'Exactly engrav'd by Tho: Cross'? The Role of Single-Sheet Prints in Preserving Performing Practices from the Restoration Stage

DOI:

[10.1525/jm.2020.37.3.305](https://doi.org/10.1525/jm.2020.37.3.305)

Document Version

Final published version

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Herissone, R. (2020). 'Exactly engrav'd by Tho: Cross'? The Role of Single-Sheet Prints in Preserving Performing Practices from the Restoration Stage. *Journal of Musicology*, 37(3), 305-348.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/jm.2020.37.3.305>

Published in:

Journal of Musicology

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.

“Exactly engrav’d by Tho: Cross”? The Role of Single-Sheet Prints in Preserving Performing Practices from the Restoration Stage

REBECCA HERISSONE

Among Henry Purcell’s dramattick operas—the four multimedia spectacular productions for the London stage to which he contributed substantial musical episodes in the last stage of his career—his first, *The Prophetess, or the History of Dioclesian*, would appear to pose the fewest problems for the modern editor. In early 1691, less than a year after the opera’s June 1690 premiere, Purcell published his complete music for the work in a folio-sized full score, entitled *The Vocal and Instrumental Musick of the Prophetess*. The source materials for *The Prophetess* therefore cause none of the editorial headaches presented by the composer’s later dramattick operas, for which he did not repeat this monumental printing effort, resulting in works with no single complete

305

I am grateful to Martin Adams, Peter Holman, Alan Howard, Katherina Lindekens, Stephen Rose, Alon Schab, Sandra Tuppen, Bryan White, and Amanda Eubanks Winkler for their constructive comments on material used in this article, and to the journal’s anonymous readers for their helpful suggestions. Particular thanks are due to James Hume for providing invaluable assistance in obtaining reproductions used in the early stages of the research. Pitches are referred to using the Helmholtz system, where c' = middle C; references to rhythms use abbreviations as follows: w = whole note; h = half note; q = quarter note; e = eighth note; s = sixteenth note; t = thirty-second note.

surviving source (*King Arthur*), with sources entwined within a complex performing history (*The Fairy Queen*), or with sources reflecting haste and lack of clarity in the process of dramatic adaptation (*The Indian Queen*).

Understandably, Purcell's self-published score of *The Prophetess* has been regarded by modern editors as the definitive record of the composer's intentions and a clear "best text"; consequently, additional contemporary sources preserving smaller fragments of the work have been relegated to the sidelines.¹ Clearly Purcell's score provides a strong and direct link to the composer and, as I have explored elsewhere, records his very personal involvement in the production process.² Research I have carried out in preparing a new edition of the opera for the Purcell Society, however, has led me to investigate in detail for the first time how *each* of the surviving contemporary notated sources may relate ontologically to the performance history of the work. This analysis has revealed that some of its most denigrated and most readily dismissed sources—a group of single-sheet songs engraved rather carelessly by Thomas Cross Jr.—may in fact more directly reflect the opera as performed on the London stage than Purcell's monument to his first essay in the dramattick-opera form. In this article I examine what we can retrieve of the process through which Cross produced his cheap, single-sheet editions of music from the London theater, evaluating what these editions can tell us about his source materials and what they may consequently reveal about contemporary performing practices. The results of this analysis suggest that these apparently ephemeral souvenirs—however unpromising they might appear to modern editors—may be more textually significant than has hitherto been acknowledged. This in turn raises broader questions about the criteria we should use when making editorial judgments about the relative authority of sources from this period.

¹ In the first modern edition of the work, J. Frederick Bridge and John Pointer explained that "the original score of *Dioclesian* has, except for the correction of obvious misprints, been closely followed in the present edition. Many of the songs and instrumental pieces were afterwards reprinted in *Orpheus Britannicus*, *Ayres for the Theatre*, and other works, . . . [but] it has not been thought necessary to give a list of all the various [*sic*] readings they contain." Henry Purcell, *Dioclesian*, ed. J. Frederick Bridge and John Pointer, *The Works of Henry Purcell* 9 (London: Novello, 1900); reprinted in revised edition, ed. Margaret Laurie (Borough Green: Novello, 1961), x. Laurie noted variants from ten contemporary or early eighteenth-century sources in the editorial commentary of her revised edition, but retained the original edition's best-text approach. All references to "Purcell," here and throughout the article, are to Henry Purcell, not Daniel Purcell.

² Rebecca Herissone, "A Complete and Correct Score"? Scribal Annotations and the Notion of Textual Fixity in Late Seventeenth-Century English Music Publications," *Musical Quarterly* 101 (2018): 244–311.

Cross and the Changing Profile of English Music Publishing in the Late Seventeenth Century

Music publishing in England underwent a distinct transformation during the 1690s. In part this was caused by the lapse in 1695 of the 1662 Press Act, putting to an end both censorship and the monopoly of the Stationers' Company: since it was no longer necessary for books to be published under license from the Company, the market at least nominally became fully competitive,³ a change made all the more significant by the death a few years earlier of John Playford—the man credited with developing the first successful commercial model for music publishing in England. It is clear, however, that this model was also profoundly affected by the transformative effect of the 1688 Glorious Revolution on how musicians earned their livings. As the size of the court's musical establishment was reduced under William and Mary, professional musicians responded by turning toward what in modern terms we would regard as self-employment, mixing contractual work in the public theater with various types of freelance activity, including teaching and giving public benefit concerts, a recent invention. As a result, their music was exposed to a much wider audience than ever before, and public music events began to expand considerably in both volume and frequency.

307

Music-publishing entrepreneurs soon capitalized on the business opportunities afforded by this newly enlarged musical output by seeking to make it available to their customers. Whereas John Playford had operated his business as a virtual monopoly (probably because the market at the time was too small and specialized for it to be worth the while of other London stationers to try to encroach upon it),⁴ his son Henry inherited a business that faced significant competition. Playford senior had managed to keep his business financially viable (if not exactly thriving),⁵ but a large body of evidence shows that Henry suffered increasing financial difficulties during the late 1690s and early 1700s, culminating in 1703

³ John Feather, *A History of British Publishing* (London: Routledge, 1988), 52–53.

⁴ The only other figure apparently involved in the trade at the time was John Carr, who published a limited number of books and writings on music, and seems to have enjoyed an amicable relationship with John Playford: the third, fourth, and fifth books of *Choice Ayres, Songs and Dialogues* were produced by them jointly in the early 1680s, as was the second edition of *The Delightful Companion* (1686). See Stephanie Louise Carter, "Music Publishing and Compositional Activity in England, 1650–1700" (PhD diss., University of Manchester, 2010), 67–68.

⁵ Comments in John Playford's will, made in November 1686, suggest that it was still evidently a challenge to make his business profitable, since he warned that his estate would "come short of the expectation of many of my friends and acquaintance." Quoted in Robert Thompson, "Playford, John, 1621x23–1686/7," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed February 5, 2019, www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-22374.

not only in a court case, through which it was revealed that he owed his printer William Pearson more than £55,⁶ but also in a desperate attempt to borrow money from his “Cosen,” one Mr. Lewis, because he owed £10 to a man who had “maid a vow if I Don’t pay him this afternoon he will give me Truble to Morrow.”⁷

The principal source of Henry Playford’s woes had first been hinted at in remarks made by Purcell more than a decade earlier, in the well-known “Advertisement” he appended at the end of *The Vocal and Instrumental Musick of the Prophetess*. The score did not appear until early in 1691, some seven or eight months after the opera’s premiere, by which time several songs had evidently already been published, causing the composer to complain that “it has been objected that some of the Songs are already common.”⁸ He was almost certainly referring here to the four songs from the opera that were among the first single-sheet prints published by Thomas Cross.⁹ The son of an engraver of portraits, Cross had begun printing music using copper-plate engraving in the 1680s. Throughout his career he worked under contract both for established stationers like John Playford and for composers undertaking self-publication; his earliest known work was Purcell’s 1683 *Sonnata’s of III Parts*,¹⁰ and he may also have been responsible for John Playford’s only music book produced through engraving, the keyboard collection *Musick’s Hand-maide*.¹¹ But around 1689 Cross responded to the burgeoning commercial environments of the London stage and concert room by inventing a new type of edition, which he published himself. He became the first music publisher to produce single-sheet prints of the text and

⁶ The outstanding sum was £55 9s 4d; see Cyrus Lawrence Day and Eleanore Boswell Murrie, “Playford *versus* Pearson,” *The Library*, 4th series, 17 (1937): 427–47, at 430–32.

⁷ Cited in Thompson, “Playford, John”; from London, Royal College of Music, MSS 2214 and 2215.

⁸ Henry Purcell, *The Vocal and Instrumental Musick of the Prophetess* (London, 1691), “Advertisement,” [175]. For a fuller analysis of the statement and what it tells us about Purcell’s understanding of the market for printed music in the 1690s, see Rebecca Herissone, “Playford, Purcell, and the Functions of Music Publishing in Restoration England,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 63 (2010): 243–90.

⁹ The only other print publication of material from *The Prophetess* published shortly after the production was a supplement to *Apollo’s Banquet . . . The Second Book* (London, 1691), issued by Henry Playford and headed “A New Addition to the Second Book of Apollo’s Banquet.” While this is undated, the two tunes from *The Prophetess* are printed with several from *King Arthur*, so the edition can only date from mid-1691 at the very earliest.

