. Con-queror : conqueror, H44 fol. 28', C44/1 fol. 44'; Conqueror : R49, R52
18. ] but more, C44/1 fol. 44'
19. ] Iöle C44/1 fol. 44'
19. ] Princess C44/1 fol. 44'
20. ] joyfull H44 fol. 28', C44/1 fol. 44'
20. ] Triumph C44/1 fol. 44'
21. ] moved H44 fol. 28', C44/1 fol. 44''
22. ] methink's, H44 fol. 28'; me thinks, C44/1 fol. 44'
22. ] would H44 fol. 28', C44/1 fol. 44'
22. ] Chains? C44/1 fol. 44'
23. ] But, say, her H44 fol. 28'
23. ] Eurytus—? H44 fol. 28'
23.-25. ] [not in C44.]
24. ] fell, in W45
23-25. ] [omitted C44, R49, R52.]
DEJANIRA.  
[13.]
No more, but haste, and wait 
Thy Lord’s Arrival.

[Exit Dejanira and Hyllus.

LICHAS.
How soon is deepest Grief exchang’d for Bliss!

AIR.
The smiling Hours, a joyful Train,
On silken Pinions waft again
The Moments of Delight:
Returning Pleasures banish Woe;
As ebbing Streams, recruited, flow,
And Day succeeds to Night.

CHORUS.
Let none despair: Relief may come, tho’ late;
And Heav’n can snatch us from the Verge of Fate.

[Exeunt.]
SCENE IV. [14.]

A Square before the Palace.

IOLE, and Oechalian Virgins, led captive.

IÖLE.

Ye faithful Followers of the wretched Iöle,
Your Bonds sit heavier on me than my own.
Unhappy Maids! my Fate has drag’d you down,
Like some huge Pile, that crushes with its Fall
The neighb’ring Domes, and spreads wide Ruin round.

I Oechalian Virgin.

You are our Mistress still.

IOLE.

Alas! Erastia,
Captivity, like the Destroyer Death,
Throws all Distinctions down, and Slaves are equal.
But, if the Gods relent, and give us back
To our lost Liberty —— Ah me! how soon
The Flatt’rer Hope is ready with his Cordial!
Vain Expectation! —— No! —— Adieu for ever,
Ye smiling Joys, and innocent Delights,
Of Youth and Liberty! — Severe Remembrance!

SCENE IV. | A Square before the Palace. IOLE, and Oechalian Virgins, led captive. | Scene 4: Iöle, and Oechalian Virgins, led Captive. A Square before the Palace | H44 fol. 33r; Scen: 4th Iöle, and Oechalian Virgins, led captive. A Square before the Palace | C44/1 fol. 58r

1. ] faithfull H44 fol. 33r, C44/1 fol. 58r
2. ] own — C44/1 fol. 58r 2.-3. ] my own unhappy Maids! H44 fol. 33r
3. ] down ; H44 fol. 33r, C44/1 fol. 58r
4. huge ] vast H44 fol. 33r, C44/1 fol. 58r 4. it’s H44 fol. 33r, C44/1 fol. 58r
5. ] neighbouring H44 fol. 33r; neighbouring C44/1 fol. 58r 5. round it. H44 fol. 33r, C44/1 fol. 58r
5. Ruin [round.] Ruin round. R49, R52
6. I Oech: H44 fol. 33r, C44/1 fol. 58r 6. ] still H44 fol. 33r, C44/1 fol. 58r
7. ] captivity H44 fol. 33r, C44/1 fol. 58r 7. ] Slaves, are equal — H44 fol. 33r, C44/1 fol. 58r
9. ] but H44 fol. 33r, C44/1 fol. 58r
10. ] Liberty *** Ah! R49, R52
11. ] flatterer H44 fol. 33r, C44/1 fol. 58r 11. ] Hope, C44/1 fol. 58r
12. ] Expectation! *** No! *** Adieu R49, R52
13. ] Delights C44/1 fol. 58r 14. ] Liberty! *** Severe R49, R52
AIR.

Daughter of Gods, bright Liberty!
With thee a thousand Graces reign;
A thousand Pleasures crowd thy Train,
And hail thee loveliest Deity:

But Thou, alas! hast wing'd thy Flight;
The Graces that surround thy Throne,
And all the Pleasures with thee gone,
Remov'd for ever from my Sight!

But hark, the Victor comes!
SCENE V.

[ A March. ]

To them, HERCULES, and Attendants.

HERCULES.

Thanks to the Pow’rs above, but chief to thee,
Father of Gods, from whose immortal Loins
I drew my Birth ! — Now my long Toils are o’er,
And Juno’s Rage appeas’d — With Pleasure, now,
At rest, my various Labours I review.

Oechalia’s Fall is added to my Titles,
And points the rising Summit of my Glory.

[Turning to Iole.

Fair Princess, weep no more—forget these Bonds—
In Trachin you are free, as in Oechalia.
Forgive me, generous Victor, if a Sigh,
For my dead Father, for my Friends, my Country,
Will have its Way — I cannot yet forget,
That such Things were, and that I once enjoy’d them.

AIR.

My Father! — Ah! methinks I see
The Sword inflict the deadly Wound:
He bleeds — he falls — in Agony
Dying he bites the crimson Ground:

Peaceful rest, dear Parent Shade!
Light the Earth be on thee laid!
In thy Daughter’s pious Mind
All thy Virtues live enshrin’d.

[Ex. Iöle and Oech.]
SCENE VI.

HERCULES.
Now farewel, Arms! — From hence the Tide
of Time
Shall bear me gently down to mellow Age.
From War to Love I fly, my Cares to lose
In gentle Dejanira’s fond Embrace.

AIR. [17.]
The God of Battles quits the bloody Field,
And useless hang the glitt’ring Spear and Shield ;
While all-resign’d to conqu’ring Beauty’s Charms,
He gives a Loose to Love, in Cytherea’s Arms.

CHORUS.
Crown with Festal Pomp the Day ;
Be Mirth extravagantly gay : 10
Bid the grateful Altars smoke ;
Bid the Maids the Youths provoke
To join the Dance ; while Musick’s Voice
Tells aloud our rapt’rous Joys.

[Ornament]
[Ornament] | ACT II. SCENE I. | [18.]

SCENE, An Apartment.

IOLE and OECHALIANS.

IōLE.

WHY was I born a Princess, rais’d on high,
To fall with greater Ruin? — Had the
Gods
Made me the humble Tenant of some Cottage,
I had been happy.

AIR.

How blest the Maid, ordain’d to dwell,
With sweet Content, in humble Cell,
From Cities far remov’d;
By murm’ring Rills, on verdant Plains,
To tend the Flocks, with Village Swains,
By ev’ry Swain belov’d:
Tho’ low, yet happy in that low Estate,
And safe from Ills, which on a Princess wait!
To her DEJANIRA.

DEJANIRA, (aside, entring.)
   It must be so—Fame speaks aloud my Wrongs,
   And ev’ry Voice proclaims Alcides’ Falshood.
   —— Love, Jealousy, and Rage at once distract me.

IÖLE.
   What anxious Cares, untimely thus, disturb
   The happy Consort of the Son of Jove?

DEJANIRA.
   Insulting Maid! I had indeed been happy,
   But for the fatal Lustre of thy Beauty.

IÖLE.
   Alas! what mean you?

DEJANIRA.
   Well-dissembled Ignorance!
   You know not, then, the force of your own
   Charms ——
   O that Alcides ne’er had felt their Influence!

IÖLE.
   False and improbable Suggestion!
   How shou’d this artless Form, these trifling
   Beauties,
Mean at the best, and discompos’d by Grief,
Kindle Love’s Fire in great Alcides’ Breast,
Which burns with Glory’s gen’rous Flame? —

DEIANIRA.
Fair Hypocrite!
The silent Rhetoric of weeping Beauty
Pleads with resistless Force.

AIR.
When Beauty Sorrow’s liv’ry wears,
Our Passions take the Fair One’s part:
Love dips his Arrows in her Tears,
And sends them pointed to the Heart.

14. best  C44/2 fol. 8v
14. grief  H44 fol. 51r, C44/2 fol. 8v
15. breast  H44 fol. 51v
16. generous Flame?  H44 fol. 51r, C44/2 fol. 8v
20. livery  H44 fol. 51r, C44/2 fol. 8v; livery  W45
21. passion’s  C44/2 fol. 8v
21. fair-one’s part  H44 fol. 51r, C44/2 fol. 8v Part, W45
22. Tears  H44 fol. 51v
23. Heart  H44 fol. 51v, C44/2 fol. 10v
Iöle.

Whence this unjust Suspicion?

DEJANIRA.

Fame of thy Beauty (so Report informs me) First brought Alcides to Oechalia’s Court.
He saw —— he lov’d —— he ask’d you of your Father ——
His Suit rejected, in revenge, he level’d The haughty Town, and bore away the Spoil.
But the rich Prize, for which he fought, and conquer’d,
Was Iöle. ——

Iöle.

Ah! no! —— It was Ambition, Not slighted Love, that laid Oechalia low,
And made the wretched Iöle a Captive. [21.]
Report, that in the Garb of Truth disguises The blackest Falshoods, has abused your Ear With a forg’d Tale — But, O! let me conjure you,
For your dear Peace of Mind, beware of Jealousy.
AIR.

Ah! think what I'll the Jealous prove:
Adieu to Peace, adieu to Love,
Exchang'd for endless Pain!
With Venom fraught, the Bosom swells,
And never-ceasing Discord dwells,
Where Harmony shou'd reign.

DEJANIRA.
Too sure it is, that Hercules is false.— [Going.

SCENE III.

To them LICHAS.

LICHAS.
My Godlike Master —

DEJANIRA.
— Is a Traitor, Lichas,
Traitor to Hymen, Love, and Dejanira.

LICHAS.
Alcides false! Impossible!
AIR. [22.]

As Stars, that rise and disappear,
Still in the same bright Circle move;
So shines unchang’d thy Heroe’s Love,
Nor absence can his Faith impair:
The Breast, where gen’rous Valour dwells,
In Constancy no less excels.

DEJANIRA.
In vain you strive his Falshood to disguise.

[Exit Dejanira.

LICHAS.
This is thy Work, accursed Jealousy!

CHORUS.

Jealousy! infernal Pest!

Tyrant of the Human Breast!

How, from slightest Causes bred,

Do’st thou lift thy hated Head!

Trifles, light as floating Air,

Strongest Proofs to thee appear.

[Exit Lichas.
SCENE IV.

IOLE: To her, HYLLUS.

HYLLUS, (aside, entring.)
She knows my Passion, and has heard me breathe
My amorous Vows; but, deaf to the soft Plea,
Rejects my offer’d Love —— See, where she stands,
Like fair Diana circled by her Nymphs!

IOLE.

Too well, young Prince,
I guess the Cause that this Way leads your Steps ——
Why will you urge a Suit, I must not hear?
Love finds no Dwelling in that hapless Breast,
Where Sorrow, and her gloomy Train, reside.

SCENE IV. ] Scene. 3. H44 fol. 64v; SCENE III. R49, R52.
To her, HYLLUS. ] To her, HYLLUS. R49, R52
HYLLUS, (aside, entring. ) ] Hyll (aside, entring) H44 fol. 64v; enter Hyllus C44/2 fol. 30f
1. ] breath C44/2 fol. 30f
2. ] Plea H44 fol. 64v, C44/2 fol. 30f
3. ] Love --- See, R49, R52
3. ] she | stands, ] she stands, R49, R52
4. ] Diana, H44 fol. 64v, C44/2 fol. 30f
6. ] cause, H44 fol. 64v, C44/2 fol. 30f
8. ] dwelling, C44/2 fol. 30f
Hyllus.

The stealing Hand of all-subduing Time
May drive these black Intruders from their Seat,
And leave the Heav'nly Mansion of thy Bosom
Serene, and vacant to a softer Guest.

Iöle.

And think'st thou, Iöle can ever love
The Son of Hercules, whose Arms depriv'd her
Of Country, Father, Liberty! — Impossible!

Hyllus.

I own the Truths, that blast my springing
Hopes ——
Yet O, permit me, charming Maid, to gaze
On those dear Beauties, that enchant my Soul,
And view, at least, that Heav'n, I must despair
to gain.

Iöle. [24.]

Is this, is this the Son of Hercules,
For Labours fam'd, and hardy Deeds of Arms?
O Prince, exert the Virtues of thy Race,
And call forth all thy Father in thy Soul.
AIR.

Banish Love from thy Breast;
'Tis a Womanish Guest,
Fit only mean Thoughts to inspire:
Bright Glory invites thee,
Fair Honour excites thee,
To tread in the Steps of thy Sire.

HYLLUS.

Forgive a Weakness, which resistless sways
Ev’n Breasts immortal.

AIR.

From celestial Seats descending,
Joys Divine awhile suspending,
Gods have left their Heav’n above,
To taste the sweeter Heav’n of Love:
Cease my Passion then to blame;
Cease to scorn a Godlike Flame.
CHORUS.

[25.]
Wanton God of amorous Fires,
Wishes, Sighs, and soft Desires!

All Nature’s Sons thy Laws maintain:
O’er liquid Air, firm Land, and swelling Main,
Extends thy uncontroll’d and boundless Reign.

SCENE V.

Another Apartment.

HERCULES and DEJANIRA.

DEJANIRA.
Yes, I congratulate your Titles swell’d
With proud Oechalia’s Fall — But, O! I grieve
To see the Victor to the Vanquish’d yield.
How lost, alas! how fall’n from what you was!
Your Fame eclips’d, and all your Laurels blasted!  

39.-43. } {freehand ink cancel; omitted R49, R52.}
39. } Fires C44/2 fol. 39r
40. } wishes sighs and soft desires H44 fols 69v-70r; desires C44/2 fol. 40v
41. } maintain H44 fol. 70r, C44/2 fol. 40r
42. } Land H44 fol. 72v, C44/2 fol. 42v
42. } main H44 fol. 71v, C44/2 fol. 44v
43. } uncontroul’d H44 fol. 71v, C44/2 fol 42v
43. } Reign. exeunt H44 fol. 74v; Reign exeunt, C44/2 fols 46v-47v

SCENE V. | Another Apartment. ] Scene 4 another apartment. H44 fol. 74v; Scen: 4th C44/2 fol. 47v;
SCENE IV. R49, R52
HERCULES and DEJANIRA. ] HERCULES and DEJANIRA. R49, R52
2. } Fall — But, R49, R52
3. } yeild. — H44 fol. 74v; yield --- C44/2 fol. 47v
4. } alass! how H44 fol. 74v; lost alass! how C44/2 fol. 47v
5. } eclips’d C44/2 fol. 47v
HERCULES.
Unjust Reproach!—No, Dejanira, no!
While glorious Deeds demand a just Applause,

AIR.
Alcides’ Name, in latest Story,
    Shall with brightest Lustre shine;
And future Heroes rise to Glory,
    By Actions emulating mine.

DEJANIRA.
[26.]
O glorious Pattern of heroic Deeds!
The mighty Warrior, whom nor Juno’s Hate,
Nor a long Series of incessant Labours,
Cou’d ere subdue, a Captive Maid has conquer’d.
O Shame to Manhood! O Disgrace of Arms!

AIR.
Resign thy Club, and Lion’s Spoils,
And fly from War to female Toils;
For the glitt’ring Sword and Shield,
The Spindle and the Distaff wield:
Thund’ring Mars no more shall arm thee,
Glory’s Call no more shall warm thee;
Venus and her whining Boy
Shall all thy wanton Hours employ.
HERCULES.

You are deceiv’d — Some Villain has belied
My ever-faithful Love and Constancy.

DEJANIRA.

Wou’d it were so, and that the Babbler Fame
Had not thro’ all the Grecian Cities spread
The shameful Tale!

HERCULES.

The Priests of Jupiter
Prepare, with solemn Rites, to thank the Pow’r
For the Success of my victorious Arms:
The ready Sacrifice expects my Presence.
I go — mean time let these Suspicions sleep,
Nor causeless Jealousy alarm your Breast.

[Exit Hercules.

SCENE VI.

DEJANIRA.

Dissembling, false, perfidious Hercules!
Did he not swear, when first he woo’d my Love,
The Sun shou’d cease to dawn, the silver Moon
Be blotted from her Orb, ere he prov’d false?

25. ] deceiv’d --- Some R49, R52
26. ] ever-faithfull H44 fol. 79v; ever faithfull C44/2 fol. 56v Constancy. [Exit Hercules. R49, R52
27.-28. ] {obscured C44/2 fol. 56v}
27.-32. ] {freehand ink cancel; omitted R49, R52.}
29. ] Tale! — H44 fol. 79v
30. ] prepare C44/2 fol. 56v Rites C44/2 fol. 56v
30. the Pow’r ] the god H44 fol. 79v, C44/2 fol. 56v
31. ] Arms C44/2 fol. 56v
32. ] Sacrifice, H44 fol. 79v, C44/2 fol. 56v
33-34. ] {freehand ink cancel; omitted R49, R52.}
33. ] go, C44/2 fol. 56v mean time, H44 fol. 79v, C44/2 fol 56v-57v
34. ] Jealousie C44/2 fol. 57v Breast C44/2 fol. 57v

SCENE VI. ] {no scene change H44, C44.}
1.-8. ] {freehand ink cancel; omitted R49, R52.}
2. ] swear C44/2 fol. 57v
2. ] Love C44/2 fol. 57v
4. ] orb C44/2 fol. 57v e’re H44 fol. 80v, C44/2 fol. 57v
4. ] proved H44 fol. 80v, C44/2 fol. 57v
AIR.

Cease, Ruler of the Day, to rise,
Nor, Cynthia, gild the Evening Skies:
To your bright Beams he made appeal;
With endless Night his Falshood seal.

Some kinder Pow’r inspire me to regain
His alienated Love, and bring the Wand’rer back!
— Hah! lucky Thought! — I have a Garment, dip’d
In Nessus’ Blood, when from the Wound he drew
The barbed Shaft, sent by Alcides’ Hand.
It boasts a wond’rous Virtue to revive
Th’ expiring Flame of Love — So Nessus told me,
When dying to my Hand he trusted it —
I will prevail with Hercules to wear it,
And prove its magic Force — And, see, the Herald!
Fit Instrument to execute my Purpose!
SCENE VII. [28.]

To her LICHAS.

DEJANIRA.

Lichas, thy Hands shall to the Temple bear
A rich embroider’d Vest, and beg thy Lord
Will instant o’er his manly Shoulders throw
His Consort’s Gift, the Pledge of Reconcilement.

LICHAS.

O pleasing Task! O happy Hercules!

AIR.

Constant Lovers, never roving,
Never jealous Torments proving,
Calm, imperfect, Pleasures taste:
But the Bliss to Rapture growing,
Bliss from Reconcilement flowing,
This is Love’s sublime Repast.

DEJANIRA.

But see the Princess Iole — Retire —
[Exit Lichas.

— Be still, my jealous Fears; and let my
Tongue
Disguise the Torture of my bleeding Heart.

SCENE VII. } [not in H44, C44.] SCENE VI. R49, R52
To her LICHAS. } enter Lichas H44 fol. 82'; enter Lichas, C44/2 fol. 61'; To her LICHAS. R49, R52
3. } many H44 fol. 82' throw, C44/2 fol. 61'
4. } reconcilement H44 fol. 82'; Reconcilement. --- R49; Reconcilement. R52
5. } {omitted R49, R52.}
6.-11. } {transferred to II.7 R49, R52.}
6. } Lover’s, never C44/2 fol. 61'; Lovers never W45
6. } roving C44/2 fol. 61'
7. } proving C44/2 fol. 61'
8. } growing H44 fol. 83', C44/2 fol. 62'
9. } flowing H44 fol. 83', C44/2 fol. 62'
10. } Repast H44 fol. 83', C44/2 fol. 62'
11. } But, H44 fol. 83', C44/2 fol. 63'
12. } Iole! — Retire! H44 fol. 83', C44/2 fol. 63'
12. } Iole — Retire — [Exit Lichas. ] Iole --- Retire ---- [Exit Lichas. R49, R52
13. } be still my jealous Fears; and H44 fol. 83', C44/2 fol. 63' Be R49, R52
13. } my ] Tongue ] my Tongue R49, R52
14. } disguise, C44/2 fol. 63'
14. } Heart H44 fol. 83'
SCENE VIII.  

To her IOLE.

DEJANIRA.

Forgive me, Princess, if my jealous Frenzy
Too roughly greeted you — I see, and blame,
The Error, that misled me to insult
That Innocence and Beauty.

IÖLE.

Thank the Gods,
That have inspired your Mind with calmer Thoughts,
And from your Breast remov’d the Vulture,
Jealousy.

Live, and be happy in Alcides’ Love,
While wretched Iöle ——

[Weeping.]

DEJANIRA.

Princess, no more; but lift those beauteous Eyes
To the fair Prospect of returning Happiness.

At my Request, Alcides shall restore you
To Liberty, and your paternal Throne.
DUET.

DEJAN. Joys of Freedom, Joys of Pow’r, 
Wait upon the coming Hour, 
And court thee to be blest. 15

IöLE. What Heav’nly-pleasing Sounds I hear! 
How sweet they steal upon my Ear, 
And charm my Soul to Rest! [Exit Iöle.

DEJANIRA. [30.] 
Father of Hercules, great Jove, succeed 
The last Expedient of despairing Love! 20

CHORUS. 
Love and Hymen, Hand in Hand, 
Come, restore the Nuptial Band; 
And sincere Delights prepare, 
To crown the Heroe and the Fair. 
[Exeunt.

[Ornament]
E Sons of Trachin, mourn your valiant Chief,
Return’d, from Foes and Dangers threatning Death,
To fall, inglorious, by a Woman’s Hand.

O doleful Tidings!

As the Heroe stood Prepared for Sacrifice, and Festal Pomp
Adorn’d the Temple, these unlucky Hands
Presented him, in Dejanira’s Name,
A costly Robe, the Pledge of Reconcilement.
With Smiles, that testify’d his rising Joy,
Alcides o’er his manly Shoulders threw
The treacherous Gift —— But, when the Altar’s Flame
With Warmth began to dew his moisten’d Limbs,  
The clinging Robe, by cursed Art invenom’d, 
Thro’ all his Joints dispers’d a subtle Poison. 
Frantic with agonizing Pain, he flings 
His tortur’d Body on the sacred Floor ——  
Then strives to rip the deathful Garment off, 
But, with it, tears the bleeding, mangled, Flesh— 
His dreadful Cries the vaulted Roof returns.

AIR.

O Scene of unexampled Woe !  
O Sun of Glory sunk so low !
What Language can our Sorrow tell !
Gallant, unhappy, Chief, farewell !

I TRACHINIAN.

O fatal Jealousy! O cruel Recompence 
Of Virtue, in severest Labours tried !

CHORUS.

Tyrants now no more shall dread 
On Necks of vanquish’d Slaves to tread :
Horrid Forms, of monstrous Birth, 
Again shall vex the groaning Earth :
All Fear of Punishment is o’er ;  
The World’s Avenger is no more.  
[Exeunt.

12. ] Limbs  C44/3 fol. 3v  
17. ] deathfull  H44 fol. 99r, C44/3 fol. 3v, C44/3 fol. 3v of, C44/3 fol. 3v 
19. ] dreadfull  H44 fol. 99r, C44/3 fol. 7r Cries, C44/3 fol. 7r 
20. ] scene, of  W45 Woe H44 fol. 97r, C44/3 fol. 7r 
21. ] Glory, R52 low, H44 fol. 97r, C44/3 fol. 7r 
22. ] tell  H44 fol. 97r, C44/3 fol. 7r 
23. ] Gallant  H44 fol. 97r farewell H44 fol. 97r; unhappy gallant chief farewell. C44/3 fol. 7r 
24. ] Jealousy! — O  H44 fol. 99r, C44/3 fol. 9r Recompence, C44/3 fol. 6r 
25. ] Virtue  H44 fol. 99r, C44/3 fol. 9r 
26. ] Tyrants, now, no  H44 fol. 99r, C44/3 fol. 9r dread, C44/3 fol. 9r 
27. ] tread  H44 fol. 102r, C44/3 fol. 14r 
28. ] forms  H44 fol. 102r, C44/3 fol. 15r birth H44 fol. 102r, C44/3 fol. 15r 
29. ] Earth  H44 fol. 103r, C44/3 fol. 15r 
30. ] o’er  H44 fol. 104r, C44/3 fol. 18r 
31. ] more  H44 fol. 104r, C44/3 fol. 18r [Exeunt. ] {not in H44, C44.}
SCENE II.

The Temple of JUPITER.

HERCULES, HYLLUS, Priests and Attendants.

HERCULES,

O Jove, what Land is this, what Clime accurst,
By raging Phoebus scorch'd ? — I burn — I burn—
Tormenting Fires consume me — O! I die —
Some Ease, ye pitying Pow'rs!

AIR.

I rage with more than Stygian Pains:
Along my fev'rish Veins,
Like liquid Fire, the subtle Poison hastes:
Boreas, bring thy Northern Blasts,
And thro' my Bosom roar;
Or, Neptune, kindly pour
Ocean's collected Flood
Into my Breast, and cool my boiling Blood.
HYLLUS.

Great Jove, relieve his Pains!

HERCULES.

Was it for this unnumber’d Toils I bore? —–
O Juno, and Eurystheus, I absolve ye;
Your keenest Malice yields to Dejanira’s;
Mistaken, cruel, treacherous Dejanira!

—— O! this curst Robe! it clings to my torn Sides,
And drinks my vital Blood.

HYLLUS.

Alas! my Father!

--- 34.
HERCULES.
My Son, observe thy dying Sire’s Request:
While yet I live, bear me to Oeta’s Top;
There, on the Summit of that Cloud-cap’d Hill,
The tow’ring Oak, and lofty Cypress, fell,
And raise a Funeral Pile —— Upon it lay me:
Then fire the kindling Heap, that I may mount
On Wings of Flame, to mingle with the Gods.

HYLLUS.
O glorious Thought! worthy the Son of Jove!

HERCULES.
My Pains redouble --- O! be quick, my Son,
And bear me to the Scene of glorious Death.

HYLLUS.
How is the Heroe fall’n!

AIR. [35.]
Let not Fame the Tidings spread
To proud Oechalia’s conquer’d Wall:
The baffled Foe will lift his Head,
And triumph in the Victor’s fall.
[Exeunt: Hercules borne off.]
SCENE III.

The PALACE.

DEJANIRA.

Where shall I fly? ---- Where hide this guilty Head? ———

O fatal Error of misguided Love! ———

O cruel Nessus, how art thou reveng’d! ———

Wretch that I am! By me Alcides dies:

These impious Hands have sent my injur’d Lord

Untimely to the Shades— Let me be mad ———

Chain me, ye Furies, to your Iron Beds,

And lash my guilty Ghost with Whips of Scorpions! ———

See! See! they come --- Alecto with her Snakes,

Megaera fell, and black Tisiphone!

The PALACE.

The PALACE. R49, R52

DEJANIRA. ] Dejanira sola H44 fol. 112\textsuperscript{r}, C44/3 fol. 31\textsuperscript{v}

1.] fly? --- where H44 fol. 112\textsuperscript{r}; fly? Where C44/3 fol. 31\textsuperscript{v}; fly? where W45

1.] fly?--Where R49; fly?--Where R52

1. guilty | Head? —– H44 fol. 112\textsuperscript{r}; guilty Head? C44/3 fol. 31\textsuperscript{v}, W45; guilty Head?-- R49; guilty Head?--- R52

2.] Love! H44 fol. 112\textsuperscript{r}; Love C44/3 fol. 31\textsuperscript{v}, W45; Love! --- R49; Love! ---- R52

3.] Nessus! H44 fol. 113\textsuperscript{r}, C44/3 fol. 31\textsuperscript{v}; Nessus W45 ar’t H44 fol. 113\textsuperscript{r}

3.] reveng’d! H44 fol. 113\textsuperscript{r}; reveng’d C44/3 fol. 32\textsuperscript{v}, W45; reveng’d! ---- R49, R52

4.] am. C44/3 fol. 32\textsuperscript{v} dies — H44 fol. 113\textsuperscript{r}, C44/3 fol. 32\textsuperscript{v}; dies. W45

5.] Lord, C44/3 fol. 32\textsuperscript{r}

5.] Shades let me be mad C44/3 fol. 32\textsuperscript{r}; Shades let me be Mad W45; Shades --- Let R49; Shades ---- Let R52

6.] shack me C44/3 fol. 32\textsuperscript{v} ye furies to C44/3 fol. 32\textsuperscript{v} Furies to W45

8.] Scorpions! H44 fol. 113\textsuperscript{r}; Scorpions! C44/3 fol. 33\textsuperscript{r}, W45

8. Scorpions! --- R49; Scorpions! ---- R52

9.] they come! H44 fol. 113\textsuperscript{r}, C44/3 fol. 33\textsuperscript{r}, W45; come ----- {rest of line omitted R52.}

9.-10. Alecto with her Snakes, | Megaera fell, } {obscured C44/3.} Snakes W45

10.] fell and W45

10.] {omitted R52.}

10. black Tisiphone! C2}
AIR. [36.]

See the dreadful Sisters rise!
Their baneful Presence taints the Skies:
See the snaky Whips they bear!
What Yellings rend my tortur’d Ear!
Hide me from their hated Sight,
Friendly Shades of blackest Night!
Alas! no Rest the Guilty find
From the pursuing Furies of the Mind.

SCENE IV.

To her IOLE.

DEJANIRA.

Lo! the fair, fatal, Cause of all this Ruin!
Fly from my Sight, detested Sorc’ress, fly,
Lest my ungovern’d Fury rush upon thee,
And scatter thee to all the Winds of Heav’n.
--- Alas! I rave --- the lovely Maid is innocent;
And I alone the guilty Cause of all.

IOLE.

Tho’ torn from ev’ry Joy, a Father’s Love,
My native Land, and dear-priz’d Liberty,
By Hercules’s Arms, still I must pity
The countless Woes of his unhappy House.

To her IOLE. ] To her IOLE. R49, R52
2. ] Sorc’ress C44/3 fol. 41r, R52
3. Lest ] Less C44/3 fol. 41r
4. ] Heav’n H44 fol. 119r, C44/3 fol. 41r; of Heaven. R52
5. ] --- alass! H44 fol. 119r; alass! C44/3 fol. 41r; --- Alas! I rave ---- the R52
5. ] innocent, H44 fol. 119r, C44/3 fol. 41r
6. ] alone, C44/3 fol. 41r
7. ] Joy C44/3 fol. 41r Fathers C44/3 fol. 41r
9. ] Hercules’s C44/3 fol. 41r
9. ] Arms ; R49, R52
9. ] I must pity ] must I pity, H44 fol. 119r, C44/3 fol. 41r
10. of his ] of <t>his H44 fol. 119r
AIR. [37.] 

My Breast with tender Pity swells,
At sight of Human Woe;
And sympathetic Anguish feels,
Where’er Heav’n strikes the Blow.

SCENE V.

To them Priest of Jupiter, HYLLUS, and Trachinians.

Priest of Jupiter.
Princess, rejoice, whose Heav’n-directed Hand
Has rais’d Alcides to the Court of Jove!

DEJANIRA.
Speak, Priest! what means this dark, mysterious Greeting?
That he is dead, and by this fatal Hand,
Too sure, alas! my bleeding Heart divines.

11. ] swells H44 fol. 120v, C44/3 fol. 42r
12. ] woe H44 fol. 120v, C44/3 fol. 44r; woe, W45
14. Where’er ] where e’er H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 44v, W45
14. ] blow H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 45r

To them Priest of Jupiter, HYLLUS, and Trachinians. ] to them, the Priest of Jupiter, Hyllus, and Trachinians. H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 45v; To them Priest of Jupiter, HYLLUS, and Trachinians. R49, R52
Priest of Jupiter. ] Pr. of Jup. (to Dej:) H44 fol. 121v; Pr. of Jup: (to Dejanira) C44/3 fol. 45v
1. ] Princess C44/3 fol. 45v
1. ] rejoice! whose H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 45v, W45
1. ] heav’n directed H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 45v, W45
1. ] hand, H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 45v
2. Has rais’d Alcides to the Court of Jove! ] has rais’d Alcides to the Court of Jove <to share th’ ambrosial Banquet of the Gods.> H44 fol. 121v; has rais’d Alcides to the Court of Jove to share th’ ambrosial Banquets of the Gods. C44/3 fol. 45v
3. ] Priest! — H44 fol. 121v
3. ] misterious C44/3 fol. 45v; mysterious, R49
3. ] greeting? — H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 45v
4. ] dead — and H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 45v
4. ] hand — too H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 45v
5. ] alass! H44 fol. 121v sure alass! C44/3 fol. 45v
5. ] divines C44/3 fol. 45v
Priest of Jupiter.

Borne (by his own Command) to Oeta’s Top,
Stretch’d on a Fun’ral Pile, the Heroe lay:
The crackling Flames surround his manly Limbs.
When, lo! an Eagle, stooping from the Clouds,
Swift to the burning Pyre his Flight directs;
There lights a Moment: then, with speedy Wing,
Regains the Sky —— Astonish’d, we consult
The sacred Grove, where Sounds Oraculare [38.]
From vocal Oaks disclose the Mind of Jove.
Here the great Sire his Offspring’s Fate declar’d;
“His Mortal Part by eating Fires consum’d,
“His Part immortal to Olympus borne,
“There with assembled Deities to dwell.”

AIR.

He, who for Atlas prop’d the Sky,
Now sees the Sphere beneath him lie :
In bright Abodes
Of kindred Gods,
A new-admitted Guest,
With purple Lips,
Brisk Nectar sips,
And shares th’ Ambrosial Feast.

7. ] stretched C44/3 fol. 45v
7. ] funeral H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 45v Pile C44/3 fol. 45v Hero R52
7. ] lay —— H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 45v
8. ] limbs —— H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 45v
9. ] lo! H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 45v Eagle C44/3 fol. 45v
10. ] directs —— there H44 fol. 121v, C44/3 fol. 46v
11. ] moment — then H44 fol. 121v & 124v, C44/3 fol. 46v Wing C44/3 fol. 46v
12. ] astonish’d C44/3 fol. 46v
12. ] Sky --- Astonish’d, R49; Sky ---- Astonish’d R52
14. Mind ] Will H44 fol. 124v, C44/3 fol. 46v; Minds R52
15.-17. ] {quotation marks not in H44, C44.}
16. ] Part, C44/3 fol. 46v consum’d H44 fol. 124v, C44/3 fol. 46v
17. ] borne C44/3 fol. 46v
18. ] <to join the bright assembly of the Sky> there with assembled Deities to dwell. H44 fol. 124v
19. ] Atlas, R52 Skie, H44 fol. 122v, C44/3 fol. 47v
20. ] lie H44 fol. 123v, C44/3 fol. 47v; lie, W45
21. ] abodes, W45
22. ] gods H44 fol. 122v, C44/3 fol. 47v
23. ] new admitted C44/3 fol. 47v, W45
24. ] lips H44 fol. 123v, C44/3 fol. 47v
25. ] sips H44 fol. 123v, C44/3 fol. 47v
26. ] Feast H44 fol. 123v, C44/3 fol. 49v; Feast, W45
DEJANIRA.
Words are too faint to speak the warring Passions,
That combat in my Breast—Grief, Wonder, Joy,
By turns deject and elevate my Soul.

Priest of Jupiter.
Nor less thy Destiny, illustrious Maid, [To Iōle. 30
Is Jove’s peculiar Care, who thus decrees:
“Hymen with purest Joys of Love shall crown
“Oechalia’s Princess and the Son of Hercules.

HYLLUS. [39.]
How blest is Hyllus, if the lovely Iōle,
Consenting, ratifies the Gift of Heav’n! 35

IōLE.
What Jove ordains, can Iōle resist?
DUET.

Iöle.  *O Prince, whose Virtues all admire,*  
*Since Jove has ev’ry bar removed,*  
*I feel my vanquish’d Heart conspire*  
*To crown a Flame by Heav’n approved.*

Hyll.  *O Princess, whose exalted Charms*  
*Above Ambition fire my Breast,*  
*How great my Joy, to fill those Arms,*  
*At once with Love and Empire blest!*  

Iöle.  *I grieve no more, since now I see*  
*All Happiness restored in thee.*

Hyll.  *I ask no more, since now I find*  
*All earthly Good in thee combin’d.*

*Priest of Jupiter.*  
*Ye Sons of Freedom, now, in ev’ry Clime,*  
*With joyful Accents, sing the deathless Chief,*  
*By Virtue to the Starry Mansions rais’d.*
CHORUS.

To Him your grateful Notes of Praise belong,
The Theme of Liberty’s immortal Song:
Aw’d by his Name, Oppression shuns the Light,
And Slav’ry hides her Head in Depths of Night;
While happy Climes to his Example owe
The Blessings that from Peace and Freedom flow.

FINIS.

[Ornament]
Chapter Two.

THE LIBRETTOS AS LITERARY WORKS.

2.1. The librettists of Joseph and Hercules.

When their collaborations with Handel commenced, James Miller (1704-1744), author of Joseph, and Thomas Broughton (1704-1774), who wrote Hercules, were new to the literary form of libretto. However, both were already experienced authors, Miller in poetry and drama and Broughton in theological debate, and both proved equal to the special demands that writing a libretto made on them.

James Miller was the son of the Reverend John Miller, who according to David Erskine Baker possessed two livings of ‘considerable value in Dorsetshire’, at Compton Valence and Upcerne.¹ A contemporary account of his career says that James Miller ‘was first designed for a Trade, and was for some Time on that account with a Merchant, his near Relation in the City, but afterwards went into Orders’.² Miller’s experience of trade makes him unique among Handel’s librettists. However, at the age of twenty-two, Miller entered Wadham College, Oxford, where the warden was his father’s patron. While still an undergraduate he wrote The Humours of Oxford, a play presented in 1730 with considerable success on the

London stage with the active encouragement of Anne Oldfield, Britain’s leading female actor.3 It is a satire against the moribund state of the university, ridiculing recognizable individuals, which unsurprisingly made him enemies.

In 1730 Miller left Oxford without a degree and took holy orders. Lack of a degree presumably debarred him from an immediate curacy, and on moving to London he accepted the post of lecturer at Trinity College chapel, a daughter chapel of St George’s, Hanover Square, which was Handel’s parish church. Miller probably preached for a fee the size of which was dependent on attendance figures; the more people his preaching attracted, the greater his fee.4 The nature of the appointment and duties of a lecturer are described by Thomas Broughton ‘as distinct from the Rector or Vicar. They are chosen by the Vestry [. . .] and are usually Afternoon Preachers [. . .] licensed by the Bishop’.5 The men of a chapel vestry were at liberty to appoint clerics with a churchmanship different from the main church, and in appointing Miller the Trinity chapel vestry would have been well aware of their lecturer’s Oxford critique of the Establishment. John Oldmixon complained at the time of the ‘corrupt and base Management of the select Vestries within the Cities of London and Westminster, and particularly of their disaffection to the Government’.6 Miller’s appointment to Trinity would seem a pro-Opposition statement by the Trinity vestry. Miller also became a

5 Thomas Broughton, An Historical Dictionary of all Religions from the Creation of the World to the present Time, 2 vols (London: Davis, 1745), II, 10.
preacher at the chapel in Roehampton Park. Both appointments were for preaching only and involved no sacramental or pastoral duties.

Prior to 1743, the year in which Handel composed the music for *Joseph*, Miller wrote polemical poetry and plays, his main interest being decidedly literary rather than clerical. This is apparent in his agreement to his name appearing as the author of his published plays, a breach of the convention that clerics did not append their names to works that were for the stage. For example, Edward Young, according to Thomas Davies, abandoned playwriting on taking holy orders in about 1726. Having rehearsed his play *The Brothers*, Young withdrew it on ‘going into holy orders’; it was ‘with some reluctance the managers gave it up’.7 The Reverend John Hoadly, in a letter to James Harris in Salisbury, cautiously broached the possibility of writing something for Handel, but his main concern was to avoid having his name associated with a performance in a tavern (he had written for the composer Maurice Greene, whose works were performed at The Devil), preferring to ‘lye snug behind the curtain’, that is, anonymous.8

Miller’s plays plunged into contentious cultural-political issues and provoked strong criticism from the bishop of London. According to Baker, bishop Edmund Gibson, at that time ecclesiastical adviser to Robert Walpole, ‘made some very harsh Remonstrances’ with Miller for writing plays. Baker thought that Miller’s refusal to give up public authorship motivated Gibson ‘to withdraw his Patronage’ and ‘retarded his [i.e. Miller’s] Advancement in the Church’ (*Biographia*, I, 315). Miller persisted in writing plays, as well as controversial poetry

on the conduct of the king’s ministry and what he regarded as the debased state of British
culture. His forthright views, however, did not inhibit his fostering of influential contacts, as
can be seen in the illustrious list of dedicatees to his plays and poems, which included the
prince of Wales, political opinion formers, such as the earl of Chesterfield, and social leaders,
such as John, duke of Montagu. It is interesting that many of Miller’s acquaintances were
known also to Handel.

Miller’s first verse satire, Harlequin-Horace, sets out in 1731 to promote British art by
ridiculing John Rich, theatre manager and entertainer, Handel, and others, for perverting
British tastes with pantomimes and Italian opera. From the eminent state that music had
attained with Purcell, Miller condemns current musical taste as tainted, since

\begin{quote}
Heydegger and Handell rul’d our Gentry;
A hundred different Instruments combine,
\end{quote}

He censures Handel’s operas for their ‘Show’ (p. 30). The third edition of Harlequin,
published in 1735, retains this jibe, but it is absent from the fourth edition, also published in
1735, in which ‘Heydegger reign’d Guardian of our Gentry’ replaced ‘Heydegger and Handell
rul’d our Gentry’ (p. 27). This airbrushing of Handel from the polemic indicates that
something had occurred during 1735 to make Miller annul his critical line against the
composer. Handel’s decisive turn towards native British literature for a libretto in that year
probably accounts for Miller’s \textit{volte-face}. In 1735 Handel set Dryden’s poem \textit{Alexander’s
Feast}, the composer’s first composition to the words of a major English author. By amending
Harlequin, Miller declared his support for the composer’s embrace of English text, and the
compliment was reciprocated when in 1736 Handel provided music for a saucy song for Kitty Clive in Miller’s play *The Universal Passion*, ‘I like the am’rous Youth that’s free’.¹⁰

Miller and Handel had a mutual friend in James Harris, a contemporary of Miller’s at Wadham College. Miller sought advice from Harris and Harris’s friends about his writing. For example, he told Robert Warner, who then informed Harris, of his plans for *The Universal Passion*.¹¹ The influential range of this circle of friends can be seen in the subscription list for Miller’s *Miscellaneous Works*, which includes the names of Harris, Robert and Richard Warner, and other friends from Oxford days, editor of the classics and cleric John Upton, and John Hoadly, librettist for Maurice Greene and chaplain to the prince of Wales. This list is further evidence that Miller, according to Ruth Smith, ‘was one of the most serious opposition writers’, deploiring the administration’s ‘expedient style of government’ and dedicating his *Miscellaneous Works* to the prince of Wales himself, the opposition’s figurehead (‘English Librettists’, p. 98). Handel subscribed to Miller’s *Works*, as did three bishops and many prominent opposition men, though no known documentary evidence links Handel with the opposition.¹²

Miller’s verse essay *The Art of Life* (1739) demands that sound should match with sense. Entertainment must not merely divert but teach, and so ensure that ‘Virtue and Wisdom from Amusement flow’.¹³ Miller persistently pressed this precept in his plays: for example, in *The Man of Taste*. Martin, a servant dressed in the guise of Lord Apemode, mimics superficial taste: ‘’Tis quite out of Fashion to go to anything one understands’, while Reynard, another

---

¹⁰ James Miller, *The Universal Passion. A Comedy. As it is Acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane, By His Majesty’s Servants* (London: Watts, 1737), p. 27.
¹¹ Robert Warner to James Harris, 13 March 1736 and 7 April 1736, in Burrows and Dunhill, pp. 13-15.
servant, in the guise of Colonel Cockade, opines, ‘‘Tis the Beauty of all polite Diversions, not
to put People upon the Drudgery of Thinking. The Eye and the Ear are enough to be employ’d
--- enough in Conscience.’ 14 Miller adapted foreign dramatic texts, and translated many of
Molière’s plays, an experience that brought him substantial understanding of French dramatic
models, plots, and construction, and which led directly to his choice of Joseph for a libretto.15
All Miller’s plays are moralistic while entertaining, but Joseph is his most serious work: it
focuses on the nature of good governance and decorum as exemplified for all administrations
by a biblical first minister. Because Miller died a few weeks after its premiere in 1744, he
never witnessed Joseph become one of Handel’s more popular English oratorios.

Thomas Broughton, also a clergyman’s son, attended Eton and St Paul’s schools and
then Cambridge University, where he studied mathematics and modern languages.16 He was
the first of Handel’s oratorio librettists to possess a degree. On leaving Cambridge in 1730,
Broughton, like Miller in the same year, took holy orders. While Miller was courting
controversy with his plays and verse, Broughton was evidently more committed to his calling.
Baker notes that he was a curate at Offley in Hertfordshire (Biographia, i, 47). Broughton’s
first book, Christianity distinct from the Religion of Nature, publicizing an orthodox antipathy
towards deism, was published in 1732. Bibliotheca Historico-Sacra followed in 1737, a

14 James Miller, The Man of Taste. A Comedy. As it is Acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane, By His
Majesty’s Servants (London: Watts, 1735), pp. 70-71.
15 [James Miller, and others], Select Comedies of Mr. De Moliere. French and English. In Eight Volumes […]
(London: Watts, 1732).
16 The librettist Thomas Broughton, incorporated MA at Oxford, 14 July 1735, is not to be confused with another
Thomas Broughton, who was a member of John Wesley’s Holy Club: see Joseph Foster, Alumni Oxoniensis: The
Members of the University of Oxford, 1715-1886: Their Parentage, Birthplace, and Year of Birth, with a Record
of their Degrees. Being the Matriculation Register of the University, Alphabetically Arranged, Revised,
Annotated (Oxford: James Parker, 1891), p. 170, and Trevor Henry Aston, The History of the University of
Leslie George Mitchell (1986), 443 and 452.
sumptuous work of reference in two volumes folio, published by impressive subscription and 
re-issued in 1739, 1742, 1745, and 1756. It was distributed in the American colonies, where 
Hannah Adams, America’s first professional writer, received a copy from one of her students 
during the Independence wars. She wrote that ‘Reading Broughton awakened my curiosity’. In this impressive work, Broughton re-affirms high-Church, established theology. He shows 
tolerance towards Islam but is less forbearing of Roman Catholicism.

Baker writes that Broughton ‘was instituted to the rectory of Stibington, in 
Huntingdonshire, on the presentation of John duke of Bedford, who also appointed him one of 
his chaplains. Soon after he [Broughton] was chosen reader to the Temple, by which means he 
became known to bishop Sherlock’ (Biographia, i, 47). As Reader to the Temple Church, his 
Master was Thomas Sherlock, bishop of Salisbury, a fact which, Baker suggests, clearly 
improved Broughton’s chances of preferment. Broughton lugubriously defined the post of 
Reader as ‘an inferior order of Ecclesiastics in the Christian Church. [. . .] The Church of 
England, and other Protestant Churches, have sunk the office of Reader among those of 
Presbyters and Deacons’ (Dictionary, ii, 316). His assiduous care of the Templars gained their 
affection, and there is a record of his diligence in ministering to a condemned prisoner in 
Newgate, situated close by the parish. In September 1741, James Hall, sentenced to death for 
Petit-Treason, that is, murder of his superior, a gentleman resident of Clements Inn, wrote to

---


18 Hannah Adams, Biography <http://uua.org/uuhs/duub/articles/hannahadams.html> [accessed 17 November 2004]. To prevent footnotes becoming overlong in the thesis, URLs for online sources are given in a footnote when short; a full URL and date of access for lengthy citations are in the Bibliography.
his wife before his death, that ‘After I parted with you, I received the holy sacrament comfortably, which Mr Broughton was so good as to administer to me, who has several times before taken a great deal of pains to instruct me.’

Broughton produced an edition of Dryden’s poems and translations in 1743, and the close acquaintance with Dryden’s poetic voice undoubtedly informed his writing of the libretto Hercules a few months later. In 1744, bishop Sherlock inducted Broughton into one of his parishes near Bristol, that of Bedminster, with St Mary Redcliffe, a living which Baker writes was collated with ‘the valuable prebend of Bedminster and Redcliffe’ (Biographia, i, 47). A prebendal stall meant a marked improvement in Broughton’s financial circumstances, and on verification of the appointment in October 1744 Broughton moved to Bristol and married. Thus Broughton was away from London soon after Handel completed the music to his libretto Hercules.

Broughton wrote Hercules without any known dramatic experience, though he had dabbled in his youth with two unpublished tragedies. He probably had some contact with the gentleman writer Charles Jennens, long-serving librettist for Handel, for in a letter to James Harris on 30 November 1744, the haughty Jennens writes with hesitant approval of Broughton, ‘that Mr Broughton of the Temple has given Handel a Hercules. I hope it is the Judgement of Hercules’ (Burrows and Dunhill, p. 208). In his letter Jennens vilified Semele (Handel’s secular oratorio performed earlier that year) because it was a salacious story, hoping it seems that Broughton would write a libretto artfully posing the moral options of pleasure.

---

19 The Malefactor’s Register; Or, New Newgate and Tyburn Calendar. Containing the Authentic Lives, Trials, Accounts of Executions, Dying Speeches, and other Curious Particulars, Relating to All the most notorious Violators of the Laws of their Country [. . .], 5 vols (London: Hogg, [1779]), III, 45.

and purity. However, Broughton’s work was dramatically grittier: a tragedy of alleged adultery.

Smith records that when Broughton died in 1774, his parishioners recorded their appreciation of his commitment to parish duties, from which it may be inferred that Broughton was a dedicated parish priest (ODNB). Broughton’s high duty of care was clearly unusual, for, as Donald Spaeth notes, ‘Contemporaries [i.e. eighteenth-century authors] have few good words to say about the quality of pastoral care provided by the clergy in the eighteenth century’.21

The librettos Joseph and Hercules display aspects of their authors’ imagination that is not evident in their other work. Broughton had never previously published any poetry or dramatic work and Miller’s libretto represents a new dramatic genre for its author. Though accustomed to writing according to their own principles and styles and pursuing projects of their own, in writing oratorio librettos Miller and Broughton engaged in a collaborative literary enterprise that entailed redrafts and revisions to their verse. An account of a vexing relationship between Handel and one of his librettists was recorded by Thomas Morell. When Morell was with the composer, who was in the act of setting the libretto, Handel, encountering a surfeit of iambics, cursed the prosody, whereupon Morell adapted the verse with what seems a weary good grace.22 Working with Handel, a strong-willed composer, must have been daunting and, probably, troublesome. The librettists had to respond rationally to his demands, for the oratorio as a work never took on finished form, even when first performed.

2.2. Chief characteristics of the librettos Joseph and Hercules.

Joseph and Hercules have plots based on reputable sources, and are tightly constructed dramas across three brief Acts. Their episodes combine in coherent sequences, each arising from the situation. They present distinctive characters credible in speech and action, and the verse suits function in a way that is almost always congenial to musical setting. Joseph and Hercules have two verse forms: blank verse and lyric (rhymed) verse. In the first and second Acts the blank verse, reserved for recitatives, conveys the decisions and the ‘action’, and the lyric verse, reserved for airs and ensembles, permits the music to deliberate on the ideas the verse contains. In the third Act both verse forms share the emotional charge of the drama. The blank verse is mainly in pentameters, the form familiar to audiences from Shakespeare’s plays and Milton’s epics. For their part, Handel’s oratorios mark the emergence of a new genre of dramatic writing in English, blank verse recitative written especially to be set to music.

Both librettos have been dismissed for literary weakness. This judgment is undeservedly harsh. Critical reception of Miller’s and Broughton’s librettos for Handel has been largely negative and mediated through the composer’s musical response to the texts. The music is praised and the librettos are considered feeble in comparison. For example, Roger Fiske thinks Joseph ‘Handel’s worst’ libretto, and Winton Dean denounces the whole oratorio as ‘a backsliding’, making Miller culpable for the composer’s failings (Fiske, p. 155; Dean, p. 414). As a composite work, the oratorio Hercules gains greater acceptance, with Paul Henry Lang regarding it as ‘the highest peak in later baroque music drama’. Dean thinks it ‘a work of
supreme genius’, while dismissing the libretto as of ‘no literary distinction’ (p. 414). Fiske and Dean discern literary ‘absurdities’ that highlight the composer’s intrepid creativity and inexhaustible inventiveness against the odds. Without documents that testify to the librettists’ aesthetic and literary aims, the librettos Joseph and Hercules must be judged according to the texts presented in the wordbooks and other sources. The thesis argues that the two librettos possess the requisite features of a literary structure capable of sustaining attractive and enthralling musical dramas.

2.2.1. Reputable sources.

All of the librettos for Handel oratorios in English were based on well-known and unimpeachable narratives. The events and characters in Joseph derived from the Book of Genesis and those in Hercules from Greek drama and Latin verse. This distanced them from association with contemporary eighteenth-century morally and politically contentious drama. Joseph allowed Miller to present himself as a ‘reformed’ author who applied his theatrical talent to advocating Christian values. Biblical stories and the myths of Greece and Rome were of interest to audiences because of their status as cornerstones of formal education. The familiarity of the stories was itself an attraction for oratorio audiences, as was the prospect of representation through Handel’s music.

Like Greek tragedians who avoided explanatory detail because their audiences knew the stories, the librettists pared down narrative details to the barest plot outlines. To make the oratorios interesting dramas meant excising words and events from the sources and making the most of what remained, so that nothing was left which was either preposterous or likely to

---

alienate. Brean Hammond, referring to Addison’s libretto for *Rosamond* (1707), usefully summarizes an essential component of libretto writing at this time: ‘the key to success lay not in *language* as such [. . .] but rather in presenting a story that was of genuine relevance and interest to the audience’.24 *Joseph* and *Hercules* complied with these expectations by depicting people whose relationships were recognized as universal while pertaining to individual direct or vicarious emotional experience. Joseph, Hercules, and Dejanira were familiar figures from well-known texts. Their quandaries had historical charge, in the words of Lucy Peltz, fashioned to create a ‘strong evocative presence’ from the past.25 The following discussions of *Joseph* and *Hercules*, with *Joseph* first, are prefaced by a synopsis to show that the librettos remained true to their sources by telling a familiar story clearly; it was music’s task to do so persuasively.

Miller based Parts II and III of *Joseph* on *Giuseppe*, a sentimental oratorio libretto in Italian by Apostolo Zeno, which was written for the composer Antonio Caldara and performed in Vienna in 1722. *Giuseppe* was itself based on a short French drama, *Joseph* (1711), written by Charles-Claude Genest. Miller expanded Zeno’s libretto by inventing a whole new Part I to demonstrate Joseph’s rise from prison to acclaim as first minister to Pharaoh and marriage to Asenath. He took the main events from Genesis, greatly contracting the time. Explanation of Joseph’s position as estranged brother was included in a summary of Joseph’s story published in the front matter of the oratorio’s first wordbook (discussed in Chapter Six). The plot of *Joseph* thus had impeccable credentials in French, Italian, and biblical origins.

Zeno influenced opera by his revisions to its form. Zeno’s contemporary, the writer Salvadori, commented ‘It is senseless for librettists to try to develop plots that are verisimilar, for the public will believe what it chooses to believe’. Zeno’s ‘reforms’ of opera instigated a change from magical transformations and unlikely coincidences to recognizably human plot resolutions. This new style of opera formulation was first seen in London in 1722 with Zeno’s libretto for Bononcini’s opera *Griselda*, which was a great success. Beatrice Corrigan writes that Zeno’s *Griselda* was ‘A pathetic opera, an opera which excited pleasurable tears, [and] was, indeed a novelty, and in it Zeno anticipated the whole school of sensibility which so delighted the eighteenth century.’ Miller’s *Joseph*, a sentimental drama, thus was written by an author well versed in continental cultural innovation.

In Part I of *Joseph*, Joseph is released from an Egyptian prison to interpret Pharaoh’s dreams. He forecasts harvests followed by famines and advises the storage of grain. For this wisdom, and to public acclaim, Pharaoh makes Joseph the first minister and marries him to Asenath, the chief priest’s daughter. An audience is to understand that Part II takes place more than seven years later than Part I and that Joseph’s brothers have appealed to him for food but have not recognized him. He has imprisoned Simeon to ensure that the brothers return to Egypt with Benjamin. In Parts II and III, when Benjamin arrives, Joseph rejects the brothers’ entreaties, and at the beginning of Part III frames his youngest brother in order to separate him from the others. This abuse of authority torments Joseph, because in spite of his anger towards his older brothers for having conspired to kill him years before, he has no desire to hurt either his father or Benjamin or abuse Pharaoh’s trust. Failure to confide in his wife makes his

---

predicament worse. The brothers’ earnest pleas for mercy, and Joseph’s consciousness that he has made Benjamin suffer needlessly, undermine his resolve and he reveals his true identity. Having learned the true nature of Joseph’s concerns, Asenath secures permission for the brothers and their father to live in Egypt.

Duncan Chisholm discusses in some detail Miller’s indebtedness to Zeno and, to reveal Miller’s unambiguous links, presents on the page much of Parts II and III of Joseph in parallel with Zeno’s text. Chisholm also indicates where Miller’s text does not derive from Zeno, including the new prison scene for Simeon. Research for this thesis shows that Miller incorporated text from his own plays to give a wider range of emotional expression than in Zeno’s original, adapting verse for some airs and recitative. Joseph’s air, ‘The Peasant tastes the Sweets of Life’ (II.3) has two lines similar to a song in An Hospital for Fools (1739), which Miller wrote for the composer Thomas Arne:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Daughter (An Hospital)} & \quad \text{Joseph} \\
A \text{ Fool enjoys the Sweets of Life,} & \quad \text{The Peasant tastes the Sweets of Life,} \\
\text{Unwounded by its Cares ;} & \quad \text{Unwounded by its Cares ;} \\
(Miscellaneous Works, p. 107) & \\
\end{align*}
\]

As the play was unsuccessful this self-quotation was probably not recognized. Asenath’s ‘Prophetick Raptures’ (III.2) is also based on earlier material. The first verse of the air derives from The Universal Passion (1737), in which Gratiano ends Act IV:

---

Gratiano (*Universal Passion*)
For O! a dawning Hope glows in my Breast,
And something whispers we shall still be blest;
That this short Morning-Gloom shall break away,
And leave more clear, more heav’nly bright the Day.

Asenath
_Prophetick Raptures swell my Breast,
And whispers we shall still be blest ;
That this black Gloom shall break away,
And leave more heav’nly bright the Day._

*The Universal Passion* and *Joseph* share the theme of hope returning, but by subtle linguistic and prosodic changes the *Joseph* stanza becomes more crisp and incisive. Gratiano expresses optimism and Asenath is buoyantly spirited when Joseph belatedly confides in her.

*Joseph* has a version of text which appeared in *The Picture: or, The Cuckold in Conceit*, published after Miller’s death. Miller’s biographer Paula O’Brien thinks that it was written earlier than Miller’s last year. The final couplet of Asenath’s closing air draws the moral of mutual trust in marriage:

Asenath
_Beauty and Wit begin the Charm ---
--- But Kindness makes it last._

*The Picture*, X.
_Beauty, ’tis true, begins the Charm,
But Kindness makes it last._

The sentiments of a young wife whose marriage has proved strong sit easily in the mouth of a young man in *The Picture* who is earnestly amorous. This example, like the previous examples, is apt, suitably brief, and pertinent to its new context, demonstrating Miller’s skill in

---

selecting from sources for a libretto. With judicious adaptation and augmentation of Zeno’s Giuseppe Miller raises tension and excitement appropriate to the drama.

There was no theatrical tradition in Broughton’s time of performing classical tragedy on the British stage. Handel introduced Greek tragedy to the London theatre first with Semele in 1744, the same year that he premiered Joseph, and secondly with Hercules. Broughton, in a brief Advertisement in the wordbook for Hercules, acknowledges that his sources were Ovid’s Metamorphoses and Sophocles’s Trachiniae. He skilfully interwove plot elements from these, and integrated another classical source, Seneca’s Hercules Oetaeus, to supply ideas concerning Dejanira’s guilt and self-loathing speeches (e.g. lines 964-81) and Hercules’s fury (e.g. lines 1218-1336), both in Act III. He took his basic plot from the story of Hercules in Metamorphoses IX, adopting the account of Hercules’s appeasement of Juno’s hatred (lines 21-22) and the idea that scandalous rumour had reached Trachin while the city was preparing sacrifices to Jupiter, but placing it ahead of the return of Hercules (lines 136-37). He incorporated Dejanira’s belief in Hercules’s love for Iole (lines 138-40), but to provide greater motivation for her action he delayed the delivery to Hercules of Nessus’s robe (lines 131-33) until after the interplay between Dejanira and her supposed rival (lines 152-54). He ignored Ovid over Dejanira’s contemplation of murdering Iole.

Hercules, based on a classical myth, is an epic and austere heroic drama. Dejanira longs for the return of her husband Hercules from his Labours, and Hyllus, their son, departs to look for his father — the Oracle has predicted Hercules’s painful death. Hercules returns

30 Line references from Seneca, Hercules Oetaeus, trans. by Frank Justus Miller, Classical E-Text.
victorious from war with Oechalia, bringing as his captive Iōle, the beautiful daughter of the slaughtered enemy king Eurytus. Generous in victory, Hercules grants Iōle freedom within the city of Trachin, but naively ignores Dejanira’s misconstruction of his motive as adulterous intent. He orders public celebration both of his military triumphs and the end of his Labours. In Act II, Hyllus seeks marriage with Iōle, a proposition she finds repugnant. Dejanira urges Hercules to devote his attentions to her, but his unwitting indifference to her accusations convinces her of his infidelity. In desperation, she remembers that the centaur Nessus gave her a robe steeped in his dying blood which, he claimed, would revive the faithful ardour of whoever wears it. Gullible, she sends the robe to the hero and, as Act III begins, the audience is to assume that Hercules has donned the robe. Hercules pronounces his funeral arrangements as he dies a lingering and agonizing death. As a result, Dejanira dissolves into a turmoil of guilt, which stimulates Iōle’s sympathy. A Trachinian priest informs his compatriots that Jove has promoted Hercules to the rank of the gods and that Iōle is to marry Hyllus.

Broughton enriched his selection from Ovid with details from *Trachiniae.*\(^{32}\) *Trachiniae* has Deianeira tell Hyllus of the Oracle’s fatal warning (lines 76-81), whereas in *Hercules* (I.2) it is Hyllus who tells Dejanira. Broughton’s is a neat device for distancing her from events, for outside the action she can brood and misconstrue. He deftly combined the roles of Sophocles’s Nurse and Lichas with that of the Messenger, relocating Dejanira’s distress to later in the drama than does Sophocles. With skill, he pitched Dejanira into sudden elation at the prospect of Hercules’s return, which he then swiftly doused when she turns gossip into incontrovertible

---

proof of her husband’s falsehood. The Messenger in *Trachiniae* gives an account of Hercules’s adultery, but in *Hercules* this ‘adultery’ is the subject of scandalous rumour (‘Report’, II.2). Broughton’s Dejanira, like her namesake in *Trachiniae*, is not concerned whether Iole loves Hercules but whether Hercules loves Iole.

An unremitting presence in *Trachiniae* and *Hercules* is the Oracle’s dire forecast, which binds the events together. Broughton stressed Hercules’s doom with Hyllus’s report of the Oracle’s prediction, but clinches the matter with Dejanira’s curse, ‘Cease Ruler of the Day to rise’ (II.6). Broughton took another Sophoclean unifying device from *Trachiniae* which, as pointed out by Malcolm Davies, lies in ‘the contrast and balance between the introverted feminine world of the wife at home and the extrovert hero-husband abroad’. Trachiniae and Hercules both centre on females, Broughton expanding Iole into a major role, whereas in *Trachiniae* she is silent. He followed Sophocles in focusing the drama on the power of love but embellished his main source by demonstrating Dejanira’s fatal moral shift from self-absorbed ignorance to self-awareness. He replaced inexplicable human suffering in *Trachiniae* with effects that have irrefutable human causes. Sophocles’s Deianeira pityingly observes the captive women in their plight, but in *Hercules* it is Iole who describes the sorry condition into which the captives have fallen.

The contrast between divine awareness and human ignorance is central to *Trachiniae*, whereas in *Hercules* the gods intervene only at the conclusion, and then by report. For Sophocles’s dour ending, because uncongenial to the tastes of eighteenth-century audiences, Broughton substituted an apotheosis for his hero. In *Trachiniae*, Dejanira’s death occurs

---

before that of Hercules, and before Hercules makes his first appearance, but in *Hercules*
Dejanira survives and the hero dies because of what Dejanira believes and does.

The chorus in *Hercules* represents two nations, Oechalia and Trachin. Sophocles’s
chorus curses, but in *Hercules* execration belongs to Dejanira in ‘Cease, Ruler of the Day’
(II.6). In *Hercules*, the chorus supports, warns, or guides characters while addressing humanity
at large. It rejoices (e.g. ‘Crown with festal Pomp’, *Hercules* I.6) but later adopts a finger-
wagging moral tone with epigrammatic pithiness to spell out the dire consequences of a
particular emotion or action (e.g. ‘Jealousy!’, *Hercules* II.3). The pronouncements which
Broughton’s choruses make encourage audiences to meditate on the meaning of selfhood.

Like its counterpart in *Trachiniae*, Broughton’s chorus directs Hyllus to go in search of
his father, ‘Go, Youth inspir’d’ (I.2), and delights at the return of Hercules. Sophocles’s
Deianeira, in her euphoria, alludes to ‘maidens’, ‘the pipe’, and ‘ivy’ and a ‘Bacchic rush!’
(*Trachiniae*, lines 205-22), which Broughton transfers to a chorus extolling the power of love
in bucolic choral celebration. ‘Crown with festal Pomp’ (I.6) describes how ‘the grateful
Altars smoke’ in Jove’s honour and young women provoke the males to ‘join the Dance’ with
music-making that tells ‘aloud our rapt’rous Joys’. This communal delight is ironically
premature, a dramatic device found in *Trachiniae*. Untimely public celebration prior to the
tense, dark portents and horror that follow is a common feature of Sophoclean drama, such as
*Antigone* (lines 781-800), and is a feature which binds and strengthens, for example,
Euripides’s *Hippolytus* (lines 525-29) and which often has pivotal significance in many operas
and oratorios with music by Handel.34

34 Euripides, *Children of Heracles, Hippolytus, Andromache, Hecuba*, ed. and trans. by David Kovacs, Loeb
Recent research by David Ross Hurley and Todd S. Gilman adds two interesting insights into Broughton’s skilful compression and unification of ideas from diverse sources. Hurley’s 1999 study (pp. 206-07) shows Broughton’s debt to Ovid’s *Heroides*, a work Broughton included in his edition of Dryden’s translation, published in 1743, a year before he wrote *Hercules*. Hurley also explains how Broughton’s language closely reflects George Oldmixon’s translation of the Hercules-Dejanira wrangle, and shows how audience knowledge of Omphale’s unmanning of Hercules is essential to make sense of Dejanira’s sardonic taunting of Hercules in ‘Resign thy Club’ (II.5). The oblique reference to Hercules’s shame aptly fits Broughton’s need as a librettist to hint at episodes tangential to the drama rather than narrate them. In his later paper, Hurley argues compellingly that Broughton knew Peter Motteux’s masque *Hercules* (1697) and took phrases from that work. And in his earlier paper, he argues that Dejanira’s characterization is a compendium of contemporary medical opinion of madness. Without offering evidence, however, Hurley apportions responsibility for the decision ‘to replace the suicide [of Deianeira] in Sophocles with a mad scene’ jointly between Broughton and Handel (‘Dejanira, Omphale’, p. 552).

There are wider source issues in Broughton’s *Hercules*. His laconic allusion to resignation to fate, ‘It must be so’, though a cliché in literature of the time, has a context weighty with irony. It is apt that Dejanira utters the phrase, for eighteenth-century audiences

---

38 *Literature Online* offered numerous instances between 1660 and 1744: <http://lion.chadwyck.co.uk> [accessed 17 November 2004]
expecting to see bad characters turn good would understand that it ominously presages Dejanira’s capitulation to the warring passions of love, jealousy, and rage with their predictably dire consequences. Probably drawing on his pastoral experience of the insane in the Temple parish, Broughton added historical truth to his text. Dejanira cries out in moral passion:

Chain me, ye Furies, to your Iron Beds,
And lash my guilty Ghost with Whips of Scorpions! (III.3)

The vocabulary of the image vividly particularizes the cruelty of contemporary incarceration methods by citing instruments which in Broughton’s day punished demented patients to exhaustion. His references to the scorpion whip and the function of iron beds, which Broughton may have witnessed in use, imaged real ordeals in the custodial treatment of the insane. Elements of his word choices are also found in Book VI of Dryden’s version of the *Aeneid* (1697). When Aeneas journeys through the Underworld to meet his father Anchises he sees the Furies’ iron beds and chains: ‘the Fury shakes | The sounding whip, and brandishes her snakes’, and Tisiphone has chains.39 Pitt’s 1740 translation, probably familiar to some of Broughton’s audience, has ‘Here the loud Scourge and louder Voice of Pain, | The crashing Fetter and the ratt’ling Chain’ (lines 768-69).40

Fashioning an oratorio libretto was essentially an exercise in eclectic selection and literary synthesis. The librettist’s prime task was to privilege excision over invention, an act counterintuitive to any creative writer who valued his reputation as an artist. Though *Joseph

and *Hercules* are texts of minor literary significance they undeniably demonstrate considerable skill in the selection and moulding of facts, ideas, and language from many sources.

2.2.2. Short, concise, tight structure.

The two librettos have the essential building blocks of drama, including three Acts, each of which prepares or presents a crisis, and both librettos rely on the educated imagination of audiences to fill in the interstices of the story.

Handel may have suggested to his librettists a three part structure to fill an evening’s entertainment. In an earlier season, he considered a two-part work insufficient for an evening, so added another, as occurred at the performance of *Alexander’s Feast* (HWV 75) on 22 November 1739, which was supplemented by *Song for St Cecilia’s Day* (HWV 76), and on 13 December 1739 when *Song for St Cecilia’s Day* (HWV 76) augmented *Acis and Galatea* (HWV 49a) (*HHb* IV, 313-15). It is likely that, in the early days of their collaboration, discussions between composer and librettist centred on particular dramatic situations, such as interesting confrontations between characters and opportunities that would suit musical ideas. In a letter to Charles Jennens, dated 19 July 1744, Handel estimated how long Act 1 in the manuscript libretto of *Belshazzar* would take to perform and suggested that Jennens keep the ‘following Acts short’ to compensate for the length of the first Act (*HHb* IV, 377). Balanced structure mattered to Handel, and he clearly expected his librettists to comply with his expectations for the overall design of the oratorio.

The basic configuration of Handelian oratorio is a dramatic sequence of alternating and contrasted emotions which evoke a strong sense of movement to hold audience attention. *Joseph* and *Hercules* are dramatically effective because their sequence of events and
encounters does not strain credibility. Miller and Broughton constructed dramas that move efficiently to their predictable crises through implied, i.e. not enacted, situations of risk. These scenes contain an element of surprise, such as when Lichas reports Hercules’s agony but then the action moves unexpectedly to Hercules in his death throes. Miller omits narration of the reasons for Joseph’s imprisonment, so that no character mentions the jealousy of Potiphar’s wife and Joseph’s being gaoled on a trumped up charge, or how Joseph came to be in Egypt for incurring his brothers’ hate. In breaking anticipation of the linear storyline, Miller constructed a plot sequence which declared its freedom from slavish observance of the biblical story. Seven years have passed between Parts I and II, though no character refers to this. To save exposition, Miller placed this information in the wordbook, as well as a description of the motives of Joseph and Simeon which are crucial to an understanding of their dilemmas (discussed in Chapter Six below).

Both librettists took elements from their sources and moulded a new story from them. This was an art because events had to be linked in ways convincing to audiences, within the constraints of the form, and skilful calculation was required to create a fresh story by being inventive with chronology and historical figures. In both Joseph and Hercules, the concatenation of events, enacted and reported, moves smoothly to the crisis. Pope’s remark in the preface to his translation of Odyssey, that ‘without probability any action is less likely to persuade’, is apt for these two word-strapped librettos, because all the events they depict or report have plausible causes.⁴¹

An opera libretto of Handel’s time differed from an oratorio libretto by its lavish stage directions, whereas oratorio wordbooks informed an oratorio audience where a scene takes

---

place and when a character is to be imagined entering or departing. Opera is a visually located and three-dimensional medium, which oratorio is not. In *Joseph* and *Hercules* the action takes place in one city, as in ancient drama. Miller and Broughton stretched the severe limitations of one overall implied location by simply suggesting changes of scene. *Joseph* has three locations within Memphis: Miller’s audience is to imagine ‘a Prison’, later ‘A Room of State in Pharaoh’s Palace’, both in Part I. Joseph bewails his circumstances in the first prison scene, while the second prison scene belongs to Simeon (II.2). Simeon moves with no explanation to the palace to confront Joseph (II.3), Miller effecting a neat introduction to Simeon’s new situation, ‘This Hebrew Prisoner----’. Joseph truncates Phanor’s opening statement because Simeon is clearly expected. Miller thus ensured that the action flows effortlessly from one implied situation to another without the need for wordy explanation.

*Hercules* is set wholly in Trachin, but there are six implied locations within that city: Act I is set in ‘A Royal Apartment’ then ‘A Square before the Palace’, while Act II takes place in ‘An Apartment’ then ‘Another Apartment’. Act III begins in an unspecified place, whereas Hercules rolls in agony in ‘The Temple of Jupiter’, and Dejanira’s moral agitation and the denouement occur in ‘The Palace’. In spite of a greater number of implied locations in the drama, Broughton managed scene changes smoothly and convincingly, for oratorio requires no pauses to facilitate physical scene changes and thus the dialogue is seamless.

To sustain audience attention, the librettists contrived a series of contrasted moods, one of which incorporates a dramatic feature from classical drama, Shakespeare, and contemporary Italian opera. This is when a character, seeking relief from oppressive public accountability, becomes preoccupied by nostalgia. Miller depicts Joseph weighed down by moral responsibility for his adopted country, Egypt, compounded by his distressing private
pressures. His heart-weary reverie of retreat amid rural peace, ‘The Peasant tastes’ (II.3), recalls the Georgic politeia of Horace and Virgil. Miller highlights the axiom of politics as essentially a moral activity, emphasizing in Joseph’s reflections the harsh personal choices required of office. He makes Joseph’s thoughts serve as a personal lament for lost peasant-like unawareness. Similarly, Broughton devotes an air of comparable wistfulness to Iole in ‘How blest the Maid’ (II.1), when she reflects on her captivity in Trachin and longingly contemplates the life of a country maiden from a ‘humble Cell’ surrounded by streams, flocks, verdure, and adoring local youths, secure from her onerous responsibilities as leader. These airs for Joseph and Iole show skill in placement within their dramatic frameworks. Joseph’s air is placed at the heart of the drama, while Iole’s, positioned at the beginning of Act II, deftly takes the action from the celebrations in the square at the end of the previous Act to the domestic setting of ‘An Apartment’ and her private thoughts.

A function of the chorus in Joseph and Hercules is to make moral and religious pronouncements that halt the unfolding of the plot. Choruses punctuate the action by demarcating critical moments in the drama. They express communal reactions to personal dilemmas, as when they dilate on ‘filial Piety’ and ‘gen’rous Love’ (Hercules, I.2), and national predicaments, such as the need to keep up morale when in captivity or are apprehensive when awaiting the return of Hercules in ‘Let none despair’ (Hercules, I.3). Choruses in both librettos ritualize response to a character’s predicaments. They express distress, gratitude, anxiety, and gaiety and the vows, prayers, and creeds of a whole nation. They pithily point the moral, thereby directing audiences to the consequences of human frailty, Joseph’s Israelite choruses having the effect of turning the theatre audience into a quasi-congregation. The choruses in both librettos restate the presence of an all-prevailing
justice and perform the function of a preceptor. Choral statement emphasizes the artifice of the librettos’ construction by drawing audiences away from the verisimilar nature of the situations depicted, such as in Joseph’s presentation of the public polity in parallel with the private world of imprisonment, innocence and guilt, dishonesty, and self-deceit. The role of the chorus in the librettos is to voice universal fundamental morality and the inescapable truths of destiny and the human condition.

Oratorio was arguably a more intellectual medium than opera. Its unstaged form demanded greater rational engagement of its audiences, who presumably gained what the twentieth-century composer Hans Werne Henze describes as ‘the sense of a dialectic mind working in a theatre of ideas’. That ‘mind’ in Handel’s theatre took form in the oratorios’ themes. These contained important threads of morality and religious dogma, and both librettists phrase their ideas inoffensively so as not to alienate either the composer or his audiences. The librettists achieved this by affirming conventional (i.e. Establishment) values.

In dealing with the sensitive and contemporary topic of political corruption, Miller took care not to affront audience sensibilities. Such restraint was absent from his earlier verse polemic, Are these Things So? (1740), in which he scourged Walpole, the king’s first minister (the office held by Joseph in the libretto), for favouritism and swindling. Miller’s diatribe against corruption continued in Seasonable Reproof (1741), but by the time he wrote Joseph Walpole had fallen from office, and Miller generalized the temptations of power. For example, Reuben’s thoughtful confession, ‘Profound and inaccessible, O Judah, | Are all the

---

42 From correspondence, Hans Werne Henze, Tempo, New Series 103 (1972), 63.
43 James Miller, Are these Things So? The Previous Question, from an Englishman in his Grotto, to a Great Man at Court (London: T. Cooper, 1740).
inward Movements of the Great, | And never by the Countenance are known’ (II.7), is not satire, but shows that Joseph unobjectionably conveyed to its audiences a serious theme about the nature of wise government. Part I of Joseph deals not only with notions of a leader’s duty of care to his people, but also stern reminders of the biblical Covenant between God and the Israelites. In Part III, Joseph, wielding power honourably but deriving no pleasure from office, resents the personal toll of popular acclaim and with a sardonic shrug, ‘The People’s Favour, and the Smiles of Pow’r, | Are no more than the Sun-shine of an Hour’ (III.2), shows sensitivity to the fickleness of public approbation. Miller knew his Horace, and this theme echoes the Epistle to Quinctius, in which the poet warns that the people who acclaim you now will, at their pleasure, remove it from you tomorrow.45 Miller dextrously fused political matters and deep religious themes within the respectable and sober medium of oratorio.

Unlike Miller, Broughton had no history of personal political campaigns; his work reasserted British core values. Hercules has many references to the ideas of ‘Freedom’ and ‘Liberty’, the libretto concluding with a paean of praise to Hercules extolling ‘Liberty’s immortal Song’ and dismissing the ‘Oppression’ and ‘Slav’ry’ associated with contemporary France, and celebrating ‘Peace and Freedom’, the much-trumpeted glories of the post-1688 British constitution. In a context of Handelian oratorio this vocabulary, though at the heart of Oppositional writing, has universal and not sectarian appeal.

Both librettists show facility in making plot events dramatically inevitable. They order the episodes so that airs and ensembles arise from situation and expression, with themes grounded in the story. They apply the consistent design principle of tight structure and

plausible sequences without longueurs. It is the effectiveness with which this principle is observed that helps render these dramas, in Pope’s words, as ‘Marvellous, Probable, and Moral’ (*Odyssey*, I, p. xxiii).

2.2.3. Distinctive and credible characters.

Distinctive and credible characters, inhabiting an interesting imaginative world, enliven *Joseph* and *Hercules*. In blank verse and terse outline they communicate their thoughts and announce their actions; in lyric verse, within an intentionally narrow range of expressive subjectivity, they respond to what is happening to them. Though confined to emblematic type, characters in librettos take on something of John Richetti’s description of characters in contemporary novels as well tuned ‘expressive instruments’. For example, Asenath’s attraction to Joseph and subsequent marriage involves no discussion or expression of doubt; she and Joseph exchange platitudes, their mutual love a ‘given’, founded in biblical truth. No verbal subtlety is therefore necessary to advance the dramatic credibility of their union. Classical mythology had a similar function in *Hercules*, so that it was unnecessary to detail relationships between the characters in a quest for verisimilar dramatic integrity. The conciseness of plots requires additional detail to be taken for granted, as for example Dejanira’s gullibility at believing the dying Nessus. It is the familiarity of the plots that permits Miller and Broughton to avoid relational and conversational factors to supplement the original sources: for example, audiences must accept that Joseph strains Asenath’s trust and that a jealous Dejanira persists in confronting a baffled Hercules.

---

What the characters say furthers or explains the action. There is no room for digression. Characters respond truthfully to ‘real’ situations so that their words and implied actions seem to possess some psychological honesty, their emotional intensity expressed in the heightened language of verse. Motivation for each action arises from the leading events, either explained in the wordbook, as in the case of the foreign Joseph being led to interpret Pharaoh’s dreams, or explicit in the exposition, as in Lichas’s explanation of Dejanira’s desolation at the beginning of Hercules. When considered in totality the verses each character receives during the oratorio create quasi-individuality. This is as close as the librettos get to a concept of ‘personality’ as was understood at the time. Characters have a temperament which governs their actions; they are not psychologically driven. Their moral nature is anatomized, in accordance with eighteenth-century thought.

The outward appearance of characters in these oratorios is symbolized by their primary moral disposition on first appearance: Dejanira is in a state of ‘sad Dejection’ and is ‘Disconsolate’ (Hercules, I.1) and both Iole and Joseph are ‘lovely’ (Hercules, I.3 and Joseph, I.4). Discourse, entirely in dialogue, reveals briefly all that is needed for audiences to make sense of characters, and the language in which it is expressed is almost always formally poetic. For example, Joseph, the misguided moral tactician, and Asenath, the central figure of moral stability, are abstracted figures, or presences, who express their mutual love conventionally, but their love is never in doubt and is never tested. Joseph is emblematic, but with recognizable human failings. In Part I he is a generalized critique of the principles of leadership and worthy of a high-born woman’s affection, an ideally selfless public administrator. But in Parts II and III his moral strength is endangered by personal weaknesses.
Character ‘development’ in the librettos is restricted to recognition by characters of their moral failings, without which there can be no redemption, and consequently characters act more wisely. In *Joseph* the defiant Simeon is central to Miller’s theodicy. He is the vindication of divine providence in the face of moral error. What makes Simeon distinctive as a character is that his heroism is unexpected, for the audience knows that he once instigated fratricide. Miller presents him as a reformed person, whose offer of his life as surrogate sacrifice for Benjamin is supremely moral and Christian-like. This unexpected moral disposition contrasts with the portrait of Joseph as a public moral paradigm with a private desire to settle scores. In the course of the drama, moral interest transfers from Joseph to Benjamin and also to Simeon the remorseful and rehabilitated former sinner.

*Joseph* is an unambiguously sentimental drama designed to excite pleasurable tears. The brethren are the medium of emotional attack on audience sensibilities. In Miller’s time sentimental literature centred on Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela* (1742) the most celebrated example of this genre.47 *Joseph* can thus be viewed as a contribution to a style that was at the forefront of cultural attention, when the sentimental plays of George Lillo and Nicholas Rowe and a reading of *Pamela* were still fresh in the memory of theatregoers. The dramatic focus on personal emotion as Joseph meets his brothers in private audience links *Joseph* to George Lillo’s plays, which do ‘not merely […] exercise his audience’s capacity for feeling but […] bring[s] them to accept and act upon the moral lessons of his plays’.48 This interpretation captures the moral scheme of *Joseph*, the characterization of which encourages an audience’s emotional attachment to the characters’ dilemmas. In contrasting the Joseph of the public

sphere in Part I and the privately flawed Joseph in Parts II and III, Miller follows a contemporary model of sentimental drama, equated with the French La Comedie Larmoyante. Oliver Goldsmith described this genre as the arena in which ‘the Virtues of Private Life are exhibited rather than the Vices exposed; and the Distresses rather than the Faults of Mankind made our interest in the piece’.\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Joseph} focuses on the emotional effect and not the cause of events: for example, Miller omits the episode when Joseph’s brothers threatened his life, which is the cause that underpins events in the drama. Joseph’s outwardly resolute appearance belies inner torment, and the contending tensions seem designed to excite audience emotions.

Several of the elements of sentimental drama identified by Laura Brown are evident in Miller’s libretto.\textsuperscript{50} Miller makes his characters incite a pitying reaction while making them distinctive and credible. His characters undergo unwarranted cruelty and are portrayed as mimetic reflections of a metaphysical truth about humans; they ‘suffer’, get ‘angry’, give way to ‘despair’, and offer the supreme altruistic sacrifice. Characterization in \textit{Joseph} is predicated by ‘its dependence upon the audience’s pitying response’ (\textit{Dramatic Form}, p. 69). As a sacred drama \textit{Joseph} demands a ‘pitying response’ grounded in Christian values. The compassionate suffering, as in \textit{Pamela}, is positioned centrally within contemporary moral and spiritual culture. Joseph’s inexcusable conduct towards himself and brothers, especially the innocent Benjamin, involves prolonged dramatic irony, as sympathies toss between the vengeful Joseph and the desperate Benjamin and Simeon. The youngster, in challenging his tormentor, becomes the sentimental personification of imperilled innocence, simplicity, goodness, moral


\textsuperscript{50} Laura Brown, \textit{English Dramatic Form}, 1670-1760 \textit{An Essay in Generic History} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981); in particular, p. 151.
purity, virtue, tear-extracting suffering, hardship, and hunger; he is, like Joseph once, a stranger in a foreign land. There is much talk of ‘Tears’ as Miller’s vocabulary tests audience resistance to sentimental ambush of their emotions.

It is this crafted sentiment which undermines the view held by Julian Herbage that Miller’s Joseph ‘displays little understanding of either the scope or the limitations of the oratorio form. With its countless “asides” and its artificial construction, it is redolent of the worst period of eighteenth-century drama’. Herbage misreads Joseph because the libretto succeeds precisely where he thinks it weak. By positioning the torment and personal suffering within a framework of consistent mood and ideology, of the kind audiences encountered in the plays of Rowe and Lillo, Miller leads his audience to feel the drama in the interior world of the human condition.

Benjamin is the finest sentimental portrait in Joseph. His exemplary goodness, ingenuous innocence, and childish candour are established in remarkably few words. These are the passions which ‘recommended themselves to the social and moral occasions of the writers of the eighteenth century’ and the pity they provoke is fundamentally Christian in nature rather than aesthetic. The decisive shift in the emotional centre from Joseph to the boy, the touchstone of Christian values in Joseph, marks a twist to the convention in affective literature, where the leading character is generally in possession of flawless decency. Benjamin’s reported epicene beauty and his lack of worldly experience endow him with the evocative pull of defenceless tenderness. His character is suggested in the form of an

archetype of virtuous and imperilled youthful perfection in a milieu of wilful adults. Not fully comprehending his predicament, he triumphs over Joseph’s base passions by tugging at the heartstrings.

The major obstacle to the creation of characters who present more than an impression of sketched human personality is the lack of room for extended dialogue. The librettists’ answer presents polarized and contrasted pairs of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ characters to create drama from their conflict. In Hercules this polarization concerns two dominant females, each with a distinct temperament. Emotions are made explicable and convincing, covering a wide range within the libretto’s short verbal scope. To contrast the pair, Broughton differentiates Dejanira’s verbal abuse from Iole’s noble demeanour, introducing a frank manner of speech that adds another pragmatic contrast to that of Hyllus’s instantaneous, shallow, and conventional courting.

Broughton’s characterization of Dejanira embraces a device from Greek tragedy. He places her execration of Hercules for breaking his vow of constancy, ‘Cease, Ruler of the Day’ (II.6) immediately before she fatefuly recalls that she possesses Nessus’s robe, as if observing Seneca’s maxim, ‘Our very Prayers many times are Curses’. This placement puts cause and effect in tight juxtaposition, inexorably driving the drama to its fatal catastrophe. The portrait of two contrasted women adopts the dramatic convention of reversal of roles, which in Joseph occurs when Simeon, like Joseph at the beginning of the drama, becomes the victim of a personal vendetta. Iole rejects Hyllus’s advances with contemptuous scorn, diminishing the ardent Hyllus to a disembodied demonstrative: ‘Is this, is this the Son of Hercules’ (II.4), but

she eventually submits to marriage. Dejanira, driven by amatory obsession, and believing both
gossip and Nessus, is delusional, mistrusts her husband, destroys her marriage, and loses self-
control and her grip on reality. Iōle is more than a convenient foil to Dejanira. As Dejanira’s
antagonist, she remains independently minded throughout, dignified in capture. Iōle’s tears
induce the dissembling Dejanira to promise that Hercules shall restore her as Oechalia’s
queen, and in a duet Dejanira’s shallow assurance throws Iōle into an ecstasy: it is as if she,
like Dejanira before her, is taking what she hears as truth. Later, in ‘My Breast with tender
Mercy’ (III.5), Iōle expresses soulful compassion for Dejanira, a particularly poignant moment
because juxtaposed with Dejanira’s delirium. This is the point when the two women’s roles
reverse and Iōle replaces Dejanira as dissembler. In conforming to a dynastic marriage, she
sharply replies her sullen obedience, ‘What Jove ordains, can Iōle resist?’ (III.5).

In few words, exploiting the tensions and conflicts consequent from moral and
temperamental polarities, Broughton created two dynamic characters, one of whom curses and
wheedles, while both lament and lambaste. With asymmetry in the pairings of Dejanira-
Hercules and Hyllus-Iōle, Broughton accentuated the distinctiveness of his characters, setting
the break up of one marriage against the formation of what looks to be another doomed
alliance. He handled superficial attachment and shallow mating rituals particularly well by
conjuring Hyllus’s love-at-first-sight encounter with Iōle in a conventional manner of the kind
familiar to readers of novels, such as Haywood’s *Love in Excess* (1719). Broughton’s
consistent powers of invention mean that he did not need to rely on sentiment as his overriding
effect.

Handel never set more contrasted and dynamic sets of characterizations than those in
*Joseph* and *Hercules*. Both librettos display ordinary and extraordinary human emotional
experience, and have a capacity to show believable events undergone by extraordinary figures illustrated in ways that audiences can recognize.

2.2.4. Function fitting form in the verse.

Miller and Broughton were literary factotums to the composer. It was their task to create possibilities in the verse which he could exploit in his music. There was no room in an effective oratorio libretto for literary ego of the kind that strives to impress, and no place for ‘originality’ of poetic voice. The librettists, once they created their text, faced the composer’s propensity to cut it to present what for him was an agreeable musical drama. Providing the composer with a working text was paramount over any desire to express for themselves an exalted literary voice of the kind found in the finest published poetry. Libretto writing had no room for literary extravagance or repetition and was conducive to ideas expressed in the barest of outline.

The verbal discipline expected of Miller and Broughton can be gauged by the fact that their coherent plots occupy few lines of verse. Joseph has 658 lines of verse, 459 of which are blank verse; the remainder is lyric verse for airs and ensembles. With 518 lines Hercules is much shorter. 326 lines are in unrhymed verse for recitative; lyric verse for airs and ensembles occupies the rest. However, in comparison with other oratorio librettos for Handel, the surviving state of the libretto for Joseph was the longest, with the exception of the 805 lines of Belshazzar (1744), published for its librettist Charles Jennens after Handel had cut his text by almost one third. Without the manuscript versions of the authors’ literary texts it is not
possible to know what was their original length.\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Hercules} was augmented when prior to the first performance Handel expanded the role of Lichas for Susanna Cibber. As this occurred after Handel had completed the main score in August 1744 it is likely that Broughton was asked to supply lyric verse airs and linking blank verse recitative long after he had submitted to the composer a text of his literary work; by October he was in Bristol.

Examples of function fitting form are the verses for Lichas in \textit{Hercules}. These are apt because of what is expressed in them and the manner of expression and their dramatic context, which makes them more than the ‘padding which impedes the action’ that Burrows thinks them (\textit{Handel}, p. 314). Lichas’s airs are moments of reflection which punctuate through contrast their dramatic context without impeding the unfolding story. These airs are essential components in a balanced drama: they pause as well as propel the drama. Broughton skilfully binds the disparate components, so that, for example, Lichas’s air ‘As Stars, that rise and disappear’ (II.3) emerges seamlessly from its context. Dejanira’s accusation that Hercules is false has Lichas defending his ‘Godlike Master’ and admonishing Dejanira for doubting Hercules’s ‘gen’rous Valour’ and his equally excellent ‘Constancy’. Seeing that his remarks have no positive effect, Lichas lays the blame on jealousy, which cues the chorus to meditate on the corrosive grip jealousy can obtain in the ‘Human Breast’. The second air in Act II was inserted to give Lichas an opportunity to react to his task of taking the robe of Nessus to Hercules. He reflects with portentous dramatic irony on constancy in lovers and how ‘Love’s sublime Repast’ is the ‘Bliss’ that flows from ‘Reconcilement’ after they experience ‘Calm,

\textsuperscript{54} Other dramatic oratorio librettos have the following approximate line totals, taken from the librettos printed in Chrysander, \textit{G.F. Händel’s Werke: Esther 282, Deborah 344, Athalia 383, Saul 531, Samson 593, Semele 549. The Occasional Oratorio} has 188 lines, \textit{Judas Maccabaeus} 317, \textit{Joshua} 352, \textit{Alexander Balus} 415, \textit{Susanna} 509, \textit{Solomon} 388, \textit{Theodora} 492, and \textit{Jephtha} 405.
imperfect, Pleasures’ (II.7). The air ‘He, who for Atlas prop’d the Sky’ (III.5) is allocated in the wordbook to the Priest of Jupiter, perhaps its original designation before Handel allocated it to Lichas. The air is descriptive of the food awaiting the arrival of Hercules among the gods: ‘With purple Lips, | Brisk Nectar sips, | And shares th’Ambrosial Feast’. It is unlike any other verse in the work. It is confidently upbeat, as befits its role as relief from the gloom of tragedy.