¹⁰ Frank Kidson, “Old-Time Music Publishing,” *Musical Times* 48 (1907): 303–4, at 303; Frank Kidson, William C. Smith, Peter Ward Jones, and David Hunter, “Cross, Thomas,” *Grove Music Online*, accessed February 6, 2019, www.oxfordmusiconline.com/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000006874.

¹¹ See Thompson, “Playford, John,” where it is also noted that Playford acquired preexisting plates for William Child’s 1639 *Chiose Musick to the Psalmes*, which he reissued in 1650 and 1656.

music of individual songs extracted from contemporary productions, which he was able to issue rapidly as cheap, eminently practical souvenirs of the songs that were all the rage at the theater. As Frank Kidson writes, “for the first time in musical history [Cross] gave the purchaser the chance of buying for a few pence popular lyrics from the latest opera or play, with its music and accompaniment, without being forced to purchase an entire collection.”¹² While there is little evidence of precisely who bought Cross’s single-sheet songs, we can infer that his clientele included members of the theater audiences themselves, and presumably others who could not attend but who had status and income that allowed them to engage in elite culture. At a time when, according to Robert D. Hume’s calculations, only about 5 percent of the entire population of England and Wales was likely to have had sufficient capital to spend money on cultural activities,¹³ it was undoubtedly the increasing wealth and cultural engagement of citizens and the lesser gentry that provided the basis of Cross’s new market.

For an experienced practioner like Cross, the engraving process was much quicker than printing from type. He appears to have turned this technical fact to his advantage by producing his single songs as quickly as possible after the new repertory reached the public domain. Indeed, in the early eighteenth century, when he had begun to face competition from John Walsh’s technique of using punches rather than engraving by hand, Cross was keen to use the rapidity of his music-engraving service as part of his sales pitch to potential clients. In an advertisement included in the single-sheet song “Dear Sally, a new Song,” dating from about 1710, for example, he claimed that “Gent. may have their Works fairly Engraved, as cheap as Puncht & Sooner; he having good hands to assist him, Covenanted for a term of Years.”¹⁴ Admittedly, hard evidence for dates of publication is almost entirely lacking: imprint statements citing the publication dates were rarely used in engraved editions, probably because such publications were often reissued repeatedly in small print runs and an absence of dating information made them more flexible in

¹² Kidson, “Old-Time Music Publishing,” 303. See also Kidson et al., “Cross, Thomas.” Of course, Broadside ballads had been published since the earliest days of printing, but these were primarily stand-alone lyrics, not connected to dramatic productions, and very few of the printed sheets included musical notation for the song tunes to which the ballads were set. On music in early Broadside see Jenni Hyde, “Mid-Tudor Ballads: Music, Words and Context” (PhD diss., University of Manchester, 2014).

¹³ Robert D. Hume, “The Economics of Culture in London, 1660–1740,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 69 (2006): 487–533, at 492–98.

¹⁴ See Charles Humphries and William C. Smith, *Music Publishing in the British Isles from the Beginning until the Middle of the Nineteenth Century: A Dictionary of Engravers, Printers, Publishers and Music Sellers, with an Historical Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970), 15. It is not clear whether it was the assistants, his engraving technique itself, or a combination of the two, that allowed for such speedy production.

this respect;¹⁵ even before the lapse of the Press Act in 1695 engravings were not covered by the rules requiring registration of publications with the Stationers' Company;¹⁶ and Cross did not use the press to advertise his single-sheet prints, so newspapers are of no assistance in determining their dates either.¹⁷

While precise dating of Cross's single-sheet prints is therefore probably not possible, the editions themselves provide strong circumstantial evidence that both supports Cross's claim that his editions were produced quickly and suggests, moreover, that they were printed in direct response to public performances. Their titles frequently refer to stage productions that are clearly current or at least very recent: sometimes Cross did not even give the work's title, evidently because his buyers would know what "the opera" was, since it was the only event in town. In Cross's print of "How blest are shepherds," for example, shown in figure 1, "A Song in the New OPERA Written by Mr. Dryden" evidently could have meant only the Dryden–Purcell dramatick opera *King Arthur*, presented by the United Company at the Dorset Garden Theater in June 1691.¹⁸ In figure 2, the lack of reference to *The Prophetess, or the History of Dioclesian* in the title for Purcell's "What shall I do?" evidently caused issues for a later owner of the copy of the print now held at the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris, who annotated the copy to identify the work. Elsewhere Cross used opera titles but described them in terms that make reference to their current status. His engraving of "I attempt from love's sickness to fly," for instance, is entitled "A Song in the Indian Queen: as it is now Compos'd into an OPERA. By Mr. Henry Purcell. Sung by Mrs. Cross."

Cross's chosen titles also consistently associate his publications with particular productions or performances. He almost always names the singers who realized the songs on the stage: for instance, in the three examples

¹⁵ Donald W. Krummel, *English Music Printing, 1553–1700* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1975), 145.

¹⁶ Equivalent protection was later provided by the Engravers' Act of 1735. Ronan Deazley, *On the Origin of the Right to Copy: Charting the Movement of the Copyright Law in Eighteenth-Century Britain (1695–1775)* (Oxford: Hart, 2004), 87–94.

¹⁷ According to Tilmouth's Calendar, Cross's name appeared in only one advertisement in the period up to 1695, for an apparently lost "Collection of new Ayres Composed for the Flute," which was announced in *A Collection for the Improvement of Husbandry and Trade* on October 13, 1693. Michael Tilmouth, "A Calendar of References to Music in Newspapers Published in London and the Provinces (1660–1719)," *R.M.A. Research Chronicle* 1 (1961): 1–107, at 13.

¹⁸ Both figures 1 and 2 are preserved in Thomas Cross's anthology, *Philomela, or the Vocal Musician, Being a Collection of the best & Newest Songs, Especially those in the two Opera's The Prophetess and King Arthur, Written by Mr. Dryden and set to Musick by Mr. Henry Purcell* (London, 1692). *Prima facie*, this would appear to negate the possibility that they were published rapidly during or just after the productions to which they refer; however, *Philomela* is one of a number of collections of single-sheet prints brought together artificially, each of the plates having been sold separately upon initial preparation.

FIGURE 1. Cross's plate for "How blest are shepherds," from John Dryden and Henry Purcell, *King Arthur*, using generic title "the New OPERA"; from Thomas Cross, *Philomela, or the Vocal Musician, Being a Collection of the best & Newest Songs, Especially those in the two Opera's The Prophetess and King Arthur, Written by Mr. Dryden and set to Musick by Mr. Henry Purcell* (London, 1692); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département de la musique, Y-604 (4), no. 92. Reproduced with permission.

92

A Song in the New OPERA, written
by Mr. Dryden, Sung by Mr. Bowman.

How blest are Shepherds, how happy their Lasses, while
Drums and Trumpets are sounding Alarms! Over our lonely
Sheds all the Storm passes; And when we die 'tis in each others
Arms. All the day on our Herds, and Flocks employing All
the Night on our Flutes, and in enjoying. M^r. H. Purcell

Bright Nymphs of Britain, with Graces attended,
Let not your days without pleasure Expire;
Honours but empty, when Youth is ended,
All men will praise you, but none will desire.
Let not Youth fly away without Contenting,
Age will come time Enough for your Repenting.

FIGURE 2. Cross's plate for "What shall I do?" from Thomas Betterton and Henry Purcell, *The Prophetess, or the History of Dioclesian*, using generic title "the OPERA"; from Cross, *Philomela, or the Vocal Musician*; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département de la musique, Y-604 (4), no. 97. Reproduced with permission.

See for 4 Brass. The whole Opera pag 67 97

A new Song fung in the OPERA
By Mr. Butler. of Dioclesian.

What shall I do to show how much I love her? How many
 Millions of Sigh's can suffice? That which wins other Hearts,
 never can more her, These common methods of Love she'll
 despise. I will love more than Man 'ere lov'd before me
 Gaze on her all the Day, melt all the Night; Till for
 her own sake at last she'll implore me, To love her
 left to preserve our delight. *M. Henry Purcell*

Since Gods themselves could not ever be loving,
 Men must have breathing Recruits for new joys
 I wish my Love could be always improving,
 Tho' eager Love more than Sorrow destroys.

In Fair Aurelia's Arms leave me expiring,
 To be Embalm'd by the Sweets of her Breath
 To the last Moment I'll still be desiring:
 Never had Hero so Glorious a Death.

*Sir John Hawking Vol. 4 pag. 524
 call's it fine,*

cited in the previous paragraph these are respectively the celebrated theater singers John Bowman, Charlotte Butler, and Letitia Cross,¹⁹ while in figure 3 his title for “Now the maids and the men” not only names John Pate as singer but also highlights his famous cross-dressing role in the part of Mopsa in *The Fairy Queen*.²⁰ Elsewhere Cross mentions specific performance venues, as in the print of “Let the soldiers rejoice” from *The Prophetess*, shown in figure 4, which identifies the venue as the Queen’s (i.e., Dorset Garden) Theater as well as identifying the singer as the countertenor John Freeman. Not all the publications refer to stage performances: some are related to public ceremonies or concerts, such as his plate for “Aloud proclaim the cheerful sound,” which he identifies as having been composed and sung by John Abell at the coronation of Queen Anne in 1704; here too the edition retains the strong impression of immediacy.

Of course, it was an extremely common marketing tool within musical publications of the latter part of the seventeenth century to emphasize the novelty of the repertory they contained, and Cross was by no means alone in relating his prints to specific public productions. The playbook containing the text for *The Prophetess*, for example—published in 1690 and almost certainly available for purchase during the opera’s first run of performances by the United Company in late May or early June of that year—referred to its representation “at the Queen’s Theatre” (see fig. 5), just like Cross’s edition of “Let the soldiers rejoice.”²¹ And before Cross’s single-sheet prints began to flood the market, Henry Playford was already publishing anthologies of theater tunes that used terminology similar to the phrases Cross habitually emphasized: the multivolume song collection *The Theater of Musick*, for example, whose first volume was published in 1685, presented the “newest and best *Songs Sung at the COURT, and Public THEATERS*,” according to its title page, the specific plays often being identified in the headings for individual songs within each volume.

Nonetheless, Cross’s simple, single-sheet engravings must have been much quicker to produce than Playford’s anthologies, and they could be sold at a fraction of the price. It is clear that his innovation gave him the

¹⁹ Thomas Cross does not seem to have been related to Letitia Cross, who was apparently only born in 1682, probably to Leonard and Ann Cross of St Martin’s, Dorking, Surrey. Olive Baldwin and Thelma Wilson, “Cross, Letitia,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed February 5, 2019, www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-64328.

²⁰ As discussed in the section “Cross’s Sources” below, the version of this duet produced by Cross is nonetheless a variant version in relation to that copied into the partial-autograph score associated with the United Company’s productions of the opera at Dorset Garden.

²¹ The playbook was advertised in the *London Gazette* for June 12–16, 1690; from contemporary correspondence the production appears to have taken place in the last days of May. Julia Muller, *Words and Music in Henry Purcell’s First Semi-Opera*, *Dioclesian: An Approach to Early Music through Early Theatre* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990), 25, 33.

FIGURE 3. Cross's first plate for "Now the maids and the men," from [Thomas Betterton] and Henry Purcell, *The Fairy Queen*, including reference to Mr. Pate "in Womans habit"; London, British Library, K.7.i.2 (15). © British Library Board. Image produced by ProQuest as part of Early English Books Online, www.proquest.com. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission.

FIGURE 4. Cross's plate for "Let the soldiers rejoice," from Thomas Betterton and Henry Purcell, *The Prophetess, or the History of Dioclesian*, referring to Mr. Freeman's performance "at the Queen's Theatre"; from Cross, *Philomela, or the Vocal Musician*; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département de la musique, Y-604 (4), no. 96. Reproduced with permission.

96

A
New song sung in the **PROPHETESS**,
or the History of **DIOCLESIAN**, at the —
Queen's Theatre. The words by *M^r. Betterton*
Set by *M^r. Henry Purcell*, and sung by *M^r. Freeman*.

Let y Soldiers rejoyce, with a Generall Voice, and
the Senate new Honours decree 'em Who at his
Armies Head, Struck y fell Monster dead,
and so boldly, so boldly, and bravely did free 'em.

To Mars let 'em raise,
And their Emperors praise,
A Trophy of the Armys own making
To Maximinnian too,
Some honours are due,
Who joynd in the brave undertaking.
With Flowers let 'em strow,
The way as they go,
Their Statues with Garlands adorning,
Who from Tyrannies Night
Drove the Mists in their Sight,
And gave 'em a glorious Morning.

FIGURE 5. Title page of playbook for *The Prophetess, or the History of Dioclesian* (London: Tonson, 1690), referring to performance "at the Queen's Theatre"; London, British Library, 161.g.32. © British Library Board. Image produced by ProQuest as part of Early English Books Online, www.proquest.com. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission.

upper hand, since there is good evidence that he soon came to be regarded as a threat by the members of the traditional music-publishing establishment in London, composers and music sellers alike: they simply could not compete with his new innovation on either timeliness or price. Public protestations began to appear within a year or so of Cross's first engravings of theater songs.²² In addition to Purcell's printed complaint about Cross's four single-sheet songs extracted from *The Prophetess*, Henry Playford clearly associated the financial woes he suffered in the late 1690s and early 1700s with the popularity of the single-sheet print. He too issued periodic complaints, such as in the "Advertisement" printed on the back page of *The Tragedy of King Saul* in 1703, where he bemoaned "the Scandalous Abuse of Musick by selling single Songs at a Penny a piece."²³ Similar objections had been expressed in the verse by Henry Hall (a colleague of John Blow and Purcell) that Playford had published among the dedicatory poems to Blow in his *Amphion Anglicus* three years earlier:

Music of many Parts, has now no force,
Whole Reams of single songs become our Curse,
With *Bass's* wond'rous Lewd, and *Trebles* worse. . . .
While at the Shops we daily dangling view
False Concord, by *Tom Cross* Engraven true.²⁴

317

More than just aiming barbed comments at Cross, Playford made concerted attempts to compete with his rival directly in this period: in the *Post Boy* for March 19, 1698, he advertised for threepence a single-sheet

²² Because of the lack of precise dating evidence, it is not at present possible to identify exactly when the first examples of Cross's single-sheet song publications appeared. As far as I have been able to ascertain, the earliest theater production from which he took songs was *The Massacre of Paris*, which the *London Stage* dates to October or November 1689, based on entries in the Lord Chamberlain's accounts (the Queen attended) and the November Term Catalogues. There is at least one earlier single-sheet song not from the theater: John Blow's "Go perjur'd man," which was included in John Playford's *Choice Ayres and Songs . . . The Fourth Book* in 1683, although it is not clear when Cross's edition was made. All of the songs that can be dated confidently are from the 1690s and early 1700s; in the absence of precise evidence, the 1689 premiere of *The Massacre of Paris* has been taken as the start of Cross's publishing career producing single-sheet songs predominantly from theater works.

²³ Henry Playford, *The Tragedy of King Saul* (London, 1703), [68], also quoted in Carter, "Music Publishing and Compositional Activity," 73; and in Cyrus Lawrence Day and Eleanore Boswell Murrie, "English Song-Books, 1651–1702, and Their Publishers," *The Library*, 4th series, 16 (1936): 355–401, at 389.

²⁴ Henry Hall, "To his Esteemed Friend, Dr. Blow, upon Publishing his Book of Songs," in John Blow, *Amphion Anglicus. A Work of Many Compositions, for One, Two, Three and Four Voices* (London, 1700), sig. a1v, also cited in Kidson et al., "Cross, Thomas"; Kidson, "Old-Time Music Publishing," 303; Frank Kidson, "Handel's Publisher, John Walsh, His Successors, and Contemporaries," *Musical Quarterly* 6 (1920): 430–50, at 440–41; and Carter, "Music Publishing and Compositional Activity," 73.

song by John Eccles, "Fair Amoret is gone astray," set in type;²⁵ and in 1699 and 1700 he published in two parts the collection *Wit and Mirth: Or, Pills to Purge Melancholy*, in which, as he later wrote, "you will find most of the single Songs that has been Cutt on Copper for these Ten Years Past,"²⁶ but which he sold for just half a crown per volume.²⁷ In 1699 he set up a type-set periodical—*Mercurius Musicus: Or, The Monthly Collection of New Teaching Songs*—which comprised anthologies of single songs. Whereas *Wit and Mirth: Or, Pills to Purge Melancholy* aimed to challenge Cross primarily on price, the periodical sought to compete both economically—each volume costing sixpence and containing about six songs—and in speed of production.²⁸ Nevertheless, it was a short-lived venture. At the end of 1701, in the edition for September to December, Playford announced that *Mercurius Musicus* was to cease production and that in future he would "Print every New Song from the Master's Copy singly, as often as they come forth; and they shall be numbred by equal sheets to be stitch'd up once a Year, or once a Month if requir'd."²⁹ It may be significant that the repertory in Playford's periodical predominantly comprised independent songs sung at public concerts rather than popular extracts from the public theater, since this could have made them somewhat less desirable than Cross's editions. Whatever the reason for the demise of *Mercurius Musicus*, Playford was apparently fighting a losing battle with Cross and the other engravers, given the evidence of his worsening financial plight.

By this point, other music publishers had begun to copy Cross's formula, adopting very similar phrasing in referring to performance contexts and singers in their collections of songs from theater productions; in fact, their descriptions are sometimes remarkably similar—an observation to which we will return. Thanks to the rise of engraving as the principal print technology within the music-publishing industry, competition had grown exponentially by the turn of the century, and Cross

²⁵ See Day and Murrie, "English Song-Books," 391n1.

²⁶ This remark was printed in the Advertisement for both volumes included among the "*Books lately Printed, and Re-printed, for Henry Playford*" given in the May/June 1701 issue of *Mercurius Musicus: Or, The Monthly Collection of New Teaching Songs* (London, 1701), 36, as noted in Day and Murrie, "English Song-Books," 392. Day and Murrie point out (391n2) that the first volume was advertised in the *Post Boy* in November 1698, so they consider its title page to be postdated.

²⁷ As stated in Day and Murrie, "English Song-Books," 392; they note that the first book contained 202 songs and the second 178, thus meaning that Playford's book was better value for money than Cross's single-sheet prints.

²⁸ Day and Murrie, "English Song-Books," 392–93.