Blank verse in these librettos carries the dialogue and expositional material, and explains events as they ‘occur’ or are reported. Its functions are demonstrative and to drive the plot without repetition or digression. Blank verse in performance takes more or less the time occupied in verbal utterance. It occupies the greater proportion of the drama, sets the scenes, and establishes situations in which the characters have brief formulaic encounters. In Joseph the blank verse in the second and third Parts, derived from Zeno, dominates as the drama moves towards the crisis of Joseph’s self-revelation. It features frequent ironic asides, unusual in oratorio librettos for Handel, which Miller augments (III.4) to intensify the rapid dialogue and help impel the drama to a genuinely affecting crisis of touching recognition between them.

Compact expression is a key to effective blank verse for oratorio. In a remarkably brief span of thirty lines of blank verse Miller adeptly condenses three pivotal situations: Simeon’s assault on Joseph’s pity when challenging the honesty of Joseph’s pitiful look, ‘The Man who flies the Wretched’ (III.4), Reuben’s reminder of their former treatment of Joseph, and the abashed Simeon’s petitioning of God for mercy, ‘O gracious God, We merit well this Scourge’. This swift alternation of furious recrimination, accusation, and penitence, is successful writing because it is brief and lucid in presenting opposing stances.

Interesting dramatic ideas are created from the discontinuities created between blocks of lyric verse and the blank verse dialogue surrounding it. Lyric verse retards the action
because the music it received was more prominent than that accorded blank verse. In lyric verse, some of the simplest words express a particular thought or emotion, which music then expands. In this way, the two librettos are not unduly ‘literary’ and avoid pretentious and stuffy diction, and appear to comply with Samuel Richardson’s thoughts on librettos. A libretto, the character of Mr B opines, is a medium dealing in explicit emotions; ‘it must have the necessary Contraste of the Grave and Light, that is, the Diverting, equally blended throughout the Whole [. . .]. Wherefore it is the Poet’s Business to adapt the Words for this agreeable Mixture’.55 The essence of an oratorio libretto is that it is indirect and symbolic. The lyric verse in Joseph and Hercules, therefore, conveys emotional states and moral homilies with ‘primary colour’ words. In performance, linguistic means yield to music’s power to provoke felt association, and simple words evoke the scene-setting of ritual, movement, and gesture, which the music brings to life.

Miller’s verse, though lacking the invention of the finest contemporary poets, is nevertheless adroit in contriving lexical density. Noun phrases do the work of complex statements, as in Joseph’s nostalgic scene, beginning ‘Ye departed Hours’ (II.3): ‘smiling Valleys’ and ‘fleecy Herd’ in contemporary published poetry would most likely have been greeted with contempt by some critics of taste, but in the libretto they serve as the thinnest of sketches to suggest rather than describe the verdant countryside Joseph once knew. ‘Sweets of Life’, however, in the following air, contrasts sufficiently with ‘Cares’ and ‘Courtly Craft’ in the next lines to communicate swiftly the moral contrast between peasant existence and conniving courts. What in another context would be otiose diction is effectual in this libretto; it is not padding.

55 Samuel Richardson, Pamela, 6th edn, 4 vols, (London: Richardson, 1742), iv, 103.
The verse-drama is characterized by a compression of ideas: for example, when dealing with the poignant agony of the bewildered brothers. Simeon’s burst of anger at the brothers’ tardy return to ransom him packs the vigour of a diatribe into very few lines. ‘Where are these Brethren---Why this base Delay!’ (II.2) is not explained in the dialogue but in the wordbook. Simeon reasons with himself as he muses ‘are not Brethren base?’, indicating his reformation and remorse without lengthy explication. Judah’s pleas for Joseph’s pity, depicting a heart-rending picture of Jacob mourning the absence of his sons, are launched in one impassioned compact clause, ‘Our Reverend Sire intreats thee’ (II.7).

Imagery in oratorio, and not the syntax, conveys much of the sense. Subtle punctuation may have communicated shades of meaning in novels but was inappropriate to oratorio libretto. It is the imagery that depicts feeling, from joy to grief, love to hate, and so on, appropriate to the specific ‘psychology’ of the moment in the drama. The linguistic simplicity of the imagery makes constant demands on educated audience memory. Imagery required audiences to expand an idea in what they heard from their knowledge and experience of the Bible, Milton, and the classics and thus contribute actively to an oratorio’s intellectual substance. In this way Miller and Broughton saved words by calling on the ‘intellectual and spiritual equipment’ which audiences brought to performances, a process enabling audiences to enjoy ‘the challenges and pleasures of the text’.56 A reliance on an audience’s prismatic interpretation of simple words accounts for the relative absence of verbal extravagance in Joseph and Hercules.

56 Steven Zwicker, ‘What every literate man once knew’, in Owners, Annotators (see Myers, and others, above), 75-90 (p. 79).
Imagery in the librettos does not intensify the sense but makes clear what is the key emotion depicted in each stanza. It conveys ideas central to the drama and confirms a situation rather than revealing further insights. Imagery in the librettos is a straightforward verbal mechanism, an essential synthesizing agent in binding the drama. In Joseph the central or holding idea is physical, emotional, and rational confinement. Blood ties are ‘Chains’ from which only Asenath releases him, and chains are the most prominent image in Joseph whose significance grows as the drama progresses, from the concrete image of iron shackles, the instruments of tyranny, tying Joseph to his prison cell, through connotations of kinship, national identity, and the obligations that tie political ministers to their duty of care to the people. Chains fetter Joseph to the careworn present as he yearns for his simpler past in ‘Ye departed Hours’ (II.3). His chains image his prejudicial refusal to act as a brother and reveal himself as who he really is. Chain imagery in Joseph is a chief unifying device.

Imagery adds little to the characterization, its function being economically to convey ideas important to a character’s response to situations. The image of the mother pelican feeding its young with blood from its breast: ‘Ah Jealousy, thou Pelican’ (III.2) compresses into only four lines an idea packed with meaning. Using a familiar trope, Asenath likens herself to the parent pelican feeding her young out of altruistic love (‘a Parent’s bleeding Heart’). This image had special contemporary charge for audiences. From verse 6 of Psalm 102, ‘I am like a pelican in the wilderness’ (Authorized version), versified in the frequently republished New Version of the Psalter (1698) by Nahum Tate and Nicholas Brady, this image would have been almost proverbial from other literary contexts. These include Shakespeare’s King Lear, Congreve’s Love for Love, Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress, and Richardson’s
But Miller’s employment of the image is problematical because it requires close reading to determine who is the central character of the air; its moral purpose is thereby confused. Miller does not make it immediately clear, a failing in a librettist, that the ‘Pelican’ he refers to is the jealously ungrateful child, and not its mother, as in the literary references. The image in:

\[
\text{thou Pelican,} \\
\text{That prey’st upon thy Parent’s bleeding Heart;} \\
\text{Though born of Love, Love’s greatest Bane,} \\
\text{Still cruel! Wounding her with her own Dart}
\]

is not centred on the sacrificial mother pelican but on the child using its bill, created by the mother, to wound its parent in feeding from her blood. Miller’s image may have lacked in the eighteenth century the obscurity it holds for today’s audiences, but Dean is right to condemn as ‘a linguistic monstrosity’ the confusion inherent in this image (p. 399). O’Brien does not discuss Joseph, but instead echoes Dean’s dismissal of Miller’s ‘stilted and rhetorical’ style’ (Life, p. 92). This woodenness of style was entirely a product of its function. For a libretto writer, a pragmatic virtue is a ‘resonant conciseness’ that bestows additional gravity on the verse, of the kind attributed by Donald Davie to the leading devotional poets Philip Doddridge and Isaac Watts. Nevertheless, Miller’s pelican image is a victim of lexical reduction.

Picturesque details animate the narrative of both librettos. Surging rivers and a bleeding mother pelican are ideas in Joseph that do not have a literary energy of their own but

---

57 References to the pelican in texts most likely available to Miller’s audiences were The History of King Lear, a Tragedy. Acted at the King’s-Theatre. Revis’d with Alterations. By N. Tate (London: Feales, 1736), p. 35; John Bunyan, The Pilgrim’s Progress from this World to that which is to come, 15th ed., 3 vols (London: Clarke, 1734), ii, 72; William Congreve, Love for Love, in Works of Mr. William Congreve: In Three Volumes (London: Tonson, 1730), ii, 61; Richardson, Pamela, 1st edn, iv, 45.

were intended to take on idealized form in the music. The function of bland phrases and diction, as in ‘The silver Stream’ (*Joseph*, II.5), and in the conventional image of love-at-first-sight in ‘I feel a spreading Flame within my Veins’ (*Joseph*, I.5), adequately serve the music.

There is no room in an oratorio libretto for a graphically rendered character, situation, or environment. The librettists achieve variety of expression within this narrow linguistic field by fittingly using everyday vocabulary in the context of high drama to rescue the commonplace from enervating dullness, as in ‘Yellings rend my tortur’d Ear’ (*Hercules*, III.3), and idiomatic expression, as in ‘That’s like what ye are’ (*Joseph*, III.3). Miller’s colloquialisms ‘grow up’ and ‘mayn’t’ (II.1) seem to have strayed from one of his plays, but they observe a prerequisite of libretto writing, to get meaning across swiftly. An attribute of both librettos is a fusion of compactness and particularity which invites the composer to make memorable the most simple, perhaps banal, phrases.

Rhyme offers no clever ‘turns’ in oratorio. Libretto rhymes are by their nature predictable: to contrive intellectually-charged rhymes would distract from the music. Familiar rhyming patterns enable audiences easily to catch the main ideas. Anticipation of the rhyming word has a key role in a libretto’s communication of ideas, e.g. ‘Care’ and ‘share’ in Phanor’s second stanza of ‘Our Fruits’ (*Joseph*, II.1). These kinds of well-worn rhyme pairs observe Horace’s principle, that ‘Whenever you instruct, be brief, so that what is quickly said the mind may readily grasp and faithfully hold.’ To that end rhyme pairs are fittingly undistinguished in the librettos.

---

59 Horace, *Satires* (see Fairclough, above): ‘*quidquid praecipies, esto brevis, ut cito dicta percipient animi dociles teneantque fideles*’ (p. 479).
However, there are two notable and fascinating exceptions to the notion that libretto rhymes are deliberately unsubtle. Broughton’s verse for the first duet, ‘Joys of Freedom’ (*Hercules*, II.8), displays an artful disposition of rhyme to suggest that Dejanira and Iöle are at odds, in spite of what they say. The function of shared rhymes in duets, a convention in opera and oratorio of the time, was to allow rhymed words simultaneous utterance in performance. Within only three lines of verse for each character in this duet Broughton packs complex meaning. The rhyming pattern is an interesting departure from conventional rhyme schemes for duets because Dejanira is deceitful and Iöle is pleased but wary. Breaking from convention, Broughton positions the shared rhyme solely on the final line of each participant’s verse: (Dejanira) ‘Pow’r’, ‘Hour’, and ‘blest’, and (Iöle) ‘hear’, and ‘Ear’, and ‘Rest’. The single incidence of shared rhyming words, ‘blest’ and ‘Rest’, is verbal evidence of the unstable resolution reached between the two women, combining in aural ‘amity’ on the last word only (‘blest’ and ‘Rest’). Exploiting the tight verbal constraints to the full, with an adroit touch Broughton presents in two words outward concord and entrenched denial.

The second, and final, duet of *Hercules*, ‘O Prince’ (III.5), conveys in very few words the complex relationship between Hyllus and Iöle. Their duet, which rounds off the drama, has a rhyming scheme that prevents them sharing a rhyme. This blatant breach of the linguistic principle that verse intended for loving couples united in reconciliation should share rhymes shows that no love exists between the participants, for Iöle’s heart remains her own. The absence of shared rhymes means that there is none of the verbal concordance of reciprocal love and that the audience is to understand this is not a harmonious relationship. An emphatic positioning of discordant words, visible on the page of the wordbook, conveys that this couple is mismatched: Hyllus has ‘see’ and ‘thee’ and Iöle ‘find’ and ‘combin’d’, whereas in
observing duet principle, ‘see’ would belong to Hyllus and ‘thee’ to Iöle. This deliberate verbal dissonance gives aural emphasis to the evasions. Iöle remarks that she feels her passions ‘conspire’ against her better judgment, for in marriage she is again a slave (‘vanquish’d’), while Hyllus, before he mentions his love for Iöle, expresses his dynastic delight at the prospect of extending his kingdom. She suppresses her feelings at seeing him happy. All of these are inescapable verbal clues that she will not be a diffident wife as Hyllus’s queen, because she obeys Jove, not Hyllus. The verses to these two duets are perhaps the finest examples in Joseph and Hercules of the librettist’s art of compressing meaning within tight space.

Broughton’s skill in clear exposition, squeezed into few lines, is noticeably evident in the chorus, ‘Crown with festal Pomp the Day’ (I.6). Each of the six lines of the stanza conjures cumulatively a specific aspect of festivity, jollity, state ceremony, dance, music, and communal elation. The strong pictorial charge of key words in this chorus evokes collective ritual and celebration. Broughton also deftly deploys geographical allusions to avoid periphrasis and mitigate severe word limitations. For example, in the short span of two phrases at the beginning of the drama, Broughton conjures exotic locations outside the probable experience of his audiences: ‘the Northern Streams, | Bound in icy Fetters’ and ‘the burning Libyan Sands’ (I.2). Such vivid details evoke a world known only from impressions gleaned perhaps from books written by travellers and tales told by mariners. Clipped reference swiftly establishes the global reach of Hyllus’s determination to search for his father, while reinforcing the drama’s mythical setting by expanding the backdrop of the action to encompass the edges of the eighteenth-century known world.
In both librettos, monosyllabic words, core components of English vocabulary, capture something of everyday speech, especially when they are strung together. The librettists seem to respect a principle later determined by Daniel Webb, who wrote that ‘Words of four syllables are, in the language of music, nothing more than the duplications of words of two’. The incisiveness of monosyllables amidst Latinate language makes Dejanira’s sarcastic sneer prosaic as well as blunt and indecorous, ‘You know not, then, the force of your own Charms’; to which Iôle replies formally, ‘improbable Suggestion’ (Hercules II.2). Broughton foregrounds the domestic language of individual human response against a formal background of myth and universal forces, razor-edged candour being all the more shocking in the context of poetic poise.

The hammer-blow effect of concerted monosyllables is particularly effective when Simeon demands to know why he and his brothers are being treated ‘Like Thieves and Traitors’, to which Phanor responds, the verbal contractions strengthening the vernacular vigour of the riposte, ‘That’s like what ye are. | You’ve stol’n the sacred Cup that’s set apart, | For my Lord’s use. --- | Why have ye thus rewarded Ill for Good?’ (Joseph III.3). Simeon’s reaction, ‘Imposture!’, in its formality distinguishes him socially from the tone of the constabulary of Phanor. A further function of monosyllabic words in these two librettos is when they heighten the dramatic effect through urgent imperatives, illocutionary words, and strongly active verbs. In the briefest of statements, such as ‘I go’ (Hercules II.5), these simple linguistic devices signify acts accomplished in the instruction and are particularly

61 Illocutionary utterance ‘is the effect the utterance is intended to have on others’: David Lodge, Deaf Sentence (London: Harvill Secker, 2008), p. 98.
appropriate to oratorio libretto because with just one or two short words they imply both movement and position statement; in this case, Hercules is exasperatedly quitting Dejanira and her suspicions in favour of preparing a feast to Jove. To enliven the tone, Broughton took from Greek drama the device of getting performative verbs and vigorous imperatives to stimulate the sense of action, with ‘See’, ‘Return’, ‘Deplore’ (I.1 and I.2), and his employment of vocatives at line beginnings similarly gives presence to absent personages, as in Dejanira’s first mention of Hercules (I.2).

Sometimes one commonplace word is sufficient to suggest emotional perturbation, as in the lively ‘surges’ (Joseph II.5) and ‘swells’ (Hercules I.2 and III.4). ‘Swells’ first triggers association with uncontrollable zeal, and when it is mentioned later in Hercules, it signifies an overwhelming compassion. This example shows how a single word in a libretto can carry multiple associations and qualities and indicates the conscious art that the librettists brought to their literary task, fitting words and imagery to the action. Joseph and Hercules are almost free from circumlocution, and though they employ rigidly artificial ‘conversation’, their language depicts a recognizable reality. The linguistic range of the librettos may be conventional, verbal experiment having no place in them, but its function was to second the music and not serve as freestanding literary works.

2.2.5. Words congenial to musical setting.

Librettists have generally ‘been viewed as little better than dedicated hacks, churning out texts whose artistic value is decidedly subordinate to that of their musical setting.’62 The nature of their literary assignment was to be direct and not ‘literary’. Benjamin Britten summarized

---

what a librettist had to do, and the truth of his view applies to the literary task faced by Miller and Broughton. Britten said that ‘To be suitable for music, poetry must be simple, succinct and crystal clear’. As if anticipating this remark, the librettists provided unaffected and undemanding poetic language which they judged apposite to Handel’s music.

Oratorio libretto writing for Handel required poetic formulations congenial to composer and singers. Lyric verse in the librettos conforms to patterns dictated by musical and not literary convention, employing as few words as possible to maximize what is left for music to do. Commonplace poetic language can be helpful to the composer, whose creative response is not contingent on sustained and diverting verbal elegance but whose music informs audiences of the feelings of a character or nation. Handel’s music required scope to broaden and intensify the poetic drama and impose its own dramatic ebb and flow on the libretto. A librettist for Handel therefore, writing a libretto to meet the composer’s dramatic aims, selected words and phrases that played to Handel’s strengths as a composer of melody, counterpoint, and extended dramatic scenes.

Miller and Broughton seem to have had a sure sense of what would work and what was appropriate. Words and phrases seem chosen to inspire, not impede, Handel. The prime function of the libretto was to supply verse for the music to vivify. Subtlety of expression was the province of the musical response, and the circumstances of performance were not appropriate for savouring exquisite poetry. The words and their music contended with the preoccupations of an audience of perhaps a thousand people, perhaps distracted by the food and drink they have had or the company that they were obliged to keep in the theatre. Audiences listened to someone singing across a large orchestra, a condition which militated

---

against concentration on literary niceties. Thus it was important for the wordbook to provide a practical verbal ‘map’ of proceedings.

To encourage audience attentiveness to the verbal contribution, the words needed to be suitable for singing by avoiding, for example, ugly consonant clusters formed from sibilants and fricatives, a feature of speech prominent in everyday spoken English. Charles Burney reflected on verbal obstacles to clear singing, considering the sibilant nature of English as ‘loaded with consonants, nasal syllables ending in ng, and other harsh and mute terminations’.64 He suggests that a librettist sensitive to his composer eradicates these lexical horrors. In this regard, Miller and Broughton chose words whose sounds do not clash unsympathetically in the music, with the imaginative exception, mentioned above, of Broughton’s verse for duets. Burney endorses verbal austerity and urges composers to communicate words and meaning at first hearing. After hearing phrases clearly stated in the music once, he avers that ‘the congregation will be already in possession of their [i.e, the words’] sense and import, nothing will be lost, on the side of instruction, if they should be repeated in canon, fugue, or other musical contrivance’ (History, ii, 126-27). In its straightforward structure, the lyric verse in the two librettos was prepared for distortion of the syntax by repetition of words and phrases. Linguistic sense is maintained, however. Burney thinks reiteration of words in song wholly acceptable because periphrasis centres on a key word, the repetition of which often ‘adorns the discourse’ (History, ii, 124).

Word selection in blank verse has a function different from that for lyric verse. These two verse forms were chosen for dissimilar musical treatment. The blank verse when sung was

---

accompanied by a continuo section of ‘cello and harpsichord, perhaps augmented by a double bass and theorbo. This is the verse of action and interaction in which things get done. It was performed almost at the speed of speech and therefore required of librettos opportunities for clear declamation without grammatical sophistication. To strengthen its dramatic impact some blank verse had the orchestra as accompaniment.

The lyric verse was structured in two parts, with a strong punctuational division, to allow da capo form in the music, which Handel could either observe or through-compose when setting airs and ensembles. Da capo takes the musical form, ABA, where the A section is repeated after the B section in what Reinhard Strohm describes as a ‘poetic refrain form’. The two sections are generally allocated a stanza or distinct phrase each. Lyric verse takes more time to perform, and its words gain greater significance than in blank verse because subjected to multiple repetition. Miller and Broughton therefore chose simple words that could withstand distortion in the music, either in repetition or when subjected to Handel’s mimetic musical style. Examples of words selected to maintain clarity when sung in counterpoint include the undemanding syllables of the choruses ‘Let none despair’ (Hercules, I.3) and ‘O God, who in thy heav’nly Hand’ (Joseph, II.7). Examples of word-selection to suit the repetition contingent on musical word-painting are ‘To keep afar from all Offence’ (Joseph, II.6) and ‘Alcides’ Name, in latest Story’ (Hercules, II.5), in which, by stating straightforwardly the main idea, the librettists subordinated any literary aims they might have had to the music. Their main task was to afford scope for the musical development of the ‘outline’ drama that they submitted to Handel.

---

Oratorio afforded many opportunities for the composer to shine. The librettos *Joseph* and *Hercules* gave Handel the literary means to release the fancy while observing poetic and musical conventions of unstaged drama, with ‘characters’ in contemporary clothes and therefore dressed similarly to the audience. A wordbook helped performances focus on verbal expression as well as the music. Adept dramatic design and a judicious choice of words with the rich potential to arrest the imagination enabled the two librettos to become new literary works and not mere retellings of well-known tales. Remarkable economy of expression in *Joseph* and *Hercules* cramps neither dramatic ideas nor themes. The blank verse, clipped and honed to keep the story moving, is sometimes elegant but always to the purpose. Lyric verse, invented to withstand the musical excitement of multiple repetitions, engages the intellect when combined with the music. Variety of expression, implied action, and movement, provide indispensable structures for the composer to maintain audience attention. Because of constricted verbal space, to communicate complex themes the two librettists proficiently relied on maxims rather than complex discourse. Yet their overall achievement lies in the consistent observation of poetic and dramatic decorum while surmounting the inflexible constraints of the form. The librettos moved beyond cramped verbal confines because of good literary judgment, exercised to convey learning and sound understanding of how people think and act. A major achievement of these two librettos is their synthesis of aesthetic, moral, and dramatic options in language of utilitarian beauty, an art belying its own complexity. Miller and Broughton created literary works that happily reconciled stern moral values with dramatic integrity. They wrote two of the finest librettos that Handel set.
Chapter Three.

JOSEPH AND HERCULES AS MANUSCRIPT UNDERLAY.

3.1. Joseph and Hercules in musical manuscript scores.

The musical manuscripts examined for this thesis are Handel’s autograph scores and the copyist’s fair scores for the oratorios Joseph and Hercules. Handel’s working methods, as generally inferred from the autograph scores, suggest that for recitatives he may first have written the verbal underlay below the musical staves and then supplied the music, and for airs and ensembles, with their multiple verbal repetitions and extended musical phrases, composed the music before writing out the words. Handel presumably copied the underlay from the authors’ manuscripts of the libretto, no longer extant, while the copyist, John Christopher Smith, derived his underlay from the composer’s autograph score. These two underlays, in the handwriting of composer and his copyist, represent an intermediate stage in the evolutionary history of the libretto, from the state in which Handel placed it in his score to its state in the first wordbook. Investigation of the differences between the copy-text and these earlier sources brings to light editorial changes that the composer or his copyist made to the libretto. It reveals verbal material that does not appear in the wordbooks and which may have belonged to the authors’ manuscript librettos from which Handel copied his underlay.

Both composer’s and copyist’s underlays contain verbal differences from the copy-texts. The variants form two categories: substantial textual items that survive in no other
source, and minor variants of spelling, punctuation, and transcription. The more substantial
textual items show the composer changing the authors’ emphases, though whether this was
unwitting or intentional cannot now be determined. The shorter variants demonstrate the
composer’s core transcriptional accuracy and competency in written English. The fair copy
scores show the copyist clarifying many ambiguities in Handel’s underlay. However, the
writing of the musical text had an impact on the linguistic text, which is important to this
thesis because both kinds of score predate the copy-texts.

The following stemma and sigla set out the diachronic sequence of possible stages (D
and E are conjectural) and key textual relations in the early transmission of the librettos

*Joseph* and *Hercules*:

A  Author’s manuscript libretto, no longer extant.

↓

B  Word underlay in the composer’s autograph score [H43, H44]. This underlay is a
mediated form of the libretto, revised by the composer, with cuts and amendments to
suit musical circumstances. Authority for emendations in the underlay is unclear.

↓

C  Word underlay in the copyist’s manuscript fair score, or ‘conducting’ score [C43,
C44]. This underlay is a further recension of the libretto, postdating the composer’s
adaptations. It contains additional revisions, authority for which is not always clear.

↓

D  The libretto, probably based on C, for the licenser and bookseller; no longer extant.

↓

E  The libretto used for typesetting, no longer extant.

↓

F  The libretto as printed in the wordbooks M44 and T45, the copy-texts, for the first
performance of the oratorios *Joseph* and *Hercules*.

↓

G  The amended libretto as printed in wordbooks J47, J57, R49, and R52 during
Handel’s lifetime.

A-F all contain texts of the literary work, i.e. the libretto. B and C also contain texts of the
composite work, the oratorio. A was the basis for the verbal component in B, Handel
presumably in his underlay reproducing closely the text he selected from A. B and C have many variant readings from F, the copy-text librettos in M44 and T45. Little evidence exists to establish direct connections between A and C, i.e. authorial involvement in the underlay of the fair copy scores. The authors’ original conception of their libretto therefore survives in changed, adapted, and shortened form in the first wordbooks F. In the absence of any documents but in compliance with contemporary print working practices, two stages of textual transmission are inferred between C and F. These two ‘ghost’ stages represent states of the libretto after preparation of C and prior to the entry into the public domain of F.

D is an inferred stage of textual transmission when were established, presumably by the authors, matters of page layout, including visual distinction between blank and lyric verse and the various character cues and scene divisions. D is also the stage at which Handel or his theatre manager sought permission to perform the work. Manuscript librettos prepared for the Lord Chamberlain for Joseph and Hercules no longer exist. The Huntington Library, however, possesses examples of manuscript oratorio librettos prepared for the licenser and these include Samson, prepared for official approval on behalf of John Rich and Handel. It has corrections and slight differences from the first wordbook. There is a manuscript libretto of Theodora prepared for licensing and written out by its librettist Thomas Morell and now in Manchester. Morell’s copy has character cues, stage directions, and layout for the lyric verse on the page as if prepared for a printer as well as the licenser.

---
Inferred stage E represents the libretto in the hands of the printer’s compositors. This stage entailed decisions relating to paratext, some of which presumably required authorial involvement and matters such as typeface, house style, and other principles governing the *mise-en-page* of the libretto and paratext. The wordbook as a commercial artefact entered the public domain with printed paratext and libretto at stage F. The authors may have coordinated their revised state of the libretto with Smith, the guardian of C, to ensure that the published text in F included the text that audiences would hear in performance, as well as unperformed text, some of which had been set to music in B, and some of which survives in no other source (discussed in Chapter Six below). Unperformed verse printed in F did not require the licenser’s approval.

B is a prime record of some literary changes Handel made while mediating the libretto through his music. In revising the text and re-shaping the drama, the composer left markers from which it is possible to detect changes made for dramatic, aesthetic, and moral reasons. However, in spite of the fact that changes in B are in the composer’s handwriting there remains a problem of authority for the literary variants. There is no proof of who instigated the verbal changes, a circumstance which complicates classification of the sources according to the degree of authorial involvement: for example, while Miller had a hand in *Joseph* F, there is no concrete evidence that Broughton did so for *Hercules* F. The study of textual transmission therefore mainly concerns variants between manuscript sources B and C and F. Transcription errors and cancelled phrases constitute textual ‘events’ in B and C and record the composer’s encounter with the literary text. Presumably, the composer and the authors discussed literary aspects of the oratorios between stages A and B, and continued to do so during the creation of B, and again during rehearsals between stages E and F. The authors may have suggested their
own amendments, to which the composer agreed and entered in the underlay. The changes made or adopted by Handel would then have appeared in C, D, E, and F. Perhaps the printer or bookseller made a few variants at stage D, but lack of evidence rules out further examination.

The purpose of B was to provide a draft full score from which the copyist made a neat version C. Both scores contain the composite work of musical and verbal texts, the oratorio. The chronology of musical manuscript sources demonstrates that a significant proportion of variants occurred within a few months. Handel signed off most of the acts of the oratorios when he completed the scores, unlike the copyist, who did not sign and date his fair copy scores. Handel signed Part I of Joseph ♀ August 26. 1743. völlig geendiget’ (H43 fol. 41v) and Part II ‘Fine della parte 2d. ⊳ September 12. 1743. völlig.’ (H43 fol. 94v).3 He did not sign and date Part III because he ended the oratorio with a chorus he had recently composed for an anthem. He signed Act I of Hercules ‘geendiget dies. 1 Akt. July 30 ⊳ 1744.’ (H44 fol. 45v), Act II ‘Fine dell Atto 2do. Agost 11. 1744. h.’ (H44 fol. 94v), and Act III ‘Fine. London: Agost: 17. ♀. 1744. völlig geendiget.’ (H44 fol. 133v).4

3.2. Musical material and literary meaning.

The kinds of music Handel set to particular verbal material had consequences for the oratorio’s meanings. The primary effect, in relation to blank verse recitative and da capo airs, has already been discussed in Chapter Two, but music’s influence on literary meaning extended beyond what is mentioned here. What to the eye of a wordbook reader was lyric

---

3 ♀ is the astronomical sign for Friday, ‘völlig geendiget’ means completed, and ⊳ is the sign for Monday (HHb IV, 365).
4 ‘geendiget dies’ means ‘finished today’ and h is the sign for Sunday evening (HHb IV, 378).
verse Handel mutated in the underlay into prose-like statements, so that the syntax *heard* in musical performance contradicted the simplicity of the printed verse *seen* in the wordbook. Whereas lyric verse might take a few seconds to read, Handel’s musical interpretation of it might take five minutes to sing. The following example illustrates the deformation of Miller’s verse in *Joseph B* into prose, the word and phrase order in Benjamin’s air ‘Remember’ (III.4) showing the composer rearranging language to accentuate literary meaning. The reader encountered this layout of the poetry in *Joseph F*:

```
Remember, at the first Embrace
You call’d me Son --- O view this Face;
I still as much deserve the Name;
Thy Heart alone is not the same.
```

The literary meaning centres on Benjamin’s request for a guarantee of fair dealing by demanding that Joseph look him in the eyes to verify the sincerity of his earlier declaration of charitable fellow feeling. The underlay version of the poetry retained its elevated vocabulary and rhymes, Handel stressing the heart as the seat of passion and unreasoned action by omitting one word in a series of repeats (the altered phrase is in editorial italics):

```
Remember, at the first Embrace you call’d me Son---O view this Face, O view this Face; I still as much deserve the Name; thy Heart alone is not the same. Remember, remember, at the first Embrace you call’d me Son I still as much deserve the Name; thy Heart alone is not the same, thy Heart alone, *thy Heart is not the same*. O view this Face; I still as much deserve the Name, thy Heart alone is not the same.
```

By eliding the distractive qualification of ‘alone’, Handel’s Benjamin names the ‘Heart’ as the seat of speciousness, a vice that the ‘Face’ cannot veil. The plea increases dramatic tension by being rooted in the boy’s unwitting irony, for Joseph is indeed dissembling. In the next scene,
the brothers intensify their impassioned appeals to Joseph for clemency and pity, Handel repositioning the simple phrases in the underlay of ‘Thou hadst, my Lord’ (Joseph III.5) to heighten the fluidity of Simeon’s desperate request:

Thou hadst, my Lord, a Father once, perhaps hast now---O feel, feel then for us! As thou didst love thy own, O pity ours---feel then our Anguish, feel! Thou hadst, my Lord, a Father once, perhaps hast now, perhaps hast now---O feel, feel then for us, our Anguish feel---O pity ours, as thou didst love thy own, then feel for us, feel then our Anguish, feel, feel then our Anguish feel.

In performance, Simeon first sings Miller’s lines in the sequence they possess in the wordbook, after which the heartfelt ‘Pity’ and embittered supplication ‘feel!’ accrue increasing linguistic force at each repetition. Simeon’s appeals to Joseph for pity look cold on the page of F, but Handel in B subjects the verse to complex musical scrutiny and interrogation of literary meanings, thus stretching the author’s simple syntax to project the sense.

The composer seems to have been well aware of the linguistic force of words in Joseph B. Practical and aesthetic issues went hand-in-hand. In Joseph 1.3 (H43 fol. 17r) the underlay is altered for no musical reason: ‘god-like’, written first in the underlay, was cancelled and replaced by ‘worthy’; ‘Saviour of the World’ was similarly cancelled in favour of ‘Father of the Country’. These amendments appear to resolve a problem relating to matters of theology and lexical stress. The cancelled text juxtaposes ideas which portray Joseph in terms of the New Testament representation of Christ. Of course, Handel’s writing is no proof that these changes were his alone, especially as he left intact a later appearance of ‘godlike’ (1.7) in Joseph B, when Asenath praises Joseph’s mien: the first ‘godlike’ appears in Joseph C, and its preservation in Joseph F is a sign of Miller’s disapproval of the revision in Joseph B. There was plainly some unease about this epithet that lingered in the mid-eighteenth century. Hall
and Macintosh recount how the parson-playwright William Mason ‘was outraged when the stage version [of his play Elfrida in 1772] turned the phrase “godlike youth” into “royal youth”’ (pp. 192-94). These verbal changes are discussed further in Chapter Six, but the folio carrying the amendments in Joseph B shows uncertainty in the music as well as choice of words, and an extra note was added for the additional syllable required in the change from ‘World’ to ‘Country’:
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Fig. 1. *Joseph* (I.4). Edited underlay text in B in Handel’s hand (H43 fol. 17v). By permission of the British Library, R.M.20.e.8.

Miller confirmed in Joseph F his partiality for ‘Saviour of the World’, in spite of Joseph B and Joseph C bearing the altered wording (C43/1 fol. 37v), which suggests that the amendments dating from just after this folio in Joseph B were the words performed. A manuscript score copied out at the time of Joseph’s first performance deepens the mystery, for its underlay has
neither ‘Saviour of the World’ nor ‘Father of the Country’ but ‘Revealer of Secrets’, an interpretation of Joseph’s given name, ‘Zaphnath Paaneah’, recorded according to Duncan Chisholm by Josephus (p. 185).5

Handel did not slavishly obey authorial instruction. There was an occasion when, for musical reasons, he imposed his own interpretation of the poetry, with the result that in performance the treatment of the text does not comply with F. Joseph F has a wedding duet between Joseph and Asenath and provided the salient pairings for them to share rhymes:

**DUET.**

Joseph.  
\[ O! \text{ canst thou, Fair Perfection! say?} \]
\[ O! \text{ canst thou bless me with thy Love?} \]

Asenath.  
\[ My Father’s Will I must obey; \]
\[ My Monarch’s Pleasure must approve. \]

(Joseph I.7)

Handel set these four lines in recitative, as if they were blank verse; the italics denoted that readers were to expect an ensemble, supported by the orchestra. He set the succeeding four lines as a duet, as Miller denoted in Joseph F, but it is Handel’s adoption of recitative for the first four lines that makes for a significant episode in performance, the amity of the pair of lovers stressed by the immediacy of their shared rhymes.

Sometimes Handel seems to have misread the author’s text, with consequences for the literary meaning. Poetic scansion of a line was lost in Hercules B in Iôle’s air ‘My Father!’.

The copy-text Hercules F reads: ‘He bleeds --- he falls --- in Agony | Dying he bites the bloody Ground’ (I.5), but B does not observe the enjambment, and so the music gives an interesting slant to the meaning: Iôle’s father ‘falls in Agony’ and was not ‘in Agony dying’.

---

5 G.F. Handel, *Joseph an Oratorio* [MS copy score of 1743], Gerald Coke Handel Collection, Foundling Museum, 2/D/JOSEPH.
as the poetry has it. The result is evocative, with the audience encouraged to visualize a man in anguished death throes.

*Joseph B* has an alternative word for Joseph’s description of Asenath in their first duet (I.7). Handel first wrote ‘Celestial Virgin heavnly maid!’ (H43 fols 26⁷-27⁷), but then substituted ‘charming’ for ‘heavnly’. B’s music for ‘heavnly’ suited the emendation, but ‘heavnly’ exists in neither C nor F. This may be an example of an early close reading of the libretto in *Joseph A*, once the duet was composed, perhaps to tone down any implication that the Egyptian Asenath was already Hebrew-like at this early juncture in the drama. As an ‘improvement’ it was consistent with the editorial treatment accorded to ‘Saviour of the World’ and a prior appearance of ‘God-like’ in Pharaoh’s reference to Joseph (I.4). Perhaps these verbal adjustments were made on the same occasion.

In *Hercules B* (I.1) Handel’s underlay contains snatches of text that did not survive into *Hercules F*. The composer entered the phrase ‘preserve the gallant Heroe’s Life’, but after checking this seems to have realised that, in contriving verbal interest through rearrangement of the syntax, he had involuntarily intruded ‘gallant’ (H44 fols 6⁷-7⁷). He then cancelled what now appears a misinscription. There is another instance in *Hercules B* where he supplied his own word (I.4; H44 fol. 33⁷). A redundant ‘it’, appended to ‘and spreads wide Ruin | round’, is not in F but neatly completes the phrase. The copyist faithfully reproduced the composer’s version (C44/1 fol. 58⁷). Handel’s version is idiomatic and makes better sense on first hearing.

*B* contains stage directions that seem to have served as essential aids to Handel’s imagination, encouraging his visualization of the implied action as he wrote the music. Underlay stage directions, however, do not wholly tally with those in F. Some appear only in the first wordbook and some only in B. *Hercules B* and C have ‘Exeunt’ at the end of the
chorus ‘Wanton God’ (H44 fol. 74r and C44/2 fols 46v-47r), a direction not in Hercules F (II.4). Perhaps the composer, intensely picturing the scene, involuntarily added an extraneous direction. It is not apparent who exits. (Wordbooks do not stipulate choral entrances and exits, but expediently cover this situation with a scene division.) Another variant stage direction appears in Hercules B and C (H44 fol. 54v and C44/2 fol. 15v) but not in Hercules F. Instead of the chance encounter between Dejanira and Lichas, Hercules F has Dejanira ‘going’, instead of ‘Dej= going out meets Lichas’ which is in Hercules B and C. The two manuscript scores thus give a mental picture of two characters crossing, as if one makes an exit as the other enters. The preservation of this intriguing stage direction in Hercules B shows that in A Broughton may have described the action to guide the composer’s musical response.

In spite of the haste in composition and copying, Handel’s handwriting is generally legible. B shows Handel to be overall a conscientious transcriber of verbal text. However, he left some errors which focus attention on the medium of transmission from authorial manuscript A to folio of B. The copying of whole phrases rather than individual words was plainly conducive to the making of mistakes. Burrows prefers the term ‘technical corrections’ to indicate ‘places where Handel had copied out the text wrongly or carelessly’ as evidence that ‘revisions to the oratorio’s text was not one-way traffic’ (Belshazzar, p. xi). It is not possible to determine what was ‘carelessness’ or attitudinal culpability rather than an excusable error, but examples in this Chapter show that Burrows is right to attribute some verbal corrections in the underlay of B to Handel. Corrections, lapses of memory, and the like, are what Harold Love calls ‘the vagaries of signification arising from scribal transmission’, and though they do not affect literary meaning they arouse curiosity for the way they influence
reception of the work. Correction required clear signs of cancellation and substitution to provide the copyist with an unambiguous state of the underlay for the next stage of textual transmission. Examples of ‘vagaries’ in Joseph B are ‘Ingratitudes’ (I.3), which Handel corrects by cancelling the unwitting plural (H43 fol. 9v); ‘in Plenty share’ (II.1) becomes ‘we Plenty share’ (H43 fol. 49v and H43/F fol. 27v); and he corrects ‘and’ (II.2) to ‘who’ (H43 fol. 66v) in ‘Who gnaw her’. Some misinscriptions, however, present a different reading from Joseph F, as can be seen in ‘of meagre Kind’ (I.4) appearing before correction to ‘Of meagre Kine’ (H43 fol. 14v). Other possible misinscriptions reveal the composer’s sensitivity to the rationality of what he wrote. In Joseph B, Handel corrected ‘ten’ brothers (II.4) to ‘twelve’ (H43 fol. 74v), perhaps because he first thought there were ten. The brothers at this point in the drama presume Joseph is dead, and Benjamin has yet to join them. Alternatively, it could be that ‘ten’ was Miller’s number in A, fitting the mise-en-scene, but ‘ten’ may subsequently have been adjusted to include all the brothers.

Handel may have discovered some misinscriptions when playing the music to Miller or Broughton, who may have pointed out those they recognized. Thomas Morell, librettist of Alexander Balus, a work written a few years after Hercules, records how Handel, during composition of the music, played from the score and requested alterations to the words. Morell witnessed Handel composing and editing the underlay as he went along, as already mentioned (Smith, ‘Letter’, pp. 217-18).

An illustration of how on rare occasions the physical constrictions of a folio impacted on composition and setting out of the underlay can be seen in the intrusion of music and words

---

into the right-hand margin. Handel, caught up in the impetus of composition and wishing for
some reason to complete his ideas without commencing a new page, continued composing,
regardless of the extra effort of drawing stave line extensions to complete the bar. An instance
of this in *Joseph* occurs in H43 fol. 15v in the chorus ‘O God of Joseph’ (1.4):

![Image of Handel's manuscript showing underlay anomalies.](image)

**Fig. 2.** *Joseph* (1.4). Underlay in the margin of B (H43 fols 15v-16v).
By permission of the British Library, R.M.20.e.8.

This example of what seems untidiness was in effect a consequence of the intensity of
composition and the need to maintain verbal sense for the copyist.

There are some interesting underlay anomalies in B preserved not in F but in the
underlays of the musical scores published by John Walsh shortly after the first performances.
Walsh sold volumes of *Joseph* and *Hercules* ‘in Score’ which contained the airs and duets,
though not the choruses and *secco* recitatives. The underlay in these scores therefore presented an incomplete version of the libretto: purchasers bought these scores for musical reasons and not to reconstruct the drama from the underlay. The main variant readings in Walsh’s scores were a contemporary though secondary means of textual transmission of the libretto, and are included in the apparatus to the editions in Chapter One. They are significant to this discussion because they point strongly to the possibility that Walsh derived his underlay from a working copy of the selected items held by Smith while the oratorio was in rehearsal. Smith, responsible for ensuring that the singers and instrumentalists received their parts, was the most reliable source of the latest performing version, and Walsh’s scores carry traces of Smith’s C in that they preserve some of Handel’s idiosyncratic spellings. *Joseph* (W44 II.7) follows C, not B, in omitting Handel’s full-stop (*Joseph* F has a semicolon) and in freely treating two lines in Benjamin’s air in *Joseph* F as run-on: ‘Thee therefore I would Father call but the Similitude of Face’ (C43/2 fol. 72v, and W44, p. 59). Walsh’s capitalization and punctuation mirror C exactly: ‘Thou deign’st to Call thy servant Son and o me thinks, my Lord I see with an amazing semblance shewn my Father’s Image stamp’d on thee’ (C43/2 fols 71v-71r and W44, p. 58). Smith’s knowledge of Handel’s last minute omission from the performing version of Dejanira’s curse ‘Cease, Ruler of the Day, to rise’ (*Hercules* II.6) must have enabled Walsh to produce a group of airs and duets that accurately reflected what was heard for the first time in 1745, whereas *Hercules* F does not. According to Dean, Handel cut the air after the wordbook was printed, and the air was never performed (p. 430).

---

3.3. Aspects of Handel’s mastery of English in the underlay.

The underlay in the composer’s autographs gives useful insights into Handel’s treatment of the English language. B shows the composer striving for consistency to provide an accurate underlay for his copyist. Copying from the author’s manuscript libretto A involved transfer of the author’s spelling, syntax, and word order in a mind perhaps simultaneously creating a musical representation of the sense. Handel’s hastiness when transcribing is revealed in the occasional lapse of spelling, a ‘lapse’ that is detectable because he corrected those he recognized when checking the underlay for linguistic coherence.

Without A there is no means of testing the ‘accuracy’ or consistency of authorial spelling and punctuation in comparison to B and C. In the illustrations that follow, notions of what constitutes a misinscription rest on the assumption that the composer’s underlay B closely mirrors A, and that fair copy score C reflects B. The few extant letters by Handel attest to the reliability of his formal literacy, which is a benchmark against which to measure some idiosyncratic spelling in the underlay. B contains many spelling irregularities that are probably signs of phonetic uncertainty. For example, there are four variations of ‘Hallelujah’ in Joseph B for the chorus which Handel adopted to conclude the oratorio (H43/DA fols 13-16); ‘Hallelujah’ is a word he would not have needed to transcribe. A similar kind of anomaly occurs when ‘weild’ appears with ‘wield’ in Dejanira’s air ‘Resign thy Club’ in Hercules B (II.5; H44 fol. 78v). However, his spelling sometimes assumed a more contemporary form than the formalized presentation found in F: he used ‘music’s’ instead of ‘Musick’s’ throughout the final chorus of Hercules Act 1 (H44 fols 43v-47v).
In *Hercules B* Handel noted a discrepancy between the spellings and his own transcriptions of ‘dreadfull’ and ‘banefull’. He inked-in the space between the double consonants, perhaps to accord with A:
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Fig. 3. *Hercules* (iii.3): Handel emends his spelling (H44 fol. 114r). By permission of the British Library, R.M.20.e.10.

Smith transmitted Handel’s original spelling into *Hercules C* (C44/3 fol. 35r). These emendations indicate the composer’s consciousness of spelling decorum and of the importance to him of the accuracy he achieved in B.

Handel’s checking the underlay for sense can be seen in Lichas’s air ‘He, who for Atlas’ (*Hercules* iii.5). He originally wrote ‘new-admitted Guest, with purple guest’, presumably spotted his mistake and so cancelled ‘guest’, substituting ‘Lips’ (H44 fol. 122r). He achieved uniform character cues by frequent correction of L<y>ichas, with the ‘i’ overwriting the ‘y’ (H44 fol. 28r), to give clearer direction to *Hercules C*. He checked the phrasing for sense, either at the time of first inscription or during oratorio rehearsals. Idiosyncratic spelling in the source text would have been standardized for F by compositors.