²⁹ Henry Playford, *Mercurius Musicus*, September–December 1701, "Advertisement," 60; also quoted (with modernized orthography) in Day and Murrie, "English Song-Books," 393. The advertisement was repeated in the issues of January 1702 (sig. C2v) and February 1702 (sig. D2v); I am grateful to one of the journal's anonymous readers for drawing my attention to this repetition.

himself had a major rival in John Walsh. The growing popularity of music publishing can be seen most crudely in the sheer increase in the numbers of music books being published, which rose from an average of seven per year in 1690 to 1694, to thirteen per year in 1696 to 1700, with a highpoint of nineteen in 1695,³⁰ figures that do not even include single-sheet prints like those in which Cross specialized. In stark contrast to the days of John Playford, when composers had been entirely unable to interest commercial publishers in single-composer editions of their music, there was now so much competition between publishers that they began to produce rival editions of the same works. As is well known, the full score of Purcell's *Te Deum*, published by Purcell's widow in 1697 and sold by Henry Playford, was pirated in the same year by Walsh, in a suspiciously similar-looking edition apparently commemorating the adoption of the piece for the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy. Another familiar example is the dramattick opera *The Island Princess*, songs from which appeared in three separate editions following the highly popular premiere in 1699, published respectively by Pearson and Playford, by Cross and Young, and by Walsh.³¹

Cross's Sources

Alongside this developing competitive market, the increasing commercial success of music publishing also led to changes in the relationships between publishers and composers. The business model adopted by John Playford in the 1650s had created England's first viable commercial market for music publishing by providing a regular supply of simple music for voice or popular instruments, sold by genre in anthologies rather than in single-composer collections, and aimed at a small but reliable customer base who wished to play or sing the latest popular tunes in the home or tavern. To an extent this already signaled movement away from the personal associations that had been inherent to earlier music publications in England, which were subsidized by aristocratic patronage. Yet there is abundant evidence to demonstrate that Playford actually acquired the musical texts for many of his publications directly from London's foremost professionals because he enjoyed close friendships with them: he left provision in his will for mourning rings for James

³⁰ These figures are according to the data reproduced in Carter, "Music Publishing and Compositional Activity," Appendix A, "Short-Title Catalogue of Extant English Music Publications, 1650–1700," 227–49. This lists precisely seven in each of 1690, 1692, 1693, and 1694, with six in 1691, and precisely thirteen each year in 1696, 1697, 1699, and 1700, with twelve in 1698.

³¹ See David Hunter, "The Publishing of Opera and Song Books in England, 1703–1726," *Notes*, 2nd series, 47 (1991): 647–85, at 657.

Clifford, Blow, and Purcell, for instance, while the composers Henry Lawes and Charles Coleman were godfathers to his children.³² He apparently had close connections to a number of musicians who held communal music meetings during the 1650s, and manuscripts preserving the repertory of those meetings evidently provided the main source material for several of his early publications. His autograph partbooks Glasgow, Euing Music Library, MSS R.d.58–61 contain on the flyleaf of the continuo part a list of nine members “Of our Musically Club” who are virtually the same as the “*endeared Friends*” from the Old Jewry Catch Club to whom he dedicated the 1667 edition of his *Musical Companion*.³³ Together with Washington, Folger Shakespeare Library, MS V.a.411, the Glasgow partbooks apparently preserve part of the repertory of this club and were in turn used to provide the core material of Playford’s early partsong publications: as Stacey Jocoy Houck has noted, forty-five of their 112 pieces occur in his printed anthologies between 1652 and 1663.³⁴ Chan has demonstrated that another manuscript—Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS Rés 2489—links Playford to an earlier group centered on the composers John Hilton, Henry Lawes, Nicholas Lanier, and John Wilson, and that this manuscript was his main exemplar for the 1669 *Select Ayres and Dialogues*.³⁵ All this suggests that we should believe Playford’s frequent claim that the materials in his other books had also come direct from their composers, such as in his Preface to *Choice Ayres & Songs... The Second Book* (1679), where he wrote that “Most of the *Songs* and *Ayres* herein contained I received exact Copies of from the Hands of their Authors, to whom I acknowledge my self much obliged, for their Assistance in promoting this Work.”³⁶

In the next generation, however, such relationships acquired an increasingly impersonal character; John Playford’s son Henry still clearly interacted directly with musicians as individuals, but he apparently did so purely on a business level, and there is little evidence that he enjoyed the

³² Carter, “Music Publishing and Compositional Activity,” 76; and Thompson, “Playford, John.”

³³ Ian Spink, “The Old Jewry ‘Musick-Society’: A 17th-Century Catch Club,” *Musichology Australia* 2 (1967): 35–41, at 36–37, 39–40. Jeremy Savile is included in the manuscript list but not the printed dedication, probably (as Spink notes) because he had died in the interim period.

³⁴ Stacey Jocoy Houck, “Decoding Musical Resistance: English Vocal Music in the Service of the King, 1625–1660” (PhD diss., University of Illinois, 2005), 306.

³⁵ Mary Chan, “A Mid-Seventeenth-Century Music Meeting and Playford’s Publishing,” in *The Well Enchanting Skill: Music, Poetry and Drama in the Culture of the Renaissance—Essays in Honour of F.W. Sternfeld*, ed. John Caldwell, Edward Olleson, and Susan Wollenberg (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), 231–44, at 243.

³⁶ John Playford, *Choice Ayres & Songs to Sing to the Theorbo-Lute or Bass-Viol, Being Most of the Newest Ayres and Songs, Sung at Court, and at the Publick Theatres... The Second Book* (London, 1679), “To all Lovers of Musick,” sig A2.

personal friendships that had been so important to his father.³⁷ Blow and Purcell were apparently commissioned to act as “editors” for the first book of *The Theater of Music* in 1685, and Henry Playford thanked them for “perusing several of the Songs of this Book before they went to the Press” and for adding thoroughbass parts; Purcell was similarly given credit in 1688 for having “review’d” the pieces in *Harmonia Sacra*.³⁸ There is no suggestion here, however, that these or other composers had supplied their music direct to the stationer—in fact the need to check and complete the music suggests a much more haphazard process for collecting each volume’s contents.

By the time music printing had become a fully competitive business, publishers typically seem to have had no contact at all with the originators of their source material. Here the lack of intellectual property rights acted in the publishers’ favor: since composers had no special claim over the use of their music, any pieces a publisher was able to acquire could be used, with or without the composer’s knowledge or permission.³⁹ Thus, if they could get their hands on music that was likely to prove popular with the public, they had a good chance of making a profit. Pirate publications like Walsh’s edition of Purcell’s *Te Deum* score soon became common, and publishers were sometimes quite blatant in acknowledging their opportunism. The best-known example is the edition of Purcell’s music from *The Indian Queen* published in movable type in 1695, at the time of the opera’s premiere, by John Hudgebutt and John May. It includes an address to the composer explaining that “*having had the good Fortune to meet with the Score*” for the opera, they had taken it upon themselves to publish the music lest someone else “*might print an imperfect Copy*,” or, worse still, “*publish them in the nature of a Common Ballad*”⁴⁰—was this perhaps a dig at Cross?

The pejorative comments directed at Cross by Purcell, Hall, and Henry Playford cited above suggest strongly that, like Hudgebutt and May, Cross worked outside the musical establishment in making his editions, and it is unlikely that he acquired his music copy via composers or other authorized means. Questions arise, therefore, about how and from

³⁷ See also Carter, “Music Publishing and Compositional Activity,” 79.

³⁸ Henry Playford, *The Theater of Music: or, a Choice Collection of the Newest and Best Songs Sung at the Court, and Public Theaters... The First Book* (London, 1685), sig. A2 (italics in original); and Henry Playford, *Harmonia Sacra; or, Divine Hymns and Dialogues: with a Thorough-Bass for the Theorbo-Lute, Bass-Viol, Harpischord, or Organ* (London, 1688), “To the Reader,” sig. a2. See also Carter, “Music Publishing and Compositional Activity,” 134.

³⁹ John Playford also used this lack of copyright protection to his advantage: it is well known that Henry Lawes complained in the Preface to his 1653 *Ayres and Dialogues* that Playford had published his music without Lawes’s knowledge in the 1652 book *Select Musickall Ayres and Dialogues*, which included twenty of Lawes’s songs. Herissone, “Playford, Purcell, and the Functions of Music Publishing,” 251–52.

⁴⁰ Henry Purcell, *The Songs in the Indian Queen: as it is now Compos’d into an Opera* (London, 1695), “The Publishers, to Mr. Henry Purcell,” sig. [A]v (italics in original).

whom he was able to acquire his source material. In some cases the answer is straightforward. Whenever the music he wished to publish was already available in print, close comparison between his editions and contemporary publications reveals that his principal sources were those printed editions, which he freely pirated. Ironically, this is almost certainly true of his edition of Purcell's "I attempt from love's sickness to fly" from *The Indian Queen*, which duplicates exactly many notational and presentational features of the song as it was published by Hudgebutt and May in their own pirated edition (see figs. 6 and 7). Cross's heading, for example, copies the precise phrasing used on the title page of the Hudgebutt and May edition: both refer to *The Indian Queen* "As it is now Compos'd into an OPERA" (although admittedly this was by no means a unique way of describing such adaptations at the time). Within the song itself there is a sufficient number of unusual features shared between the editions to make it highly probable that Cross was working from Hudgebutt and May's publication. It is significant, for instance, that Cross provides both the melody line and accompaniment for the song, as do Hudgebutt and May, since many of his publications reproduced the melody line alone. Other notable parallels, which are highlighted in figures 7 and 8, comprise:

322

1. The identification of Mrs. Cross as the performer: these are the only extant sources for the song that name her.⁴¹
2. The unusual use of written rubrics in both upper and lower staves to indicate the two repeats of the first phrase, telling the singer to sing the "First strain again" at the end of the second phrase and then to "End with the first strain" after the third. In fact the wording of this written instruction is used in all the contemporary surviving copies of the song, manuscript and printed, but only one other extant source—Purcell's posthumous song collection *Orpheus Britannicus*, which was not published until 1698—presents each instruction on both staves, so it is notable that Cross follows Hudgebutt and May in this respect.⁴²
3. The presence of virtually identical pitches and rhythms: there is just a single variant, at the beginning of the final phrase, "For love has more power," in m. 23, where Cross prints the bass note a third lower than Hudgebutt and May, giving f# rather than a.⁴³

⁴¹ This is according to the commentary in Henry Purcell, *The Indian Queen*, ed. Margaret Laurie and Andrew Pinnock, rev. ed., *The Works of Henry Purcell* 19 (London: Novello, 1994), 169.

⁴² See Henry Purcell, *Orpheus Britannicus: A Collection of the Choicest Songs for One, Two, and Three Voices* (London, 1698), 226. The other sources including the rubric are listed in Purcell, *The Indian Queen*, ed. Laurie and Pinnock, 155, 170.

⁴³ Since the lower pitch given by Cross is the reading given in the manuscript source that appears to have been the theater's file copy of the song (London, British Library, Add.

FIGURE 6. Title page of Hudgebutt and May's edition, *The Songs in the Indian Queen* (London, 1695); London, British Library, K.4.i.20. © British Library Board. Image produced by ProQuest as part of Early English Books Online, www.proquest.com. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission.

FIGURE 7. Cross s plate for Henry Purcell’s “I attempt from love’s sickness to fly,” from *The Indian Queen*; London, British Library, K.7.i.2 (11); highlighted boxes indicate features of layout and notation shared with Hudgebutt and May’s edition. © British Library Board. Image produced by ProQuest as part of Early English Books Online, www.proquest.com. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission.

17

11

A Song in the Indian Queen: as it is now Compos'd into an OPERA. By Mr. Henry Purcell, Sung by Mrs. Crofts. and exactly engrav'd by Tho: Crofts.

I attempt from Love's sickness to fly in vain, since I am my self my own
Fearer, since I am my self my own Fearer and Pain; No more now, no more now find heart to
Pride, no more swell, thou canst not raise Forces, thou canst not raise Forces e
nough to re bell: For Love has more pow'r and lets mercy than fate, to
make us seek ruin, to make us seek ruin and love those that hate.

FIGURE 8. Henry Purcell, "I attempt from love's sickness to fly," as printed in Hudgebutt and May's edition, *The Songs in the Indian Queen* (London, 1695) 12–13; London, British Library, K.4.i.20; highlighted boxes indicate features of layout and notation shared with Cross's plate. © British Library Board. Image produced by ProQuest as part of Early English Books Online, www.proquest.com. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission.

A Song Sung by Mrs. Cross.

Attempt from Love's sickness to fly in vain, since I am

my self my own Feaver, since I am my self my own Feaver and Pain; No

more now, no more now fond Heart with Pride, no more I will, thou can't not raise

Forces, thou can't not raise Forces enough to re-bell:

Love has more pow'r and less mercy than fate, to make us seek ru-in,

to make us seek ru-in, and love those that hate.

First strain again.

End with the first Strain

4. Similarities in other details of the physical presentation of the song, particularly the addition and positioning of accidentals. Examples include the unnecessary repetition of the sharp sign in m. 5 and the placement of sharp signs either beside or below the note: in the passage “thou can’st not raise forces,” in the second phrase, the $g\sharp'$ on “raise” in the highlighted section is placed directly under the preceding b' in both scores; and in the final phrase, the sharp signs in the vocal line in the first and third bars of the highlighted passage are placed under rather than beside the $g\sharp'$ in both editions, while all the others are placed next to the note to which they apply.

There are two other movable-type collections of songs from plays for which Purcell wrote music that are similar types of publication to the Hudgebutt and May edition, and that seem to have been used by Cross as exemplars for his single-sheet songs. *The Songs to the New Play of Don Quixote, As they are Sung at The Queen’s Theatre in Dorset Garden. Part the First, Sett by the most Eminent Masters of the Age* was evidently published contemporaneously with the Dorset-Garden production of 1694, printed by John Heptinstall for one Samuel Briscoe. This may have been the exemplar for Cross’s edition of “Let the dreadful engines,” although the parallels here are less striking, not least because Cross prints the melody line in the treble clef, an octave higher than the bass-clef version in Heptinstall’s print. Nonetheless, apart from the general closeness of the readings, there are similarities of presentation that include the split placement of letters within single-syllable words set to melismas and superfluous repetition of accidentals, just as in his plate for the *Indian Queen* song.

Cross’s edition of “Oh lead me to some peaceful gloom,” a song from the 1695 Drury Lane production of *Bonduca*, provides a more clear-cut example. It almost certainly derives from a simple four-page collection entitled *The Songs in the Tragedy of Bonduca. Set by Mr. Henry Purcell*. Little is known about this collection, but a list of “Excellent Musick-Books lately Printed for and sold by” Henry Playford is given on the final page, implying that it was published by, or at least connected to, Playford, while the contents of the list suggest that it probably dates from the time of the play’s premiere.⁴⁴ Again the musical texts are virtually identical, apart from three

MS 31449), this is unlikely to be an error on Cross’s part; it may indeed be a correction of Hudgebutt and May’s reading, although use of a different or additional source is also possible.

⁴⁴ The books listed are *The New Treasury of Musick*, which Playford published in 1695, the third book of *Deliciae Musicae*, described here as being “in the presse” and published in 1696, three elegies written following the death of Queen Mary in 1694, and an edition of the *Second Book of the Pleasant Musical Companion*, which Playford describes as “a Choice

engraving errors made by Cross,⁴⁵ and there are close parallels in their layout and presentational details. Similar to “I attempt from love’s sickness to fly,” these include the phrasing used in the titles, the identification of the singer Mrs. Cross, and parallels in the positioning of accidentals beside, above, or below the note to which they apply—again there are no places where these do not correspond. There are further similarities of spelling and of the splitting of letters where melismas occur on single-syllable words.⁴⁶ Both editions also make repeated use of the same irregular beaming in the continuo part in the triple-time section at “There let me sooth by pleasing pain,” with six quavers grouped as two sets of three rather than three sets of two, as the meter would imply. Henry Playford included this song again in two of his later volumes of music—*Deliciae Musicae... The Third Book* (from 1696, which was already in production when the set of *Bonduca* songs was printed)⁴⁷ and *Orpheus Britannicus* (from 1698). Although many aspects of both editions of the song are presented in a manner visually very similar to *Songs in the Tragedy of Bonduca*, the process of resetting the type for each edition led to variants of some of the features listed above, including in the splitting of letters within words where melismas occur and the use of a more conventional beaming pattern in the continuo part in the triple-time section. In this light it seems unlikely that the close connection between Cross’s plate and *Songs in the Tragedy of Bonduca* was merely coincidental.

In these three cases Cross was able to use exemplars that were published contemporaneously with the productions with which they are associated, or very shortly thereafter. But this seems to have been very much the exception rather than the rule. From the circumstantial evidence cited above it appears that Cross’s other single-sheet songs were almost always the first printed editions of music from the productions on the London stage in which he specialized. Since this would have meant he could not habitually draw on publicly available printed versions of the

Collection of *Catches*, . . . from the Year 1690, to 1695” (thus probably referring to the third edition, which appeared in 1695).

⁴⁵ The engraving errors are in m. 7, where the second note in the continuo part is mistakenly given as a quarter note rather than an eighth note by Cross; m. 58, where again he miscopies an eighth note as a quarter note in the continuo part on beat 1; and probably m. 8, where the vocal part’s rhythm at the start of the bar is slightly different in Cross’s edition in comparison to that in the *Songs*, giving *e t t s q* in place of *t t e s q*. Although this could simply be a variant, the fact that both sources have the latter reading in the second half of the bar, thus creating a sequence in *Songs*, suggests that Cross’s variant may have been unintentional. References follow the measure numbers given in Henry Purcell, *Dramatic Music: Vocal and Instrumental Music for the Stage, Part I*, ed. Margaret Laurie, The Works of Henry Purcell 16 (London: Novello, 2007), 93–95.

⁴⁶ The splitting of the single syllable “sound” as “soun—d” in mm. 11–12 is particularly notable in this respect.

⁴⁷ See note 44 above.

music as his exemplars, identifying his source materials is as challenging as it is important. Given the evidence that Cross was on bad terms with the composers of the music he published and yet was still able to produce his editions with great speed, he must have derived his materials from other contacts directly connected to the theaters where the music was being heard. This accords with the conclusions drawn by David Hunter about the various routes by which notated sources for opera and song books containing music from the London stage were obtained in a slightly later period, from 1703–26: as well as the composers themselves, Hunter believes these probably included arrangers, copyists, playhouse impresarios, and performers.⁴⁸ While we should not underestimate the many changes to the management, repertory, and financial arrangements of the London theaters that occurred between Purcell's generation and Handel's, and should note that Hunter concentrates specifically on anthologies as opposed to single-sheet prints, the fundamental structure through which music was provided for London stage productions remained strongly similar.⁴⁹ It is possible, then, that Hunter's evidence of the involvement of various singers, players, copyists, and others working in the early eighteenth-century theater in providing musical exemplars to publishers may provide some clues about Cross's sources.