Mid-eighteenth century word-contractions operated as scansion devices in published poetry, but they posed problems in the underlay of B. For example, if a word was not to be
contracted, the composer supplied an additional note to cover the syllable. As B served as a source for C it presented the copyist with many examples of uncertainty over word-contraction and syllabication. It may be that A observed this convention while Handel thought and spelled more conversationally. Hercules F has examples of inconsistent contractions, giving ‘assembled’ (H44 fol. 124ır) and ‘combin’d’ (H44 fol. 128ır) in the final scene, words which in Hercules B Handel treated as two syllables, with an exception discussed below. In the chorus ‘Wanton God’ (Hercules ıı.4), Handel spelled ‘uncontrolled’ three different ways: ‘uncontrould’ (H44 fol. 71ır), ‘uncontroul’d’ (H44 fol. 72ır), and ‘uncontroll’d’ (H44 fol. 73ır). Hercules B also shows the composer encountering a problem when setting ‘Evening’ (ıı.6). The copy-text has ‘Evening’, the triplet of syllables helping to form a decasyllabic line. In Hercules B, ‘Ev’en’ing’ is set to four separate musical notes:

![Figure 4. Hercules: syllabication of ‘Ev’ning’. (ıı.6; H44 fol. 80ır). By permission of the British Library, R.M.20.e.10.]

The composer probably recognized the awkwardness of singing three syllables to four notes (which syllable was to receive two notes?), and reduced ‘Evening’ to its usual contracted spelling, a slimming arguably made on practical musical grounds. The copyist faithfully
reproduced the musical phrase in *Hercules C* but denoted unambiguously two syllables in the underlay.

*Hercules B* has an interesting example where someone, perhaps a singer, may have pointed to a small and unintended problem of articulation. The composer presumably copied ‘assembled’ from *A* but then allocated five notes to the word (iii.4; H44 fol. 124r), leaving Smith the problem of how many notes to allocate to each syllable in *C*. Later, Handel’s contraction of ‘ed’ in ‘approved’ gets two notes, while on the next leaf he wrote ‘removed’, not ‘remov’d’, as might be expected. The music allocates notes for the contracted form (H44 fol. 125r). These examples show how the composer’s, and perhaps the author’s, manner of contracting past tense verbs was inconsistent, indicating mixed formal and private orthographic conventions in the underlay.

Other corrections made by the composer in *Hercules B* indicate uncertainty over spellings and a reliance on phonetic spelling which, probably having compared it with *A*, he corrected. With ‘glittering’ entered on the page (1.6; H44 fol. 40r), Handel must have checked *A* for the authorial number of syllables against those he had provided in the music. He may then have made his underlay word conform to *A*, for the copy-text has ‘glittring’. These departures in *B* from *F*, usefully demonstrate the operative orthographic conventions of the time and confirm that the hurried transcription of the word underlay had its own codes and standards, with spellings and expression that were much freer in form than the public copy-text.

Transcriptional errors of the kind discussed fuel an impression of Handel’s lack of mastery of English. Criticism of Handel’s facility, made long after the composer’s death by Charles Burney, raises the possibility that *B* exhibits improvements to the euphonious
properties of the libretto. Roger Lonsdale writes that Burney coached the singers Giulia Frasi and Gaetano Guadagni when they sang under contract to Handel sometime in 1749-50. This teaching role brought Burney ‘into contact with the great composer himself, “who used to bring an Air, or Duet, hot from the brain, in order to give me the time & style, that I might communicate them to my scholar”’.8 Burney registers injured pride at his treatment as a kind of factotum, commenting that the composer gave inadequate musical directions for the singers. The underlay in B is eloquent testimony to the composer’s ease with the language, and contradicts Burney’s protest. On the evidence of the underlay, Handel’s language never sank into incoherence. Some variant spellings, however, amusingly show that Handel’s hold on his adopted language occasionally slipped. Hercules B has ‘length’ rendered as ‘lenght’ (H44 fol. 11r), an anomaly the German born Smith carried into C (C44/1 fol. 19r). The reversal of consonants encodes a Germanic pronunciation.

Smith mostly carried forward variant spellings from B unaltered into C, but sometimes he corrected the composer’s spellings and punctuation. Perhaps years of scribal duties for Handel inured him to encounters with the composer’s orthography. However, like the composer in B, Smith exhibits in C instances of uncertain written English, as can be seen in Joseph (I.2), where the composer’s ‘meritt’s’ (H43 fol. 9r) becomes ‘merit’s’ in C (C43/1 fol. 19r). (The editions in Chapter One record these differences in punctuation from B, which can be identified by their context as mistakes.) A strange spelling of ‘forget Tale’ (C44 fol. 11r) in Hercules (II.2), instead of ‘forged Tale’, is peculiar to C, the unvoiced ‘d’ being transliterated phonetically as a Germanic ‘t’ sound. However, the copyist was more alert when the composer wrote ‘uncomittett’ instead of ‘uncommitted’ in Joseph (II.6):

Joseph C has the conventional spelling. The diacritic above the single ‘m’ indicates that Handel was aware of the double ‘m’ spelling, which Smith, in this instance, interpreted and then provided the double consonant and correct spelling in C.

Burney’s disparagement of Handel’s ‘erroneous pronunciation’ of English (History, II, 505) was probably exaggerated, for in spite of its numerous and fascinating inconsistencies, the underlay B confirms Burrows’s judgment that the caricature ‘Germanized voice’ ascribed to Handel ‘need perhaps not be taken too literally’ (Handel, p. 376).

3.4. Handel’s underlay revisions.

Handel checked verbal sense in the underlay against musical notation, a procedure which is evident in several places. He corrected inadvertent omissions generally in superscript. Sometimes the correction is applied after the music, an example of which is in Hercules B at Iōle’s verse, ‘How blest the Maid’ (II.1), which shows that Handel probably scanned the
underlay against the number of notes and, finding ‘Swains’ missing, entered it in superscript within the upper stave:

Fig. 6. Hercules (II.1): ‘Swains’ added superscript (H44 fol. 49v). By permission of the British Library, R.M.20.e.10.

Fortuitously there was room for this correction, but where there was insufficient room above the stave Handel corrected the underlay in subscript. Figure 7 shows this. ‘Sweetness’ is missing from the line, ‘Join’d to such Sweetness, Dignity, and Virtue’ in Joseph B (I.8), though the music provides for it (an example that perhaps shows he may not always have written recitative underlay before applying the music):

Fig. 7. Joseph (I.8): ‘Sweetness’ entered subscript (H43 fol. 32v). By permission of the British Library, R.M.20.e.8.
Handel’s punctuation displays a mixture of practical signs of pause and the strict transcription of poetical phrases. In the multiple verbal repetitions, a comma signified a pause between phrases, some phrase orders being reversed. Dashes in B were an organic part of the compositional procedure and formed part of Handel’s grammatical system, their operation in the underlay holding meaning intended only for himself, the copyist, and musicians. Most dashes in B indicate visual hiatuses, during which the music takes up more room on the stave than the written word it describes. These dashes mark suspension of a syllable over a musical phrase, and have no literary significance. Handel’s punctuation in these circumstances reflects its rhetorical function in musical composition, where the prosody in the underlay obeys musical necessity. The flourished dash-lengths, characteristic of F, are not applied uniformly in B. However, when several short dashes appear in B they suggest that the author may have used them in A. The underlay offers many examples of these dashes, but of particular interest is the sole example of triple dashes in Joseph B. The three dashes signify an attempt by Joseph to hide his vulnerability from his brothers. Perhaps Miller wrote Joseph A conscious of the layout a printer would eventually need. In F Joseph excuses himself in an aside, and then addresses his servants: ‘by your Leave ---- [To Servants.] Attend, prepare’:

![Fig. 8. Joseph (II.7): Handel uses triple dashed punctuation (H43 fol. 89').](image)

By permission of the British Library, R.M.20.e.8.
It is a mystery why ‘attendents’ in B became ‘Servants’ in F.

When Handel repeated verbal phrases in airs and ensembles, he frequently elided full stops. To point the reading of the verbal text he preferred either a system of commas or no punctuation at all, as when he left clauses unstopped, e.g. Hercules F has ‘tortur’d Ear, my’ (Iii.3) and Hercules B ‘tortur’d ear my’ (H44 fols 114v-115v). As B is a draft document, Handel had no need to maintain consistent forms of punctuation and spelling; his forms often follow a phonetic reading rather than that which he may have read in A. For instance, when hurriedly transcribing ‘prov’d’, as the word appears in Hercules F, he wrote ‘proved’, but set it appropriately as one syllable (H44 fol. 80r). When Handel inserted commas in the verbal underlay, he probably did so from habit: he had many years’ experience of transcribing poetry and adapting its carefully crafted phrasing into segments of musical ‘prose’.

Many of Handel’s corrections in his underlay were made to achieve greater euphony. Burney, writing at the end of the eighteenth century but with opinions informed by working with Handel, urged composers to spot awkward clashes between words and consonants. He drew the attention of librettists to the ugly sounds produced by consonantal clusters: for example, bunched sounds in phrases that a singer found difficult to make distinct for the hearer (History, II, 505). Amanda Holden, librettist and translator of librettos for English National Opera, has explained that today there are few ground rules to guide librettists and so, when translating, she relies on her ‘ear’ to avoid awkward consonantal clusters, and for a performance of Hercules in 2005, singer Buddug Verona James confessed to substituting
‘daring’ for ‘advent’rous’ (I.2) because she found Broughton’s word uncomfortable to sing.\(^9\)

Handel’s corrections may have been designed to pre-empt the perplexity of Italian singers and assist their coaches, such as Burney.

A prime example of an ugly consonantal cluster occurs in *Joseph B* (H43 fol. 15\(^v\)) at the point when Joseph becomes first minister of Egypt and dutifully acknowledges God’s agency at his elevation, ‘These are thy Workings, Infinite Jehovah!’ (I.4). B indicates some indecision on Handel’s part. ‘Workings’, also found in *Joseph F*, was the word first written out in B. The composer then deleted this and substituted ‘Doings’, perhaps to remove the harsh plosive. The oddly prosaic ‘Doings’ was then cancelled and Handel reinstated ‘Workings’. Perhaps Miller (or someone else) convinced the composer that the original word was preferable.

The composer adjusted verbal phrases in *Joseph B* (I.4) to avoid unsympathetic clashes of consonants:

---

\(^9\) This information comes from Amanda Holden and Buddug Verona James in a private communication.
Handel cancelled ‘stick’ in ‘mystick’ in the bass line and substituted ‘reveal’, deftly converting ‘my’ into ‘may’. Annulment of ‘the’ in the alto line, with ‘reveal’ substituted, suggests that verbal principles were integral to his musical composition. With word-phrases in mind, Handel composed clear sounds in direct expression and meaning in the choral counterpoint. His checking of B to ensure no clashes occurred between words sung against parallel lines of verse shows assiduous attention to the verbal component of oratorio. The first version in Joseph B in Fig. 9 has ‘-veal’ sound simultaneously against ‘-stick’. The correction shows further conscious striving for a smoother sound.

Joseph B exhibits a verbal phrasing which is notably more even in flow than that found in Joseph F. B and Joseph C have ‘let every one go forth’ (H43 fol. 117v; C43/3 fol. 36v), while F has ‘Let ev’ry Man depart’ (III.5), as Joseph clears the room to ensure that his kinship to his brothers is revealed privately to them. The composer’s sensitive ear for euphony is displayed in his phrase’s longer vowels and the removal of two plosive segments involving oral stops, ‘d’ and ‘p’, in ‘depart’, an example further belying Burney’s claim that Handel was insensitive to English.

However, sometimes A may have proved too demanding even for Handel to make the words clear-sounding. Joseph F has three instances of ugly consonantal clusters. There are three sets of close sibilant segments in ‘to Strangers sold’ (II.3), juxtaposed dentals and fricatives in ‘Whilst from the richest Viands’ (II.1), and complexity of contending sounds in ‘Whilst from her Pinnacle proud Vice is hurl’d’ (III.6). Perhaps because of their unattractiveness, Handel chose not to set to music any of these three examples, and they do not therefore appear in B and C.
Two further examples show the composer’s editing of verbal material to achieve more agreeable sounds. *Hercules* F has Lichas rejoicing at Dejanira’s positive attitude change: ‘How soon is deepest Grief exchang’d for Bliss!’ (I.3), though *Hercules* B (H44 fol. 28r) and *Hercules* C offer ‘Joy’ instead of ‘Bliss’, thereby eliminating the noisy sibilant digraph ‘ss’. The copyist in C did not manage his usual faithful version in the composer’s score because he, perhaps inadvertently, intruded his own preposition, ‘in Bliss’ (C44/1 fol. 44v). A further variant may result from a euphemism as much as elimination of sibilance: *Hercules* F has Hyllus politely but firmly asking Iöle to ‘Forgive a Weakness’ (II.4). *Hercules* B is much more direct: ‘Forgive a Passion’ (H44 fol. 68r), i.e. Hyllus seeks formal but insincere pardon for loss of control, placing the blame on Iöle. ‘Passion’ is also in *Hercules* C (C44/2 fol. 34v). Perhaps *Hercules* A had ‘Passion’, the author’s second thought appearing in F.

3.5. Revisions in Handel’s underlay and the fair copy not in the copy-text.

The composer’s autograph scores and the fair copies contain literary material that does not appear in the first wordbooks. In some instances, this material, as first entered in the underlay, remains legible beneath cancellation marks. Though Handel’s initial approval of this material may be inferred from his inclusion of it in B and Smith’s copying it into C, its omission from F neither hinders narrative flow nor impairs characterization in the composite work. Nevertheless, this material, considered as textual events in the transmission of the libretto, has largely been ignored in scholarly literature on the oratorios.

There are two kinds of remnant verse in B. There is underlay that was not set to music and there is underlay that was set to music but later cancelled. B also includes stage directions not in F. While the amount involved is small, some verse in B has yet to be published, and it is
significant for the glimpses it allows into Handel’s aesthetic priorities over those of his
librettists. Dean (pp. 412-13, 433) and Burrows and Ronish (e.g., p. 121) record amendments
to what Burrows and Ronish term the ‘original text’, but none of these authors, or any
scholarly music edition of Handel’s oratorios, gives a full record of vestigial verbal material of
the kind that can be found in the apparatus to the editions in Chapter One above. Existence of
this remnant material complicates any attempt at a simple historicist interpretation that
transmission of the author’s libretto from A was a process of smooth dissemination: the
bibliographical reality is more complex.

*Joseph* displays an oddity in the dialogue between Phanor and Asenath about Joseph’s
fluctuating moods. *Joseph* F reads coherently enough: ‘Yet something seems of late to bear
upon him, | And cloud his wonted Smile’ (II.1). *Joseph* B and *Joseph* C, however, have
‘Shine’ instead of ‘Smile’ (H43 fol. 61r; C43/2 fol. 33r). ‘Shine’ is too disparate from Miller’s
published word in *Joseph* F feasibly to be regarded as unintentional substitution. Perhaps
‘Shine’ survived from *Joseph* A into the underlay in B and C, Miller deciding later to change
it to ‘Smile’ in *Joseph* F. In context, ‘Smile’ is a metaphor directly suggestive of Joseph’s
physical reaction to popular acclaim, whereas ‘Shine’ subtly suggests superficial sheen
glossing private personal tensions.

There is a variant in the underlays of *Joseph* B and C which presents the first version
as an altogether more graphic descriptor of the privations of Jacob’s people. This is ‘Mire’
(H43 fol. 86r; C43/2 fol. 75r), whereas *Joseph* F has ‘Drought’ (II.7) in an image satisfactorily
extended:
Our Fields lie desolate, and cover’d o’er
With naught but Horror, Barrenness and Drought,
Menacing the distress’d Inhabitant

‘Mire’ is more congenial for singer and hearers than the harsh phonological segments in ‘Drought’, but unfortunately ‘Mire’ conjures a contradictory representation of moistened mud amidst aridity. Though ‘Mire’ conveys the further connotation of a physical obstacle to agrarian labour, the incongruent suggestion of dampness may have helped ‘Drought’ prevail. Yet it is possible that ‘Mire’ was the word in A, which Handel correctly transferred to B and the copyist into C, and which was later changed to ‘Drought’ as a result of second-thought intervention, presumably by Miller, for F. Presumably, ‘Mire’ was the word audiences heard.

Joseph B and C have phrasing which differs from Joseph F. The underlay has ‘our good old Father sues to thee for Pity’ (H43 fol. 86r; C43/2 fol. 76r), while the copy-text has ‘Our good old Father sues for Pity from thee’ (II.7). The more conversational style in the underlays raises the possibility that B and C followed A, which was revised by Miller for F.

Sometimes the composer appears keenly sensitive to contextual sense, so that what appears in F as a ‘correction’ of B was not necessarily an error in the first instance. When Handel wrote ‘relict’ instead of ‘Relick’ in Joseph B (III.5; H43 fol. 115r) and C followed this (C43/3 fol. 36r), the composer’s reading, and possibly that of A, is justifiable, because the sense of ‘Relict’ meant not only widowhood but also ‘left behind’, so that B and C convey both connotations. Though this and other possible misinscriptions may not impair readings of the work or confuse hearers receiving the oratorio in performance, they are nevertheless heartening signs of human frailty in the literary workings of a great musical mind.
When composing, Handel exercised what Love describes as ‘autonomous aesthetic preference’ in B and, by extension, also in C (p. 31). With regard to their libretto in F, Miller and Broughton must have dealt directly with the bookseller, a distinction of importance because it demonstrates what Love labels the ‘scholarly lines of demarcation’ between the activities of composer, authors, and copyist (p. 8). However, demarcation is not always clear-cut in the underlay. There is no proof of who insisted on substitution of words or phrases in Handel’s autograph. Though substitutions are in Handel’s hand, the composer may have been acting under agreement with another party, the author or printer. An instance of indeterminate authority is in Hercules F (II.5), and occurred perhaps at the stage of publication. Both B and C offer ‘thank the God for the Success’ (H44 fol. 79v, C44/2 fol. 56v), but F has ‘thank the Pow’r for the Success’. The reading in F avoids impiety arising from unwitting confusion of Jupiter with the Judeo-Christian God. Confirming this interpretation is another word-replacement with uncertain authority in Hercules: B and C refer to ‘the Will of Jove’ (H44 fol. 124r, C44/3 fol. 46v) in contradistinction to F, which has ‘the Mind of Jove’ (III.5). ‘Mind’ was probably an authorial replacement. Broughton may have adjusted the text later than C, having spotted his endowment of Jupiter with Christian God-like omniscient reason.

Music subjected words in lyric verse to multiple repetitions, as has already been mentioned, but the verse itself contains rare examples of repetition. This repetition points to authorial clumsiness in matters of diction, and because it added nothing to the meaning was vulnerable to editing by the composer. Pharaoh’s Part I air in Joseph F has tautological lines: ‘Ne’er was so much Wisdom found, | With such matchless Wisdom crown’d’ (I.8). Both Joseph B and C present ‘matchless beauty’ (H43 fol. 34r and C43/1 fol. 69v), while, interestingly, both J47 and J57 present ‘matchless Lustre’. The disparity displayed between
sources over ‘Beauty’, ‘Wisdom’, and ‘Lustre’ acknowledges some unease about the awkward effect of two wisdsms in such close proximity. It could be that Miller’s word in Joseph A was ‘Wisdom’, which he preserved in Joseph F, and that ‘Lustre’ was the composer’s preference, imposed after Miller’s death.

*Hercules* offers fewer examples of lexical discrepancies, but there is an instance where the composer, or author, avoided uncomfortable repetition, not in the verse but in the musical rendering of it. Iöle’s air ‘My Father!’ (i.5) uses the descriptor for the Oechalian battlefield as the ‘bloody Ground’ in *Hercules* B and C (H44 fols 38r-v; C44/1 fols 67r-v). *Hercules* F, however, has the more tastefully epic ‘crimson Ground’. The first instance of ‘Bloody’ is treated to many repetitions in the music, but the decorous epithet in *Hercules* F suggests a sober afterthought. *Joseph* B has ‘flattring Hope’ (H43 fol. 81r), as has C, which became ‘kindly Hope’ (ii.6) in Joseph F. In the next scene, *Joseph* B (H43 fol. 85v) and C have the simple, idiomatic ‘has’ which Miller published as the antique ‘hath’ (ii.7). Later in *Hercules* B (ii.2), a verbal alteration moderates a character relationship. Dejanira’s taunt of Iöle, ‘thou know’st not then, the force of thy own Charms’ (H44 fol. 50v) becomes ‘You know not, then, | The force of your own Charms’ in F. A pasted white slip obscures this passage in *Hercules* C (C43/2 fol. 7v). Broughton’s inconsistent usage in *Hercules* F of the heroic address ‘thee’ and ‘thy’, suggests that A also had the familiar ‘You’ for informal address, though why Handel changed it in this instance is not known.

A deletion in *Hercules* B further shows the composer’s acute awareness of verbal padding, and suggests some confusion over the concluding verse for the oratorio. Ideas overlap in the final scene. The Priest of Jupiter consoles the grieving Dejanira by enlarging the
honours accorded the hero and announces to the Trachinians Hercules’s happy fate (verse layout is editorial; deleted text is in italics):

Princess, rejoice, whose Heav’n-directed Hand
Has rais’d Alcides to the Court of Jove!
_to share th’Ambrosial Banquet of the Gods._
(H44 fol. 121v)

The copyist included the line in _Hercules C_, after which it was cancelled in both scores. In _Hercules F_, after the priest’s declaration, Lichas elatedly describes Hercules’s apotheosis. He tells the Trachinians that their hero is a ‘new-admitted Guest’ among ‘kindred Gods’ and shares in the ‘Ambrosial Feast’, phrases that get many repetitions in the musical setting, which had a bearing on which phrase was privileged. This second instance renders redundant the earlier reference to the ‘Ambrosial Banquet’ (_C_ has ‘Banquets’: C44/3 fol. 45v). The composer, or Broughton, probably became aware of the repetition and cut the line to strengthen the uplifting effect of Lichas’s elation after the gloom of Hercules’s death throes and Dejanira’s moral-mental distraction.

There are some variant stage directions, mostly minor in nature, but one rejected direction reveals a possible loss from _Joseph A_ of a vivid dramatic effect interlineated in _Joseph_ almost as an afterthought. _Joseph B_ has the odd instruction at the climax of the drama (III.5), ‘Ramsey rise them’ (H43 fol. 117v). This phrase has no music, so it seems either an instruction to Phanor from Joseph that was not set to music for some reason or it was a stage direction for Phanor to raise the brothers from their knees after Joseph says “Arise”. The strange phrase also appears in _Joseph C_, though the copyist, while preserving the grammatical solecism, corrects ‘Ramsey’ to ‘Phanor’ (C43/3 fol. 40v). It is reasonable to suggest, that
because Handel provided no music for it, this phrase should have read ‘Phanor raises them’, a
direction inessential to the oratorio but which nonetheless suggests that A guided the
composer’s perception of the *mise-en-scène*. After completion of the underlay and music for
*Hercules* B and C Handel changed the order of items in the opening scene. *Hercules* B and C
begin with Dejanira’s longing apostrophe to her absent husband, ‘O Hercules!’; and then
follow this with Lichas’s commentary, ‘See, with what sad Dejection’. *Hercules* F reverses
this order, beginning the oratorio with Lichas’s commentary.

Intriguing details in the underlay let the reader into the working environment of
composer and copyist. For example, Handel drew a manicule, or marginal hand, of three-
fingers (H44 fol. 28r) to alert his copyist to a change in the sequence of recitatives and airs in
*Hercules* B: ‘segue Aria of Lichas the smiling Hours [printed]’ (I.3).10 In *Joseph* (III.3) he used a
Latin sign for omission of a repeated consonant, as in the dash above the ‘m’ in ‘comand’
(H43 fol. 114v), which the copyist duly transferred into *Joseph* C (C43/3 fol. 36f).

### 3.6. Verbal material in Handel’s underlay not in the fair copy or the copy-text.

The underlay in B records the interface between musical conventions and poetic text. It
contains the libretto-in-draft as it underwent Handel’s corrections, cuts, and cancellations, and
is therefore a source invaluable for being the closest to A that it is now possible to get. It
shows that the libretto for *Joseph* and for *Hercules* was perhaps more expansive than survives
in B and later sources. B has text that is not in C and F. C has text that is not in B and F. F has
text that is not in B and C. The chief manuscript source B deserves bibliographical attention

---

10 For manicule as a term for the marginal hand or annotation of index, see William Sherman, ‘Toward a History
because of the deletions and emendations of verbal text it contains, Handel’s editing of the underlay being a key stage in the textual transmission of both librettos. The literary changes in **B** are traces of the composer’s critical stance towards the librettos at the time when he created both oratorios.

When Handel judged that a libretto required shortening, he cut it before composing the music and also afterwards. His correspondence with Charles Jennens concerning the libretto for the oratorio *Belshazzar* included a letter written on 19 July 1744 in which Handel thanked Jennens for the ‘great Pleasure’ given him by the first Act of *Belshazzar*, adding his desire ‘to have the following Acts short’ (*HHb* IV, 377). On 2 October 1744, Handel wrote again to Jennens, preparing him for a knock to his pride. The libretto of *Belshazzar* ‘is realy too long, if I should extend the Musick, it would last 4 Hours and more. I retrench’d already a great deal of the Musick, that I might preserve the Poetry as much as I could, yet still it must be shortned’ (*HHb* IV, 379). In an act of literary defiance of the composer, Jennens published his *Belshazzar* in 1745 as a freestanding literary work which, with its character cues and musical descriptors (e.g. Air), demonstrated that Handel had not set one-third of it to music.

*Belshazzar* in its first published state **F** is therefore a useful guide to the savage cuts the composer was prepared to administer to a libretto. Miller and Broughton did not publish their librettos independently, most likely because they did not have the financial means of the wealthy Jennens.

Yet there is extant in **B** verse which never survived to be copied into **C** or published in **F**. This verse has yet to be published. Discarded during composition of the music, unique therefore to **B**, this verse shows the composer impressing his conception of the oratorio on the libretto in its manuscript state **A**. The cuts generally intensify the drama without detriment to
the sense, tightening the action. A prime example of this retrenchment can be seen in Hercules B when the hero lists his labours on his first appearance (I.5). The excised lines present a vignette of the war-weary warrior recounting with hubristic arrogance his epic experience to the Trachinians (verse layout is editorial; cancelled text is in italics):

With Pleasure, now,  
At rest, my various Labours I review.  
[illegible words] Lion’s sinew force subdu’d, 
the sprouting Hydra’s still-recruited Life extinguish’d, 
triple-headed Cerberus drag’d up to Light —  
and countless Toils of Arms —  
Oechalia’s Fall is added to my Titles,  
And points the rising Summit of my Glory.  
(H44 fol. 36v-37v)

The composer wrote the words into Hercules B, but then cancelled the lines italicized above before supplying music:

Fig. 10. Hercules I.5: example of cancelled verbal material found only in B and without music (H44 fol. 37v).  
By permission of the British Library, R.M.20.e.10.

Examination of the context offers a reason why the composer, or Broughton, cut these lines.

The truncated verse stamps Hercules with the flaw of being a braggart, setting up his overweening pride for its inescapable nemesis in Act III. If the composer instigated the cancellation, he probably wished to speed to Hercules’s introductory lyric verse, in which the
hero equates himself with a god. The removal of the account of the Labours, however, excises a neat touch of ironic humour as the warrior triumphantly brags to his wife before greeting her. Broughton here was including a device from Euripides’s *Heracles*, which has a lengthy choral ode describing the hero’s labours, though Broughton’s catalogue, in the surviving lines, was clearly much briefer (*Heracles*, lines 359-407). The composer cropped the blank verse narrative at this point, relying instead on the bombast in the succeeding lyric verse to establish Hercules’s lumpen military nature, ‘The God of Battles’. By this pruning, Handel threw prominence on the decision by Hercules to quit warfare and abandon his weapons at the very moment when he needs to be on his guard against his wife’s insidious insinuations.

One example of expunged verse in B supports the notion of a scene designed to evoke a picture of movement. *Joseph* (II.4) in F has ‘Exit’ to signify that Simeon leaves the action, but *Joseph* B has a brief extension at this point that particularizes Joseph’s conflicting emotions as he summarily dismisses the tarrying Simeon (the verse layout of Joseph’s speech is editorial):

[Simeon:]  
*Tho’ treach’rous Hearts from mortal Sight  
May veil a while  
Their impious Guile,  
Heav’n sees, and brings dark Deeds to Light.*  
[Exit.

Joseph  
Begone – away – thou’rt baneful to my Eye,  
thy Crimes go with thee (Aside (Tears betray me now Exit Simeon

Having set the words to music, Handel cancelled them:
A reason for the composer’s action may lie in the mise-en-scene of the deleted words. Joseph’s recriminatory, ‘thy Crimes go with thee’, requires vocal venom, possibly a shout, appropriate to spoken theatre, whereas music, with its emphasis on tunefulness, cannot recreate the effect with similar and decorous force. This deleted scene has Joseph bursting in on Simeon to scold and hector him and Joseph then breaking down in self-pity. Dean upbraids Miller for ineptitude over this deletion. He praises Handel for recognizing the scene’s clumsiness: ‘The absurdity of Simeon admitting his “foul offence” in front of Joseph evidently occurred to Handel but not to Miller’ (pp. 412-13). Dean chooses to ignore the fact that oratorio has its own conventions and is not staged drama. What he sees as an authorial dramatic blunder is explicable: in effect, Joseph ‘re-enters’ after Simeon completes his air. They both inhabit a private world of dissimulation, distracted from fully conscious explanation. The whole cameo is imaginary and not enacted; it can therefore transcend stage convention. Miller’s dramatic perception deserves preservation in future scholarly editions of the music.

*Hercules* B presents an interesting emphasis that appears in neither C nor F. The First Trachinian appeals for the protection of Hercules (i.1; editorial layout; H44 fols 6v-7r):
On great Alcides, Jove, look down!
Preserve the gallant Heroe’s Life!

which becomes in *Hercules* C and is presented in F as:

*No longer, Fate, relentless frown!*
*Preserve, Great Jove, the Heroe’s Life!*

*Hercules* B directs attention to the hero and, by the double reference to him as ‘Alcides’ and ‘gallant Heroe’, neatly emphasizes his absence from Dejanira. *Hercules* F, though, removes this focus from Hercules and places it instead on Fate and Jove, which is a seemly relocation because it removes an awkward introduction of Hercules by one of his Greek names.

Later in *Hercules* (II.6), the distracted Dejanira schemes to win back the affection of her husband by making the robe of Nessus the means of reviving his love for her, when fortuitously Iōle enters and becomes an accessory to Dejanira’s plan. She determines to manipulate Iōle, the object of her hate, to help her regain Hercules’s love. Handel’s underlay cancellation strengthens the drama by abbreviating what is in effect dispensable exposition, for in the following scene Dejanira acknowledges her intention to dissemble (H44 fol. 84r). The force of the ideas of ‘will’, ‘prove’ and ‘see’ sufficiently clarify Dejanira’s sudden decisiveness. The robe of Nessus, she tells us (cancelled verse layout is editorial and in italics):

...boasts a wond’rous Virtue to revive
Th’ expiring Flame of Love — So Nessus told me,
When dying to my Hand he trusted it —
I will prevail with Hercules to wear it,
And prove its magic Force — till then be still, my Jealous Fears,
and let my tongue dissemble, the torture of my heart.
the Princess Iōle — And, see, the Herald!
Fit Instrument to execute my Purpose!
Dejanira’s wily malice sucks the unwitting Iōle into her design. Her monologue strikingly evokes a sense of wary movement, as Dejanira addresses the audience in an aside. Iōle enters the scene at the very moment Dejanira determines to dissemble. The composer, or perhaps Broughton, realized the dramatic tautology before the deleted verse was copied into *Hercules C*.

The final recitative of *Hercules*, sung by the Priest of Jupiter (III.5), has a deleted line in *Hercules B* that is barely legible (cancelled verse layout is editorial and in italics):

> Ye Sons of Freedom, now, in ev’ry Clime,
> With joyful Accents sing the deathless Chief,
> *By Virtue [rais’d] with kindred gods [?to dwell.]*
> By Virtue to the starry Mansions rais’d.
> (H44 fol. 128v.)

Deletion here demonstrates the composer’s dislike of periphrasis. The statement that gods inhabit heaven (‘the Sky’) is expendable because it is redundant expansion. Broughton presumably intended repetition of ‘Virtue’ to be the pivot of his moral scheme, an assumption based on the same priest’s proffering of similar information earlier in the scene, ‘There with assembled Deities to dwell’, a repetition of ideas which presumably prompted the cut. This is another instance of the composer’s desire to clip the dialogue to the minimum required to make sense.

*Hercules B* (III.5) has a line for the Priest of Jupiter (in italics) that was deleted before Smith copied out the scene in *Hercules C* (H44 fol. 121v.):
“His Mortal Part by eating Fires consum’d,
“His Part immortal to Olympus borne,
to join the bright Assembly of the Sky
“There with assembled Deities to dwell.

The phrase ‘assembled Deities’ duplicates the idea of the gods gathering in ‘bright Assembly of the Sky’, hence Handel’s cancellation of the superfluous line.

Examples of the composer’s, perhaps unwitting, re-wording occur in both underlay librettos. *Joseph B* offers the mundane ‘of more than half Mankind’ (H43 fol. 118’), whereas *Joseph F* has ‘Of half Mankind’ (III.5), Handel’s version being an interesting example of extra-authorial intrusion that was never transferred to C. Handel’s variants give the impression that the composer’s editorial involvement in the libretto at stage B was eminently practical.

3.7. **Verbal material in the fair copy not in Handel’s underlay or the copy-text.**

The prime purpose of fair copy score C was to provide an exemplum from which scribes wrote out instrumental and choral parts and to make available a full score from which Handel directed rehearsals and performances. Burney shows that Handel performed from Smith’s copy C, or one derived from it, and did not direct rehearsals or performances from B (*History*, II, 505). C has amendments to the underlay that accommodate new singers and incorporate cuts for revivals of the oratorio. It is a record of airs and choruses intercalated from other works, with words sometimes altered to suit their new literary context. In order for Handel and scribes to gain clean copy, C takes up more folios than B. Smith’s underlay is always legible, which means that the distribution of words and syllables under musical roulades and under words allocated dense choral counterpoint receive a consistent, though not entirely unblemished, clarity.
Writing out a fair copy score involved elucidating Handel’s intentions from his many variants in B. The decision to replace the name Ramse in *Joseph B* with Phanor is observed in *Joseph C*. In *Hercules C* the copyist corrected the composer’s ‘hand and hand’ (H44 fol. 90\(^\circ\)) in the choral entries to ‘hand in hand’ (II.8; C44/2 fol. 80\(^\circ\)), demonstrating Smith’s authority to emend errors.

Another example shows Smith explicating what the composer provided in B. A superscript emendation within the musical stave in *Joseph B*, too scarred to give a clear reading, is made distinct in *Joseph C*, showing that the composer changed his mind more than once when composing *Joseph III.4-5*. At the point in B when Joseph adopts feigned anger at the brothers’ continued presence in Egypt, Handel first cut Joseph’s expostulation ‘Ye Insolent, away!’ but relented, placing the restored underlay within the stave, leaving its text difficult to discriminate:

![Image](image)

Fig. 12. *Joseph* (III.4-5): underlay in B (H43 fol. 114\(^\circ\)).
By permission of the British Library, R.M.20.e.8.

*Joseph C* duly presented this section in a neat hand, though misinterpreting ‘insolent’; perhaps Smith asked the composer for clarification of the emended and barely legible words, having guessed them, and then corrected C after his enquiry:
The copyist added brackets to distinguish the stage direction from its surroundings. The paired examples above (not reproduced to the same scale) show Smith’s roomier layout in *Joseph C*.

Speedy copying prevented complete accuracy in the underlay of *C*. Sometimes *C* follows *B* in perpetrating errors. *Hercules B* has ‘stips’ (H44 fol. 67v) for ‘Steps’ (II.4), but ‘stips’ was nevertheless neatly copied into *Hercules C* (C44/2 34v). Later in *Hercules B*, Handel’s apparently faulty reading ‘Stygians pains’ (III.2; H44 fol. 106v) appears in all repetitions until the final occurrence, when the composer corrected the sense by cancelling the ‘s’ on ‘Stygians’ (H44 fol. 107v). *Hercules C* repeated the anomaly, sometimes rectified it, (C44/3 fol. 21v), but presented the word accurately at its final appearance (C44/3 fol. 23v).

Attention to verbal detail also lapsed in the final chorus, ‘To Him your grateful Notes’. Handel wrote ‘grateful’ on first appearance (H44 fol. 129v) but ‘grateful’ thereafter. *Hercules C* has ‘grateful’ throughout the piece (C44/3 fol. 59v).
In the heat of transcribing, the copyist, like Handel, sometimes misread words. *Hercules* B and F have ‘Lest’ in ‘Fly from my Sight, detested Sorc’ress, fly, | Lest my ungovern’d Fury rush upon thee’ (III.4). The copyist, however, wrote ‘less’ (C44/3 fol. 41v), making nonsense of the phrase. Infrequently there is no apparent reason for a word in C that does not appear in B and F. Iöle’s reference to a wall as ‘huge’ in *Hercules* B and F (I.4) is unaccountably ‘vast’ in C (C44/1 fol. 58v), and ‘Behold thy Bride’ in *Joseph* F (I.7) is ‘Behold the Bride’ (C43/1 fol. 51v) in *Joseph* C. *Joseph* B and F have Joseph weeping that ‘Anguish and Joy Jointly demand my Tears’ (II.5), while the copyist substituted ‘Command’ for ‘Demand’ (C43/2 fol. 74ar), though without injury to the sense. Dejanira’s gush of joy in ‘And rising Transport swell my Soul’ (I.3) becomes impersonal in *Hercules* C where ‘thy’ replaced the personal pronoun, a form of address seemingly directed at whoever is left ‘on stage’ (C44/1 fol. 43v). Dejanira’s sardonic entreaty to Hercules (I.6) to return to domestic life names in ‘the glittering Spear and Shield’ the symbols of wars he must forego. *Hercules* C refracts this to ‘the glittering Spear the Shield’ (C44/1 fol. 70v). Another prominent example of verbal confusion not found in any source other than *Hercules* C occurs in Dejanira’s air ‘Cease, Ruler of the Day’ (II.6), which has the jumbled phrasing ‘with endless night his endless night falshood seal’ (C44/2 fol. 58v). These instances of mangled syntax suggest a rush towards prompt distribution of parts, copied from C, for rehearsals. It is not known which version of the words was performed.

In *Joseph* C (C43/3 fols 7r and 9v) Smith inconsistently applied exclamation marks in the repetitions of Asenath’s air ‘Ah! jealousie!’ (III.2), imposing his own system, it seems, rather than consulting *Joseph* A or B on each occasion. He presumably understood that foreign
singers familiarizing themselves with the pointing of phrases would follow the music’s lead. Audiences cannot ‘hear’ in the musical setting the subtle nuanced meaning in the various application of exclamation marks, semi-colons, and colons. C thus shows how these sophisticated signs of literary meaning lose much of their significance in a scribal document intended for singers’ practical use.

Revivals of *Joseph* and *Hercules* involved revision, and the insertion of new items, with their own underlay, pasted in or inserted into the gatherings. None of these insertions was dated. Overall, C shows more cancellations and corrections than does B. As has been shown, the many changes prevented C from providing a neatly unambiguous version of B, but as well as accommodating emendations C had to be linguistically coherent for the singers, which entailed the provision of comprehensible spelling and punctuation. Unlike Handel, Smith never encroached on the margins of the page, and the spacious musical texts and underlay are relatively unscathed by subsequent binding. C has additions pasted over the page, obliterating both music and underlay, and sometimes paper was interleaved to supply additional music and underlay. C also has pasted slips that do not clarify cuts to the underlay but result in contextually orphaned phonemes, words, and phrases. (The editions in Chapter One record these kinds of inconsistency with the note: {obscured}.) Handel inserted revisions in his own hand in C, further complicating the issue of their precise chronology. For example, Lichas’s air ‘O Scene of unexampled Woe’ in *Hercules* (III.1) has a short passage of underlay and music in the composer’s hand (C44/3 fols 5v-6v).
Smith probably compiled manuscript librettos D and E for the librettist to compile a manuscript libretto based on text surviving in C. E was for the printer’s use prior to the oratorio’s first performances. After its many manuscript recensions, the libretto could then be prepared for presentation to the public in a print artefact, the wordbook.
Chapter Four.

BOOKSELLERS AND WORDBOOKS FOR JOSEPH AND HERCULES.

4.1. The function of wordbooks.

Ruth Smith describes the function of wordbooks as ‘an indispensable part of attendance at an oratorio’ (Oratorios, p. 23). Wordbooks were sold prior to performances so that ‘they could be studied beforehand’ and gave audiences ‘information essential to full understanding and enjoyment of the performance’. The copy-text wordbook for Joseph, for example, ‘gave the larger narrative context of the part of the story being presented’, and included sections of the textual narrative excised from the oratorio, as did ‘similarly marketed’ opera wordbooks. Oratorio wordbooks had printed ‘stage directions’ to compensate for ‘the lack of visible action’, such as ‘Scene, a Prison. Joseph reclining in a melancholy Posture’ (Joseph I.1), an image in staged plays which would have been supplied through costume, gesture, scenery, and formalized movement. Audiences, by referring to the text, could distinguish between characters in a genre without costume or action, the text clarifying situations when ‘soloists doubled minor and even major roles [because] doubling would have been extremely confusing to the audience but for the wordbook’ (p. 23). A wordbook was the prime non-musical medium for evoking a ‘staging’ of the drama in the hearer’s imagination. To this end, the print layout of a wordbook was analogous to that of printed plays. A Dramatis Personae explained the names and status, race, nation, or creed of characters, whether Hebrews, Egyptians, Trachinians, or Oechalians. Cues in the wordbook made clear which character was singing.
The printed libretto enabled readers to anticipate how the verse might be transformed by Handel’s music, and consulting it after a performance could evoke recollections of surprise and expectation. Wordbooks were therefore an important, perhaps essential, component of the oratorio experience.

Oratorio wordbooks differed from wordbooks for Italian opera. Opera wordbooks supplied an audience of English speakers with an Italian text and a facing page English translation, so that an English-speaking audience could interpret, in the words of an anonymous pamphlet, the ‘Nonsense well tun’d, and sweet Stupidity’ of the Italian poetry.\(^1\) The English libretto in oratorio wordbooks enabled audiences to read what Handel’s oratorio singers, many of whom were Italian opera singers with poor English pronunciation, were singing. As an anonymous wag who attended a performance of Handel’s oratorio *Esther* in London in 1732 wrote: ‘the English Tongue’ was so mangled by the Italian singers that ‘you would have sworn it had been *Welch*’.\(^2\) The lack of staging of oratorio gave the wordbooks a crucial role, that of enabling audiences to follow the finer points of the *mise-en-scène* and the libretto.

Handel composed *Joseph* and *Hercules* in the middle of the year, intending them to be performed in the following season. Librettists and booksellers therefore had several months’ advance warning of the need for a wordbook. To ensure that a wordbook was available for sale at the appropriate time, the bookseller required a copy of the libretto from the author, who in turn needed to liaise with Smith, Handel’s chief copyist, to ascertain the latest state of the


libretto. The author, presumably with the bookseller’s agreement, could restore text that Handel had deleted and add paratextual material, as was the case with both oratorios (discussed in Chapter Six). It was the bookseller who probably bore the expense of embracing the composer’s late adaptations to the libretto in a wordbook he had already printed. By augmenting a libretto with authorial material and printer’s advertisements, booksellers turned the wordbook into more than solely a printed libretto. A wordbook as an artefact was a bookseller’s tangible contribution to the success of a new genre of high art, oratorio in English.

4.2. Booksellers, the book trade, and wordbook imprints.

The imprints of wordbooks for Joseph and Hercules name six booksellers, some of whom are not major figures in book trade history. Wordbooks for Joseph name ‘J. Watts’ and ‘B. Dod’, and those for Hercules name ‘J. and R. Tonson’, ‘S. Draper’, and ‘J. Roberts’. It is Roberts who is the best remembered of the six names, for reasons explained below, and discussion in Chapter Five offers an explanation of why his name, and not those of the Tonson brothers, appears on two wordbooks for Hercules. The mystery of Roberts’s name in wordbook imprints is grounded in the circumstances of wordbook publication, a hitherto relatively unexplored area of Handel studies. This thesis was in part generated by a curiosity to know something about the men in the imprint and their contribution to book trade history. The knowledge gained motivated examination of the wordbooks as print artefacts, the focus of Chapter Six. Most of these men, it appears, valued the part played by wordbooks in their
business, and knowledge gained about them, their commercial enterprise, and the processes involved in wordbook production adds to the Handel literature.

Wordbooks made it possible for a libretto to become a commodity available for sale to purchasers. Their production swelled the growing number of published titles in the mid-eighteenth century, an expansion that has been the subject of recent debate. Brewer writes that ‘publishing expanded rapidly’ within a growing print culture (p. 137). This idea accords with the views of Jürgen Habermas, who centres cultural change on, among other factors, the growth of print materials and public conversation.3 Recently, however, this notion of a burgeoning book trade has been challenged by William St. Clair, whose research was based on sales figures for books as a guide to the size of readership, and not the growth in titles published (p. 99). But Brewer and St Clair are in agreement that the London book trade thrived in the first half of the eighteenth century. St Clair’s exact methods cannot be applied to gauge how many wordbook readers there were because statistics of print runs and purchasers no longer exist for wordbooks. Whereas St Clair’s judgments are persuasive because statistically based, the lack of secure evidence means that the nature and extent of wordbook readership must inevitably be tentative.

Divisions of labour in the book trade are not readily apparent from wordbook imprints. The term ‘bookseller’ is used in this thesis to describe the publishing agency, for as Michael Treadwell explains, in the mid-eighteenth century the style ‘bookseller’ served ‘to cover any one who engaged in any one, or any combination, of the three activities, now generally

---

separate, which [are designated] as wholesale, and retail bookselling and publishing'.\textsuperscript{4} The undertakers of book production were in effect its publishers, in the modern sense. Trade publishers were different from booksellers because they did not own the copyright to what they published: they distributed books ‘on behalf of the other members of the book trade’ (p. 100). These are more than semantic distinctions: they epitomize strong social demarcations within what is broadly termed the ‘book trade’, between artisans, printers and their workers, and the capitalist entrepreneurs, the booksellers. That few booksellers risked their capital in production of wordbooks is an intriguing aspect of the eighteenth-century book trade.

Investigation of the individuals named as booksellers and their activities uncovers, in spite of the trade’s restrictive practices, extensive collaboration between them. Wordbook publication embraced authors (librettists), venture capitalist booksellers, printers, compositors, and sellers. Of this group, it was the booksellers who had opportunities to compete to publish wordbooks for Handel’s dramatic oratorios, but the fact that hardly any did so suggests that those who did colluded to minimize financial risk and corner the market.

Michael Harris describes the book trade in the mid-eighteenth century as ‘a vast range of interlocking activity: from type-founders and paper-makers to hack authors, from prosperous business men to destitute entrepreneurs, and from complicated commercial

structures to low-key personal operations’. More booksellers entered the general wordbook market than endured in it. For example, W. Mears with the T. Philips’s masque *Love and Glory* (London, 1734) and R. Turbut with Mr Pritchard’s *The Fall of Phaeton* (London, 1736) may have learned to their cost that the wordbook market for such fleeting entertainments was too tied to the commercial viability of the music and its composer (in both cases Thomas Arne) to justify the financial risk. All six named people in the imprints for *Joseph* and *Hercules* had strong connections in the busy world of print enterprise. Though not pioneers in the print genre of oratorio wordbooks, Watts and the Tonson brothers between them showed a tenacious commitment to their production through the 1740s and the 1750s. On the evidence of the imprints for *Joseph* and *Hercules*, it is apparent that these men arranged never to produce wordbooks for the same oratorio in the same season.

It is not known how wordbooks for specific oratorios became associated with a particular bookseller. There is no evidence to tie oratorio wordbook booksellers to particular theatres, managers, or exclusively to individual composers. Nor is there proof that managers and composers commissioned printers for wordbooks, though without offering evidence Eva Zöllner claims that printers’ fees were paid by theatre managements. The market for wordbooks was tested in Britain in the early eighteenth-century by a few intrepid booksellers. For many years Thomas Wood dominated the production of wordbooks for Handel’s operas and oratorios, as well as for other composers. The first appearance of his name in the imprint to a work by Handel was in the opera wordbook for *Radamisto* (HWV 12A, 1720), the

---


composer’s first opera for the newly founded Royal Academy of Music. Wood’s final wordbook was for Handel’s oratorio Saul in 1744, the year of his death (1747) being inferred from the sale of his English Stock (Stationers’ Company, Court Book K, 5 April 1748).

Samuel Buckley published the wordbook to Handel’s opera Teseo (HWV 9, 1713) and J. Crichley made a brief foray into opera wordbook production with Faramondo (HWV 39, 1738) and Deidamia (HWV 42, 1741). A member of the Woodfall family produced the wordbook in 1747 for Handel’s pasticcio opera, Lucio Vero, and for a revival of Handel’s opera Admeto (HWV 22) in 1754. The first time that the name of Tonson appears in a wordbook imprint for a work by Handel is for the opera Amadigi (HWV 11, 1715). This wordbook was probably an initiative by Jacob Tonson junior, whose firm also published a wordbook for a revival of Handel’s opera Rinaldo (HWV 7A, 1717) and commissioned wordbooks for the works of other composers. The Tonson brothers, inheritors of the business from their father Tonson junior, funded wordbooks for Handel’s English works from 1736 until the composer’s death in 1759.

4.2.1. John Watts, printer and bookseller.

Among the six names in the imprints to the oratorio wordbooks Joseph and Hercules that of John Watts takes pride of place for the comprehensive nature of his financial and practical involvement in wordbook production for Handel’s oratorios. (The significance of wordbook copyrights, the Stationers’ Company, and the English Stock is discussed in Chapter Five.)

John Watts printed theatrical texts throughout his career, but his first theatrical publication as a

---

7 Henry R. Plomer, and others, Dictionaries of the Printers and Booksellers who were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland, 1557-1775 (London: Bibliographical Society, 1932; repr. 1992), gives no first name for Crichley, who was ‘one of the printers employed by Robert Dodsley’ (p. 51).
bookseller was the immensely successful *The Beggar’s Opera* in 1728; his final publication was a wordbook to *Judas Maccabaeus* in 1763, the year of his death. His first oratorio wordbook was for Thomas Arne senior’s production of Handel’s serenata *Acis and Galatea* (HWV 49) at the Little Theatre in the Haymarket in 1732, followed by a wordbook for the premiere of *Deborah* (HWV 51) in London in 1733, an event notorious for the inflated seat prices charged by Handel. Watts produced a wordbook for *Athalia* (HWV 52), an oratorio performed as part of Handel’s visit to Oxford in July 1733, and for *Acis and Galatea*, performed in the same week in Oxford’s Christ Church College. For some reason in the next few years Watts published no wordbooks, but he re-entered the market with a wordbook for Handel’s benefit performance, which according to Burrows took place on 28 March 1738 as ‘An Oratorio’, a pasticcio of items from other works by Handel (*Handel*, pp. 199-200). Watts produced a wordbook for *Acis & Galatea* in 1739. Understanding his involvement in wordbooks in relation to his other printing work leads to new understanding of the importance of Watts in publications associated with works by Handel.

No record of Watts’s birth is known, though he may be the John Watts who was baptized on 5 July 1682 in the parish of St Martin-in-the-Fields, Middlesex. Other details of his early life can be traced through the Stationers’ Company files and in the National Archives. Bound apprentice in 1698 at about the age of sixteen, Watts would have been older than other new apprentices at the time. His binding is recorded in the Stationers’ Company ‘Bindings from 1640 to 1748’ as having taken place on 7 October 1698:

---

Robert Everingham John Watts son of William Watts late of the parish of St. Martin in the fields in the county of Midds victualor Deced [with a line over the top of the c to indicate abbreviation] to Robert Everingham For seven years.

The delayed commencement to his apprenticeship possibly allowed him to improve his standard of education, literacy being, as Cyprian Blagden remarks, an essential criterion for entry into the printing trade. Everingham, some of whose print work was for Jacob Tonson senior, died in 1705, and Watts, after serving a seven year apprenticeship, was freed by William Watts, his brother, on 9 June 1707 (Foxon, p. 15). The Stationers’ Company’s ‘Register of Freemen, 6 March 1703 to 3 December 1751’, records ‘Free 9 June 1707 John Watts Servant to William Watts Sworn and Admitted into the freedom of this Company’. On 1 January 1712, less than four years later, Watts’s name appears in the Company’s ‘Entry of Copies, 28 April to 25 September 1746’ with ‘The Rhapsody, an half sheet’, indicating Watts’s confidence as a printer-trader. Donald F. McKenzie cites Watts’s enterprise as an example of ‘exceptional growth’ in one man’s printing business in the proliferation of multiple establishments as the book trade expanded in the eighteenth century. Two philanthropic actions by Watts highlight the growing strength of his business. John Nichols writes of a loan by Watts to the type founder, William Caslon, of one hundred pounds to enable Caslon to start up in trade as a punch-cutter. Talbot Reed notes that in recognizing the accuracy and neatness of Caslon’s typeface, Watts ‘accordingly encouraged Caslon to persevere in letter-

Nichols also adds that Watts donated two guineas to William Bowyer after a disastrous fire, ‘a gift made before Watts had attained the Livery’ (II, p. 356). This strengthens an impression of the generosity of Watts the journeyman printer and contrasts with the niggardly response of well-established booksellers.

The kind concern shown by the young Watts towards other book trade workers went hand-in-hand with an ambition assisted by fortunate contacts. He attained the Livery two years before the customary length of service as a journeyman, as recorded in the entry ‘John Watts Admitted into the Livery of this Company 7 Dec’. Fine £20’ in the Stationers’ Company ‘Call of the Livery, 22 June to 5 November 1765’, the ‘Fine’ being the admittance fee. His trading position must have been promising, for by 1716 the Company registers show that Watts had four apprentices; and it was in this year, in his early thirties, that he married Anne Williams in St Martin-in-the-Fields on 13 June. Interestingly, the Society of Genealogists records a marriage licence granted to a Watts and a Williams, the twentieth-century record omitting their Christian names, on 1 April 1708, indicating that the bride was underage. This entry may refer to William, John’s elder brother.

Watts acquired a printing office, type, and presses, occupying, according to David Foxon, Tonson senior’s house in Bow Street. Foxon adds that ‘it is reasonable to surmise that Tonson set him up there and later took him into partnership; hence their joint ownership of the house by 1717’ (p. 17). Jacob Tonson junior’s will refers to Watts as his ‘Partner in the Printing Business’, a commercial arrangement which survived Tonson junior’s death in 1735.

---

and which included the third Jacob Tonson until 1758, when Watts retired.\(^{15}\) For most of his working life Watts was never independent of the Tonson connection, a factor which becomes important to the discussion in Chapter Five of the provenance of wordbooks for *Hercules* and other wordbooks published by the Tonsons.

Watts established a reputation for printing high-quality work for the Tonsons. According to St Clair, Watts ‘printed for Jacob Tonson an excellent series of classics in duodecimo edited by Maittaire and illustrated throughout with charming engravings in the French manner of the period’ (p. 186).\(^{16}\) Maittaire’s Classics, with their imprint ‘ex officinâ Jacobi Tonson & Johannis Watts’, would, writes Nichols, ‘alone have been sufficient to have immortalized his memory, both for correctness and neatness’ (1, 292 *fn*.). In contrast to the duodecimo Maittaire Classics, Watts also printed prestigious large folios, such as Matthew Prior’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (1718), which were notable for their high standard of typeface, layout, and ornaments. In the following decade, for a brief time Watts employed Benjamin Franklin as a compositor, who recalled his experiences of Watts’s printing-house and his own successful proposal for improvements to the printing ‘chappel laws’. Franklin writes that his ‘constant attendance […] recommended me to the master [i.e. Watts], and my uncommon quickness at composing occasioned my being put upon all work of dispatch, which was generally better paid. So I went on now very agreeably.’ Franklin mentions the good educational standard of Watts’s compositors.\(^{17}\) This high standard of learning among the

---

\(^{15}\) Tonson junior’s will dated 16 August 1735, National Archives, PROB 11/674.


\(^{17}\) Quotations from *Benjamin Franklin His Autobiography* 1706-1757: <http://odur.let.rug.nl/usanew/B/bfranklin/frank.htm> [accessed 24 June 2003].
workforce presumably strengthened Watts’s hold on the printing for Tonson junior of major literary classics.

Watt is known to have printed the first three volumes of Pope’s version of the *Odyssey* (1725-26) for Tonson junior, because a letter from Pope to Tonson expresses disappointment at the standard of printing:

> [. . .] in regard to the beauty of the Impression, that you will use your interest with Mr. Watts, to cause them [the printers] to work off the Sheets more carefully than they usually do: & to preserve the blackness of the Letter, by good working, as well as by the best Ink. The sheets I’ve seen since the first Proof, are not so well in this respect as the first [. . .] nothing so mu[ch] contributes to the Beauty & credit of a Book [. . .]. (Alexander Pope to Jacob Tonson, February 1724, cited in Foxon, p. 85.)

This letter gives an interesting insight into the Tonson-Watts relationship. Pope as client appeals to the senior partner to prevail on the printer to produce the highest quality printing: Watts, indebted to Tonson, would wish to please such an important author. Pope’s *Odyssey* confirms the placing of Watts and the Tonson firm in the secure and respectable market for polite reading and classical texts, a market to which wordbooks would be sold a few years later.

Advertisements show Watts to have been a consistently busy printer, producing a vast and varied portfolio of titles. But to augment the income from his printing he purchased whole shares in copyright, focusing on an area the Tonsons had avoided, namely, the often-lucrative market of contemporary plays, in particular some controversial entertainments banned or hissed from the stage. His first venture into bookselling in 1728 was with the hugely successful *The Beggar’s Opera*, followed by diverse theatrical entertainments, including
frivolous, light, contentious, and serious theatre. By 1734 his expanding theatrical titles were truly eclectic in scope, from popular plays and afterpieces, such as Cibber’s *The Provok’d Husband* (Drury Lane), *The Doctor the Disease*, and Fielding’s *Don Quixote in England* (New Theatre, Haymarket), *The Whim; or, The Miser’s Retreat* and *Cupid and Psyche*, both at Drury Lane, to Handel’s grand oratorio *Deborah* at Covent Garden.

Watts moved premises as his business grew. The archives of the Stationers’ Company record that in 1734 Watts had a printing-office in St Giles in the Fields; by 1741 his premises were in Little Queen Street near Lincoln’s Inn Fields; and his final location was in Wild-Court nearby (Stationers’ Company, Court Book I, 2 July 1734 and 3 November 1741). In 1745, his advertisement in *Mahomet* for his other products gives a fascinating insight into the diversity of subjects he stocked and printed. Volumes ‘for Schools’ feature a Latin New Testament, tragedies by Sophocles, Homer’s *Iliad*, works by Virgil, Horace, Catullus, Ovid, Terence, Aesop, Juvenal, Livy ‘In 6 Vols’, Pliny, Sallust, and Julius Caesar, all essential books for scholars and well-read customers. Less serious reading offered under the Watts imprint was Richard Brookes’s *The Art of Angling, Rock and Sea-Fishing* (1740), Samuel Croxall’s *Fables of Aesop and Others* and the enormously popular and influential play *The Fair Circassian*, and John Hughes’s equally popular *Letters of Abelard and Heloise* (1713).

Watts’s publications show a conservative preference for popular but respectable works, such as plays by Vanbrugh and Cibber, and translations from French, such as plays by Molière. They show that Watts eschewed lewd works and published very few novels, a strategy which seems to have kept him from public vilification which might have threatened

---

his enterprise and livelihood and jeopardized his partnership with Tonson. His titles display a conscious breadth of views, among which oppositional writers during Walpole’s administration are balanced by government supporters, demonstrating Watts’s public support of a religious-political via media, as is evident in the names of those writers whose works he selected, purchased, printed, and published. Theological works, including a New Testament in Greek (1730), and A Farewell Sermon (1724) and The Miracles of Jesus Vindicated (1729) by Zachary Pearce, were advertised alongside plays by Henry Fielding, including The Author’s Farce (1730) and The Lottery (1731), Sylvia (1730), an opera wordbook for George Lillo, and The Musical Miscellany [. . .] by the Most Eminent Masters (1729-1730). Pearce was appointed Dean of Winchester by Walpole in 1739 and attacked the bishop of Rochester for ambition after Atterbury’s impeachment for high treason; Fielding was a constant public critic of government and Walpole in particular; and Lillo demonstrated fealty to Court interests by writing a masque to celebrate the marriage in 1734 of Princess Anne.19

Watts probably became enfeebled in old age. By 1755 the Treasurer of the Stationers’ Company, Richard Hett, signed on behalf of Watts when collecting the latter’s English Stock dividends (Stationers’ Company, Dividend Book, Midsummer 1754 to Christmas 1761). Watts made his will on 23 July 1760, recording that he was ‘sick and weak in body’ and had ‘been so for some time past but of sound and disposing Mind Memory and Understanding’. The sale of many of his copyrights to Thomas Lowndes in 1758 shows that Watts effectively ceased trading in that year (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Eng. misc.c.297, item 50). According to the proving of his will on 17 February 1763 in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury (PRO,

---

PROB 11/884, fols 388r-389v), Watts died childless in 1763 in the parish of St Mary, Whitechapel. On 2 August 1763 Anne, Watts’s executrix, was granted ‘the Goods Chattels and Credits’ of John Watts late of the Parish of St Botolph Aldgate’ (PRO, PROB 6/139, fol. 408). The omission from the will of the fate of Watts’s printing-office seems to confirm the surmise of Nichols that Hett had taken over the business (III, 607). Nichols recalls Watts as one of the most important printers of the first half of the eighteenth century, whose fame as a printer ‘will endure as long as any public library shall exist’ (I, 292 fn).

### 4.2.2. Benjamin Dod, stationer.

Benjamin Dod was a trade publisher and bookseller by profession. His name is absent from Plomer’s *Dictionary* but appears in the Handel literature because he is named in many Watts wordbook imprints. He was baptised on 2 April 1707 at St Giles in the Fields, Holborn. The Stationers’ Company freed him by redemption on 1 August 1738 (Stationers’ Company, Apprentice Register 2 April 1728 to 7 December 1762) and when he gained the Livery on 29 October 1743 (Stationers’ Company, Court Books 1741/2-63), Dod began to acquire copyright shares, as well as paper and printed sheets, as shown by the Ward Trade Sales catalogues in the John Johnson Collection, Bodleian Library, Oxford. His trade in copyright shares increased as the hold of perpetual copyright weakened, and Dod, in line with other London booksellers, protected his individual investments ‘by ever more widespread sharing of

---

20 Church of Christ and Latter Day Saints
copyrights’. In a commercial arrangement evidently existed between him and Watts, because after 1743 all but one of the books that Watts published named Dod as retailer.

In 1745, when Dod began publishing on his own account, his imprints announced him as bookseller to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK), e.g. the eleventh edition of Robert Nelson’s *The Practice of True Devotion*, and on 1 August 1751 the Ward catalogues show that he acquired useful part-shares in current best-sellers, such as student textbooks and Nelson’s *The Great Duty of Frequenting the Christian Sacrifice*, first published in 1706.

Over the following years Dod increased his ownership of titles. By the early 1750s religion dominated those titles in which he was part shareholder, but interestingly his name also appears in a major reissue of *Paradise Lost* in 1751, published by a conger led by the Tonson brothers. The trade sales catalogues and Dod’s advertisements show that he selectively stocked his shop with popular works and cannily accumulated shares in religious and classical titles essential for clergy, scholars and students. Dod vacated his shop and sign-address at ‘The Bible and Key’ in Ave-Mary-Lane when, in 1751, he took out a lease from the Stationers’ Company on premises in nearby Amen Corner; Dod’s lease document is in the Stationers’ archives, his signature authenticating the spelling of his surname. His new address in Amen Corner, just off Paternoster Row, indicated his status within the trade, for, as Treadwell writes, ‘all known trade publishers, without exception, had their shops within the area around Paternoster Row which was the centre, particularly for wholesalers, of the Augustan book

---

22 Benjamin Dod’s deed of tenancy is in *Records of the Worshipful Company of Stationers 1554-1920*, ed. by Robin Myers (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1985), 115 microfilm reels and Handlist, Serial Date no. 66.
trade’ (p. 124). In 1757, with Watts its publisher ill, the publication of Joseph may have been supervised by Dod, for it is Dod’s advertisements that appear and not those of Watts. By 1761, Dod had part-ownership of Shakespeare’s Othello and The Tempest and Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe. He rarely sold plays on his own account, never advertised the sale of Watts’s bestsellers, such as The Beggar’s Opera, and in harmony with his SPCK involvement was never associated with books that were religiously or politically controversial. The regular appearance of his name in the imprint to wordbooks for Handel’s oratorios points to their importance to him as a bookseller of religiously orthodox material.

Dod’s will (PRO, PROB 11/911, dated 13 June 1755; proved 23 August 1765), in stiff legal prose burns with barely concealed rancour. It is testimony to a marital relationship turned sour, for he never names his wife. Dod recognizes that she is entitled to ‘a very handsome Provision’, but any benefit she may enjoy is hedged with conditions. If she does not agree to his terms, she is to receive an income from the rents of Dod’s ‘personal Estate’ and his sister receives all of his ‘Estate’ of what ‘Nature or Kindsoever’. He offers his wife the ‘Produce of the [English] Stock I have in the Stationers Company’, explaining that ten pounds of the dividend is hers because she is his wife. If she accepts this reduced income she is to have it for the rest of her life; if she refuses, then his sister receives it. Events intervened, however, for Dod’s sister died shortly after him. A marginal note, dated 12 May 1766, awards the ‘Goods Chattels and Credits of Benjamin Dod late of the Parish of St Martin Ludgate’ to Elizabeth Dawes, presumably a relation of his sister. Though Dod’s wife may have survived him and his sister, the note proves that she inherited none of Dod’s property, showing that marital disharmony existed between them, a sad insight into Dod’s life.
4.2.3. Jacob Tonson and Richard Tonson, stationers.

Of the six names in the wordbook imprints, it was Jacob Tonson who earned Samuel Johnson’s approval as ‘a man who is to be praised as often as he is named’, a commendation of Tonson’s character which first appeared in print in 1779. Reference to the publishing firm of Tonson is complicated by the fact that there were three generations named Jacob Tonson. Jacob Tonson senior (1655-1736) established the business and founded the Whig Kit-Cat Club in the early eighteenth century, its members including many eminent men of letters. Personal contacts and shrewd business deals, such as the rights to Joseph Addison’s *Cato* (1713), the century’s most revived play, made a fortune for the Tonson firm. Kathleen Lynch describes Tonson senior as ‘England’s first professional publisher’, and he and his successors ran one of the most successful book businesses of the eighteenth century.

Tonson junior, nephew of Tonson senior, was born in 1682, the same year as John Watts, and was freed by patrimony on 6 September 1708. Taught the bookselling business by his uncle, he became at twenty-one ‘his uncle’s invaluable partner’ (Lynch, p. 27). He was official bookseller for the *Votes* of the House of Commons from 1708 to 1710, and from 1715 onwards he purchased copyrights to key canonical works, the most notable being a half share in twenty-five Shakespeare plays (Lynch, p. 112). Tonson senior retired in 1722, handing over the business to Tonson junior, along with a considerable property portfolio (Lynch, pp. 158-60).

---

There is no evidence that any Tonson was a printer: John Watts ran the printing side of their business. The ‘Jacob Tonson’ named in imprints from 1713 until 1736 may have been a title of convenience for Jacob Tonson junior trading in place of his uncle. It is this name that appears in imprints to the new editions of the popular Maittaire Classics, published in association with John Watts. Tonson junior died at the age of fifty-two on 25 November 1735, shortly before his uncle died on 17 March 1736 (Lynch, p. 174).

Tonson junior’s will (PRO, PROB 11/674) dispersed considerable wealth and property among his children, making special mention of an extension he commissioned to his property in Barnes to accommodate the Kit-Cat portraits, which he bequeathed to his eldest son, Jacob. This third Jacob Tonson became a very wealthy man, inheriting numerous properties and farms. When Tonson senior died, Jacob’s riches swelled with an estate valued, according to the Gentleman’s Magazine vi (1736), ‘at £40,000’, a sum Lynch thinks was likely ‘very much larger’ (p. 174). The third Tonson took over the firm at twenty-one years of age.

Jacob’s brother, Richard Tonson, initially assisted him in the business. Both brothers attended Eton and a writing school and were trained as booksellers by their father. While still in their teens they visited Oxford in July 1733 to offer a donation from their great-uncle to Hart Hall. This was the month of the Oxford Encaenia and Handel’s visit to the University. Donald McKenzie records that the brothers’ apprenticeships were interrupted by their father’s death, but they were freed by patrimony, with the agreement of the Chamberlain on 3 April 1739 (Apprentices, p. 352). Richard took less interest in the business when he became MP for Wallingford in 1747.26 The Tonsons’ business relied for much of its income on reissues of

26 Raymond N. MacKenzie, ‘Tonson, Jacob, the elder (1655/6-1736), bookseller’, ODNB [accessed 29 April 2008].
works to which the brothers held the rights, a practice that maximized profits because no author’s fee was involved. Their most noteworthy deal with a living author was with Samuel Johnson in 1754. The commercial triumph of Johnson’s *Dictionary*, published by Andrew Millar in 1755, encouraged the Tonsons to open a subscription in 1756 for Johnson’s edition of Shakespeare, the eight volumes of which were eventually published by them in 1765. In spite of their gaining far more from his literary exertions than he did, Johnson’s goodwill towards his booksellers is well known. He appears to have socialized with Jacob Tonson, for Boswell recalls that ‘Soon after Edwards’s “Canons of Criticism” came out, Johnson was dining at Tonson the bookseller’s’. Tonson may also have acted as Johnson’s personal banker, David Garrick informing the lexicographer that ‘an hundred pounds of yours is in Mr Tonson’s hands’.

Jacob Tonson showed an active interest in the theatre, though the works he published were mainly re-issues of Tonson copyright titles, the brothers holding the rights to many major writers. With regard to oratorio wordbooks, the imprint ‘J. and R. Tonson’ was first found in the wordbook for Handel’s setting of Dryden’s *Alexander’s Feast* in 1736. The brothers held the rights to Dryden’s works, and this product was the first of what would be an enduring association with the composer’s oratorios. In 1739 they published a wordbook for *Alexander’s Feast* and Dryden’s ‘Song for St Cecilia’s Day’ and a wordbook that presented *Alexander’s Feast* together with *Acis and Galatea*. In 1740 they published a wordbook for Handel’s setting of Milton’s *L’Allegro* and in succeeding years reissued that and the Dryden odes, these works
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being based on literary works to which they held the perpetual rights. In 1743 they published
the wordbook to Handel’s *Samson*, and the following season a wordbook based on Congreve’s
*Semele*: they owned the perpetual copyright to Congreve’s works. *Hercules* in 1745 is the first
wordbook to associate the Tonsons with Somerset Draper. Their three names also appear in
the imprint to Handel’s *Occasional Oratorio* (1746). For two seasons of oratorios by Handel,
1748–49, the Tonsons published three wordbooks whose authorship they never disclosed:
*Joshua* (1748), *Solomon* (1748), and *Susanna* (1749), the latter two naming Draper in their
imprints. They re-issued their wordbooks for oratorio revivals until Handel’s final oratorio
season in 1759, but after the composer’s death, their interest in publishing oratorio wordbooks
waned. That they published a wordbook for Thomas Arne’s opera *Artaxerxes* (1762) suggests
a willingness to give public endorsement to opera in English, as the firm had done with
Addison’s libretto *Rosamond* thirty years before.

Neither brother married, so that on Jacob’s death Richard gained most of the Tonson
wealth, while some went to their sister Ann, Lady Baker, and her sons. Richard’s will (PRO,
PROB 11/983, dated 26 September 1767) bequeathed all his property and ten thousand pounds
to his ‘housekeeper’, a benefaction contested by his brother-in-law on the grounds that Jacob
Tonson junior’s will had stipulated that the properties revert to the Tonson interests should the
sons die without issue. A marginal note in the will records that Sir William Baker, having the
will declared unadministered, received Letters of Administration for the estates. According to
a marginal note in Jacob Tonson’s will (PRO, PROB 11/928, fol. 85, dated 17 March 1767),
Baker became ‘Marquis of Powis’. In a sale, the Tonson copyrights passed into several hands,
including those of the Rivingtons. So ended the thriving publishing enterprise established by Jacob Tonson senior, ‘midwife to the muse’. For over seventy years the firm had been instrumental in establishing the literary canon by making the classics and the works of British authors available to the reading public. The Tonsons had proved proficient publishers of texts that attained serious, lasting literary value. Wordbooks to Handel’s oratorios feature prominently in the list of titles sold by the Tonson estate in 1767. The sales catalogue places oratorio wordbooks alongside canonical British titles as worthy products of an outstandingly successful firm of booksellers.

4.2.4. Somerset Draper, stationer.

Draper’s connection to oratorios has not been securely established before. Draper, the son of a brewer, was baptised on 1 April 1706 in Wandsworth, Surrey. He was a kinsman of the Tonson family, the father of Jacob Tonson junior having married Mary Draper, Somerset’s grandmother, in 1679 (Lynch, p. 26). The brewery in Wandsworth run by Draper’s father was mortgaged to Tonson junior, to whom Somerset was apprenticed from 5 September 1720 until 6 September 1727 (Proceedings of the Stationers’ Company). Tonson junior’s will describes Draper as ‘my kinsman and faithfull servant’ (PRO, PROB 11/674, fol. 303v), and it was as an employee that on 20 October 1722 Draper witnessed an agreement between Tonson junior and Richard Steele concerning the rights to The Conscious Lovers. Draper’s character and terms

29 A Collection of the Catalogues of Trade Sales of Books, Books in Quires, Copyrights, held on the 11th December, 1704, and from 3rd of April, 1718, until 15th December, 1768.
of employment are described in Tonson junior’s will (fol. 303v), which acknowledges Draper’s fifteen years of loyalty and diligence:

Somersett Draper has in all respects acquitted himself in my Service with great Application Industry and Honesty of Heart and I being desirous that he should continue in the same Station he is now in under Me and serve my Sons for a Term of Seven Years from the Time of my Decease in like Manner as He did Me in my Lifetime.[.

The stipulation of a seven year term of service mirrors a formal binding to the firm, in return for observance of which Tonson junior bequeaths everything to Draper should Tonson’s issue predecease Draper. This is an astonishingly generous legacy for an employee and distant relative. Draper, in serving Tonson junior’s sons as well as Tonson junior himself, was to be paid ‘a yearly Salary of Sixty Pounds’, and at the end of seven years loyal duty to the Tonson brothers Draper was to receive five hundred pounds and the mortgage held in the Draper brewery was to be written off. In effect, Tonson junior tied Draper securely to the business; the will makes it clear that if Draper set up on his own or worked for others his mortgage would be payable, his salary jeopardized, and he would receive no interest on investments made on his behalf by the executors. Tonson junior plainly felt that Draper’s services were crucial to the firm’s success, perhaps in view of the fact that his sons were underage when the will was written. Draper did not stint in his allegiance, devoting his expertise to the Tonson business. Donald Nichol speculates that the Somerset Draper named in the imprint of Pope’s *Dunciad* in 1755 ‘may have been the Draper who delivered a letter to Hugh Bethel in Yorkshire from Pope in 1736’ (*Literary Legacy*, p. xliv). Draper was clearly at the heart of business negotiations on behalf of the Tonson firm for many years.
Draper’s competent management of contracts and finance is apparent in Nichol’s claim that the ‘account of the five Warburton editions of Pope’s Works was drawn up by Somerset Draper, who evidently had a talent for figures and negotiations’ (*Literary Legacy*, p. 179). According to Nichol, Draper held part of the Tonson 6.7% share in Pope’s Works, and the 1752 edition of the Works made a profit of approximately 21%, of which Draper would take a fair share (*Literary Legacy*, p. 181). In a letter written, perhaps to Knapton the bookseller, in December 1755 Warburton complained that he was the loser in a hard bargain struck by Draper, which left Warburton ‘extreme vexed’ (*Literary Legacy*, p. 115). James Boswell testifies to Draper’s thorough understanding of bookselling and comprehensive knowledge of authors’ copies, recalling that Samuel Johnson ‘told us [in 1776] that “Addison wrote Budgell’s papers in the Spectator, at least amended them so much, that he made them almost his own; and that Draper, Tonson’s partner, assured Mrs. Johnson, that the much admired Epilogue to ‘The Distressed Mother,’ which came out in Budgell’s name, was in reality written by Addison”’ (*Life*, II, 32). Draper would have known this because the rights to Addison’s works belonged to the Tonsons. Johnson’s allusion to Draper as a ‘partner’ attests to the change in Draper’s business relationship with his former employers at the end of the specified seven years.

So it is that Draper’s name appears with the Tonsons in imprints for several oratorio wordbooks beginning with *Hercules* (1745) and ending with a revival of *Joshua* in 1754. In the light of his career thus far, his name in the imprint to *Hercules* signifies the personal regard the Tonsons, his former employers, had for him. It marks Draper’s emergence as a bookseller;
also in 1745 his name appears among shareholders named in the imprints to an edition of Shakespeare.\(^3^3\)

Draper was married but had no issue when he made his will on 1 March 1747 (PRO, PROB 11/820, dated 14 February 1756). At his death in 1756 he owned property in Shropshire and the once-mortgaged properties in Wandsworth, comprising a dwelling house, two further houses, stables, gardens, and the brewery formerly belonging to his father. This estate seems fair recompense for an astute business mind.

4.2.5. James Roberts, bookseller.

J[ames] Roberts (c. 1669-c. 1756) is named in the imprints to two wordbooks for Hercules. Winton Dean thinks this signifies ‘probably a case of exchanged copyright’ (p. 98). This hypothesis of Dean’s needs revising in the light of new knowledge about the Tonson copyrights (discussed in Chapter Five). Roberts’s trade activities differed ethically from those conducted by the Tonsons and are discussed in some detail by Treadwell. Plomer points out that there may have been more than one James Roberts who was a bookseller (p. 255). Keith Maslen describes Roberts as one of several ‘well-known “publishers” (in the strict sense of distributor)’, and James McLaverty cautions against literal reading of imprints bearing the name of Roberts during the 1730s’ pamphlet wars: ‘The appearance of [. . .] Roberts’s name on the title-page is in itself of only minor interest---[he] handled a huge volume of newspapers, pamphlets, and books, and [his name] appeared on many title-pages’.\(^3^4\) Frederick


Ribble points out that Roberts ‘allowed his name to be used in imprints but seldom had any real control over the production of the work’. According to James May, Roberts acted as a publisher for copyright holders. In spite of his known flexibility in allowing the use of his name as publisher, Roberts may have had a publishing arrangement with Samuel Johnson, for in 1743 Roberts allegedly published the *Life* of Richard Savage, which, Johnson wrote, ‘will be published in 8vo by Mr. Roberts, in Warwick-lane’ (Redford, *Letters*, 1, 32-33). James Boswell was baffled as to why Savage’s *Life* was published by Roberts, and commented that ‘In February, 1744, [it] accordingly came forth from the shop of Roberts, between whom and Johnson I have not traced any connection, except the casual one of this publication’ (*Letters*, 1, 96). His use of ‘casual’ suits Ribble’s characterization of Roberts’s obliging approach to the use of his name, and has a bearing on his name’s appearance in wordbooks for *Hercules*. In common with other trade publishers, Roberts denied an interest in the controversial works he published, and the advice given to readers both by Maslen and McLaverty is not to take Roberts’s name in an imprint as proof of his being the commissioning bookseller (*Richardson*, p. 40; ‘Of which’, pp. 193-94).

The appearance of Roberts’s name in wordbook imprints for *Hercules* should not therefore be accepted literally, for reasons discussed in Chapter Five, where a suggested solution is proposed. In the broader context of the book trade, however, all six men named in the wordbook imprints for *Joseph* and *Hercules* were men of particular enterprise, producing print artefacts that were integral to enjoyment and appreciation of oratorios. Gauging the
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practical nature of their involvement entails some understanding of the costs they sustained and the likely returns they could expect for commitment to this niche market.

4.3. *Wordbook printing costs.*

In contrast to the prices of wordbooks, which appear on most title-pages, there are no extant ledgers for Watts and the Tonsons from which to verify wordbook printing costs. These costs can only be reconstructed by examining printers’ ledgers for the known expenses of similar publications. There is thus no firm evidence of costs and size of impressions for wordbooks in connection with Handel’s London oratorios. An entry in a ledger belonging to the printer Charles Ackers is important to the following discussion because it records the charge for printing of John Hoadly’s oratorio libretto *Jephtha* (for music by Maurice Greene) in 1739. From this entry it is possible to deduce some idea of the costs involved in printing the wordbooks for *Joseph* and *Hercules* and to throw light on the funding of their production. That Watts and the Tonsons were involved in wordbook production for more than two decades suggests that the returns for their enterprise were favourable.

Size and number of sheets are significant factors in determining wordbook publishing costs. Wordbooks for Handel’s oratorios were produced in quarto and entirely in English, in contrast to wordbooks for his operas. Opera wordbooks were octavo and had facing-page Italian and English texts, which entailed printing two versions of the libretto, once in each language. For example, the first wordbook for Handel’s opera *Alcina* crammed up to forty-two lines of text per Italian and English octavo page, leaving little room for generous point spacing
between blocks of text and headings. The cost of type-setting an opera wordbook was greater because of the intricate work involved in handling small fount and the Italian language and the greater number of pages required to accommodate the dual-language libretto. Opera wordbooks were therefore presumably more expensive to produce than their oratorio counterparts. Three opera wordbooks from the 1730s, when oratorios became a public event and Handel’s opera seasons struggled, provide examples of the scale of dual-language print work involved. The number of printed pages in the opera octavo wordbooks for *Partenope* (HWV 27, 1730) was 78 pages, for *Alcina* (HWV, 1735) 54 pages, and for *Faramondo* (HWV 39, 1737) 70 pages. In comparison, the copy-text wordbook for *Joseph* occupies 32 spacious quarto pages. An oratorio libretto with its larger fount reduced the intricacy of print work as no extended foreign language material was involved and each libretto page required less type than for an Italian opera. But these elementary inferences do not suggest the costs associated with oratorio wordbooks, which were dependent on the number and size of sheets, the number of pressings, and the cost of labour of the several crafts concerned.

The print processes involved in oratorio wordbook production can be inferred from practitioners such as Moxon and Smith. Once the libretto had been secured from the author, the text was prepared by the master printer for his compositor in a process termed casting-off copy, which initiated conversion of the oratorio manuscript libretto into print work. This procedure is summarized by Richard Clement as an ‘estimation of the length of a book, page by page, to enable the appropriate amount of paper to be ordered, to allow the allotment of’
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work, and to make overall decisions about typographical details.\textsuperscript{39} The compositor collated the required typefaces (e.g. capitals and black letters) and ornaments and applied printer’s furniture to set margins and white spaces. He then set the type in the frame prior to the forme being put to the press. The pressman received the appropriate size of sheet, as determined for an oratorio wordbook by the bookseller. The printed sheets were folded, cut and trimmed, punched, and then thread-sewn, processes which can be inferred from the Birmingham copy of J47A.

Maslen explains that Samuel Richardson’s printing charges, set out in a letter to Alexander Gordon, Secretary of the Society for the Encouragement of Learning and dated 9 November 1738, were based on the rule of ‘common 3rds’ (Richardson, p. 13). This means that composition was paid per sheet, payment dependent on type size and other factors. Presswork was paid per 250 impressions, correction at one-sixth the rate of composition. The master’s share was one-third of the total charge for his work. Maslen’s suggestion that Richardson thinks ‘that there is nothing idiosyncratic about this procedure’ underpins the cautious application of this printer’s figures to wordbook production (Richardson, pp. 13-14).

Printers reduced their costs when the author and not an employee corrected the proofs. Miller and Broughton may have done so for their oratorio librettos. There are no extant manuscript librettos of Joseph and Hercules prepared for the stage licensing authorities, and thus no proof of who determined page layout, including the placing of character cues. That this stage may have been the responsibility of the librettist is borne out by Morell’s manuscript libretto of the oratorio Theodora (for music by Handel) in Manchester Central Library, signed

by the composer for submission to the stage licensing officer, and set out as if a setting copy.

Whatever the extent of cutting costs by involving the librettist, the bookseller’s risk in underwriting oratorio wordbooks was perhaps greater than for many of his other publications. The black-and-white plainness of wordbook title pages, none of which gained the expensive luxury of red and black lettering, is in keeping with their status as publications for a specific event and sold to a small and unpredictable market.

Handel’s adjustments to an oratorio close to its first performance necessitated the printer scoring hasty signs on the sheets to mark text that had been altered. The wordbook printer thus was faced with additional work and expense. Hand corrections, as found in the copy-text Hercules (T45), disfigured the printed sheets, but to the printer they were preferable to the cost of emergency resetting. But it was the extent of Handel’s revisions for oratorio revivals, including those of Joseph and Hercules, which probably posed the greatest threat of supplementary costs.

Revivals of an oratorio also presented an opportunity to circumvent some of those additional costs. To mitigate the expense of resetting a new wordbook, more sheets were printed at first impression than were required for immediate sale. By putting surplus sheets from the previous printing into store, a practice inferred from trade sales catalogues advertising books ‘in sheets’ (i.e. in gatherings), the printer had a stock of sheets ready for a revival of the work. The economy of this practical measure was nevertheless vulnerable to Handel’s editorial changes. Since subsequent performances of his oratorios invariably involved alterations to the libretto, costs could be minimized, provided the composer’s cuts and interpolations required the resetting of one sheet only. Such an expedient enabled the printer to make up ‘new’ wordbooks by supplementing the reprinted sheet with the rest of the
stored stock. Costs could further be minimized when, to accommodate textual changes, printed slips containing the verse for an air introduced from another work were pasted on to the stored leaves. Presumably, these slips were prepared by printing the altered text several times on waste sheets, which apprentices then cut up and pasted on to the previously printed sheets. Copies of J47 have a pasted cancel slip that was probably applied as a cost-cutting measure. However, counteracting whatever steps the printer took to avoid resetting a wordbook for a revival was the fact that Handel’s changes often resulted in a shortened libretto, requiring fewer leaves than previously. But the bookseller presumably found that any savings in paper costs was partially offset by the cost of resetting.

When wordbooks sold well, type was left standing, a procedure which could only be attempted when the requisite typeface was available in sufficient quantity so as not to interfere with other jobs in the printing office requiring the same typeface. Type was expensive, so type left standing was probably a rare occurrence. Dean, however, maintains that ‘printers kept the type standing; sometimes they reset one or more pages’ (p. 96). This statement needs qualifying in the light of known printing practices. Because a year or more separated oratorio revivals, leaving type standing would have been feasible only when impressions quickly followed each other. Watts was a busy printer, often with many books in simultaneous production. Careful disposition of type to particular publications probably avoided those hold-ups arising from having to wait for pages of one book to be composed before a type could be made available for another book. Dean’s supposition that Watts stored the formes while waiting for the next pressing seems predicated on the considerable expenditure of buying and retaining large quantities of duplicate type. But such expense could only be justified if standing type was a commercial alternative to resetting, which in turn would have to be paid
for from plentiful sales. *Samson*, for example, proved a popular work in the theatre, its wordbook, according to Burrows, going through four issues in the period 1742-43 (*Samson*, p. xiii). Even the success of a *Samson* did not necessarily justify the retention of the wordbook as standing type, because oratorio librettos represented uncomplicated work for the compositor, who could use earlier wordbooks as casting-off copy. Should standing type have been used, in the words of Maslen the ‘reduced cost of reimpresion [was] passed on to the customer, apparently as a matter of right’.⁴⁰ Any savings in wordbook printing costs may have reduced overall costs to the bookseller.

Few revivals of oratorios took place without a new wordbook. Because imprint dates do not always match known years of performances, it can safely be assumed that wordbooks for those seasons from which no date-specific wordbook survives used sheets from previous impressions. Many later wordbooks were not dated in order to give the product a prolonged saleability. This pragmatic response is similar to the music scores printed by John Walsh, who left his printed scores undated, presumably because of Handel’s failing health and the consequent uncertainty of oratorio seasons and future sales. Dean’s interpretation that undated wordbooks were a response to ‘growing demand’ is compatible with this view (p. 98).

Copyright was a high proportion of the total cost of many publications (wordbook copyrights are discussed in Chapter Five). As there is no evidence that librettists were paid for their literary effort, they may have given the rights to their copy to the bookseller. A gift of the copyright may have improved the economics of wordbook production. Miller and Broughton did not possess the funds to commission the printing of their wordbooks. As already
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mentioned, Jennens may have commissioned Watts to publish the complete text to *Belshazzar* in 1745, which was almost one third longer than the text which Handel set. If he underwrote the wordbook’s costs, it was Jennens who therefore exercised some control over the publication process. In contrast, Miller and Broughton could only manage the inclusion of some text that Handel had not set and their paratext.

An entry for a wordbook in a printer’s ledger dating from Watts’s time compensates to some extent for the lack of documentary evidence of wordbook production costs for Handel’s oratorios. From this single item it is possible to extrapolate an idea of these costs. The ledger records that Charles Ackers charged James Bettenham, a printer mainly of theological and historical works and textbooks for Westminster School, for printing a sheet for the wordbook of Hoadly’s oratorio libretto *Jephtha.* As no performance of *Jephtha* is known for 1739 it is not certain that these sheets ever formed wordbooks. There does exist, however, a copy of a wordbook for this work dated 1737, when, according to a contemporary marginal note, it was first performed at the ‘Academy of Apollo’ (Otago University Library, Eb 1737 H). For the 1739 wordbook, Ackers’s ledger notes, ‘Due from Mr Bettenham 6 Nov [1739] To printing Jeptha; an Oratoria, no. 500, containing one sheet Pd 14[.[s.]] 0[d.].’ This means that Bettenham was charged fourteen shillings for the printing work involved in an impression of five-hundred. McKenzie and Ross explain that this *Jephtha* wordbook has not been traced and is ‘presumably a further edition’ of that published in 1737 (p. 265). A collation of the earlier wordbook (1737, 8vo: A—B⁴) shows that the first edition required two sheets. It may be that
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42 Collation details taken from *Jephtha* (1737) in the library of the University of Otago: details supplied in private communication with Donald Kerr, Keeper of Special Collections, University of Otago.
the sheet charged for by Ackers replaced one of the two 1737 sheets to make up a wordbook for a revival that may never have taken place. The charge for printing two sheets in an impression of five-hundred would, therefore, have been twenty-eight shillings.

To arrive at an overall charge for a wordbook sheet, paper charges must be added to the printing charge. Paper was a significant cost to the bookseller. It accounted for up to half of the total cost of production, as Patricia Hernlund has shown in her studies of William Strahan’s ledgers, which were maintained from 1738 to 1785. Hernlund found that Strahan charged his customers about fourteen shillings for a ream of paper, a cost which must be added to Ackers’s charge for printing the *Jephtha* sheet (‘Papers’, p. 191). The likely paper cost for a two-sheet wordbook would therefore have been about twenty-eight shillings for an impression of five-hundred, which when added to the printing cost suggests a cost to the bookseller of fifty-six shillings.

Within his printing charge Ackers presumably included his customary ‘third’, which would have brought him four shillings and eight pence. The remaining nine shillings and four pence was to cover wages and presswork, and extras that included minor processes, such as ink, replacement typeface, and additional washing of the forme between the pressings of different sheets (Hernlund, ‘Printing’, p. 105). As with all calculations in this discussion, inferences for Handel’s oratorio wordbooks need drawing with caution: for example, Ackers may have calculated his charges differently from other printers.

Print work requiring fewer than two-and-a-half sheets reduced costs. Printers regarded this as ‘jobbing work’, which could be fitted in between the pressings for large publications, a
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procedure that may have been the case with *Jephtha*. The greater number of sheets required for all the wordbooks for *Joseph* and *Hercules* means that this cost-saving procedure was unavailable. But the nature of the print work for wordbooks possibly led to economy of a different kind. Small type faces cost more to set, Strahan, for example, appearing to have charged his customers more for small typefaces. Watts’s wordbooks may have been cheaper to print because of an almost uniform deployment of large typefaces, Miller’s two-page advertisement in *Joseph* (discussed in Chapter Six) being an exception. The lack of complex syntactical structures avoided decelerating the rate of composition. As stationers, the Tonsons would have had paper in stock to supply Watts, their printer, who probably accessed this at cost, a transaction likely to have reduced the overall cost of wordbook publication.

As Watts’s ledgers no longer exist, there are no verifiable means of accurately assessing the size and therefore the costs of wordbook impressions. Ackers’s charges, however, give a clue to the impression size of a wordbook for a minor musical event. For a larger event, such as a Handel oratorio, impressions were probably much larger than five hundred. Nichol, relating that William Warburton thought one thousand the smallest impression ‘as can possibly be printed’, gives a useful intimation that the larger number may have been generally the case (*Literary Legacy*, p. 50).

Insofar as it relates to one print run, the authenticated entry in Ackers’s ledger and the cost of paper make it possible to produce a broad estimate of the cost of producing wordbooks for Handel’s oratorios. This procedure involves dividing the sum of the printing charge and paper cost (adding a small margin for punching and stitching) by five-hundred. Each individual printed sheet therefore cost about one penny to produce.
The economics of wordbook production for oratorio revivals were unlikely to differ from those of the first wordbooks. M44 required four sheets, a batch of five hundred therefore costing in the region of £8 6s. 8d. to produce. Some allowance needs to be made for the extra print work involved with J47 in resetting and preparing slips for the air ‘Pow’rful Guardians’, pasted and hinged on to the outer face of sheet B to save resetting, though this would have been more than offset by the thrift of using printed sheets from M44. Watts twice reset sheet A, perhaps to meet customer demand. J57, wholly reset because the text was much reduced from the earlier libretto, required three and a half sheets and possibly cost, on the basis of Ackers’s charges, about £7 5s. 10d. to produce. The octavo T45, formed from three and a half sheets, may have cost the Tonsons about £5 4s. 2d. Because of the change from octavo to quarto for R49, new setting was required. R49 and R52 used three sheets each. R49 therefore possibly cost Tonson about £6 5s. 0d. per five hundred wordbooks.