This is significant. Cross's single-sheet engraved editions are habitually dismissed by modern editors as lacking authority in relation to sources that were produced by or directly linked to the composer, despite the fact that until now no one has sought to investigate from where he must have drawn his materials. Certainly it is understandable that the prints are considered to have little appeal from a modern editorial perspective: they are visually unattractive, often incomplete (since they frequently transmit only the melodic line of each song without the accompaniment), and show a marked tendency toward minor errors of pitch and rhythm, perhaps partly owing to the speed with which they were produced. It is hardly surprising that in modern editions they tend to fall into the category of sources "examined but not collated" whenever alternative sources are available, even if those sources postdate Cross's editions and/or contain problematical readings themselves. Within the Purcell Society complete

⁴⁸ Hunter, "Publishing of Opera and Song Books," 649–55.

⁴⁹ See also William C. Smith's comments on Walsh's likely sources for the instrumental series *Theatre Music*, which ran from 1698 to 1700. While these comments are anachronistic in referring to the need to acquire the right to publish, they acknowledge the same transmission routes: "as Walsh's business was only a step or two away from Drury Lane Theatre he was probably well acquainted with the managers and thus able to acquire the right to publish the music used in various productions." William C. Smith, *A Bibliography of the Musical Works Published by John Walsh During the Years 1695–1720* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1948), xxi; also quoted in Hunter, "Publishing of Opera and Song Books," 654, and Carter, "Music Publishing and Compositional Activity," 79–80.

edition, for example, Cross's prints are virtually ignored for all four of Purcell's dramattick operas,⁵⁰ and the same is true of the editions of his 1692 *St. Cecilia's* day ode (from which "'Tis Nature's voice" was printed by Cross) and the independent duet "Fair Cloe my breast so alarms."⁵¹ In the three volumes of the Purcell Society edition containing his songs from non-operatic public theater productions, Cross's prints—which include songs from six plays—tend to be consulted as the sources of last resort: they are used only when necessary due to the lack of an alternative.⁵²

Despite their imperfections, there is good evidence that Cross's editions are more significant than they appear, reflecting directly the way in which this repertory was performed and heard on the London stage in its earliest productions. That is, because of the nature of the sources that Cross must have used to enable him to produce his publications as quickly as possible, his single-sheet prints may actually preserve contemporary performance practices more closely than "authoritative" sources produced under more formal conditions. These include authorized publications (as in the case of Purcell's self-published score *The Vocal and Instrumental Musick of the Prophetess*) or the library scores of the theater companies themselves (such as the partial autograph manuscript of Purcell's music for *The Fairy Queen*, London, Royal Academy of Music, MS 3). In the final part of this article I use close analysis of a few key examples of

329

⁵⁰ As well as the original edition of *Dioclesian* cited in note 1 above, and Laurie's revised edition, in which Cross's publications are listed among the sources "Also consulted but not collated" ("Printed single sheet songs in British Museum, G.304" and "Meares's *Collection of the Most Celebrated Songs* [1705]"), this is the case for Cross's publications of songs that occur in the following Purcell Society publications (page numbers refer to the listings of sources given in each edition): Henry Purcell, *King Arthur*, ed. Margaret Laurie, rev. ed., *The Works of Henry Purcell* 26 (London: Novello, 1971), xiv ("Also consulted but not collated"); Purcell, *The Indian Queen*, ed. Laurie and Pinnock, xxx; and Henry Purcell, *The Fairy Queen*, ed. Bruce Wood and Andrew Pinnock, new ed., *The Works of Henry Purcell* 12 (London: Stainer and Bell, 2009), xli (among the "Secondary sources," which are not collated).

⁵¹ Henry Purcell, *Ode on St Cecilia's Day, 1692*, ed. Peter Dennison, *The Works of Henry Purcell* 8 (Borough Green: Novello, 1978), xi; and Henry Purcell, *Duets, Dialogues and Trios*, ed. Ian Spink, *The Works of Henry Purcell* 22b (London: Novello, 2007), 212–13.

⁵² The plays in question are *Bonduca*, *Don Quixote*, *The Massacre of Paris*, *Oronooko*, *The Tempest*, and *The Wive's Excuse*. See Purcell, *Dramatic Music I*, ed. Laurie, 276–77, 290–91 (*Bonduca* and *Don Quixote*), where the principal sources used are the typeset collections *The Songs in the Tragedy of Bonduca* (London, ca. 1695), and *The Songs to the New Play of Don Quixote* (London, 1694); Henry Purcell, *Dramatic Music Part II: Songs and Instrumental Music for the Stage*, ed. Ian Spink, *The Works of Henry Purcell* 20 (London: Novello, 1998), 149 (*The Massacre of Paris*, where Cross's edition is the only one extant for the second setting of "Thy Genius, lo!"); and Henry Purcell, *Dramatic Music: Vocal and Instrumental Music for the Stage, Part III*, ed. Margaret Laurie, *The Works of Henry Purcell* 21 (London: Stainer and Bell, 2010), 214, 221, 227–28 (*Oronooko*, *The Tempest*, and *The Wive's Excuse*; again, Cross's edition is the only surviving source for Version "A" of "Dear Pretty Youth" from *The Tempest*, but for *Oronooko* and *The Wive's Excuse* Laurie's principal sources are respectively *Deliciae Musicae* and *The Banquet of Musick*).

Cross's prints to demonstrate that his single-sheet songs almost certainly do show traces of the way the songs were interpreted and heard in London's theaters in the late seventeenth century—possibly even resulting from aural transcription of such performances—and thus to argue that they deserve to be considered more valuable as sources than today's editorial practices would suggest.

Reflections of Performance in Cross's Single-Sheet Prints

In her study of the creative role of the performer on the Restoration stage, Amanda Eubanks Winkler drew attention to the way in which single-sheet song publications from this period—including those produced by Cross—not only emphasize the identities of the performers by naming them prominently in headings but also evoke the very performances that they had given:

One need only consult the myriad printed songs from the period to find evidence of the importance of the performer. . . . The name of the singer is often placed side by side with that of the composer. . . . Indeed, sometimes the singer's name gets sole billing and the composer's name is omitted altogether. . . . By invoking the singer's name in this way the printer invited the consumer to remember or imagine the performance of the composer's song by that specific person. Restoration consumers purchased not just the notes on a page, which they might later perform at their leisure, but also a souvenir of an embodied performance.⁵³

As we have seen, the consistent references in the headings of most of Cross's prints to the singers who performed each song confirm Winkler's assertion that it was a priority in these sorts of editions for the person of the performer to be given prominent emphasis (see the headings in figs. 1, 3, 4, 7, and 8, for example). One cannot help but wonder, also, whether Cross's trademark signature, "exactly engrav'd by Tho: Cross," might have a more potent meaning than first appears to be the case. "Exactly engrav'd" could just have been a marketing tool intended to communicate the accuracy of his notation (somewhat ironically, given his tendency to make errors), but might it also be a claim that Cross had "exactly engrav'd" what the singer had sung? Is it possible, for instance, that he was able to use the singer's own performing part or that he

⁵³ Amanda Eubanks Winkler, "'Our Friend Venus Performed to a Miracle': Anne Bracegirdle, John Eccles and Creativity," in *Concepts of Creativity in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Rebecca Herissone and Alan Howard (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013), 255–80, at 265.

employed musicians playing in the theater band, or even someone planted in the audience, to write down what they heard?

The primary way of testing this hypothesis is to look for signs in Cross's notation of the sorts of nuances that we know performers incorporated into their interpretations of song in this period, including inflexions of rhythm, melody, and ornamentation. Comparison between Cross's notation and that of composer-authorized sources indeed reveals some interesting disparities between them that could reflect these sorts of traces. The problem here, however, is that it is not always possible to distinguish confidently between typographical errors and genuine variant readings that might be indicative of the singer's interpretation of the music. In addition, we have to take into account the possibility of mis-transcription or approximation resulting from imperfect memorization, given that the sources for Cross's prints may have included aural transcriptions. The difficulty of the task is highlighted in Purcell's setting of "Let monarchs fight" from *The Prophetess*, where we can compare Cross's print against the version of the song in Purcell's self-published score (see figs. 9 and 10). The principal difference between them is structural: Cross sets mm. 17–24 to the final two lines of the stanza, starting "Greatness shall ne'er my Soul inthral," but Purcell's score indicates a return to the first two lines; Cross then omits the final phrase where Purcell's score (at mm. 33–40) repeats mm. 17–24, this time setting them to the final two lines of the stanza, which Cross had used previously. Cross's version thus conflates Purcell's two iterations of the phrase, which might be the result of misunderstanding or miscopying from a written exemplar, but could equally reflect a partial mismemorization on the part of someone making an aural transcription.

331

There are further variants in the details of the melody line. Some of these—such as the ones circled in figures 9 and 10—are very probably engraving mistakes on Cross's part: the first example, in mm. 6–7, produces parallel octaves with Purcell's bass line, while the second, in m. 11, produces dissonant harmony with the bass as given in Purcell's score. But elsewhere there are variants where Cross's edition produces a convincing or at least plausible reading, such as in the three examples boxed in the figures. The difficulty is that these sorts of minor differences are not sufficiently distinctive to allow us to determine with any certainty whether they reflect performance interpretations, slight mistranscription from memory, or simple typographical errors.