4.4. Wordbook markets and prices.

Defining the market for wordbooks in Handel’s time requires reliable audience figures. In determining the size of a wordbook impression the bookseller probably estimated the size of Handel’s audiences and the number of times the oratorio was to be performed that season. Complicating his calculation was the uncertainty of Handel’s repertory, which was never fixed because it was subject to the vagaries of singer-availability and fickle audience response. The 1745 season, featuring Hercules, proved especially problematic, as explained by Burrows (Handel, pp. 278-84), and Hercules failed to attract a substantial audience. However, it can be shown that reduced attendance figures may not have endangered the underlying profitability of wordbook production.
In the mid-eighteenth century oratorios in English quickly gained canonical status, though the season in which they were performed was short, and the number of times each oratorio was performed was far fewer than sparkling theatrical successes like *The Beggar’s Opera*. *Joseph* was performed ten times before Handel’s death and *Hercules* five times. Wordbooks thus served a small clientele whose number cannot be verified by box office figures, because they are not extant for Handel’s time in London. However, the impression size for the wordbook for Handel’s Roman oratorio *La Resurrezione* (1708) is recorded as one and a half thousand (*HHb iv*, 34), and Eva Zöllner cites a Covent Garden account book which recorded at a performance of *Judas Maccabaeus* on 17 February 1761 ‘a crowd of 1158’ (p. 120). Eighteenth-century writers are less exact. A description of a house as ‘empty’ might mean that the writer’s class of person was not present in great numbers. To a spectator, an audience scattered about the benches in the pit and around the boxes could appear ‘full’ or ‘crowded’, so that knowledge of theatre capacity is no aid when assessing the extent of the booksellers’ market. Burney thought none of Handel’s oratorios ‘well attended’, except *Samson* and *Messiah*. Yet wordbook income from less ‘well attended’ houses was presumably sufficient to justify new wordbooks for numerous revivals of, for example, *Judas Maccabaeus*. Estimation of the wordbook market must therefore rest on sounder bases than these descriptions. *Joseph*, as already mentioned, was performed four times in 1744, giving four specific sales opportunities. With revivals in mind, Watts may have printed a larger impression in 1744 than he knew he would sell in that year on the assumption that unsold sheets could make up wordbooks for a revival at minimal cost. In the event, *Joseph* was
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revived on two occasions in the 1745 season, but no wordbook exists with that year in its imprint, suggesting that Watts did indeed overprint in 1744 in anticipation of a revival.

In calculating the impression figures for a revived oratorio, the bookseller may have taken into account the proportion of audience members who already possessed a wordbook for that work. Considering the relatively high price charged for wordbooks, previous customers are unlikely to have bought fresh copies for later performances. Audience statistics therefore, if they were available, could not be a sure guide to wordbook markets. Additionally, there is evidence that wordbook customers were not restricted to Handel’s audiences. The library of the University of St Andrews holds a copyright copy of *Joseph* annotated by a student but for which there is no record of a local musical performance. The student’s annotation of this copy in the Dramatis Personae, e.g. Asenath is ‘Daughter to the High-Priest’, shows that this particular wordbook was read independently of the music. The Birmingham copy of J47A may be further proof of this practice, as already mentioned. Wordbooks may have been retained for reading after performances, enabling customers to revisit the drama in its literary form and recall the oratorio’s choicest moments. Reinhard Strohm comments that ‘The massive survival of librettos in private collections is one of the signs that *dramma per musica* were widely read at home, like other literature’ (p. 1). This observation reflects reading and book collection habits in Britain. Wordbook reading probably took place in the private space of the home, before and after performances, as well as in the social space of a theatre during a performance. But retention of wordbooks by customers for use at revivals would have involved them in encountering many verbal divergences between what was printed and what was heard in a performance in a later season. Wealthier patrons may have purchased subsequent wordbooks to avoid the inconvenience of consulting an inaccurate text.
Since theatre-size, readership, and wordbook impression size cannot be stated accurately, the entry in Ackers’s ledger is a particularly useful guide to the extent of Bettenham’s market. But Maslen cautions against inductive readings of ledgers. His criticism of Hernlund’s reconstruction of William Strahan’s printing charges, for what he claims is its obfuscation of gaps and anomalies, rightly focuses a search for the scale of wordbook markets on the ‘right kind of evidence’ (*Printing House*, p. 91). For this discussion, that evidence resides in trade practices. Maslen’s survey of Richardson’s methods notes that Richardson regarded his own explanation of trade practices as ‘nothing idiosyncratic’ (*Richardson*, p. 14). Richardson’s testimony strengthens the estimate above that Hoadly’s *Jephtha* cost Bettenham about a penny a sheet. Treadwell’s judgment that ‘dealings with publishers conform to the same general pattern’ encourages extension of this costing method when considering Watts’s wordbook costs (p. 126).

An idea of costs leads to consideration of booksellers’ income from wordbooks. *Jephtha* (1737) has the price of sixpence on its title-page. Supposing this book had a similar impression size as in 1739, two sheets for an impression of five hundred at 1d. per each sheet means that the *Jephtha* wordbook cost about £4 3s. 4d. to produce. Sold to an audience of perhaps two hundred or so crowded into the Apollo tavern venue, it may have required sales of one hundred and sixty copies to cover its costs. The notion of tight margins is reinforced by evidence in Fielding’s *Amelia*, already mentioned, which reveals that during oratorio performances more than one person may have shared a wordbook (II, 80-81). So, for a small venture such as *Jephtha*, such sharing would have severely constrained sales and publisher’s income. That Bettenham was active in wordbook production for the tiny market of those attending at the Apollo suggests that he published *Jephtha* without the prospect of selling all
wordbooks. If he sold most of his wordbooks for *Jephtha*, Bettenham probably more than covered his costs.

Wordbooks for *Joseph* and *Hercules* were priced at one shilling, double the price for the Hoadly-Greene *Jephtha* and similar to the price applied to nearly all wordbooks for Handel’s oratorios. Adopting the crude formulation used above for Hoadly’s *Jephtha*, the relation of costs to prices and income for the wordbooks *Joseph* and *Hercules* may have been as follows. M44’s printing and paper cost, a sum possibly similar for J47, was about £8 6s. 8d for a sale of five hundred wordbooks. Watts would have needed to sell at least one hundred and sixty seven wordbooks to cover his costs. Even taking into account any incidental expenses, repeat performances in 1744 may well have achieved a reasonable surplus for Watts. J57 required three-and-a-half sheets for each copy, and the cost for print work and paper was probably about £7 5s. 10d. Bearing in mind the additional expense of resetting, a sale of one hundred and forty six copies would have covered costs. The octavo T45 required two-and-a-half sheets, representing print work and paper charges of about £5 4s. 2d. and a relatively low sale of one hundred and five copies to repay its costs, while R49 and R52, both requiring three sheets, may have cost at least £6 5s. 0d. for paper and print work and therefore needing sales of about one hundred and twenty six copies to cover costs. It is now clear why Watts and the Tonson dominated the market represented by Handel’s audiences. This market was considerably larger than Hoadly’s, for Handel performed his oratorios in large theatres, often to hundreds of patrons at repeat performances. Because wordbooks for Handel’s audiences were almost certainly produced in greater quantities in a more generous format than Hoadly’s *Jephtha*, it is safe to assume that Watts and the Tonsons recouped their outlay even without selling all their stock.
Some financial liberties appear to have been attempted by wordbook sellers, whose illegitimate price inflation, while not diminishing the bookseller’s profit in itself, may have indirectly harmed his reputation. After the price ‘One Shilling’ on the title-pages of the two ‘Roberts’ wordbooks for *Hercules* appears the cryptic conditional phrase ‘And no more’. This stern admonition warns the seller not to bilk the customer, whose attention is drawn to the correct (and maximum) price. While reinforcing the tentative nature of estimating booksellers’ profits, ‘And no more’ nevertheless injects a note of harsh economic reality into the realms of high art.

No wordbook is known to have been the subject of share sales, perhaps because commissioning booksellers embraced the full financial risk of selling these ephemeral and slim publications tied to specific musical events and to a clientele of a few hundred aficionados. In taking on the whole financial scheme, the bookseller priced a wordbook at a rate he thought the market would bear. The shilling price of wordbooks was cheaper than many contemporary printed plays: for example, Watts priced Miller’s plays at one shilling and sixpence, the same price as his first edition of *The Beggar’s Opera*. But the cheaper price of wordbooks failed to impress Thomas Hearne, who in his diary protested at the price charged in connection with Handel’s visit to Oxford in 1733. On 8 July he wrote:

> Half an hour after 5 Clock yesterday in the afternoon was another Performance, at 5s. a ticket, in the Theater by M’ Handel for his own benefit, continuing till about 8 clock. NB. His book (not worth 1d.) he sells for 1s. *(HHb iv, 218.)*

The wordbook was for *Esther*, printed by Thomas Wood. Hearne’s dyspeptic comment is of course no proof that he was a purchaser, but his reaction indicates that he was sensitive to
perceived value represented by the price. Watts and the Tonsons possessed a sound understanding of the drawing power of Handel’s oratorios. They publicly and consistently supported the composer’s new works by publishing wordbooks for the composer’s audiences.

4.5. Wordbook advertisements and distribution.

Watts and the Tonsons spent money on announcements of the publication of their wordbooks in the London press. Advertising was thus an additional cost. Because newspaper proprietors set their fees in response to demand, Handel’s Lenten oratorio seasons coincided with advertisement charges at their highest, as proprietors took advantage of clients wishing to sell during London’s busiest social period. Nichol notes that the Gentleman’s Magazine and London Magazine carried longer lists of new books between December and May in some years when Parliament was sitting and the theatres were active, ‘with March generally being the peak time for advertising’ (Literary Legacy, p. 14). February to April was the time when booksellers placed their wordbook announcements sparingly, in view of the cost of newspaper advertisements.

Watts announced his wordbooks in the London press on more occasions than did the Tonsons, and his announcements provide evidence from which to date his activities. He publicized a wordbook to Acis and Galatea on 3 December 1739 in the London Daily Post with a warning to his customers: ‘The Price to Gentlemen and Ladies in the Theatre is One Shilling: if more is ask’d, it is an Imposition’ (HHb iv, 315). The wordbook for Joseph needed audience awareness of the product to hope to cover its costs, and Watts announced the publication of Joseph on 29 February 1744 in the London Daily Post (HHb iv, 373). He informed readers that the wordbook could be purchased on 1 March 1744, the day of the
oratorio’s first performance (\textit{HHb} IV, 371-72). He announced his next wordbook, \textit{Belshazzar}, on 26 March 1745 in the \textit{General Advertiser} and made three further announcements in the newspapers over the years (\textit{HHb} IV, 388). On 2 April 1747 Watts announced the wordbook of \textit{Judas Maccabaeus} in the \textit{General Advertiser} (\textit{HHb} IV, 407). Two years later, on 22 March 1749, he advertised a wordbook for \textit{Messiah} in the \textit{General Advertiser} (\textit{HHb} IV, 422). On 22 February 1758, perhaps at Jennens’s instigation, Watts advertised a wordbook for \textit{Belshazzar} (\textit{HHb} IV, 513). Though his announcements of wordbook publications may be greater in number than those made by the Tonsons, Watts was an irregular customer of the newspapers and many of his wordbooks were sold without any known publicity.

The Tonsons advertised their wordbook for \textit{Semele} shortly before Watts publicized \textit{Joseph}. On 10 February 1744 in the \textit{London Daily Post} Jacob Tonson inserted the following announcement:

\begin{quote}
This Day is published, Price 1s. (As it will this Evening be perform’d at the Theatre-Royal in Covent-Garden;) The Story of Semele; Alter’d from the Semele of Mr. Congreve. Set to Musick by Mr. Handel. Printed for J. and R. Tonson, in the Strand. (\textit{HHb} IV, 371-72.)
\end{quote}

The allusion to Congreve roots the work firmly in the literary mainstream, allying it with a respected and popular dramatist. The following year the Tonsons advertised the wordbook for \textit{Hercules} in the \textit{General Advertiser}, 5 January 1745 (not in \textit{HHb} IV):

\begin{quote}
This Day is Publish’d Price 1s. Hercules. A Musical Drama. As it is perform’d at the King’s Theatre in the Hay-Market. The Musick by Mr. Handel. Printed for J. and R. Tonson and S. Draper, in the Strand.\textsuperscript{45}
\end{quote}

In 1759 the Tonsons printed two different issues of the wordbook for *Samson*, announcing in the *Public Advertiser* on the 14 March a second, amended wordbook incorporating cuts to the text (*HHb* iv, 526). They presumably drew attention to the changes to entice holders of the previous wordbook to buy a new one.

There were other means by which Watts made his wordbooks known. Watts advertised *Joseph* in a general catalogue of his books for sale. In *Joseph*, he used adroit product placement to suggest to readers other books they might be interested in buying (discussed in Chapter Six). In the 1757 wordbook, Dod advertised publications for which he was responsible because Watts was unwell.

Distribution of wordbooks to customers for *Joseph* was convenient, in that Watts had his printing-office in Wild Court in Middlesex, while Dod had premises in Ave-Mary Lane, among the trade publishers in the City. The working relationship between these two men is misrepresented by Burrows and Shaw, who write that all wordbooks for *Messiah* from 1749 onwards were ‘published by Watts and Dod’.

This interpretation is a misreading of the imprint in the 1749 *Messiah* wordbook:

> Printed by and for J. Watts, and Sold by him at the printing-Office in Wild-Court near Lincoln’s-Inn-Fields: And by B. Dod, at the Bible and Key in Ave-Mary-Lane, near Stationers-Hall.

This notice carefully differentiates the two participants: Watts is commissioning bookseller and Dod probably his named City retailer. Treadwell claims that printers ‘did not generally retail their own works’, but the imprint from the 1749 *Messiah* wordbook shows Watts to be

---

an exception to this principle, for he was his own bookseller and printer and sold wordbooks from his printing office (p. 104). Dod did not publish wordbooks, with the probable exception of J57; he was not the risk partner. He may have sold Watts’s wordbooks at wholesale prices, the kind of commercial arrangement that can be seen in the imprint to Bartholome Casas’s *Popery and Slavery Display’d* (1745), which was priced at 1s. each or 10s. per dozen.47 Books accumulated in this way were available for the distributor bookseller to exchange for titles held by other booksellers, a transaction described by John Dunton at the beginning of the eighteenth century:

> The very first Copy, I wou’d venture to Print, was by the Reverend Mr. Doolittle, and entituled THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST. This Book fully answer’d my End, for exchanging it, thro’ the whole Trade, it furnish’d my Shop with all sorts of Books, saleable at that Time [. . .].48

When items such as wordbooks promised a restricted sale, Watts it seems minimized his distribution costs by limiting the number of sales outlets to the theatre, himself, and Dod.

Watts proudly claimed ownership of his wordbooks: ‘Printed for’. Treadwell thinks ‘printed for’ should be treated with vigilance, because the printer may not have received instructions about the required wording (p. 116). But Watts used this formulation more than once on books he registered as his own products, e.g. *Belshazzar* (1745). The imprint of M44 implies that it was published at the instigation and expense (‘for’) of Watts and then ‘Sold by him’. Wild Court, near Lincoln’s Inn, was close to an educated and sophisticated clientele; Dod’s address was convenient to the City, as the imprint’s precise wording makes clear, and

---

47 Bartholome Casas, *Popery and Slavery Display’d, 3rd edition.* (London: Corbett, 1745): ‘Price 1s. or 10s. per Dozen’.
thus accessible for those merchants who were regular patrons of Handel’s oratorio seasons. Not only were Londoners able to receive wordbooks near their places of business, but distribution to the provinces was also swift, for the University of St Andrews’s accession books, under the heading ‘Books from Stationers’ Hall, Lady Day 1744’ (no document reference), record the arrival of a copy of *Joseph* only four weeks after Watts deposited it with the Stationers’ Company.

Watts and the Tonsons between them financed print artefacts whose contemporary utility quickly vanished. The persistence of both entrepreneurs in protecting their rights in wordbooks, and publishing them for nearly two decades, attests to the likely profitability of their enterprise. If what little is known about wordbook costs is set against the verifiable prices charged for wordbooks, as well as the general popularity of Handel’s oratorio performances and the wordbooks published for oratorio revivals, then it is safe to assume that wordbook production was sufficiently attractive on financial grounds to sustain the interest of Watts and the Tonsons. The potential indirect benefits, if only to a particular kind of bookseller, of publishing so respectable yet luxurious-looking an art-form may have constituted further commercial enticements. It is surprising, then, that more booksellers were not tempted into the market. But any lack of interest by booksellers in competing with the Tonsons and Watts in such a narrow market probably lay with issues concerning copyright and book trade practices as much as capital risk.
Chapter Five.

PRINTER, COPYRIGHTS, AND WORDBOOKS FOR JOSEPH AND HERCULES.

5.1. Identifying the printer from ornament evidence.

Ornaments can confirm the identity of the printer of wordbooks. They are traces of his involvement, detectable in factotums, headpieces, end-pieces, flowers, woodblock designs, and friezes. Ornaments are bibliographically important because they provide a useful check on the trustworthiness of imprints and, when the imprint gives no clue, help determine the identity of each wordbook’s printer.

As was their usual practice, the Tonsons did not name their printer for Hercules in the imprints to T45, R49, and R52. The ornaments, however, offer a means of discovering the name of the printer they contracted for R49 and R52, which name ‘Roberts’ as their bookseller. Before naming the printer of R49 and R52, it will first be helpful to identify who printed the three Joseph wordbooks (M44, J47, and J57) and the first wordbook for Hercules (T45), because they share print features. On ornament evidence alone, it is sound to maintain that Watts printed all three wordbooks for Joseph: M44, J47, and J57. His ornaments in

---

Joseph wordbooks begin an evidential trail to the distinctiveness of the printer of the three Hercules wordbooks.  

5.2. Watts and Joseph.

Watts’s ornaments are visual markers of the printer’s involvement in the book’s production, though they are not infallible guides to accurate dating of the publication in which they appear. Nevertheless, when all other print details appear identical, they can help to differentiate between candidate printers. As McLaverty found when preparing work on John Wright, whose print shop records are lost, bibliographers can look to ornaments to establish a link when imprint notices do not name a printer.  

Watts applied ornaments in a manner similar to Samuel Richardson, of whom Maslen writes that his ‘habitual use of distinctive hand-cut printer’s ornaments’ was a method of ‘signing’ books; ornaments were usually ‘spread throughout the body of the text, especially at the beginning and end of chapters or other text divisions, and provide the chief (sometimes only) hope of identifying work from Richardson’s printing house’ (Richardson, p. 46). Watts similarly deployed ornaments in wordbooks to divide blocks of verse and to occupy what would otherwise be expanses of unprinted space. Used in this way, by emphasizing the partitions, ornaments in wordbooks emphasise the structure of pagination. Elsewhere they act as tailpieces to Parts and adorn the title-page as the printer’s ornament, this latter being a characteristic mark of Watts’s participation in the wordbooks.

---

2 In connection with the study of Watts’s ornaments and house style, a selection of books printed by Watts was examined. These books are listed individually in the general bibliography.

Maslen’s caveat about reliance on ornament provenance needs, however, to be borne in mind: ‘Printer’s [sic] ornaments, no matter how carefully tracked, do not always unlock the secrets of the printing house. This may simply be because of paucity of data’ (Richardson, p. 49). However, ornaments compensate for the lack of documentation about wordbook production, provided they adorn only one printer’s publications. Maslen shows that printers shared ornaments: ‘the firm of Tonson and Watts [and others] share most designs with the Bowyers, but in each case only a few ornaments are concerned (Bowyer, p. 8)’. There is as yet no evidence that Watts shared ornaments in Joseph with other printers. His ornaments, therefore, link him directly to the wordbooks for Joseph.

Watts’s use of his most characteristic ornaments spans many years, and some ornaments in Joseph have a long pedigree. Most prominent is the printer’s ornament on the title-page of all three wordbooks for Joseph (51 x 35 mm; all dimensions stated are approximate and in millimetres; the illustrations are not to scale):

![Watts monogram](image)

Fig. 14. Watts monogram used as the printer’s ornament on title-pages of M44, J47, and J57. Private collection.
This elaborate design is a monogram formed from ‘W’, perhaps signifying ‘Watts’, which was used as his printer’s ornament only from as early as Rapin’s *Christus Patiens* (1713).4 It appears on his very first wordbook, *Acis and Galatea* of 1732, for a private performance not directed by Handel. It can also be found in Henry Fielding’s *The Modern Husband* (1732), and *The Mock Doctor* (1732), an adaptation of a play by Molière formerly attributed to Henry Fielding but now thought to be by Miller.5 Watts deployed this device in the wordbook for *Deborah* in 1733, and also used it in his wordbooks for the oratorios *Theodora* (1750) and *Jephtha* (1751). Dominating the title-page, this elegant ornament discreetly portrays the skill of the printer as contributing to the artefact. Its reappearance in the three wordbooks for *Joseph* shows that Watts printed them.

The three wordbooks for *Joseph* share other ornaments, signifying common production by one printer. The initial ‘J’ which commences the synopsis of Joseph’s story (the Advertisement) in M44, p. [5], appears in J47, p. [5], and J57, p. [3]. The initial ‘B’ at the start of the main text in J47, p. [7], also appears in J57, p. [5]. Two flowers, each suitable for a duodecimo book, and which separate Parts 1 and 2 in M44 and J47A and J47B, appear side by side to occupy the width of the quarto type area. All three wordbooks share the design centred on a crown: in M44 and J47 this flower is the right-hand one, whereas in J57 it forms the left-hand flower. The flowers are of similar dimensions in the three wordbooks (123 x 4):

---

4 René Rapin, *Christus Patiens. Carmen Heroicum* (London: Tonson & Watts, 1713), title-page; reproduced in Foxon, p. 27, Fig. 17.
Fig. 15. Two duodecimo flower ornaments in M44, p. 13. By permission of the Gerald Coke Handel Collection, Foundling Museum, 10/D/JOSEPH.

Fig. 16. Two duodecimo flower ornaments in J47, p. 13. By permission of Special Collections, University of Birmingham, Shaw-Hellier 632.

Fig. 17. Two duodecimo flower ornaments in J57, p. 11. By permission of the British Library, 162.m.18.

The flowers heading the page containing Miller’s Advertisement are interesting because they show that there were at least two versions of J47:

Fig. 18. Flower ornament above Advertisement, J47A p. [5] (127 x 6). By permission of Special Collections, University of Birmingham, Shaw-Hellier 632.

Fig. 19. Flower ornament above Advertisement, J47B p. [5] (125 x 6). By permission of the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds, Mt MIL.
Further tying M44 to both versions of J47 are the paired duodecimo flowers that divide Part I from Part II (123 x 4; the image is indistinct in M44):

Fig. 20. The pair of flower ornaments dividing Part I from Part II, M44 p, 22, and J47 p. 22.
By permission of the Gerald Coke Handel Collection, Foundling Museum, 10/D/JOSEPH; and Special Collections, University of Birmingham, Shaw-Hellier 632.

Though Watts never explicitly claimed to have printed the three Joseph wordbooks, ornament evidence shows conclusively that he did so, as does an undated catalogue of his books that he printed after 1744, which has Joseph listed under works by ‘the late Mr. Miller’ and which carries in its imprint, also its title, ‘Printed by and for J. Watts, and Sold by him at the Printing. [sic] Office in Wild-Court near Lincolns-Inn-Fields; and by the Booksellers of Town and Country’. Having established Watts as the printer of the three Joseph wordbooks, it is now possible to establish a similar connection between him and the three wordbooks for Hercules.

5.3. The printer of the first wordbook for Hercules.

The three wordbooks for Hercules share something that the Handel literature has not yet acknowledged. Namely, ornament evidence shows that Watts printed all three editions of Hercules, T45, R49, and R52, including those with the name of Roberts in their imprint.

Before pursuing the thread that ties the Tonsons to the ‘Roberts’ wordbooks, it is necessary to establish a firm connection between Watts and the first wordbook for Hercules, because he is the common link between the Tonsons and their wordbooks from 1744 onwards.
T45 has ‘Printed for J. & R. Tonson and S. Draper’ as its imprint notice, which does not name the printer. Watts declares his ownership of the wordbooks for *Joseph* in the imprints and his ornaments verify that he printed them. Ornament links can be established between Watts and T45. As there is no evidence that Watts shared any wordbook ornament with other printers, it is reasonable to propose that books bearing his ornaments were printed by him.

Throughout his career Watts frequently used a monogram as a title-page device. The printer’s ornament on the title-page of T45, presumably chosen by the printer and not the Tonsons, formed from a ‘W’ entwined with an inverted ‘W’ (33 x 8), can also be found for example in Addison’s *Miscellaneous Works* of 1736, pp. 19, 96, 126, 156, and frequently in Molière’s *Select Comedies* of 1732, e.g. *Le Medecin*, p. 121, a work Watts registered for copyright: 6

![Image of printer's ornament](image)

Fig. 21. Printer’s ornament used on title-page of T45. Private collection.

T45’s elaborately bordered headpiece already had a lengthy lineage by 1745. This ornament, comprising a two-handled urn with fruit, on which sit two butterflies flanked on either side by birds almost in flight, appears in numerous books printed by Watts. It appears as early as L’Estrange’s edition of Seneca’s *Morals* (1718), printed by Watts for Jacob Tonson (p. [355]). It is seen in Miller’s *The Coffee-House* (1737) and *An Hospital for Fools* (1739),

---

6 According to the Stationers’ Company ‘Entry of Copies 1710 to 1746’, Watts registered volumes of *Select Comedies of Mr. de Moliere* on 6 May 1731; 7 and 27 July, 15 August, 9 September, 12 October, and 7 December 1732.
plays printed and published by Watts and registered for copyright by him. It appears only once in a Watts oratorio wordbook because it is designed for octavo and T45 is the sole octavo oratorio wordbook. It also appears in Miller’s *The Universal Passion* (1737), where it heads the dedication (86 x 29):

Fig. 22. Headpiece in Watts’s printing of Miller’s *The Universal Passion*, p. [iii]. Private collection.

The quality of pressing makes the ornament appear, eight years later in T45, as sharp as its earlier appearances:

Fig. 23. Headpiece to T45, p. [7]. By permission of the British Library, 161.e.37.

---

7 According to the Stationers’ Company ‘Entry of Copies 1710 to 1746’, Watts registered James Miller’s *The Coffee-House* on 31 January 1732 and Miller’s *An Hospital for Fools* on 19 November 1739.
Factotums provide additional connections between Watts and Hercules. The imprint to Walter Jones’s *Seventeen Sermons* states that Watts was the printer, so that the sharing of one of its factotums (20 x 20) with T45 indisputably connects Watts to the printing of this wordbook:  

![Factotum Images](image)

Fig. 24. Watts factotum in (a) Jones, *Sermons*, p. 99; (b) T45, p. [5]; (c) M44, p. [3].

- a) Private collection; b) and c) By permission of Gerald Coke Handel Collection, Foundling Museum, b) 10/E/HERCULES, and c) 10/D/JOSEPH.

This factotum appears as the first letter of the dedication in *Joseph*, M44 (p. [3]), and is used in Littleton’s *Sermons* of 1749 (p. 320), the imprint of which declares Watts as the printer.  

Also connecting Watts to the printing of T45 is the sharing of an initial ‘W’ (12 x 12) between a wordbook for *Joseph* (J57) and T45:

---


A winged and trumpeting Victory or Fame holding a laurel branch is in many of Watts’s printings, for instance in the Maittaire edition of six comedies by Terence of 1713 and Molière’s *Select Comedies* of 1732, Ⅱ, *Le Medecin*, 129, and materializes as an endpiece to Act 1 in T45 (48 x 40):¹⁰

The ornaments described are thus strong evidence that Watts printed the first wordbook for *Hercules*.

---

¹⁰ [Terence], *Publīi Terentii Carthaginīensis Afri Comoedīae Sex.* (London: Tonson and Watts, 1713), p. [xvi].
5.4. Hercules: *Roberts and Watts*.

Ornament evidence also authenticates Watts’s printing of the two wordbooks with the name of ‘J. Roberts’ in the imprints. Because of this, the imprint claim for Roberts’s ownership should not be taken at face value. As a trade publisher Roberts was willing to allow his name to be used as an alias on contentious books and pamphlets. It might seem a mystery why an elderly Roberts should suddenly engage in wordbook production in 1749, when he had never published wordbooks before for oratorios directed by Handel. However, evidence shows that he had collaborated earlier with Watts, partner to Tonson, so, for that reason, his name on R49 and R52 would not have seemed unusual. For example, Roberts and Watts shared publication of the ballad opera *Robin Hood*, with Watts as bookseller and Roberts as nominated City retailer, a distribution arrangement similar to the one Watts later made with Dod.\(^{11}\)

The most prominent ornament that connects Watts with the ‘Roberts’ wordbooks is a Watts ornament used on the title-page. It has two cherubs blowing clouds, with crossed trumpets (33 mm x 19mm):

![Watts cherubs-and-trumpets ornament](image)

Fig. 27. Watts cherubs-and-trumpets ornament used on the title-pages of R49 and R52. Private collection.

\(^{11}\) [Anonymous], *Robin Hood. An Opera. As it is perform’d at Lee’s and Harper’s Great Theatrical Booth in Bartholomew-fair. Printed for J. Watts* [1730]; cited in Burling, p. 168.
This delightful design occurs frequently in Watts’s work, and can be found, for instance, in Molière’s *Select Comedies* of 1732, III, 46, a publication which Watts copyright-registered and advertised as his property for many years. It appears, for example, as an Act divider in Addison’s *Works* of 1736, II, 47, and in Littleton’s *Sermons*, p. 128, and also on the title-page of the 1759 wordbook for Handel’s and Morell’s *Theodora*, which names Watts as the printer. The effect of this device for those who recognized it may have been to question the veracity of the imprint connection with Roberts. Watts’s title-page ornaments are sufficiently distinctive for discerning readers to detect the identity of the printer and associate him with the Tonsons.

Other ornaments also relate R49 and R52 to Watts. The flower that extends the full width of the type-block to divide Parts II and III in J57 can be found above the Advertisement on page [3] of R49 and R52. In R49 and R52 it measures 145 x 7, slightly wider than the type area:

![Fig. 28. Watts flower in R49 and R52, p. [3]. By permission of the British Library, 1344.n.17 (shown). By permission of the Trustees of the National Library of Scotland, BH Lib. 83.](image)

Five years after its appearance in R52, the same ornament was displayed in J57, but with a less sharp outline:
This later blurred appearance in *Joseph* suggests less careful pressing; perhaps because of Watts’s illness the pressing was less scrupulously supervised. The ornament’s use in *Joseph* provides another link between Watts and R49 and R52.

An elegant ornament, centred on a bird with spread wings, adorns the start of the main text in both versions of J47 (137 x 20), where it acts as headpiece to the main text, the position it occupies in R49 and R52:

A similar headpiece also tops the first page of the main text in both ‘Roberts’ wordbooks. The flower placed above the Advertisement in J47A (illustrated earlier) occurs beneath the Advertisement in R52, p. [5]:
Small ‘mirrored’ printer’s flowers (13 x 6) are found in many publications printed by Watts. It appears, for example, in Addison’s *Works*, II, [123] and 156, and in Littleton’s *Sermons*, pp. vi, 173, 214. Its presence in R52 helps to confirm that this printing is the work of Watts:

These flowers, and the other examples already mentioned, provide sound proof of ornamental commonality between books and wordbooks printed by Watts and the editions of *Hercules* issued under the name of ‘J. Roberts’.

5.5. Hercules: the Tonsons, Watts, and Roberts.

In view of the caution mentioned in Chapter Four, that readers should not take literally imprints which state ‘Printed for J. Roberts’, the imprints to *Hercules* that name this bookseller demand vigilance. Though the imprints for R49 and R52 declare the ownership of Roberts, his name raises the question of why the Tonsons should appear publicly to yield their property in *Hercules* to him. An answer could be that these wordbooks were apparently
commissioned by Roberts because *Hercules*, a secular oratorio, was a genre with which the Tonsons did not wish to be associated publicly when it was revived. The Tonsons may have been responding to critical reaction to Handel’s 1744 Lenten season, in which *Semele*, for which the Tonsons published the wordbook, was not well received because it was secular and considered risqué. Dean highlights how Jennens, in his copy of Mainwaring’s *Memoirs*, describes *Semele* as ‘no oratorio but a baudy [*sic*] opera’.¹² Jennens’s reaction was indicative of a general disquiet over classical, non-Christian musical drama by an audience which preferred biblical oratorios and demonstrated its displeasure by staying away from performances. Perhaps Handel intended a succession of Greek tragedies to complement his biblical oratorios during Lent, one of each in a season, as in 1744 and 1745. It could be that his audience learned of this aim and registered its disapproval by staying away from *Hercules*. If the Tonsons were privy to Handel’s intentions, they may have sought to conceal their loyal commitment to the composer, for they had already signalled that *Hercules* was not a sacred oratorio when they departed from the customary quarto by publishing T45 in octavo. It may be that when they reverted to quarto they put ‘J. Roberts’ on the title-pages of R49 and R52 to divert attention from their possession of the copyright. But it is not the imprint alone which declared that the claim of ownership by Roberts was a deception.

In using Roberts as their proxy, the Tonsons bore, using Treadwell’s words, ‘the slight added expense of paying a publisher to stand between the authorities and the person really responsible’ (p. 113). The Tonsons may have viewed explicit association with *Hercules* as likely to damage their reputation with leading living authors and their guardianship of the

---

literary standing of dead writers. In a poem addressed to Jacob Tonson, William Collins praised Tonson for protecting his authors:

Yours is the price, whate’er their merits claim,
Heir of their verse and guardian of their flame!
(William Collins, Drafts and Fragments 24, in The Poems, p. 532).

James May’s remark that the Tonsons put their names to books that were ‘more likely to sell to “fine-paper” customers than the trade publisher Roberts’, seems highly relevant to this ploy of using Roberts to avoid besmirching their association with serious literature.13

The oddity of Roberts’s name in wordbook imprints was first examined by Dean, who focuses on connections between the Tonson partners and Roberts: ‘Roberts evidently worked in association with Watts, who had an arrangement with the Tonsons’ (p. 433). Dean does not explain what Watts had to do with Hercules, but suggests that the appearance of the name of Roberts ‘was probably a case of exchanged copyright rather than piracy’, adding in a footnote that ‘Roberts may have printed it [Hercules] from the first: the 1745 edition is quite different in format and layout from the other Tonson librettos’ (p. 98 fn. 2). He correctly surmises that Watts and the Tonsons were in partnership, but gives no evidence with which to solve the conundrum. For him, Roberts’s name in imprints verifies Roberts’s contribution to wordbook production: ‘It is impossible to say why Roberts took over this Tonson libretto, but it was a legal transaction, not a piracy’, another claim for which Dean offers no evidence (p. 433). This thesis offers new knowledge about copyrights and wordbooks that challenges Dean’s supposition that Roberts was involved.

5.6. Copyright and the first wordbooks for Joseph and Hercules.

Watts and the Tonson brothers, the booksellers for Joseph and Hercules, never competed with each other because, from 1744 onwards, there appears to have been an arrangement between them to publish a wordbook each for one of the two new oratorios by Handel in the season. The Tonsons published Semele and Watts Joseph in 1744, and in 1745 Watts published Belshazzar and the Tonsons Hercules. Both booksellers could rely on the deterrent effect of the narrowness and unpredictability of the market to fend off potential competition from other booksellers. In addition, they could call on the common law to protect their property, or secure a defence under statute law by registering the books they published. The Tonsons chose the common law course. William Blackstone mentions injunctions acquired by Jacob Tonson in Chancery against infringement of perpetual copyright. The first of these actions involved Tonson, at only twenty-one years old and in his first weeks as owner of the business and perhaps with Draper at his side, pursuing a legal remedy to a violation of his perpetual copyright. The alternative to recourse to Chancery was official registration of titles with the Stationers’ Company. Of the few booksellers involved in the production of wordbooks for Handel’s oratorios in Britain, only Watts exercised this right to register wordbooks, entering in the Stationers’ register the titles of Joseph and his Brethren on 26 February 1744, and Belshazzar (librettist Charles Jennens) on 25 March 1745. The reasons for this difference of approach between Watts and the Tonsons in relation to the protection of rights in books as
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15 Stationers’ Company, Entry of Copies 1710 to 1746, items 578, 28 February 1743 [1744], and 594, 25 March 1745, the last entry of a Watts title.
property lie in the complicated attitudes and practices of the book trade in the first half of the eighteenth century.

At this time, the trade was in what St Clair calls its ‘high monopoly period’, when booksellers held intellectual property rights in books (p. 485). Since the introduction of printing into Britain, intellectual, or perpetual, property had been a literary property, ‘heritable, transferable, and divisible, and held in perpetuity’ (p. 93). But this situation was formalized by the 1710 ‘Copyright’ Act (8 Anne c.19), which empowered the Stationers’ Company to maintain a register of owners of copy. Thus protection of copy was now available under statutory law as well as common law. St Clair summarizes the status of registration:

the author of any book not yet published had the sole right of printing it for a term of fourteen years from first publication. If the author was still alive at the end of the first fourteen year term, the act made provision for a second term of fourteen years, making a maximum of twenty-eight years in all circumstances’ (p. 91).

Books whose rights had been assigned by the author to a bookseller were copyright-protected for twenty-one years. Ownership rights were also claimed ‘under the old common law right to property, held to confer perpetual ownership’ (Maslen, Richardson, p. 43). Ownership of both kinds of copyright ‘formed the foundation of the booksellers’ success, and printers were generally not encouraged to encroach’ (p. 43). Some booksellers therefore accumulated substantial copyright property, either in whole shares or part shares, which they could defend inexpensively by threatening proceedings in Chancery. The 1710 Act gave only weak punitive powers to the Stationers for infringement of registration, or piracy, which did not encourage booksellers to register titles in the Stationers’ register, and not all booksellers did so.
There were financial disincentives to registration. A bookseller had to pay a fee to enter the title of his publication in the register of titles of the Stationers’ Company, and had to deposit at his own expense nine copies of the publication, in a state ready for sale, at Stationers’ Hall. The nine copies of the publication were distributed free of charge to the nine deposit libraries stipulated in the 1710 Act.\textsuperscript{16} To avoid booksellers stinting on costs, the Act stipulated that copies be made ‘upon the best Paper’. In observing these procedures Watts incurred expenses which the Tonsons avoided because they relied on perpetual rights held under common law to protect their commercial interests.

Though only those titles registered at Stationers’ Hall were protected under the Act, most booksellers avoided the expensive procedure of registration. A bookseller buying the copy outright from the author held that intellectual property in perpetuity: other booksellers acknowledged the bookseller’s property by not pirating it. The Tonsons amassed an impressive portfolio of canonical works, including Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, and Congreve, without registering their property. Milhous and Hume explain that ‘throughout the century the publishers continued to operate in most respects as though they had purchased perpetual copyright’.\textsuperscript{17} This kind of copyright was treated as if tangible property, with the effect that purchase lengthened the time in which the holder had a right to publish the book. It was therefore unnecessary to pay registration expenses to the Stationers’ Company. As

\textsuperscript{16} Registered books could be claimed by ‘the Royal Library, the Libraries of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the Libraries of the Four Universities in Scotland, the Library of Sion College in London, and the Library commonly called the Library belonging to the Faculty of Advocates at Edinburgh’. Philip Ardagh, ‘St Andrews University Library and the Copyright Acts’, \textit{Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions}, 3 (1948-55) [1957], 183-211 (p. 185). The Act nominated the University of Aberdeen as a deposit library, but as there was no such institution, King’s College, Aberdeen, claimed the books, which were then made available to members of Marischal College, Aberdeen. Books claimed by Sion College from this time are now in Lambeth Palace library.

property, perpetual copyright could be shared between several owners to diminish the individual burden of publishing costs.

The Tonsons dealt in perpetual copyrights, taking shares in some popular and lucrative publications, such as fifteen one-twentieth shares in an octavo *Paradise Lost* and seventeen one-twentieth shares in a duodecimo *Paradise Regain’d*. These shares, the Tonsons’ sales catalogue of 1767 explains, ‘entitle the Purchaser to proportionable Shares in Bishop Newton’s and other Editions’, a best-selling author. Up until that time, the Tonsons had retained rights to works in which they held whole shares, such as *The Spectator*. Printers, however, unlike stationers and booksellers, did not generally trade in shares in book titles, though they were not prevented from owning some. This restricted trade practice may be a reason why Watts as a printer sought protection of his interests through registration of copy, which the Tonsons as influential booksellers did not need to do. The partnership between Watts and the Tonson firm, as already mentioned, flourished when it had a palpable hit with their joint copyright in *The Beggar’s Opera*, registered in 1728. Watts’s half-share was a notable exception in his portfolio of whole share purchases and may have proved his most profitable acquisition. Watts registered *The Beggar’s Opera* at Stationers’ Hall on behalf of himself and Jacob Tonson junior (Stationers’ Company, Entry of Copies 1710 to 1746, item 362, 15 February 1727[1728]). But the title-page of *The Beggar’s Opera* has an imprint which names Watts alone, suggesting that Tonson junior must have declined public association with such a controversial theatrical event. This was not to be the last time that the role of the Tonsons was concealed in the publication of what some influential people might have judged an impolitic work: the ‘Roberts’ wordbooks for *Hercules* was perhaps a similar deception. Registration of *The Beggar’s Opera* verifies that the firm of Tonson had at least once before
publishing *Hercules* in 1749 declined public allegiance to a theatrical event that they privately supported.

Watts began acquiring copyrights almost at the beginning of his career. After *The Beggar’s Opera*, he specialized in acquiring the copies of contemporary plays, a predilection immortalized by a joke in Fielding’s *Eurydice Hiss’d* (1737):

3 Gent  But it was mighty pleasant to behold,
When the Damnation of the farce was sure,
How all those Friends
Who had begun the Claps,
With greatest Vigour strove who first should Hiss,
And show Disapprobation. And John Watts,
Who was this Morning eager for the Copy,
Slunk hasty from the Pit, and shook his Head.19

John Hoadly, writing to Richard Warner, referred to Watts as ‘the Knight of the small Thumb’, which may allude the printer’s tight-fistedness.20 This sketched characterization needs placing against the large sum Watts paid to the would-be playwright James Miller in 1730. While still at university, Miller received from Watts the generous sum of £80 for *The Humours of Oxford*. For this sum Watts gained the approbation of a promising young author, translator, critic, and entertainer. Watts’s warm support seems counterbalanced by a hard-nosed interest in buying the rights from one who might prove a highly successful dramatist. To put this £80 in perspective, Tonson junior bought Addison’s *Cato* in 1713 for £107 50s, and Milhous and Hume comment that in general ‘after 1700 £20 was a good price and £30 an

---

18 Watts’s first registration was in 1711/2 (no month entered), with *The Rhapsody*, ‘an half sheet’ to be published three days a week. Its fate is not known.
19 Henry Fielding, *The Historical Register, for the Year 1736 [. . .] To which is added a very Merry Tragedy called Eurydice Hiss’d, or a Word to the Wise* (London: Watts, 1741), p. 47. The first London edition was ‘printed for J. Roberts’ in 1737.
20 This reference, though not its interpretation, is indebted to a private communication from H. Diack Johnstone.
excellent one’. Watts may have hazarded, like other booksellers, that if a play did not take at the box-office, he might gain from sales of the published play.

Watts continued to pay Miller handsomely for plays over the next decade; receipts are in BL Add. MS 38,728. On 1 December 1731, £80 was paid by Watts to Charles Bodens for *The Modish Couple* (1732), though Winton Calhoun identifies the real author as Miller (Bodens was a decoy author), so presumably the fee was split between the two men (Stationers’ Company, Entry of Copies 1710-1746, 179, dated 25 April 1713). £40 would, according to Milhous and Hume, have been above the ‘excellent’ level paid an author. In 1734, Watts paid Miller £80 for the rights to *The Mother-in-Law*, a comedy presented by the rebel Drury Lane actors at the Little Haymarket. The receipt for this play, a week after its premiere, verifies the opportunist alacrity with which Watts distributed his published plays (Register, II, 823). In 1735 Watts paid Miller £50 for *The Man of Taste* (better known as *The Doctor the Disease*) and registered it at Stationers’ Hall a fortnight later (Stationers’ Company, Entry of Copies 1710-1746, 445). At this point in the discussion, it should be noted that Milhous and Hume make no connection between purchase of copy, registration, and first performance (Register, II, 839). This thesis links purchase of copy and registration for the first time. Sales of Miller’s plays must have been fruitful for Watts, for in the following year he issued a second edition of *The Man of Taste*. The reduced purchase price, when compared with Miller’s earlier works, may signal that Watts consolidated his fees as ‘investments’ in Miller’s by now tried-and-tested authorship. Continuing to pay above the going rate, Watts

21 *Cato* is one of the relatively few registrations of copyright by the Tonson firm: Milhous and Hume, ‘Playwrights and Remuneration’, p. 38.
paid £57 15s in 1736 for *Love the Universal Passion*, an adaptation of *Much Ado about Nothing* (*Register*, II, 886). Unusually, this play was not entered in the Stationers’ register, though Watts registered Miller’s eight-volume set of Molière’s plays in the period 1731 to 1732, as well as *An Hospital for Fools* in 1739.

It is not known how, or if, Miller was remunerated by Watts for *Joseph*. Registered in 1744, the wordbook would have emerged from statutory copyright twenty-eight years later, in 1772, unless Watts were to sell it. In the event, though he sold most of his copyrights in 1758, Watts retained his copyright in *Joseph* for the rest of his life.

5.7. Copyright in *Joseph, the English Stock, and Watts’s administrator and executors.*

Evidence of the fate of Watts’s registered copyright in *Joseph* after his death in 1763 can be found in the record of his share in the English Stock. This document also identifies an individual involved in wordbook production after Watts’s death.

The most senior members of the Stationers’ Company, according to St Clair, became eligible to acquire shares in an accumulation of ‘prime intellectual properties’ and ‘initial corporate endowment, by grant, purchase, and inheritance’ making up ‘a collective portfolio called the “English stock”’ (pp. 94-95). Holding of Stock was a privilege reserved for senior members of the Company and holders of a Company office. Senior members were expected to progress through the various offices, perhaps first taking responsibility as Renter Warden, collecting the dues, dinner and rent money, and organizing a dinner for the Livery on Lord Mayor’s Day. Refusal of office entailed a fine of £50 without loss of seniority. None of the persons named in the imprint notices of the copy-text wordbooks to *Joseph* and *Hercules*
accepted the responsibility of Renter Warden, suggesting that their businesses were sufficiently sound to withstand the harsh financial penalty for refusal, or that income from another source compensated for the fine. For Watts, this other source was the English Stock, in which he gained the highest permissible amount, in spite of assiduously evading office in the Company.

Members were eligible for election for office, regardless of having previously declined it. Watts was elected as Upper Warden, 30 June 1739, but was fined on refusal. He was elected Master in his absence on 25 July 1742, without serving in any office. This was a great honour for a printer, for as Maslen writes of Samuel Richardson’s election as Master, it ‘was a dignity the more remarkable for being conferred on a printer rather than as much more usual on a bookseller or paper merchant’ (Richardson, p. 7). Nevertheless, Watts declined office and paid the fine (Court Book K). Though he never again took part in a Company election, he rose in seniority inexorably, so that as an Assistant when he died in 1763 he was outranked only by three members, two of whom were City aldermen. Most puzzling is the fact that, while never attending a meeting for the annual election of officers, Watts attended Court meetings regularly from election in 1727 until 1758. Whether this was out of modesty, indifference, or the pressures of managing a busy printing-office, the records are silent.

Watts also regularly attended meetings governing the Company’s English Stock, his interest perhaps stemming from his receipt of steady dividend income. His holdings accumulated as he rose in seniority, so that by the mid-eighteenth century the value of his Stock was considerable. After being ‘chose into’ a £40 share, he was ‘granted’ an £80 share on 2 February 1725; his holdings doubled on 4 March 1729, and doubled again to the permitted maximum of £320 on 6 July 1742 (Court Books H, I, and K). Dividend records in the
Company’s Court Books make it possible to estimate his total dividend income. From 1721-1725 he received about £25; 1724/5-1728/9 about £35; between 1728/9 and 1740 about £110; and from 1740 until his death in 1763 about £900. Thus his total dividend income was in the region of £1070, which meant he could easily pay his fines for refusal of office and all other dues for membership without touching his capital. His Stock holding was clearly important to Watts, but he made no provision for it in his will. A Stockholder’s widow was permitted by Stock rules to receive her deceased husband’s portion and take the dividend. Anne Watts was not named as the recipient of this investment, and neither was anyone else.

Watts’s will, proved on 17 February 1763 (PROB 11/884), has no reference to assets and investments, perhaps because he had few material possessions to bequeath. His printing premises presumably belonged to the Tonsons, and he had already sold most of his copyrights when his health deteriorated. For example, on 30 June 1758 he received £67 from Thomas Lowndes for a batch of copyrights, which was a modest sum for what was a lifetime’s collection and which was much less than Miller was paid by Watts for his first play. The receipt (Bodleian Library MS Eng.miss.c.297, item 50) records the sale of rights and materials, though whether of sheets or of books is not specified. On this occasion Watts sold no oratorio wordbooks or their rights, so presumably these remained in his estate when he died, and thus became vulnerable to claimants.

Watts’s will does not mention William Ward, his nephew, but it was he who was granted his uncle’s English Stock on appointment as legal administrator. Ward applied successfully to control that part of Watts’s estate declared ‘intestate’, that is, outside the terms of Watts’s testate will, which may have included the remaining copyrights, including Joseph. The successful petitioner for Watts’s intestate interests, according to Dean when quoting an

Whereas John Watts late of the Parish of St George the Martyr in the County of Middlesex decd. was in his life Time possessed of a Share of Three Hundred & Twenty Pounds in the English Stock of the Company of Stationers died intestate and Letters of Administration dated the 14th. Day of October 1763 have been granted by the prerogative Court of Canterbury into William Ward Gent: as by the said Letters of Administration doth appear

Feb. 9. 1764 Rec’d. of English Stock by the Hands of Mr Hett
Eighty Pounds being the first Payment on the above Share [of] my late Uncle John Watts to whom I am the Administrator

[signed] Wm Ward

Hett had taken on Watts’s printing-house by 1763. If the William Ward who witnessed the copyright sale of The Life and History of Captain Robert Boyle, by William Rufus Chetwood, in 1725 (Bodleian MS Eng. Misc.c.297, item 11), was Watts’s nephew, there was a business as well as kinship connection between Watts and Ward. After the disbursement of £80 of unpaid dividends on Watts’s share, Ward received three further payments of the final dividends due.

Ward, therefore, probably gained the copyrights to Watts’s wordbooks for Handel’s oratorios. This proposition is strengthened when it is realised that after 1763 the imprints of the wordbooks formerly produced by Watts show that Ward was not the sole claimant of Watts’s wordbooks rights. The stipulated beneficiaries, Anne Watts perhaps among them, also issued wordbooks, the property of which once belonged to Watts. To demarcate the two sets of claimants, the imprints in these later wordbooks have distinct formulations: one is ‘Printed
for the Administrator of J. Watts’, i.e. William Ward, and the other is ‘Printed for the Executors’, one of whom was presumably Watts’s widow, Anne. It would seem that in effect the executors and administrator avoided direct competition by continuing the kind of arrangement practised by Watts and the Tonsons before them. Table 1 lists the wordbooks published by the two parties from 1764 to 1777 and demonstrates for the first time that some kind of understanding probably existed between them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Executors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td><em>Acis and Galatea</em> ; <em>Messiah</em></td>
<td><em>L'allegro, ed il penseroso</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td><em>Jephtha</em> ; <em>Israel in Egypt</em> ; <em>Judas Macchabaeus</em></td>
<td><em>Esther</em> ; <em>Acis and Galatea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td><em>Israel in Egypt</em> ; <em>Judas Macchabaeus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td><em>Acis and Galatea</em> ; <em>Messiah</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td><em>Messiah</em> ; <em>Judas Macchabaeus</em></td>
<td><em>Joseph and his Brethren</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769?</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Acis and Galatea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770?</td>
<td><em>Joseph and his Brethren</em></td>
<td><em>Acis and Galatea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775?</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Acis and Galatea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td><em>Israel in Egypt</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Wordbooks published by Watts’s administrator and executors, 1764-77.
[Note to Table 1.] Merlin Channon notes that *Judas Maccabaeus* ‘was revived annually in London from 1760 until 1774’: Merlin Channon, ‘Handel’s early performances of “Judas Maccabaeus”: Some new evidence and interpretations’, *ML*, 74.4 (1996), 499-526 (p. 499). To supply wordbooks for these performances, Watts’s administrator, Ward, and his printer presumably sold old stock. The two wordbooks mentioned above may therefore represent new issues.

It is clear from Table 1 that neither party produced a wordbook for the same work in the same year as the other party. Lowndes the bookseller acted for both parties, sometimes in the same season: in 1768 and *c.* 1770. There was an exchange of opportunity to produce a wordbook for *Acis*, first by Ward in 1764 and then by the Executors in 1765, and then a wordbook by the Executors for *Joseph* of 1768 which was followed by Ward’s *Joseph* in *c.* 1770. Ward seems to have acquired permission to produce a wordbook for *Israel in Egypt*, a Tonson property, by 1765. His ownership of his uncle’s copyright in *Belshazzar* does not feature among wordbooks produced after 1763, probably because it was not performed. This apparently amicable arrangement between administrator and executors was challenged when another bookseller, with no known association with wordbooks previously, attempted to enter the wordbook market after Watts’s death. Benjamin Dod published a wordbook for *Deborah* on his own account in 1764, though he was neither an administrator nor an executor of Watts’s estate.\(^{23}\) The following year he was named retailer for an *Israel in Egypt* published by Ward, suggesting that Dod and Ward worked collaboratively. But the challenge to them and to Watts’s copyrights came from the bookseller E. Johnson, who published a wordbook for *Messiah* (1770?), claiming the authority of the compiler of the libretto, Jennens, for his exploit. Earlier, Watts had taken over the publication of the wordbook for this popular oratorio

\(^{23}\) Samuel Humphreys, *Deborah, An Oratorio; or Sacred Drama [. . .]*. (London: Dod, 1764).
from Thomas Wood, whose decease can be inferred from records of the distribution of his English Stock (entry dated 5 April 1748 in the Stationers’ Company Court Book K).

Johnson’s quarrel over Messiah arose in 1767. Dean’s discussion of the dispute shows that Johnson claimed that Dod held a wordbook copyright. When Watts’s administrator, i.e. Ward, commissioned a wordbook to Messiah in 1767, bookseller E. Johnson set up in direct competition, declaring that he (Johnson) had prepared the text ‘From a Copy corrected by the Compiler’, meaning Jennens. (There is no entry for ‘E. Johnson’ which fits this era in Plomer’s Dictionary.)24 Dean reiterates the claim that Johnson was Dod’s successor (p. 99), and the mention by Johnson of Jennens’s approval strengthens this claim. Then Dean, without citing a source, adds that ‘The Administrator of Watts’s estate objected to this as an infringement of copyright’ (p. 99). Johnson responded by announcing his next Messiah wordbook in the Public Advertiser, 25 March 1768, openly defending his position:

The Compiler has given me not only the entire Property of this, but also that of his other Oratorios, under his Signature: All of which will be published by them, from Copies corrected by himself, as they shall occasionally be performed. (Cited in Dean, p. 99.)

In the light of this and further evidence given below, Johnson’s bullish allegation that Jennens had assigned all his librettos over to him cannot be substantiated. Johnson plainly wished to enter the market for oratorio wordbooks, for he issued a wordbook for Judas Maccabaeus, claiming once again that he was ‘Successor to Mr. B. Dod’.25 Dean reports that Johnson assured his customers that the compiler had corrected the sheets personally from the press but

24 According to its imprint, François de Salignac de La Mothe-Fenelon, Aventures de Télémaque, trans. by Tobias Smollett as The Adventures of Telemachus, the Son of Ulysses, ed. by O.M. Brack, intro. by Leslie A. Chilton (Athens GA and London: University of Georgia Press, 1997), an ‘E. Johnston’ was a copyright holder.

25 Thomas Morell, Judas Macchabaeus [. . .]. (London: Johnson, [n.d.]).
‘enjoined the said Administrator to print it no more’, adding that the promoters of the oratorios ‘refused to sell Johnson’s librettos [i.e. wordbooks] in the theatre’ (p. 99). Johnson complained of a ‘spurious’ version of Messiah that had been published ‘Notwithstanding the Compiler’s Injunction against it’, a claim he published in the wordbook thought by Dean to date from about 1770 (p. 99). The hold of Watts’s successors over wordbooks to Messiah prevailed, but Johnson continued to challenge Ward’s control of rights to Judas Maccabaeus (c.1770), an oratorio long the preserve of Watts and his heirs. Johnson raged against his adversary in the wordbook, careful not to name him:

This edition is correctly printed from the last Administrator of Mr Watts, or his assigns, and is done on the Principle of Lex Talionis; for as he or they have several times printed Messiah, which E. JOHNSON has a Property in, and he or they have none, he has thought it perfectly justifiable to avail himself of the Advantage (which yet is far from being adequate to the Injury he has received by that means) of printing Judas. — His Property in Messiah is derived from the Compiler of it, who is now living, and is a Gentleman of a very respectable Character, and of a very opulent Fortune. (Dean, pp. 99-100.)

‘Lex Talionis’ (the law of retaliation) was the unwritten principle in common law governing perpetual copyrights, which could be defended in Chancery. Watts’s administrator erred, Johnson claimed, when he presumed to publish Messiah, for the right to do so could only derive from Jennens. The anonymously published copy of Messiah in 1770 sold for sixpence may represent Johnson’s desperate testing of the strength of Ward’s hold on copyright. Dean writes that ‘The whole episode [of E. Johnson vs the Administrator] shows how profitable and jealously guarded the oratorio copyrights were’ (p. 100). Johnson’s fuss over several of the rights to publish wordbooks is further evidence of their potential profitability. The notice ‘Printed for the Administrator of J. Watts’ appeared in wordbook notices up until Israel in
Egypt in 1777, fourteen years after Ward acquired his administrative rights, these fourteen years coinciding with the limit of the statutory copyright ownership in force in 1763.

5.8. The Tonsons and copyright in Hercules in 1767.

It has hitherto been unclear what copyrights the Tonson brothers held in wordbooks for Handel’s oratorios. Light is shed on this matter by three documents, two of which record subsequent trading in stock and copyrights by the Tonsons. The third document is dealt with in 5.9 below. The first two documents are trade catalogues of sales of property owned by the Tonsons mentioned by Terry Belanger (p. 295). Belanger does not, however, reveal that these catalogues, now on loan to the BL from the Longman family, deal with wordbooks as artefacts and their copyright. It is important to note that trade sales catalogues distinguish between stock and shares in copyrights, and this has a bearing on how oratorio material was traded. (Stock, as materials, is not to be confused with the English Stock.) The first catalogue describes the Tonson brothers’ stock in quires for sale on 26 May 1767, and the second on 18 August 1767 indexes copyrights now solely belonging to Richard Tonson, Jacob having died weeks before the second sale. Authors are listed alphabetically, and each author’s listing is subdivided according to format, e.g. ‘Addison Works, 4 vols. demy 4to’. Plays are the second category. Then follows a separate category headed ‘Oratorios, &c.’, which gives title and number of wordbooks available with that title, but does not mention the format for most of them. In the whole catalogue of hundreds of titles, only sixteen were offered in folio, many of which were weighty sermons, e.g. ‘340 Tillotson’s Works, 3 vols. folio’. The August

---

27 Sale of stock is in *A Collection of Catalogues*, 156, 26 May 1767, Jacob and Richard Tonson; sale of copyrights is in *A Collection of Catalogues*, 158, 18 August 1767, Jacob and Richard Tonson (BL: Cup.497.e.6).
catalogue listed authors alphabetically, with whole shares given preference, as were collected works. The section ‘Oratorios’ interrupts the section devoted to plays, which are listed by titles rather than authors.

The proving of his will on 16 March 1767 indicates that Jacob Tonson died before the first sale of Tonson stock. Richard Tonson made a will on 26 September of that year before winding up his business interests. The first auction, held in May 1767, concerned ‘Books in Quires, Being the Genuine Stock of Jacob and Richard Tonson, Esqrs.’, and included ten thousand books of Maittaire classics but only two hundred and sixteen of *The Beggar’s Opera*. The whole sale realized many hundreds of pounds for the surviving brother, Richard. Notably, wordbooks were granted their own section in the catalogue of stock for sale, with the number showing the quantity of books in quires:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>Alexander’s Feast, 4to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>with Coronation Anthem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>L’Allegro and Dryden’s Ode, 4to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>Occasional Oratorio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>Sampson, 4to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Semele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>Susanna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This substantial stock was sold as a job lot to an unnamed buyer for £52. 10s. 0d.. The list has one noteworthy omission and one puzzling inclusion. Christopher Smart’s *Hannah*, set to music by John Worgan, sits among wordbooks for Handel oratorios, suggesting that the Tonsons were left with what appears to be half a print run unsold. But oddly *Hercules*, one of the Tonsons’ titles, is absent. 1767 is twenty-two years after the Tonsons brought out their first wordbook for this oratorio and fifteen since the 1752 wordbook and latest revival before the
sale. Omission of a title might suggest that no wordbooks remained. But as will be seen in a
receipt of a sale of oratorio copyrights to William Lowndes (see 5.9 below), wordbooks for
Hercules existed in 1783, so perhaps the Tonsons persisted in their denial of involvement in
wordbooks for revivals of Hercules, choosing to omit unsold stock for this oratorio from the
sale. Alternatively, Hercules’s absence from the list may be an oversight by a clerk compiling
the list, because the wordbooks had Roberts’s name on them and not the Tonsons’.

In the shares section of Richard Tonson’s catalogue of August 1767 concerning literary
property rights, ‘Lot 435’ is headed ‘Oratorios’. Whole shares in Tonson wordbooks are
Alexander’s Feast, with the Choice of Hercules and the Coronation Anthems; L’Allegro il
Penseroso, ed il Moderato, and Dryden’s Ode; Hannah; Hercules; Joshua; the Occasional
Oratorio; Samson; Semele; Solomon; and Susanna. So it can be seen in this catalogue of
Tonson copyrights that Hercules emerged from obscurity. Here is proof that the Tonsons
regarded Hercules as their property and convincing evidence that Roberts was a decoy for
their involvement. The Tonsons’ defence of their property, appended to the printed list of
oratorios, offers a fascinating glimpse into Tonson’s awareness of the limitations to his
intellectual property in wordbooks in 1767:

N.B. The Purchaser of the above [i.e. wordbooks] is only to be entitled to print them as
Oratorios, but not to claim Shares in the Works of the Authors, from whence they have
been altered for Music.

With this stipulation Richard Tonson clarified that his sale concerned the right to publish
wordbooks and not ownership of the author’s literary property. His note shows that only the
material property in wordbooks was for sale, leaving authors and their heirs the property in the
works as they existed before being adapted for music. The note also indicates Tonson’s
awareness of the nature of different instantiations of the literary work: that the literary work is not the same as the text printed in wordbooks. The two parties to wordbooks after Watts’s death, E. Johnson’s several challenges to Ward, and Richard Tonson’s loss of interest in bookselling, are symptomatic of the general break up of the monopoly in intellectual property in the book trade during the mid-eighteenth century, culminating in the ground-breaking decision by the House of Lords in 1774 in the case of Donaldson v. Becket to end ‘perpetual’ copyright (discussed in St Clair, p. 486).

An accurate total of receipts from the sales is difficult to gauge because the sum paid for many individual items was not recorded, but an estimate suggests that Richard Tonson gained several thousand pounds from them. The ten wordbook copyrights were purchased by Hardy (no first initial is visible in the catalogue) for £110, a considerable sum when compared with the meagre price later paid for Watts’s stock and copyrights (discussed in 5.9 below). Dean is therefore correct in writing that after 1767 wordbooks were ‘published by J. Hardy “by assignment of R. Tonson”’, a formulation that appears in imprints (p. 99). Plomer’s Dictionary has no entry for Hardy at this time. However, the Tonson catalogue does not support Dean’s claim that the rights to L’Allegro ‘passed to the heirs of Watts’, a statement for which he gives no evidence (p. 99). These rights also feature in the Tonson sale.

5.9. Copyright in Joseph and Hercules in the 1780s.

Dean’s assumption that the Tonson wordbook copyrights, that is, the rights held in the material wordbooks, went to Watts’s heirs, needs revising (p. 99). The third document, mentioned at the beginning of 5.8 above, is a receipt of a sale by Mrs Ann Condell in 1783 of a clutch of oratorio wordbook rights to the bookselling firm of Lowndes, successors of
Thomas Lowndes, to whom Watts had sold other copyrights in 1758. This document records a transaction that shows the further succession of Handel wordbook copyrights. Nothing else is known of the vendor, Condell, and no information has come to light to provide a link between J. Hardy and her.

Here for the first time is a transcription of the Condell-Lowndes receipt, including the cancellation lines. The original has no number of copies marked against the final entry:

Feb 24 1783 Rec'd of Messrs J & W Lowndes the sum of Ten Guineas for the within mentioned Oratorios and all the Copy Right of the said Oratorios to me belonging
By Mee Ann Condell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semele</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susannah</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td>267+41 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodora</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Abel</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty an Virtue</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional Oratorio</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanah</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel in Egypt</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeptha</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’allegro il Penseroso</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexanders Feast</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnipotence</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belthasar</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judas mackabees</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel in Egypt</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

29 Spelling in the manuscript is idiosyncratic, and there is thus no ‘sic’ in this transcription to denote departures from standard spellings. Lowndes signed without the ‘e’ in his surname, though the preamble included it, so this thesis observes the spelling the family placed in its imprints at the time.
Interestingly, this list includes titles (with music by Handel, Arne, Worgan, Arnold, and Hook) previously owned both by Watts and by the Tonsons. It is unclear if the numerical references are to copies ready for sale or to books in quires (gatherings, i.e. the number of books they would make up at a bindery). The money received was modest, because perpetual rights had been rendered null and void by the House of Lords in 1774. By 1783 the value of intellectual property in wordbooks was almost nothing, but purchase at this time by William Lowndes of Condell’s rights accorded with his collection of copyrights of old dramas. Perhaps he was a bookseller who had not given up hope that perpetual copyright could be revived. In 1786, for example, in a quitclaim (renunciation of rights) Lowndes bought from Isaac Bickerstaff for ten guineas the inalienable rights to seventeen plays and entertainments. Bickerstaff, ‘the most successful musical-drama librettist of the 1760s’, had fled London in disgrace in 1772.30 The acquisition by Lowndes of the publishing rights to Evelina from the untested young author, Frances Burney in 1776 is also testimony of his foresight and commercial nous.31 In this light, the purchase of oratorio wordbook stock, as unstitched printed sheets, was probably a pre-emptive move to profit from any reinstatement of perpetual copyright. Besides, in the offing was the 1784 Handel Commemoration, a musical festival of unprecedented scale which would

31 Frances Burney, Evelina or The History of a Young Lady’s Entrance into the World, ed. by Margaret Anne Doody (London: Penguin, 1994), xi.
need wordbooks. The impending festival gave the gatherings purchased by Lowndes some value as potential wordbooks that could easily be stitched together and sold to oratorio audiences. By purchasing the apparently-exhausted copyright along with the gatherings, Lowndes removed them from the market, consolidated his position should wordbooks be needed in the future, and protected the price of any wordbooks he later chose to publish. If these motives for Lowndes’s action are accurate, they proved fruitless, for Burney records that the commissioners of the Commemoration paid £289. 2s. to H. Meynell for wordbook printing work. Receipts from wordbook sales at the Commemoration show that they failed to cover their costs (Commemoration, pp. 124-25).

Lowndes advertised his wordbooks in a pamphlet catalogue which he published after 1783. In the section headed ‘Oratorios, either Quarto or Octavo, many of them both Sizes, 6d. each’ he announced for sale all the wordbooks he bought from Mrs Condell, with the exception of Omnipotence and Ascension, while Saul, a Watts publication, reappeared, as did the Tonsons’ Judith, Dryden’s ‘Ode’, and the Coronation Anthems.

With the fate of wordbook copyrights established, it is appropriate to turn to consider the wordbooks for Joseph and Hercules in terms of the physical form given them by Watts.

---

Chapter Six.

THE MATERIALITY OF WORDBOOKS.

6.1. Wordbooks as print artefacts.

Wordbooks were created by the combined efforts of author, bookseller, and printer; the composer of the music was rarely involved in their production. For their part, Watts and the Tonsons ensured that through the quality of design these ephemeral publications were best suited to their purpose. Though the names of individual book trade craftsmen who produced the wordbooks as artefacts are not known, each wordbook nevertheless bears eloquent testimony to their individual efforts. The stationer, compositor, pressmen, and printer, who were engaged in the physical production of wordbooks, conferred visual and tactile appeal through good quality paper and accurate, readable texts. These men’s labours produced an artefact that provided utility and presented an elegant aesthetic.

Graphic excellence, quality of production, and practicality were distinct features of wordbooks, whose use and visual delight were intrinsic to audience experience of oratorio performance. Wordbooks conveyed information clearly so that audiences could understand what words they were hearing during a performance. They gave scenic and explanatory information not available through the sung text, and thus guided readers’ interpretation of what they heard. Yet wordbooks were not merely functional artefacts. They display visual beauty, making them more than, using Kate Bennett’s words, ‘a self-sufficient or purely
literary text’. Wordbooks had multiple objectives. They contain a literary text, readable under performance conditions, along with commercial product promotion and sometimes direct, sometimes tangential, authorial commentary. Together, all these purposes influenced reception of the sung and musical texts.

The manner in which the libretto was printed and the clarity of its typeface are accessories in the author’s and bookseller’s quest to engage audiences in reading a text of the libretto while hearing it in its musical setting. To encourage purchase, wordbooks possessed the kind of visual sophistication in punctuation and typography evident in contemporary published poetry. Books by Miller and Broughton published before their librettos display clear presentation, an appealing visual quality evident, for example, in Miller’s polemical poem *Art of Life* (1739), printed by Watts, and also in Broughton’s encyclopaedic *Bibliotheca* (1737). The attractiveness apparent in these works, surely intended to be pored over appreciatively and shared by readers, was applied to wordbooks, in spite of their being occasional publications. The good print and presentational quality of wordbooks thus made them worthy to be advertised alongside the fine editions of leading authors published by Watts and the Tonsons.

A wordbook as a print artefact included preliminary matter, of which Watts’s wordbooks contained more than those of the Tonsons. This additional matter is one factor rendering the label ‘libretto’ bibliographically inappropriate when it is taken to represent the whole wordbook artefact. The unique state of the libretto’s presentation in any given wordbook gives that wordbook a particular historical and bibliographical significance. But
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what they possess in common is a set of consistent design principles, whose symbolic and interpretive codes derived from its bookseller and printer.

Materially, the wordbooks for most of Handel’s oratorios stand out as generously proportioned quarto booklets, whereas wordbooks for oratorios by other composers were produced mostly in octavo, e.g. Hoadly’s *Jephtha* (1737), as already discussed. Handel’s oratorio wordbooks were not, however, the first publications associated with music-theatre to adopt quarto: for example, Theobald’s *Decius and Paulinus* of 1719, with music by Galliard, had a quarto wordbook. In the seventeenth century quarto had been preferred for editions of contemporary plays: for instance, Jacob Tonson senior issued most of Dryden’s plays in quarto. The oratorio wordbooks were manifestations of a trend favouring quarto for serious poetry that became established by the mid-eighteenth century.

Alexander Pope’s *Essay on Criticism* (1711) was first published in quarto, a format, writes Foxon, ‘normal enough for a critical pamphlet’ but which ‘allowed more scope for typographical elegance’ than octavo (p. 23). Foxon continues: ‘One of the most influential changes that Pope made in English book production was the introduction of the quarto format for the *Iliad* (as well as for the *Odyssey*, Shakespeare, and his collected works)’ (p. 63). The transfer from folio at the luxury end of the market was shown by the increasing preference of booksellers to publish quartos to meet customer-demand for luxury at more affordable prices. Folio had been the format during the seventeenth century for major works by Shakespeare and Jonson, and Dryden’s works were produced in large folios as late as 1701. Foxon notes that Pope’s *Iliad* was also offered in fine-paper folios to the public, but without the engravings that were reserved for the subscribers’ quartos (p. 52). In this way, customers of quarto editions
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purchased beauty of presentation as well as the book’s physical manageability to readers. Foxon identifies Watts as the printer of several editions of Pope’s Essay on Criticism (1711), a fact prominently positioning Watts in this transition from folio to quarto publication of serious poetry (p. 23). McLaverty praises the sumptuous visual allure and luxury feel of the quarto Works, and it is fair to claim that visual allure is readily perceptible in most oratorio wordbooks (Pope, p. 47).

Quarto was increasingly chosen for new and reprinted poetry worthy of literary-critical notice. Bernard Bronson explains quarto’s cultural importance in the eighteenth century:

Whatever the personal preferences, the reams of forgotten poetry that issued decade after decade, in all the dignity of Caslon’s heavily leaded English Roman, in quarto pamphlet form, impress one, as perhaps nothing else can do, with a sense of the honor in which poetry in that age was held among the general reading public.3

Quarto emphasized genre status, and because almost all Handel oratorio wordbooks were quarto, they could be associated materially with some of the finest contemporary poetry. Bentley’s edition of Paradise Lost in 1732 was published in quarto in the same year as the first quarto wordbooks for oratorios by Handel. This congruence between formal poetry and poetic librettos in wordbooks is therefore more than coincidental. Quarto wordbooks were on a visual and tactile parity with publications of poetry by the finest contemporary poets, and their luxury format was in keeping with their association with Handel. For the twenty-first century their cultural and bibliographical significance lies in the fact that they were indicative of a polite and elite culture found in Handel’s audiences. The loyal commitment of these audiences was paralleled by the enduring commercial loyalty shown by Watts and the Tonsons to
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wordbook production. Quarto presented spacious pages for the application of large print that facilitated clear presentation, aided by generous margins, so that the text could be read easily in the theatre. As McLaverty notes, quarto was ‘impressive without being unwieldy’, a quality evident in the large fount and plentiful white space (p. 47).

The precise dimensions for white space given in the wordbooks as first sold to purchasers are difficult to estimate because, as already mentioned, of the copies consulted in Britain only one wordbook remains for *Joseph*, and none for *Hercules*, in the state that it left the printer. However, the feature they have in common is the type area. J47A permits measurement of the exact proportion of marginal space on the pages of a Watts wordbook. On page 15, for example, the type area measures 127 mm by 217 mm, on a page measuring 205 mm by 257 mm, so that the marginal space takes up just under 50 per cent of the page, which is a very generous allowance for an ephemeral publication. Even though crowded on pp. 26-27, the type area is presented surrounded by generous white space (the image, though faint, effectively demonstrates the relation of type area to page size):

[Fig. 33 follows at the top of the next page.]
The type area in J47A matches that for M44, and though the block is slightly smaller in J57 it nevertheless retains the sense of spaciousness of its predecessors. Because no copy of the octavo T45 or the ‘Roberts’ Hercules that was consulted personally exists in the state it left the printer, any notion of the liberality of white space is speculative. The two copies of R49 in the BL indicate that Watts may have allowed a similar proportion of white space as in J47, a ratio found in many quarto poetry books. Together, the large fount and copious white space used in wordbooks enabled readers to find their way through the text in the poor lighting conditions of a theatre.

The extent to which wordbook readers ‘read’ the printer’s notation for helping them follow the text cannot be calculated, though the codes are plainly evident. Graphic awareness, or readers’ consciousness of the nature of their interaction with the printer’s codes, is a recent area of study. Janine Barchas claims the idea of graphic awareness ‘is so young that it is, like the emerging novel in the eighteenth century, defined by a collective self-consciousness and a
shared investigational approach rather than a common vocabulary or unified subject’ (p. 9). However, while discussion of aspects of mise-en-page may lack a range of accepted descriptors, elements of this aesthetic nevertheless exist in wordbooks, where they contrive to make the packaged libretto, or wordbook, particularly appealing. The layout of the verse is interspersed, and is therefore variegated, by stage directions, character cues, and the various marks of punctuation, all of which enliven the visual effect, particularly when viewed as a double-page spread. The interplay between the reading of a libretto for its verse and any pleasure gained from the wordbook’s graphical presentation constitute what Barchas calls the ‘complicated relationship between a book’s graphic architecture and its narrative tenant’ (p. 20). In the wordbooks, the libretto’s layout emphasizes the author’s text and so helps give it interpretive force. The relationship between wordbook presentation and the way in which readers’ understanding of the notation assisted their application of the text to what they heard made wordbooks admirably suited to their purpose in the theatre. But wordbook layout design had an additional function: it served as a promotional tool for its booksellers, a function activated by its attractive design components of founts, sizes of type, ornaments, and pagination.

Together, these ‘signs’ were subliminal persuaders in readers’ interpretation of the text. Each page was designed as a coherent unit: for example, poetic couplets were not split by a page turn; if they had been, they would have left a clinching rhyme stranded on the next page. This elementary courtesy towards the integrity of poetic art observed in his wordbooks did not always extend to other publications by Watts. For example, in Watts’s printing of Molière comedies, translated and edited by Miller and others, a page turn sometimes interrupts a couplet, two examples of which can be found in L’Ecole des Maris, in Isabelle’s speech:
Et qu’après cet avis, quoi qu’il puisse entreprendre, [page turn]
J’ose le désir de me pouvoir surprendre
(Select Comedies, iv, 62-64.)

and, secondly, in a later speech:

Vous ne me sauriez faire un plus charmant plaisir; [page turn]
Car enfin cette vue est fâcheuse à souffrir. (pp. 72-74.)

Perhaps an assumption behind this example of practical awkwardness was that readers would
scan the English prose translation and study the French original. Preliminary investigation has
not uncovered examples of graphically orphaned rhymes in published English poetry of the
period, which suggests that this detailed attention to presentation bestowed a distinctly literary
dimension to the graphics on the wordbook page.

While it is not possible to know whether wordbook readers appreciated the luxury
conferred on such a minor publication, these readers were evidently part of a community
defined by familiarity with the printer’s notational codes. Readers were clearly expected to use
their familiarity with published plays and poetry to apply the same codes to the pages of
wordbooks, a process which was thus part of the textual transmission of the libretto. These
codes were represented by a system of notation whose signs indicated when readers were to
imagine silences and pauses in speech. For example, long dashes denoted when to expect
interruptions to speech, analogous to the same function in published plays and novels, whose
readers were accustomed to imagine movement and visual spectacle. This textually engaged
interpretation, in Paul Hunter’s words, conditioned readers ‘into habits of narration that might
have seemed individual but, in fact, depended on the textual authority and conventions of
print. Educated individual members of the audience could be expected by the printer to apply to the text the analytical machinery ingrained from childhood to decode wordbook conventions of layout and typography in the shared public space of the theatre.

Graphics in wordbooks are therefore codes to prompt active interpretation by readers. Some blocks of verse have labels in common with musical scores, e.g. ‘Air’ and ‘Chorus’. In addition, they suggest pace in delivery by informing the reader-listener of the varied musical treatment to be anticipated between the blocks of blank verse and shorter lyric verse. The layout mimics different visual rhythms, the ‘frantic’ type area being energized by the busy effects of italics, indentations, brackets, capitals, small capitals, and multiple forms of punctuation. The way in which the text on the page echoes the pace of the drama allows some distinction to be made between wordbooks. Comparing a double page spread from M44 with one from T45 shows how the components that contribute to the mise-en-page emphasize the mood of the drama at that point:

[Fig 34 follows at the top of the next page.]
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Fig. 34. M44, I.4-I.6, pp. 18-19.
By permission of the Gerald Coke Handel Collection, Foundling Museum, 10/D/JOSEPH.

Fig. 35. T45, I.3, pp. 12-13.
By permission of the Gerald Coke Handel Collection, Foundling Museum, 10/E/HERCULES.
The *Joseph* image presents fast and urgent action, while that from *Hercules* does not. Both images show the shared notation while displaying differences in how the appearance of the type and layout reinforces the pace of the drama. Page 18 of *Joseph* has 955 print characters whose density in the close-packed verse, interspersed by little white space, indicates a frenetic scene. In contrast, the disposition of the 521 characters on page 12 of *Hercules* gives a sense of roominess and measured delivery. The expanse of white space on page 13 particularly conveys a visual sense of closure, graced with what Donald McKenzie refers to as ‘the further refinement of centred speech headings’ for the characters’ names.\(^5\) T45 shows greater visual variety, with the air on the left emphasizing an *aabbccdd* rhyming scheme, and that on the right an *aabcccb* rhyming pattern. The pages of M44 encode furious exchanges between the characters, the musical labels clearly marked by centred headings, as in T45.

Both wordbooks demonstrate conscious design in the careful disposition of layout and graphics, both visual components influencing reception of the text. The fount employed for the libretto in M44, 18-point Caslon English Roman, was larger than in most contemporary printed plays and was used for some contemporary folio publications of poetry: for example, in Miller’s *Are These Things So?* (1740). In T45, the same fount was used but in 14-point.\(^6\) Legibility of fount was a primary design principle for the display of essential information, and this was supported by the spacious layout. In both examples above, the short lines of the lyric verse are given considerably more space and are in italics while the blank verse is in roman type, a typographical code clearly demarcating the different musical treatment afforded each

---


\(^6\) For the thesis, M44 and T45 founts were measured against Caslon specimens in H. W. Caslon & Co. Ltd, *Caslon Old Face Roman and Italic Cast Entirely from the Original Punches Engraved in the Early Part of the Eighteenth Century in Chiswell Street, London by William Caslon* (London: Caslon, 1924).
kind of verse. Italicized (lyric) verse denoted that in its musical setting it would take longer to perform than blank verse. Lyric verse of four lines, for example, could take much longer to perform than the same number of lines of blank verse recitative, and its italic presentation formalized the response to the text expected of readers. Italicized verse signalled to readers that in performance it would occupy ‘unreal’ (elongated) time; in contrast, blank verse was performed near the speed of normal speech delivery. Italics therefore indicated more reflective verse. Thus the typography contained signs adapted from printed plays to fulfil a dual purpose, primarily to allow readers during a performance to identify quickly the point reached in the drama, and secondly to focus on the current emotional state of a character.

For its lyric verse, M44 has patterns of indentation from the left-hand margin that synchronize with the rhyming schemes, which was a development from seventeenth century patterns of indentation that did not generally match indentation and rhymes. Watts applied discrete levels of indentation to M44 to indicate the rhyming pattern: for example, for a rhyming scheme of \textit{ababcc} each rhyme has a degree of indentation different from the other two. Joseph’s air ‘The People’s Favour’ (\textit{Joseph}, II.2), remarkably has a pattern of four indentations. T45, however, follows a more conventional pattern of two levels of indentation, regardless of the number of rhymes. Whatever the incidence of indentation of lyric verse, the clear delineation of rhyming schemes highlights the convention of locating key ideas in rhyme words.

Watts seems to have taken meticulous care with the overall appearance of print on the wordbook page, a task complicated by attempts to sell a text that tallied with what was
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7 See, for example, Thomas Stanzani (1705), \textit{Arsinoe, Queen of Cyprus. An Opera, After the Italian Manner}, and Peter Motteux (1708), \textit{Love’s Triumph. An Opera}, wordbooks published by Jacob Tonson in quarto with a large fount, features found in Peter Motteux’s (c. 1697), \textit{Hercules, A Masque}. 
performed. Unfortunately for Watts, Handel’s invariable textual cancellations involved him in applying corrections to the wordbooks after the sheets had been printed, thus spoiling the fastidiously achieved elegance of the printed page.\(^8\) Watts was an old hand at this manoeuvre, so that the amendments he made to *Joseph* and *Hercules* avoided the confusion probably produced by his announcement of amendments to Lediard’s *Britannia* (set to music by John Frederick Lampe).\(^9\) In this publication, priced at 1s. 6d., which was the maximum Watts charged for wordbooks, there is an impressive fold-out engraving of the stage set, but this concern for the fidelity of the *Britannia* wordbook to the theatrical event is undermined by a well-meaning but unhelpful instruction printed on the verso of the title-leaf:

> The Reader is desir’d to take Notice, That, for Reasons found proper since the Printing of the Book, the First Act will end with the Chorus at the End of the Third Scene, and not, as in the Book, at the End of the Seventh Scene. As likewise, That the Part of Phoebus is perform’d by Mr. Barret, and that of Neptune by Mr. Mounteir.

By printing this statement in large type and alone on the verso of the title-page, Watts drew attention to the fact that he had sold an inaccurate text. The oratorio wordbooks circumvent similar confusion, first by excluding singer’s names from the Dramatis Personae, and secondly by marking cancellations to the text in ink or by covering the cancelled text with a pasted slip.

It is a safe assumption that the composer made most of his cuts to the libretto before he wrote out the underlay. That verse was excised from *Joseph* and *Hercules* at this stage is known because some of it appears in the first wordbooks, the most prominent example of which is Miller’s final chorus (III.6) in *Joseph*: it appears in F but not in B or C. By printing
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\(^8\) It has not proved possible to use a collation machine to examine the almost-identical cancel marks in ink applied to all copies of T45 inspected personally, to see if they were applied mechanically.

some unperformed verse, Miller unwittingly highlighted possible reasons for such drastic surgery by the composer. The poetic design of his final chorus is straightforward, as two quatrains draw the oratorio’s main moral and spiritual message. It could be that Miller strove to replicate verse formulations of which Handel approved, for both quatrains proffer the composer three verse clauses, a pattern familiar from oratorios Handel had composed before *Joseph*. Miller expressed distinct ideas in each of three sections. The first stanza has weighty words placed in such proximity that it is hard to take in their significance: ‘Jehovah’, ‘Lord’ ‘Mercy-Seat’, ‘Movements’, ‘Virtuous’ and ‘Bounties’, ‘Pinnacle’, and ‘Vice’. This surfeit of abstractions is relieved by the one active verb, ‘hurl’d’, to offer the composer an option for more immediate musical imitation. The second section, from ‘Therefore with Angels’ to ‘in ev’ry Prayer’, is appropriately celebratory worship, and the final section, beginning ‘in ev’ry Song’, is about proclaiming God’s ‘Justice’ and ‘Goodness’. The invocation of the Deity at the start of the stanzas is a plain statement, but the meaning is confused by a sudden shift to contemplation of ‘The Virtuous’ meeting God’s ‘Bounties’, which leads directly to an image of the hurling of Vice from her pinnacle. For Handel, supremely a composer of vocal music grounded in its verbal text, this close juxtaposition of disparate images may have proved too troublesome to set coherently. He resolved this dilemma by incorporating a chorus, with its underlay of prose, from a recently composed work previously unheard in a theatre, the final chorus from the *Dettingen Anthem*. Ruth Smith gives a political rather than literary explanation for this interpolation. She writes: ‘Handel [. . .] cemented the Britain-Israel analogy in the last chorus, by drawing for it on his recent Dettingen Te Deum, which celebrated national success against the forces of Catholic absolutism’ (*Oratorios*, p. 305). This interpretation suggests a political motive on the composer’s part, a theme beyond the scope of
this thesis, but there are sound literary grounds to account for the choral intrusion and the single line of prose, compiled from the Psalms. The new text, not from Miller, is absent from *Joseph* B and C but duly printed in *Joseph* F. Miller’s objection to the composer’s excision is manifest in the publication of the discarded verses in the first wordbook, an act in which he declares to readers his original ‘alternative’ ending and his libretto as a literary and not a musical conception.

The first wordbook for *Joseph* (M44) contains segments of libretto text not found in B or C and excluded from J57. Each variant contributes to the unique materiality of each wordbook. All passages unique to M44 and J47 were marked by the printer as unperformed, and reasons for their deletion by Handel prior to setting the music may lie in repetition of ideas and emotions. *Joseph*, I.4 contains a passage, labelled ‘Invocation’, as Joseph calls on Heaven to communicate its purpose. In I.7 Joseph has three lines of blank verse which reiterate the sentiment of admiration already expressed in the duet immediately preceding them. In II.1 Phanor explains in blank verse why Joseph has detained Simeon, a motive which can be found in Miller’s synopsis. Phanor describes the effect on Simeon of the brothers’ delayed return to Egypt, on which Simeon comments in the following recitative. In III.1 Phanor and Asenath reflect on the ingratitude the brothers seem to show in return for Joseph’s favour, anticipating the sentiment Phanor expresses in the succeeding air, ‘The Wanton Favours’. Someone reading the item labelled in M44 and J47 as a ‘Duet’ (‘O! canst thou’, I.7) would surely have espied a discrepancy from what they were hearing. Why the printer did not correct this anomaly remains a mystery. A similar puzzle lies in the printing of the final duet, marked ‘Duetto’ (III.6), which is interrupted by a page turn; verse for Asenath is on the recto and that for Asenath and Joseph on the verso, this latter verse being cancelled by a pasted slip which
allocates the remaining verse to an air. It is safe to presume that the slip was pasted as an expedient to avoid reprinting in the final hours before sale.

While Miller’s participation in the publication of the first wordbook for *Joseph* is known, Broughton’s involvement in the first wordbook for *Hercules* is much less certain, as his move to Bristol late in 1744 probably impeded his participation. However, distance was no barrier to supervision of proofs, for as Burrows and Dunhill record in 1739 Miller sent proofs of *The Art of Life* to Salisbury for James Harris to suggest improvements: ‘send any alterations or corrections you shall think proper’ (p. 77). There was time for Harris to return proofs with his notes and for Miller to revise the poem before despatching it to the bookseller for printing. What may have inhibited Broughton’s involvement was the fact that only a few days separated a ‘final’ state of the libretto and Handel’s first performance. This may be one reason why the earliest wordbooks differ markedly in authorial imprimatur: Miller’s has a signed dedication, synopsis, and a footnote, while Broughton’s has a terse unsigned ‘Advertisement’. By rescuing text expunged by Handel, Miller and Broughton inevitably enlarged the libretto, stamping authorial agency on the published work and changing materially the wordbook audiences received.

Underneath the Dramatis Personae in M44 and J47 Watts placed a note to the effect that lines beginning with a diple mark (‘’) would not be performed. This form of annotation of ‘silent’ lines was standard in wordbooks for musical entertainments: for example, Peter Motteux’s *Hercules. A Masque* (c.1697) displays a much earlier instance of this rubric. The note and diple marks function as scholastic devices intrinsically part of the libretto’s essential literariness, but they also add materially to the complexity of the visual codes.
In spite of the uncertainty these irregularities induce, the typography in the wordbooks is a fine exemplar of organized data. By their appearance, words can denote what is going on, who is speaking and to whom, who is moving in or out of the action, and where geographically events are happening, and, peculiar to wordbooks, what kind of music to expect. Through the typography the printer demonstrates visual dexterity by providing readers with many meanings in a single glance at the page.

Typography’s mimetic function in wordbooks exploits a wide graphical repertory. Graphic markers indicate dramatic tension: for example, punctuation conveys to the reader the implied tone of the text. A flourish of capitals and small capitals imposes layers of meaning on the textual page, the complexity and sophistication of the typographical effect constituting what Paul Hunter describes as ‘verbal and visual intertextuality’ (p. 55). Readers’ proficiency in interpreting typographical symbols of rhythm, pace, tone, and attack, etc, was required in order to infer meaning. This expertise was probably reinforced during oratorio performances as readers participated in a significant interaction between visual presentation on the page and what they heard.

The visual appearance of punctuation performs a semiotic function reminiscent of notes and rubric in a musical score. Type was not used, however, to emphasise expression, which was music’s function. As well as demarcating grammatical units, type signified to the reader when the character pauses to catch breath. To this effect the dash has the most flexible meaning of the many punctuation marks employed and is therefore ubiquitous on the pages containing the libretto. The effect of dashes is to disturb the visual harmony of measured text, making its effect visually uncomfortable. Dashes can demonstrate a disjunction between thought and spoken expression and instigate anticipation of how they may be interpreted in the
music: for example, as Joseph struggles to control his emotions on meeting Benjamin, the layout of the text adds to the idea of drama, M44, II.7:

Fig. 36. Layout illustrating Joseph’s emotion and movement, M44, p. 21. By permission of the Gerald Coke Handel Collection, Foundling Museum, 10/D/JOSEPH.

Punctuation notates, for example, a character’s incoherence, the punctuation forming a print subtext that supplements the rhetorical and grammatical components of the verse. The look of the page captures something of the dramatic force of sudden silence, the momentary loss of eloquence, and the interruption to a torrent of impassioned speech. Conversely, a flurry of punctuation marks can convey in typographical gesture the speaker’s sudden eloquence after emotional inhibition. Some dashes denote unspoken thoughts, emotive non-utterances ungoverned by rational imperative or processes, and a break between thought and utterance. They can suggest animated motion, as occurs in the narration by Hyllus of an encounter with the Oracle in T45 (1.2), when his recollection of an overwhelming experience is represented by rules of different lengths that disturb the visual ‘flow’ of words:
In this instance, the dashes which impede the grandiloquence of his speech suggest Hyllus’s awe.

Punctuation marks enliven presentation of blank verse by indicating at a glance the level of emotional intensity of the drama at that moment. Grammatical separators become paralinguistic signs, such as multiple dashes to supply essential imaginative touches of movement and emotional colour. Dense blocks of verse with few white lines denote levels of dramatic tension. Thus artful disposition of print promotes a visual narrative in parallel with its musical form.