There are some examples within Cross's oeuvre, however, for which external evidence supports the hypothesis that they relate closely to the performance practices of the singers who performed them on the public stage. To illustrate this, I first consider a piece that did not, in fact, come from a theater production but that is one of a number of Cross's prints

FIGURE 9. Henry Purcell, "Let monarchs fight," as printed in the composer's self-published score, *The Vocal and Instrumental Musick of the Prophetess, or, The History of Dioclesian* (London, 1691), 121–22; highlighted passages indicate variants with Cross's edition shown in figure 10; London, Royal Academy of Music, 1 PURCELL. Image reproduced with permission from the Royal Academy of Music, London.

FIGURE 10. Cross's plate for "Let monarchs fight," from Thomas Betterton and Henry Purcell, *The Prophetess, or the History of Dioclesian*; highlighted passages indicate variants with Purcell's edition shown in figure 9; from Cross, *Philomela, or the Vocal Musician*; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département de la musique, Y-604 (4), no. 98. Reproduced with permission.

90

A new Song fung in the OPERA call'd
The Prophetess. At the Queen's Theatre.
 The words by M^r. Betterton. And sung by M^r. Freeman —

Let Monarchs fight for Pow'r and Fame, with Noise
 and Arms mankind alarm; Let daily Fears their quiet
 fright, And cares disturb their Rest at Night Greatnes
 shall ne'er my Soul intral; Give me content and I
 have all. Greatness shall ne'er my Soul intrall
 Give me content and I have all. M^r. Henry Purcell. —

Hear, Mighty Love! to thee I call;
 Give me Astræa, she's my all;
 That soft, that sweet, that charming Fair,
 Fate cannot hurt while I have her.
 She's Wealth, and Power and only she,
 Astræa's all the World to me.

with repertorial links to Purcell's so-called "Gresham" songbook, London, Guildhall Library, MS Safe 3. An autograph manuscript containing songs for the public theater and court that were written in the period ca. 1692–95, this source has long been recognized from its informal and incomplete notation to be the composer's personal score. It is now generally agreed that it was prepared for private performances, probably at or connected to the royal court.⁵⁴ These origins make it extremely unlikely that it was ever available as a source to which other contemporary musicians would have had access, an assertion supported by the highly individual versions of many of the pieces it contains, versions not shared by any other contemporary sources, including other autographs and manuscripts copied by musicians with close links to Purcell. Given that Cross lacked such personal access in any case, we can surely discount the possibility that he could have made copies from it directly. Nonetheless, the substantially variant readings in the Gresham manuscript are pertinent here because they relate predominantly to details of interpretation that appear to reflect performing practices.⁵⁵ There are signs, too, that Purcell sometimes entered the material into the manuscript from memory and that he improvised some of his accompaniments directly from incomplete notation within the manuscript.⁵⁶ All these features suggest an immediate connection to a live performance tradition.

The piece in question is the duet "Fair Cloe my breast so alarms." In the Purcell Society edition of this piece, Ian Spink presents two versions of the piece side by side and concludes that the "A" version represents the widely disseminated form, having been published initially in Henry Playford's *The Banquet of Musick . . . The Sixth Book* in February 1692, after which it appeared in two single-sheet prints (not including Cross's), as well as in the posthumous Purcell anthology *Orpheus Britannicus* in 1698, and in five contemporary manuscript sources. The "B" version, on the other hand, is the one Purcell entered into the Gresham songbook, also probably in 1692, since it is copied at the beginning of the manuscript among songs from his opera *The Fairy Queen*, staged that summer.⁵⁷ It is a bar shorter than the *Banquet of Musick* version, due to a shortened linking passage, contains melodic and rhythmic variants mainly affecting decoration, and a thoroughly reworked continuo part, which is more independent from the vocal bass than the "A" version.

⁵⁴ See Margaret Laurie and Robert Thompson, introduction to *The Gresham Autograph*, by Henry Purcell, facsimile ed. (London: Novello, 1995), vii–ix.

⁵⁵ Laurie and Thompson, introduction, *Gresham Autograph*, vii–ix.

⁵⁶ See Rebecca Herissone, *Musical Creativity in Restoration England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 368.

⁵⁷ Purcell, *Duets, Dialogues and Trios*, ed. Spink, 213.

The “B” version, Spink concludes, is “unlikely to have been available to copyists” precisely because it is transmitted in the essentially private Gresham manuscript.⁵⁸ It is therefore all the more surprising that—while the relationship is not exact—Cross’s single-sheet print has marked similarities to the Gresham copy and reflects a number of its variants when compared against the version of the song in *The Banquet of Musick*,⁵⁹ including reharmonization. For instance:

1. In the phrase from mm. 8–15, shown in example 1.1,⁶⁰ Cross’s copy shares with the *Banquet of Musick* version the bass voice’s reading in m. 12 and includes the soprano’s slide, but it follows Gresham’s plainer melodic line in the soprano in m. 13 and its textual variant by giving “take *to* my arms” rather than “take *in* my arms.” The continuo part in Cross’s edition is also striking: the *Banquet of Musick* version mainly doubles the vocal bass, and some elements of Cross’s print follow this version (such as most of mm. 9 and 11), but the reharmonized elements in m. 10 and in the latter part of the phrase relate closely to Purcell’s autograph; interestingly the reading in m. 13 is in fact apparently unique to Cross’s score.
2. Another passage demonstrating the closeness of Cross’s readings to Purcell’s is mm. 25–35 (see ex. 1.2), where the continuo line again differs substantially from that in *The Banquet of Musick*: Cross’s score duplicates the Gresham autograph exactly in four of the eight measures, including the reharmonization in

⁵⁸ Purcell, *Duets, Dialogues and Trios*, ed. Spink, 213.

⁵⁹ According to Spink it is closest to the versions in two later manuscripts, Tokyo, Nanki Ongaku Bunko, MS 3/27, 33–5, a songbook copied in ca. 1700, and Washington, Folger Shakespeare Library, MS V.b.197, pp. 38–40, inscribed “Liber Georgij Forman Anno Domini 1721.” The Tokyo manuscript in particular probably used Cross’s single-sheet print as an exemplar.

⁶⁰ All music examples are diplomatic transcriptions from the cited sources as far as possible, retaining original clefs, note values, pitches, and meter; stave signatures are retained, but where a single accidental is given at both higher and lower octaves the superfluous accidental is omitted, following modern convention. Because the association between bar lines and meter was not yet established, and bar lines could be irregular or absent, barring is tacitly regularized. Accidentals given in the sources are reproduced but converted to modern equivalents where necessary, taking into account the fact that the natural sign was not widely used in English notation in this period. Accidentals repeated within the measure are omitted, but care has been taken to show ambiguity where it occurs. Since there is no indication that beaming was significant to seventeenth-century scribes and it is inconsistent in the sources, beaming here follows modern conventions, joining notes sung to the same syllable where possible. Slurring has been retained, and editorial slurs, marked with a vertical slash, have been added sparingly for consistency. Original spellings and capitalizations have been reproduced, and a minimum of necessary additional punctuation has been added tacitly where necessary.

EXAMPLE 1. Variant readings in Version “B” of “Fair Cloe my breast so alarms”: (a) *The Banquet of Musick* . . . *The Sixth Book* (London, 1692), 21; (b) *A Song Set by Mr Henry Purcell and exactly engrav'd by Tho: Cross*; (c) London, Guildhall Library, MS Safe 3 (Gresham College manuscript), in the hand of Henry Purcell, f. 40v (boxes indicate passages with notable variants).

Ex. 1.1. Mm. 8–15

(a) *The Banquet of Musick* . . . *The Sixth Book* (London, 1692), 21

(b) *A Song Set by Mr Henry Purcell and exactly engrav'd by Tho: Cross*

(c) London, Guildhall Library, MS Safe 3 (Gresham College manuscript), in the hand of Henry Purcell, f. 40v

EXAMPLE 1. (Continued)

Ex. 1.2. Mm. 25-35

[illegible]

EXAMPLE 1. (*Continued*)

Ex. 1.2. (*continued*)

(a) 31

and I feel my Heart spring — with De - light;

(b)

(c)

m. 33,⁶¹ and three of the remaining four measures are markedly similar, particularly when compared to the *Banquet* readings.

I do not wish to suggest that the closeness of the relationship between Cross's copy and the version of the song Purcell copied into the Gresham manuscript implies that Cross was somehow able to use that autograph as an exemplar; rather, it is clear that his version followed the same performance tradition as Purcell's private score, in contrast to the published version we see in *The Banquet of Musick* and almost all other extant copies of the song.

Cross's edition of the Dialogue between Coridon and Mopsa, from act 3 of *The Fairy Queen*, shows a markedly similar relationship to the authoritative sources for this duet. Again there are two distinct versions: version "A" is the one copied by the main copyist of Purcell's partial-autograph score, Royal Academy of Music, MS 3 (ff. 44r–46v), which is in G and attributes the two parts to the characters of Coridon and Mopsa; version "B," a tone lower in F, simply refers to the protagonists as "she" and "he" and includes the verbal insertion "pish" (a nonsense word) several times for the female character toward the end. This version was copied by Purcell in the Gresham autograph; it is also the one reproduced by Cross. Again there is no possibility that Cross used the Gresham manuscript as his source; apart from it being extremely unlikely that he would have been able to gain access to it, Purcell's autograph is also incomplete, omitting sections of the continuo part. In this case we have to consider whether Cross used an available printed source, since another single-song print, produced in Heptinstall's movable type, also contains version "B" (see fig. 11, and compare with Cross's print shown in fig. 3 above).⁶² Both appear to have been produced close to the date of the original stage production in 1692: the movable-type version is entitled "The Dialogue, in the last *Opera*, call'd the *Fairy Queen*," while, as we noted before, Cross's refers to the production's personnel, entitling the song "A *Dialogue in the Opera*, call'd the *Fairy Queen*, Set by Mr. Henry Purcell[,] Sung by Mr. Reading and (Mr. Pate in Womans habit)." Neither is dated, however, and it is not possible to ascertain which came first.