Dashes have a quantitative function in signifying the timing of expression, its tone, and its rhythm. They disconnect from exposition what need not be said or explained. A bunching of dashes can symbolize immediacy, a lively now-ness. In Joseph, more than in Hercules, dashes of differing length, including long rules, occur in multiple formations. Long rules detain the eye, signifying breaks in forceful speech, whereas short rules that intersperse the dialogue denote disturbance in syntax, sudden changes in direction of thoughts, or the dithering silence of aposiopesis. An example of short rules can be seen in T45, at the point in II.2 where Dejanira goads the hapless Iole. The rules notating Dejanira’s ‘pauses’ suggest that she momentarily judges the effect of her words before continuing:
Multiple short dashes, including four ens, represent similar hiatuses in M44, p. 27. They also serve to right-justify a line, as in M44 (II.5), ‘Great God sustain my Fortitude!-----’:

Dashes sometimes signify syntactical closure or incompleteness. In the case of the latter, and the punctuation of gesticulation, they denote illocutionary action.
The variability of dash lengths was probably due to the fact that Watts’s compositor could only use the fount available in the cases. When Watts printed several books at the same time, there may have been a heavy demand for particular types in this Caslon fount resulting in insufficient type, a situation which perhaps arose in Part III of J57, because there are no multiple short dashes but only single and longer dashes, suggesting the shortage of en-rules. In M44 (III.4), close inspection of the wordbook reveals a variety of dashes punctuating ‘O Pity! ---’, in visual echo of the brothers’ estrangement:

![Fig. 40. Rules and dashes in the Arioso ‘O Pity!’](image)

By permission of the Gerald Coke Handel Collection, Foundling Museum, 10/D/JOSEPH.

Dashes also reveal on the page the presence and absence of characters ‘on’ or ‘off stage’.

Ellipses in wordbooks are essentially symbols of division, of incompletion, of disintegration, and of incoherence, and have been absorbed into textual presentation in what Paul Hunter succinctly calls ‘colloquial syntax’ (p. 67). Ellipses in *Joseph* and *Hercules* foreground the stylistic limitations against which Miller rails in his dedication: ‘this kind of Drama deprives the Writer of sufficient Room for the gradual and artful Unravelling of his
Subject’. For his part, Watts cleverly exploited typography to extend libretto’s etiolated verbal form.

A combination of Handel’s cuts to the text and market economics led to briefer wordbooks for oratorio revivals. These cuts required adjustment to the libretto, and sometimes a resetting of the type. The wordbooks J57 and R52 display minor changes in line-separation, justification (with far fewer orphan words or phrases in both wordbooks), and ornaments. Flowers and initials are the sole ornaments in J57 and R52, a reduction in adornment that creates different, more functional, visual emphases from the copy-texts. R52 is a thinner artefact than its octavo predecessor. J57 and R52 retain the large fount but the white space in the type area is less because one or more lines are added to each page. This constriction led to deterioration of textual clarity. The earlier typographical codes were continued, such as italics for lyric verse and roman for blank verse, and patterns of indentation, but in these later wordbooks the overall effect is much nearer to the rushed appearance associated with print ephemera.

Ornaments supplement the attractiveness of the mise-en-page for the reader of both copy-texts. Joseph, an overtly religious work, is not the soberly presented text that Maslen claims was reserved for ‘the more serious texts, and those in which space is at a premium, such as reprints and reference works’; these, he suggests, ‘tend to carry fewer ornaments. Works of learning, such as theology, generally have less ornament than belles-lettres, such as the quarto poem, heavily leaded and set in English type’ (Bowyer, p. 6). Watts made no such distinction between his secular and theological printing, an assertion verified, as explained in Chapter Five, by Watts’s publication of the collected sermons of Jones in 1741 and Littleton in 1749. The wordbooks share with these sermons consistently applied design principles that
produce a pleasing *mise-en-page* of the libretto and its paratext to give strong visual unity to the whole artefact.

The essence of the wordbook printer’s art of ornamentation was to avoid swamping the visual impact of the verse on the page, the kind of problem circumvented by Alexander Pope. McLaverty relates how, when preparing his *Works* for print in 1717, Pope directed his printer, William Bowyer, to apply ‘Only a small ornament at the top [. . .], not so large as four lines breadth’ (‘Modes’, p. 61). Pope’s shrewd constraint on his printer imposes a design principle clearly evident later in the wordbooks, whose ornaments delight the eye without being a distraction: ornaments in *Joseph* and *Hercules* do not illustrate the meanings of the text they embellish.

One feature that distinguishes the wordbooks for *Joseph* from those for *Hercules* is that wordbooks for the latter begin each Act on a fresh page, topped with a headpiece, with white space on the preceding page occupied by an ornamental end-piece. Printer’s flowers separate the Parts in *Joseph*, and in *Hercules* they visually expand the short advertisement. All six wordbooks display pleasing unity of design with fine headpieces (T45’s is framed) as decorative lintels to the beginning of the libretto. These features of visual delight most likely contributed materially to audience enjoyment of oratorio.

**6.2. Paratext in the wordbooks for *Joseph* and *Hercules***.

The libretto is the major textual item in a wordbook, but it is not the sole material contained in the print artefact. Supplementing the libretto are the front matter of title-page, authorial advertisement, and Dramatis Personae. M44 and J47 additionally have a dedication and bookseller’s advertisements; J57 lacks the dedication. Because readers of the libretto are likely
to have encountered this paratext at an oratorio performance, this material is particularly worth investigation.

Like the libretto, paratext possesses interpretive force. It was shaped by the author and printer to influence reading of the libretto and to entice prospective customers to purchase the wordbook and announce to them other publications they may like to purchase. This dual approach places the wordbook soundly within commercial book trade traditions. In the case of M44 and J47, the paratext highlights the moral, philosophical, and theological values of the drama. Readers turning straight to the libretto avoided important introductory material designed to influence their responses. This influence was in part achieved by the display in the paratext of a wide repertoire of lively typographical features that draw and detain the eye and carry significance beyond verbal communication. Paratext did not require the readers’ close attention during performances, but contained a mixture of useful material and literary commentary. This disparity in purpose made different demands of the reader and the paratext which engendered these responses therefore constitutes part of the wordbook’s transmissional history.

Jerome McGann, exploring the effect of textual presentation on reading, distinguishes ‘linear reading’ from ‘radial or spatial reading’. Linear reading is the response of the uncritical reader, while radial reading is encouraged by text which imparts erudition and wide cultural knowledge. Wordbook paratext encouraged radial reading. During a performance the libretto was probably read in linear fashion, line by line, as the performance progressed, a reading that was ‘non-self-reflexive’, or informational, because the reader noted words being
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sung. Reading a libretto during a performance enabled the reader to make sense of what was going on; also, with its prayers, invocations, imagery, and compact language, the libretto invited radial reading. The paratext in *Joseph* and *Hercules*, too, had a dual function. Watts’s advertisements served as a ‘self-reflexive text’, and Miller’s advertisement informed readers how the oratorio plot fitted in to the sequence of events in Genesis. The paratext of *Joseph* and *Hercules* was also ‘radial’ reading material because it expected readers to apply critical judgment to Miller’s dedication and advertisement and to Broughton’s advertisement and to the title-pages.

The quarto wordbook title-page, in large Great Roman Primer point, gives the title of the composite work and in a reduced point names the composer of the music to the oratorio and the bookseller who produced the wordbook, and in the case of *Joseph* names a retailer. The imprint includes a date, in some cases a misleading one. Laid out in the traditional manner of published plays, the title-page information is, using David Scott’s words, a ‘paradigm of semiotic (mis-) information’. What is announced on these pages is not always the whole truth, especially with regard to the declaration of creative ownership.¹¹

The title-page prominently displays the genre label of the composite work as an extension of the title. This makes important distinctions: *Joseph* is ‘A Sacred Drama’ and *Hercules* is ‘A Musical Drama’. The difference is more than semantic, because even as early as 1744 audiences attended oratorio in Lent in the belief that they would experience biblically-based, morally improving entertainment. The bold genre labels accorded *Joseph* and *Hercules*

¹¹ David Scott, ‘Signs in the text: the role of epigraphs, footnotes and typography in clarifying the narrator-character relationship in Stendhal’s Le Rouge et le Noir’, in *Ma(r)king the Text* (see Bray, above), 26-34, p. 27.
are unambiguous. Whether Handel or his authors decided these categories is not clear, though
the balance of probability rests with the librettists.

Authorial presence is invisible on the title-pages because the name of the author of the
libretto is missing. Instead, the ‘author’ of the ‘Sacred Drama’ is proclaimed as the composer,
even though not a note of his music appears in the wordbook. It was the bookseller who
decided whether the title of the work contained in the wordbook ‘shall be determinative,
descriptive, or suggestive’ (Bronson, p. 20). This situation differs from ballad operas, which
often included a musical score, as in the second edition of The Beggar’s Opera and Miller’s
An Hospital for Fools, both of which were printed and registered for copyright by Watts. The
absence of Broughton’s name from Hercules is owing to his observance of an unwritten code
that clergymen did not append their name to works for performance in theatres. In contrast,
though attribution of the composite work of Joseph was accorded to Handel on the title-page,
Miller had no qualms about his name appearing elsewhere in the front matter. The booksellers
put their own names on the title-page in the same size of small capitals as the composer,
asserting their presence and claiming ownership of the wordbook. Miller is named in small
capitals at the end of his dedication.

The notice ‘Set to Musick by Mr. Handel’ employs the conventional form of address of
creative artists on the title-page, and has the same prominence in that position as the
acknowledgment of a playwright of a published play. In the public’s mind oratorios by Handel
were associated with him; he, not the librettist, was their impresario, and the prestige of his
name sanctioned and endorsed the product. His name on the title-page is thus what Bronson
might have considered a ‘suggestive’ attribution (p. 20). The name of the theatre in which the
oratorio was performed receives large, bold type, the booksellers thereby locating the
oratorio’s performance in the specific theatrical space of Covent Garden or the King’s Theatre.

Those title-pages printed by Watts in the mid-eighteenth century inspected personally
are models of clean lines and orderly capitals, with some italic titling. *Joseph* is no exception.

T45, shown above to be printed by Watts, is strikingly different. Its title-page displays two
founts, Caslon Great Roman Primer and some swash italics, in ten different fount sizes. Swash
italics is a Watts hallmark. Much of ‘Musical Drama’ on the title-page is in Caslon’s ‘peculiar
sort’ italics (the ‘U’ is swash), and ‘Hay-Market’ is in swash italic, with the exception of the
‘Y’, which is a large Greek ‘γ’.¹² Foxon notes that ‘what is distinctive about Watts is his use of
the letterspaced italic capitals alone in titles’ (pp. 13-14), and this feature is evident in T45 in
‘Musical Drama’ and ‘Hay-Market’, rather than the name of the drama, as is the case with
M44. Watts was subtly differentiating T45 from other wordbooks he printed, perhaps using
this orderly busy-ness as another means of ownership disguise to distance the Tonsons from
the product.

The explicit nature of the author’s identity of *Joseph* contrasts with the anonymous and
brief statement of sources in *Hercules*. Miller made two challenges to the apparent
‘objectivity’ of his libretto: first, by giving it a dedication and, secondly, by using the
dedication as a channel for publicizing personal responses to the literary task that Handel had
given him. Newburgh Hamilton, who dedicated to the prince of Wales his libretto of *Samson*
in the wordbook of 1743, drew readers’ attention to the remarkable confluence of literary and
musical genius in Milton and Handel. Miller, less circumspect than either Hamilton or
Broughton, uses ironic inversion to rehearse a critique already familiar in Bernard

¹² The assistance is acknowledged of Nigel Roche of the St Bride Printing Library in this identification.
Mandeville’s *Fable of the Bees*, for example, in which dedicatory remarks alert readers to a
critical-authorial voice. In bold typeface, twice the size of the main text, Miller’s signed
dedication supplies the authorial presence that is missing from the title-page, his observations
on literary form mediated obliquely through remarks to the dedicatee, John, duke of Montagu.
Miller departs from the conventional eulogium of public fawning and extravagant diction by
acknowledging the benevolence shown to him by Montagu couched in terms that draw public
attention to a friendship transcending the social barriers of wealth and aristocratic privilege.

*Joseph* has the most lavish paratext of oratorio wordbooks, its most prominent
component being Miller’s dedication. This address served financial and personal
considerations. On the assumption that Miller gained permission from Montagu, he may well
have earned as a customary courtesy a few guineas of gratitude from the duke. The tenor of
Miller’s address to Montagu is laudatory but not obsequious: the great were generally treated
as virtuous *ex officio*, their frailties metamorphosed into exemplary strengths. Miller had
dedicated work to Montagu before *Joseph*: for example, *Le Misantrope* (1732). In these earlier
dedications Miller politely praised a man at the heart of the Court, while promoting his own
powerful connections. In *The Man-Hater (Select Comedies of Mr. de Moliere*, VI, dedication
pages not numbered), addressing the duke twelve years before *Joseph*, Miller sincerely relates
how the play’s ‘Sentiments are not only proper, but strong and nervous’, and makes direct
connections between these literary attributes and the duke’s patronage of the arts. The social
circle centred on the duke extended throughout the aristocracy, and among artists and
Freemasons, and it included Handel, as confirmed in a report of a dinner party held by
Montagu and his duchess on 4 May 1747, which numbered several nobles and ‘Mr Handell’
among the guests. Miller’s invocation of Montagu’s name claims aristocratic approval for *Joseph*, his first libretto.

The concise authorial commentary on the nature of libretto writing, set in large fount, calculatedly gives an illusion of a ‘private’ correspondence between author and ducal patron. Its confident tone and oblique criticisms of the genre were surely intended to colour readers’ responses to the libretto and their experience of it in performance. While praising ‘the great Master’ (Handel is not named) Miller complains that he as librettist has laboured to satisfy musical and not poetic-dramatic principles. His verse is subordinate to another art, for the composer’s ‘Music is sure to talk to the Purpose, whether the Words it is set to do so, or not’. A libretto ‘deprives the Writer of sufficient Room for the gradual and artful Unravelling of his Subject, as well as the clear and full Explication of his Character’. His apologetic address was a common ploy, and is reminiscent of Mandeville’s warning to his readers that his *Fable* was ‘a Story told in Dogrel, which without the least design of being Witty, I have endeavour’d to do in as easy and familiar manner as I was able’. Miller asks Montagu to pardon the ‘unavoidable’ defects of the libretto, the creation of which has involved excising dialogue in favour of musical expression of character. He seems anxious to preserve his reputation from censure, adumbrating the literary shortcomings of oratorio form and addressing several readerships simultaneously (duke, composer, critic, and oratorio audience). His dedication prepares, preconditions, and directs his readership to the literary constraints under which he worked.

---

13 Donald Burrows, ‘Handel, George Frideric, composer (1685-1759)’, *ODNB*; this event is not in *HHb iv*.
Miller employs a form of inverse special pleading. He, as author, calls to readers’ attention the unfavourable literary features he has had to contend with because of musical considerations. This strategy receives a contrary interpretation from Otto Deutsch, who thinks the dedication displays ‘arrogance even worse than that in Hamilton’s preface to the book of Samson’. Deutsch fails to see that Miller’s expression is poised, his judgments rational, showing genuine gratitude for kindnesses received and a need to be candid with his readers about the libretto’s literary shortcomings. Dean concurs with Deutsch’s condemnation, commenting that Miller makes a ‘singularly unfortunate’ excuse that there is insufficient room for ‘artful Unravelling’ of the plot and character (p. 399). Dean dismisses Miller’s dedication and libretto with a Wildean quip that Miller ‘was too much a man of letters to make a good librettist’ (p. 398). These two music historians are selective in their commentaries, ignoring Miller’s situation as a struggling dramatist probably motivated by his eagerness to please a powerful patron, Montagu, while moving into new literary territory by writing a libretto for Handel. There is sufficient self-awareness in Miller’s remarks to prove that he was no sycophant. Miller writes as a man of literary sensibilities. He forewarns readers of loose ends in the drama. His fulsome praise of the composer is balanced by a tone of ‘wounded’ poet, his lyrical ingenuity overshadowed by the composer’s towering presence. This brief dedication foregrounds the underlying, allegedly stultifying, principles of libretto writing, resulting in a literary work, Miller suggests, appreciation of which requires alternative critical judgment from that applied to his other works. In a dedication free from the composer’s interference, Miller takes advantage of his opportunity to engage readers’ indulgence.

Embedded in the dedication is an apothegmatic message to Miller’s readers, and thereby to Handel’s audience. Rejecting ‘the usual Mode of Epistles Dedicatory’, Miller remarks that the duke is one who respects ‘the Nosce Teipsum’, and thus displays the kind of expressive economy to which he had raised objections earlier. ‘Nosce Teipsum’, the cryptic inscription for visitors to read at Apollo’s Temple in Delphi, is an important theme in *Joseph*: when Joseph suppresses public knowledge of his blood relationship with the brethren, his loss of self-control threatens his authority. Epictetus in *The Discourses* explains that tyrants can chain legs, remove heads, but cannot cut off one’s choice, ‘Hence the advice of the ancients—Know thyself’. Juvenal writes in *Satire* Xi that ‘The saying, ‘Know Yourself’ comes from heaven. It should be fixed and pondered in the unforgetting heart.’ Boethius follows in the Greek tradition, teaching the Stoical principle that ignorance of oneself is a defect, for man should be master of himself. The key point to be made here is that with this simple saying Miller mined a rich vein in literature lodged within the associative recall of his readers. For example, in *Paradise Regain’d* Milton contemplates the liberating power of self-knowledge:

Yet he who reigns within himself, and rules Passions, desires, and fears, is more a king; Which every wise and virtuous man attains (II, lines 466-468).

Miller intimates that his main purpose in *Joseph* is to demonstrate that wisdom follows from difficult and perhaps painful moral improvement and that virtue is a moral and not a personal or social quality. The works of these ancient writers would have been well known to Miller’s
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educated readers, but it may be that the reference was intended to call to mind a much more recent poem as well as earlier references. John Arbuthnot’s ‘Know your Self’, containing thoughts derived from Pascal, was published by Tonson and printed by Watts in 1734, and moralizes against hubris, urging the reader to ‘Regain by Meekness what you lost by Pride’.20 This instruction is echoed in Pope’s Essay on Man, also published in 1734: ‘Know then thyself, presume not God to scan; | The proper study of mankind is man.’21 The title-page of Pope’s poem has an engraving incorporating ‘know thyself’. Miller applies nosce teipsum to Montagu’s position of greatness, stressing that any tendency to pride and arrogance should be balanced by self-awareness (an allusion to Freemasonry seems inescapable, Montagu having been Grand Master). The precept remained at the forefront of literary consciousness, revivified by appearances in, for example, Richardson’s novel Pamela: ‘(be curbed in, my proud Heart, know thyself)’ (1741 edn, ii, 168), and in Young’s poem Night Thoughts: ‘Man! Know thyself; all Wisdom centers there’.22

The drama centred on Joseph arises from tensions between self-knowledge and political power, and pivots on issues of identity and moral integrity in public life. These concerns, fresh in public consciousness in 1743-44 from memories of Robert Walpole’s ministry, Miller foregrounded as guiding principles for political successors. By directing readers’ attention to this primary theme, Miller’s dedication therefore serves an essential interpretive function. Miller’s deft use of epigram in the dedication prepares his readers, in the words of Paul Hunter, to be ‘diligent enough to read all the relevant texts’, paratexts and main

text, as an integrated literary conception (p. 41). Miller’s reiteration of *nosce teipsum* acts as a device to assist in the unity of plot with narrative action and language. It helps him control the constrictions of libretto form which prevent, Miller avers, the deepening of character and complication of the plot. However, the prominence given *nosce teipsum* in M44 and J47 did not long survive Miller. J57 omits the dedication, Miller and Montagu being dead, and thus strips from this material form of the libretto Miller’s informative and revealing prefatory remarks.

Not content, it seems, with prefacing his libretto with advice to his readers about the drama’s meaning, Miller makes a striking authorial intrusion into the presentation of the libretto itself. In the spirit of impaired authority, Miller interrupts the flow of the reading with a footnote, which distacts as much as it explains. It must have confused readers, perhaps deliberately, because the text it ‘corrects’ is not in the wordbook, though it would be heard in performance. The text on the page reads ‘henceforth, as Saviour of the World, | Let *Zaphnath-Paaneah be thy Name’, but the words performed were ‘henceforth, as Father of the Country, | Let Zaphnath-Paaneah be thy Name’ (Joseph, I.4). The asterisk alerts readers to the meaning of the new name given Joseph by Pharaoh. Miller’s comment, ‘*Zaphnath-Paaneah signifies Saviour of the World’ printed in its own apparatus below the main text, may have left readers wondering the purpose of this textual intrusion. The ‘clarification’ is not only a formal sign of authorial presence but an unambiguous retrieval of his text from someone else, possibly the composer, who had edited the phrase and therefore changed its meaning against his wishes. Miller chose to interrupt the main text to trigger, perhaps, a brief parallel discourse with his readers. This visual solecism intrudes into marginal space, a region rarely invaded in wordbooks and never in so ‘literary’ a way as here.
The footnote enriches the system of notation in *Joseph*. Miller’s strategy as author, in promoting his libretto, seems to counteract the inferior status given it in musical performance. The alternative meaning that the footnote offers contradicts Gerard Genette’s description of paratext, that it ‘is always subordinate to “its” text, and this functionality determines the essence of its appeal and its existence’.

With its combative tone, Miller’s footnote takes on greater emphasis than the libretto’s phrase, because it introduces an element of doubt into ideas of textual authenticity. Miller’s voice questions ownership of the text as presented, invading the dialogue between readers, printed text, and musical presentation. By throwing doubt on what seems otherwise a neutral transactional text, Miller questions readers’ belief in the text’s integrity and illustrates the formal weakness of libretto to which he alluded in the dedication.

Miller’s footnote skilfully roots the *Joseph* wordbook within bookish and scholarly interpretive traditions, further distancing the libretto from musical performance. It once again turns his readers into critics, which Miller had accomplished previously in the dedication. The implied anonymous amendment signalled by the footnote becomes anti-text, whereas the author’s source has impeccable theological veracity. The truthful text, Miller’s footnote insinuates, lies in the author’s original libretto and not the text that readers encounter in performance. Miller notifies readers of the existence of a literary work of which the libretto they are reading is an edited version. *Joseph* thus becomes a partial and concerned text, steeped in disguise, and positing two authorial presences: Miller’s and an unseen other, a censoring agency. The intimation is that Handel instigated the verbal change. To achieve his
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aim in both the dedication and this footnote, Miller encourages his readers, in Love’s helpful phrase, to read ‘against the surface of the writing’ (p. 310).

The front matter of *Joseph* (M44) also carries a lengthy ‘Advertisement’. It is printed in a small fount, half the size of that used for the libretto and much smaller than that for the dedication immediately preceding it, and is set solid (i.e. unled) to cram as much text on the page as possible. This arrangement indicated that the text was not intended to be read during a performance. It sets the scene at the commencement of the plot by giving a summary of Joseph’s history, from his becoming an Egyptian slave until his false imprisonment, and then to his estrangement from his brothers. Because the libretto is not entirely self-explanatory, a defect Miller acknowledged in the dedication, the advertisement provides essential information for readers to help them to make sense of the drama. It reads as though originally written as a proposal to Handel for an oratorio on the subject of *Joseph*.

Ruth Smith writes that Miller’s provision of a synopsis in the wordbook for *Joseph* obviates ‘the charge occasionally made by modern critics that the librettist rendered the “plot” unintelligible’ (*Oratorios*, p. 23), and thus the advertisement is important paratext as a résumé of the biblical narrative. Miller fills gaps in the dramatic story, and by doing so reinforces his complaint in the dedication of the constraints on an author of a libretto who attempts a coherent, self-contained drama. The advertisement neatly serves as a coda between the highly-personalized dedication and the ‘objective’ libretto that follows it, delaying reading of the dramatic poem. Miller’s authorial presence obtrudes between a biblical story and its new guise as a libretto.

At a crucial point in his advertisement narrative Miller addresses his readers with an inclusive voice, ‘our’, evocative of novels of the time: ‘Here then our Drama finds Joseph, two
Years after this Incident had happened’. Writing of an Old Testament figure in the ‘present’ time of the reader he once again draws readers’ attention to the lack of space in libretto form to unfold a coherent story. He omits the episode of the many-coloured coat, concentrating instead on explicating the visions of Joseph and Pharaoh, all the while recruiting attention to the fact that understanding the drama is not possible without his synopsis.

Miller makes no reference in the advertisement to the literary sources for *Joseph*. This is puzzling. In many of his earlier translations and other adaptations, Miller always acknowledged his literary debts, but about his literary obligation to Zeno’s *Giuseppe* he is silent. Perhaps he felt his own contribution to *Joseph* greater than any obligation to the Italian author. Broughton’s acknowledgment of his sources for *Hercules* is one short sentence in T45, which the printer surrounds with white space, with the lines separated by 2-points, so as to look comfortable on a whole page. This objectified sentence is free from authorial colour: ‘The following Drama is founded on the Story of Hercules and Dejanira’. It continues by evoking a shared acquaintance between author and audience of classical heritage: ‘as it is related by Ovid’ and ‘as it is treated by Sophocles’. Broughton firmly positions his libretto within classical tradition. In placing these classical references at the front of the wordbook, Broughton heightens readers’ anticipation of a mythical marriage unpredictably transformed, displaying authorial integrity with regard to the sources and enlarging the sense of a metatext. Broughton’s unsigned advertisement distracts attention from its true authorship. Both advertisements display a common authorial intent to legitimize the integrity of the drama by affirming the irreproachable sources from which their plots are taken.

Watts advertised selected books in *Joseph* that might also appeal to customers of the wordbook. His trade announcement is placed on the verso of the title-leaf and therefore before
the large-type dedication to Montagu. Watts addresses customer-readers free from the intervention and mediation of either the author or composer. It is a third ‘voice’ in the publication. It seeks to entice customers, some perhaps already in possession of an earlier copy, with the announcement of a second edition, ‘Just Publish’d’, of *The Lady’s Preceptor*, with ‘large Alterations and Additions, beautifully Printed’. The title-page had claimed the wordbook was owned by Watts, and this commercial advertisement immediately after it reinforces this provenance. The respectable reading material promised by a conduct-book, announced in a wordbook for Handel’s audiences, was product-placement precisely aimed at parents and young women. The advertisement includes a quotation from *Paradise Lost*, VIII, which ambitiously situates *The Lady’s Preceptor* in the culture of polite literature:

——— Adorn’d
With all that Earth or Heav’n could bestow,
To make her amiable: —— On she came,
Grace was in all her Steps, Heav’n in her Eye,
In every Gesture Dignity and Love.  

This quotation, located within a commercial context of customer inducement, has a wider semiotic charge. It plays on implicit parallels between Milton’s Edenic couple and the married pair in *Joseph*. Its real force, however, derives from the iconic literary status of Milton’s poetry at the time of *Joseph*, which made the libretto and *The Lady’s Preceptor* admirable artistic companions, like Adam and Eve and Joseph and Asenath. To assert the moral worth of his product, Watts announces that the book is dedicated to Lady Augusta, a member of the royal family, thereby claiming tacit regal endorsement of its suitability for young women. Its

social and cultural prestige is further consolidated by Watts’s revelation that *The Lady’s Preceptor* is translated from the French.

*J*47 has no advertisement for *The Lady’s Preceptor*, and the verso of the title-leaf is left unprinted. *J*57 contains more advertisements than *M*44. To tap into a notion of a command of French as a polite accomplishment, on the verso of the title-leaf in *J*57 are announcements for a New Testament in French, a French grammar, and an edition of Fenelon’s *Télémaque* (‘Beautifully Printed in One Volume in Twelves’) with maps, a promotion of one of Watts’s printing specialities. *Télémaque*, Leslie Chilton explains, ‘was used to teach children the geography of the ancient world’ (p. 347). The advertisement therefore puffs the educational benefit of this book as a moral tale of a young man learning the wisdom requisite to a ruler and its usefulness to those learning French. This alliance of *Télémaque* to a wordbook for *Joseph* sets up intertextual links between the two works, with their themes of political corruption and the necessity for virtuous rulers to guarantee individual freedom and liberty.

The increase in the number of advertisements in *J*57 may be due to Dod, who promoted his own publications in a wordbook which Watts may not have supervised on account of ill health. One of these advertisements is for a fourth edition of *The Lady’s Preceptor* (‘Beautifully Printed in Octavo’); no advertisement mentions Watts.

Watts and the Tonsons dignified their wordbooks with a tactile and visual quality that presented the libretto as favourably as possible within the parameters of print and economic viability. They turned the wordbooks into an interesting combination of printer’s brochure and memento of an oratorio experience, products presented with the sober gravity of published formal poetry. The paratext of *Joseph* frames the literary event of libretto reading, shaping
readers’ responses by recommending meanings not easily discerned during performance of the oratorio.

### 6.3. Wordbooks and modern audiences.

Words were important to Handel, a statement verified by a letter the composer wrote to a newspaper shortly before the (delayed) first performance of *Hercules* and first revival of *Joseph*. He apologized for the failure to complete his season of subscription oratorio, as advertised, pleading that it was uneconomic for him to continue. He suggested reasons for the lack of public support for his music and justified attempts to satisfy public taste. He affirmed:

> that joining good Sense and significant Words to Musick [is] the best Method of recommending [oratorios] to an English Audience; I have directed my Studies that way, and endeavoured to shew, that the English Language, which is so expressive of the sublimest Sentiments is the best adapted of any to the full and solemn Kind of Musick’  
*(Daily Advertiser, 17 January 1745: HHb iv, 383).*

These are not merely soothing sentiments to preserve the composer’s reputation during commercial difficulties; they are a creative artist’s manifesto. Handel saw his oratorios as unique combinations of rational thought, solemn poetry, and orchestral and vocal music. He hinted that in working in the same medium as Shakespeare and Milton his endeavour was to promote the English language to its own speakers. Because Handel stressed in this letter the importance of words to his oratorios it is therefore reasonable to claim that he regarded wordbooks as important to the experience of his oratorios.

Wordbooks as literary aids for audiences ceased to be published regularly in the late eighteenth century. In the second half of the nineteenth century wordbooks were sold at some
of the Handel Festivals held in the Crystal Palace, but they subsequently disappeared as the number of Handel’s oratorios in the repertory shrank and those that were performed became ever more familiar. Printing advances enabled the production of cheap vocal scores, with a version of the libretto in the underlay, which further reduced the market for wordbooks. According to Burrows, Novello’s vocal scores had a significant impact on how oratorio audiences engaged with the performance. He notes that the ‘particular success (and originality) of the octavo scores [lay in] “the use of such books by the AUDIENCE, instead of being confined as previously to the PERFORMERS”’. 25 Mid-nineteenth-century audiences were willing to purchase these vocal scores, in the absence of wordbooks, to aid their enjoyment of the work.

Possibly accounting for their absence from critical and bibliographical studies of eighteenth-century and the Handel literature is the fact that wordbooks were never published as stand-alone literary works. Scholarly neglect is evident in the two biographies of the eldest Jacob Tonson. When the two biographers, George Papali and Kathleen Lynch, refer to the third Jacob Tonson’s business, neither mentions his loyal and lasting engagement in wordbook publication, which was such a notable and regular feature of his activities. 26 Foxon discusses the collaboration between John Watts and the Tonsons without mentioning wordbooks.

Neglect of a different kind can be seen in approaches to the libretto in the three main editions of Handel’s music. As already mentioned, Chrysander’s full scores of the oratorios provided a German translation of an unspecified version of the English libretto. The editorial principles governing this version of the music did not extend to scholarly consideration of the

26 George Francis Papali, Jacob Tonson, Publisher: His Life and Work (Auckland: Tonson, 1968).
words. Burrows’s edition of *Belshazzar* exceptionally quotes Charles Jennens’s epigraph from the title-page, a rare example of inclusion of wordbook paratext to suggest that the music has a literary context. In oratorio scores currently in publication by the *Hallische Händel-Ausgabe* (*HHA*), there is inconsistency in how to present the forms the libretto took in manuscripts and wordbooks. *HHA* editors briefly account for their decisions regarding the libretto in a prefatory section called ‘The Libretto’.

The privileging of musical text over verbal text in modern editions of Handel’s oratorios is paralleled by the disappearance of wordbooks from the experience of oratorio in the twentieth century. At the beginning of the twenty-first, wordbooks no longer have a material presence in oratorio performances. Time has separated audiences from the cultural milieu in which oratorios were written. It has distanced them from the librettists, from the metatext of their predecessors, and from the force of the images. This may mean that some compressed phrases now require elucidation for audiences. For example, the pelican image in Asenath’s air ‘Ah Jealousy, thou Pelican’, *Joseph* II.2, no longer has the theological charge it had in the eighteenth century, when it was part of cultural knowledge. Without guidance, modern audiences unfamiliar with Greek mythology may struggle with Dejanira’s air ‘Resign thy Club, and Lion’s Spoils’, in *Hercules* II.5, and its references to ‘Spear’, ‘Shield’, ‘Spindle’, and ‘Distaff’; they may think its noun clusters odd and cumbersome. Today, a brief explanation appended to a printed libretto could show that this is a mordant and oblique reference to the shameful occasion when Hercules, during his Labours, dressed as Omphale’s androgynous slave, and that Dejanira’s taunt challenges him to prove his virile love. Brief notes such as this can reveal rich hidden meanings, supplementing an essay covering the oratorio’s contextual history printed in a programme, significantly enhancing oratorio as
convincing musical drama. Theatre house lighting would need adjusting to allow both the
libretto and its annotation to be consulted during performances. When a libretto is provided in
a programme and its fount is too small to read easily with the theatre lights dimmed, oratorio
becomes predominantly a musical experience, and not the aesthetic fusion of words and music
evisioned by its creators. Without a printed libretto modern oratorio audiences are primarily
listeners, in contrast to Handel’s audiences who were also readers of the words. Oratorio
audiences bereft of access to a libretto experience the words physically and emotionally and
perhaps unconsciously, but less intellectually, as Darrel Mansell explains:

As you read [the] words on the page you parse them for syntax, and assemble them
into an idea [. You] can think of what the voice is doing as contributing to, underlining
the rational order of what is said in the words [. The] words are in the service of the
voice projecting itself so as to express [. . .] an emotional impulse.27

With a libretto to hand, audiences can enjoy the possibilities presented by the nuanced literary
text of the oratorio as presumably did the first audiences. Lack of a libretto prevents modern
oratorio audiences from gaining the finest possible aesthetic pleasure; it renders more complex
the process of engagement with their own cultural values and concerns and seeing them
mirrored or confronted in Joseph and Hercules. To enter fully into the cultural world,
conventions, and values of the eighteenth century, audiences need access to a libretto if they
are to avoid having the nature of their encounter with oratorio determined almost entirely by
its musical setting. A printed libretto mitigates the effective misrepresentation of the
composite work when words have to be identified solely from performance during the airs and
choral counterpoint. When audiences direct their attention away from the music in order to

catch and comprehend them, their experience of oratorio as a composite work is not the deeply meaningful cultural event it could be.

Whereas the three wordbooks for *Joseph*, in their provision of paratext and libretto, acknowledged their readers’ comfortable social, cultural, and moral background, most modern oratorio programmes, of which English National Opera’s programme for *Semele* is a prime example, do not provide a libretto, but pack these publications with non-literary material. ENO’s programme is dominated by advertisements for expensive restaurants and fashion accessories, concerts and operas, local fee-paying schools, and a cast list with copious artist biographies, all making presumptions about the aspirations of readers. Though there seems little likelihood, for commercial reasons, that the production of wordbooks as separate publications can be revived, the most practicable way of providing a libretto is to include one in the programme. A libretto and associated notes could then take their place in those programmes produced as glossy keepsakes, along with commercial advertisements, biographies, and photographs of performers. A programme containing a libretto could refocus audience comprehension on the oratorio’s themes, provided that a libretto is given in a sufficiently large fount to make it easy to consult during a performance.

As a substitute for a libretto, many oratorio programmes today include an essay outlining the musical and social context in which the work was composed and first performed. They generally include an assessment of the reception it received over the centuries, but concentrate readers’ and therefore the audience’s attention on musical expression, such as judicious harmonic shifts and attractive vocal and orchestral colours. This kind of information

---

28 Programme for English National Opera’s *Semele*, first performed in this production, 19 April 1999, at the London Coliseum.
extends appreciation of what readers hear but also reinforces an impression that delight is possible only through their discursive mediation. Without these kinds of essays, however, oratorio may seem arcane and deficient in exposition and narrative representation. Historicist recovery of oratorio’s cultural context has nevertheless the potential to distract modern audiences from appreciating oratorio as an arresting fusion of verse and music. When programme essays focus entirely on the music they historicize only one aspect of the oratorio experience, unstaged musical drama, whereas introductions to the literary component of oratorio could lead audiences into greater understanding of what they hear. Programme essays by Anthony Hicks and Ruth Smith, by commenting on the libretto, however briefly, represent a paradigm shift in this direction, for they highlight connections between the words and themes.\textsuperscript{29} They are a new kind of paratext to the work in the theatre, commenting, informing, and contributing to mediation of the whole experience. An example of paratext in a programme which went some way towards recognizing oratorio’s literariness is that issued for performances by the Scottish Early Music Consort of \textit{Samson} in October 1990.\textsuperscript{30} This programme presented the libretto from the first wordbook of 1743, including verse that was not performed. Unfortunately, because of the small fount used, presumably on grounds of economy, it was difficult to consult during the presentation, which created problems for the reader during a performance. To fit the performance within three hours, several items were not performed, making the printed libretto indispensable to those unfamiliar with \textit{Samson}. Though the programme featured an extended essay about the original vocal soloists, it was the inclusion of a libretto which commendably directed readers to the literary basis of oratorio, as

\textsuperscript{29} For example, Anthony Hicks, ‘Programme note’ for Handel’s oratorio \textit{Joshua}, 31st London Handel Festival 2008, 13 March to 24 April, 2008, pp. 18-19.

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Samson}, performed by the Scottish Early Music Consort in Edinburgh and Glasgow, 20 and 21 October 1990.
wordbooks did for eighteenth-century audiences. In similar vein, the programme for *Joseph* at the London Handel Festival in 1988 incorporated Miller’s advertisement, though this was ingeniously cut into sections, each section introducing a Part. The effect was to make the drama’s narrative much plainer to the reader. It thus situated the work in its eighteenth-century cultural context and included vital insights to stimulate sophisticated thought about the composite work. The Festival audience did not have to rely wholly on the musical performance for its presentation of meaning, the kind of dependence which can lead to a sense that oratorio as a work of art is ‘incomplete’. Promoters of these late-twentieth century performances of *Samson* and *Joseph* understood the need for a libretto, though neither explored the potential of a large-type libretto and accompanying notes, as were found in Watts’s wordbooks.

These commendable moves towards resurrection of a printed libretto have, unfortunately, increasingly been supplanted in recent years by opera companies’ preference for staging Handel’s dramatic oratorios. The first staging of a Handel oratorio, *Esther* in 1732, was not under Handel’s direction, but promoted by Bernard Gates, Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal, and performed three times ‘after the Manner of the Ancients’ at the Crown and Anchor tavern in the Strand. In a London Handel Festival 2008 programme note, Hicks writes that ‘This was the only staged performance of any of Handel’s dramatic oratorios before the twentieth century’ (p. 95). In other words, Handel never staged oratorios himself.

No wordbook for this staging is known.

---

31 *Joseph and his Brethren*, performed as part of The London Handel Festival at St George’s, Hanover Square, London, 30 April 1988; essay by Donald Burrows.
There are many objections to the staging of oratorios. Staging blunts oratorio’s fundamental literariness by depriving audiences of the means to consult a printed text. It is based on a deliberate conceptual misrepresentation by the impresario of the art-form’s aesthetic integrity. Oratorio’s unstageable presences become ‘staged’. As a result, audiences receive a distorted perception of the nature of oratorio representation on the grounds that staged oratorio is alien to the original endeavours of librettist and composer: it detracts from the fundamental importance of words in the composite work.

The movement for staged oratorio in Britain stems from a staging of *Semele* in Cambridge in 1925, which led to the staging of several oratorios at that city’s university in the 1930s. Winton Dean’s persuasive advocacy of the viability of Handel’s oratorios as stage dramas dates from this time: Philip Radcliffe recounts that Dean was cast as Jesse in *Saul* in 1936.³² Dean asserts that staging liberates the dramatic oratorios from the aesthetic obscurity into which they had fallen and acts as a catalyst for renewed interest in the whole range of Handel’s oratorios. His influential assessment that ‘the dramatic oratorios and masques have been revealed, in stage performance, as the masterpieces they are’ led to revision of the misjudged view of these works as lifeless dramas (p. 149). Dean evaluates Handel’s dramatic oratorios according to their stage worthiness, an example of which is his ardent assertion, fired by Handel’s magnificent music, that *Hercules* ‘should be in the repertory of half the opera houses of Europe’ (p. 432).

Staged oratorio was a speciality of the Handel Opera Society, founded in 1959, whose existence was cut short when the Arts Council deemed that in 1985 Handel’s operas no longer
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needed justification and therefore subsidy. The Society revived the composer’s operas in repertory alongside staged oratorios, setting out as if to demonstrate that oratorio is unfulfilled dramatic spectacle. This was in direct contravention of oratorio’s essential principle, namely, that it is unstaged drama. By staging oratorio, numerous opera companies today, as the Handel Opera Society before them, turn the work into something it was never intended to be. Oratorio as unstaged music-drama has an aesthetic closer to the novels of its time than to opera and plays; it was created with hearers and readers in mind, not spectators. Staging turns the reflective sections of the work into dramatic ‘chasms’ that require filling with irrelevant stage business. Staging encrusts words and music with supra-illustration, foisting on the work layers of meanings that have little to do with the work as envisaged by the librettist and composer. Oratorio was a demanding listening experience for its original audiences, and modern superimposition of visual spectacle, aimed presumably at enhancing audience enjoyment, turns oratorio into a quasi-operatic event. Staging seems predicated on the basis that oratorio’s perceived ‘failings’ require interventionist attempts to annul these weaknesses by diverting attention to the work’s dramatic strengths. These ‘strengths’, according to Dean, lie in Handelian oratorio’s supposed operatic qualities. In contradiction of this claim is the fact that staging is inimical to the verbal drama.

Staging, alien to the principles underlying oratorio’s original conception, entertains the eye while weakening the force of the words and music. It imposes a mis-en-scène irrelevant and perhaps in sharp conflict with the work’s original conception. Staging also often sets oratorio in historical settings different from those stipulated by the librettist, introducing inappropriate periodization by placing the singers in modern dress, intended to provide ‘relevance’ to modern audiences. In attempting to do so, staging foists the determinacy of
opera on to a virtual medium. Staging indulges in visual counterpoint on an oratorio’s themes, some promoters relying on the unfamiliarity of the work to enable them to indulge their free interpretation. Oratorio is not a concert version of an opera, and staging, however popular in terms of the box-office, reinforces observation of oratorios as unconvincing works of art in need of staging to accomplish their dramatic possibilities.

Provision of a libretto for audiences of staged oratorio has been inconsistent. The English National Opera programme for its staged Semele in 1999 included a general essay by Philip Reed occupying three pages in a seventy page publication. In place of a libretto were surtitles, which is the same technology that assists audience comprehension of opera. Surtitles were provided even though the staged oratorio was performed in the vernacular. To fit the oratorio text on a screen, the libretto’s poetry was chopped into short phrases that appeared only as they were first sung, and not during repetition or da capos. This demonstrated how surtitles are no substitute for printed presentation of the poetry, which was such a distinct and pleasing material feature of wordbooks.

Digital video disc technology and recording has further emphasized the visual dimension of oratorio in performance. It offers a facility to read subtitles on screen, a device which in fragmenting the verbal text devalues the poetry and therefore the literariness of the composite work. This proved disadvantageous for Broughton’s libretto in the production of Hercules by Luc Bondy for the Garnier Theatre in Paris in 2004. The staging and surtitles created a new composite work, which in spite of its visually seductive qualities cannot replicate the complex negotiation between printed libretto and the reader-listener's imaginative agency at an unstaged oratorio with a printed libretto. A staging of Hercules at the Buxton
Festival of 2004 was assisted neither by surtitles nor printed libretto but expected audiences to make sense of the drama entirely from the musical presentation of the words.

One piece of technology which gets closer to the original experience of oratorio is the liner note for compact disc recordings. Some recordings offer a miniature facsimile eighteenth-century libretto, including stage directions, from the original wordbook. It is listeners to oratorio on CD, with access to these kinds of liner notes and following a libretto while hearing the music, who are able to replicate an important aspect of Handel’s first audience, that of experiencing oratorio as an individual while reading the libretto.

Staging and lack of provision of a printed libretto are inauthentic for oratorio and are contrary to recent musicological developments, which have embraced principles of faithfulness to the composer’s musical score in order to present ‘historically-informed’ musical performances. This approach promotes the use of original or reproduction instruments, all tuned to an eighteenth-century pitch, and encourages development of voices that attempt to approach the sound presumed to have been made by castratos. In other words, ‘authentic’ performance values are those judged as closely resembling an original auditory experience. However, historically-informed practice has yet to embrace the literary dimension of authenticity, namely, presentation of a large-print libretto to audiences. The effect of such exclusive attention to musical values creates disparity of respect between musical and literary components of oratorio, a situation exacerbated by staging. To approach the original audience experience of oratorio requires a text which can be consulted during performances, which would entail abandoning the routine dimming of houselights. Explanatory notes could then offer some contact with eighteenth-century cultural vocabularies and allow audiences to encounter the moral and spiritual values shaped by earlier formations of meaning. Provision of
a readable literary text under these conditions may encourage today’s audiences to discern more clearly the librettist’s theological and philosophical ideas intellectually rather than entirely through musical representation.

The contents of wordbooks, as signifiers of the intellectual climate in which they were produced, admitted oratorio’s earliest audiences to the ‘familiar territory within the text’. A libretto’s economy of expression made its printed form in wordbooks required reading for audiences, so that they could infer meaning subliminally from the metatext or standard repertoire of cultivated reading from which the libretto emerged. The significance of wordbooks in theatre history lies in the fact that they were indispensable aids to a musical art form which gave words much more prominence than in opera.

Of the two composite works that are the focus of this thesis, Hercules is now the better known, as shown by staged performances in Montpellier, Paris, and Buxton. Joseph, however, continues to languish in the shadows of critical consciousness, rarely exciting the curiosity of scholars or of theatre directors. Since the suppression of Miller’s dedication from 1757 onwards, Joseph has been judged to suffer from an incomprehensible libretto that disables the drama. In performance, however, with a printed libretto and notes to help audiences navigate the narrative, Joseph can prove a coherent and satisfying blend of literary and musical art. A printed libretto text that can be consulted conveniently during performances could help today’s audiences recapture the active participation, as readers and interpreters, of oratorio’s first patrons, the printed libretto being a physical statement of oratorio’s essential literariness.

Reading the libretto in the wordbook before performance has the potential to unlock readers’

---

imagination and whet their anticipation of musical realization to be given to the poetry. When supplemented by germane paratextual material, a printed literary text can advance recognition of the effectiveness of oratorio as convincing music-drama.
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