339

⁶¹ There are four typographical errors in Cross's edition, which are tacitly corrected here: the first note of the thoroughbass in m. 26 in Cross's edition is misprinted as a *h* rather than b *h*; the third note of the soprano in m. 27 is misprinted as d'' *q*; and the third note of the soprano in m. 29 is misprinted as b' *q*; the flat sign in the bass voice is also omitted in m. 34, beat 1.

⁶² Wood and Pinnock note that "though it lacks a title-page," this publication "appears to be a product of the same printing-house" as *Some Select Songs as they are Sung in the Fairy Queen*, which identifies Heptinstall as printer on its title page. Why this should in itself imply that "it possesses a similarly high degree of legitimacy," as they claim, is not clear, since the printer would have acted according to the instructions of the person paying for the setting, who need not have been the same person both times. Purcell, *The Fairy Queen*, ed. Wood and Pinnock, xxxvii.

FIGURE 11. Opening of Henry Purcell, "Now the maids and the men," from *The Dialogue in the last Opera, call'd the Fairy Queen* ([London?], n.d.), 1; San Marino, CA, Huntington Library, Rare Books, 131931. Reproduced by permission of the Huntington Library, San Marino, California. Image produced by ProQuest as part of Early English Books Online, www.proquest.com. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission.

**The Dialogue in the last Opera, call'd
the Fairy Queen.**

He
N Ow the Maids and the Men are making their Hay, we've left the dull
fools, we've left the dull fools and are roign a—way; then Mopla. no
more be Coy as before, but let's mer-ri-ly, mer-ri-ly, mer-ri-ly, mer-ri-ly
play; and kiss, and kiss, and kiss, and kiss, and kiss the sweet time a—way.
She
Why how now Sir Clown, why how now, what makes you so bold? I'd

A

Yet, even if the movable-type print does predate Cross's score, it is unlikely to have been Cross's source. Although the two publications are very similar, as example 2 shows, Cross's score contains several variant readings, and it shares these differences with the Gresham autograph. Given that we know from examples like "I attempt from love's sickness to fly" and "Oh lead me to some peaceful gloom" that Cross kept closely to his exemplars when printed sources were available, this implies that—while Cross's score, the Gresham autograph, and the typeset print all contain version "B," and thus reflect the same performance tradition—Cross's score did not use the same source as the typeset score. The fact that Cross's variants align his print with Purcell's private version of the song in Gresham indicates that they are almost certainly authoritative. Examples 2.1 and 2.2 both show variants in the thoroughbass part; although the reading in the movable-type score (shown as source (a) in ex. 2.2) is probably a misprint, it is significant that it is not followed by Cross. This in turn suggests that Cross's occasional unique readings, such as the rhythmic variant at "Maids must never kiss" in m. 24, shown in example 2.3, should be taken as genuine alternative readings, rather than dismissed.

These parallels between Cross's prints and the Gresham autograph suggest strongly that at least some of Cross's sources reflected directly the way the songs were realized in performance. They may even suggest that the singers whose courtly interpretations appear to be recorded in Purcell's Gresham copies were also theater employees, and that the similarities thereby reflect performing practices shared between both spaces.⁶³ Although in other examples it is usually not possible to make direct comparisons with authoritative sources, like the Gresham score, that are closely associated with contemporary performing practices, there is no reason to doubt that plausible, unique variants in his other printed songs also reflect genuine differences of interpretation in performances of the day: they show exactly the same sorts of variants, affecting details of ornamentation, melody, and/or rhythm. Cross's single-sheet prints of songs from *The Prophetess* provide a number of examples of these types of variants. Some are short-lived differences, such as the three excerpts illustrated in example 3.1, from the dialogue between the Shepherd and Shepherdess in act 5, "Tell me why," which shows reversed dotted rhythms and differences of underlay. Others show small but notable differences in ornamentation, such as "Sound fame" shown in example 3.2. Elsewhere ornamentation variants are more substantial, sometimes incorporating rather less melodic decoration than Purcell's score, such as in example 3.3, from the final phrase of "Let the soldiers rejoice." Finally, some incorporate a wide range of these kinds of variants in quick succession, such as in

⁶³ I am grateful to one of the journal's anonymous readers for this suggestion.

EXAMPLE 2. Variant readings in Henry Purcell's "Now the maids and the men," from *The Fairy Queen*: (a) *The Dialogue in the last Opera, call'd the Fairy Queen*; (b) *A Dialogue in the Opera, call'd the Fairy Queen, . . . exactly engrav'd by Tho: Cross*; (c) London, Guildhall Library, MS Safe 3 (Gresham College manuscript), in the hand of Henry Purcell, f. 1r (boxes indicate passages with notable variants).

Ex. 2.1. Mm. 4–6

(a) *The Dialogue in the last Opera, call'd The Fairy Queen*

fools, we've left the dull fools and are sto - len a - way; _____ then

(b) *A Dialogue in the Opera, call'd The Fairy Queen, . . . exactly engrav'd by Tho: Cross*

(c) London, Guildhall Library, MS Safe 3 (Gresham College manuscript), in the hand of Henry Purcell, f. 1r

342

Ex. 2.2. Mm. 20–22

(a)

know I'm not made of that mold. _____ I tell you a - gain, a -

(b)

(c)

Ex. 2.3. Mm. 24–26

(a)

Maids _____ must ne - ver, must ne - ver kiss no Men; _____ no,

(b)

Maids _____ must ne - ver, must ne - ver kiss no Men; _____ no,

(c)

Maids _____ must ne - ver, must ne - ver kiss no Men; _____ no,

EXAMPLE 3.1. "Tell me why": (a) *A Dialogue in the Prophetess... T. Cross Junr. Sculp.*; (b) *The Vocal and Instrumental Musick of the Prophetess* (London, 1691), 141 (boxes indicate passages with notable variants).

Ex. 3.1a. Mm. 2–5

(a) *A Dialogue in the Prophetess... T. Cross Junr. Sculp*

Musical notation for Ex. 3.1a (a) in 4/4 time, key of B-flat major. The melody is on a single staff. The lyrics are: "Tell me why, tell me why my charm - - - ing fair,". A box highlights the phrase "charm - - - ing".

(b) *The Vocal and Instrumental Musick of the Prophetess* (London, 1691), 141

Musical notation for Ex. 3.1a (b) in 4/4 time, key of B-flat major. It features a vocal line and a lute line. The lyrics are: "Tell me why, tell me why my Charm - - - ing fair,". A box highlights the phrase "Charm - - - ing".

Ex. 3.1b. Mm. 17–20

(a)

Musical notation for Ex. 3.1b (a) in 4/4 time, key of B-flat major. The melody is on a single staff. The lyrics are: "Tell me why, tell me why my charm - - - ing fair,". A box highlights the phrase "charm - - - ing".

(b)

Musical notation for Ex. 3.1b (b) in 4/4 time, key of B-flat major. It features a vocal line and a lute line. The lyrics are: "Tell me why, tell me why my Charm - - - ing fair,". A box highlights the phrase "Charm - - - ing".

Ex. 3.1c. Mm. 23–26

(a)

Musical notation for Ex. 3.1c (a) in 4/4 time, key of B-flat major. The melody is on a single staff. The lyrics are: "Oh _____ Mir - til - - - lo, you're _____ a - bove me,". A box highlights the phrase "Mir - til - - - lo".

(b)

Musical notation for Ex. 3.1c (b) in 4/4 time, key of B-flat major. It features a vocal line and a lute line. The lyrics are: "Oh _____ Mir - ti - - - lo, you're _____ a - bove me,". A box highlights the phrase "Mir - ti - - - lo".

EXAMPLE 3.2. "Sound fame," mm. 12–15: (a) *A Song in Dioclesian...exactly engrav'd by Tho: Cross*; (b) *The Vocal and Instrumental Musick of the Prophetess* (London, 1691), 73.

(a) *A Song in Dioclesian...exactly engrav'd by Tho: Cross*

(b) *The Vocal and Instrumental Musick of the Prophetess* (London, 1691), 73

EXAMPLE 3.3. "Let the soldiers rejoice," mm. 32–36: (a) *A New song sung in The Prophetess, from Philomela, or the Vocal Musician* (London, 1692); (b) *The Vocal and Instrumental Musick of the Prophetess* (London, 1691), 34.

344

(a) *A New song sung in The Prophetess, from Philomela, or the Vocal Musician* (London, 1692)

(b) *The Vocal and Instrumental Musick of the Prophetess* (London, 1691), 34

the passage from the second half of "What shall I do?" in act 3 shown in example 3.4: there are rhythmic variants where Cross's notation incorporates dotted rhythms not notated in the authorized score; there are differences of underlay; and there are variants in the melodic ornamentation.

These types of variants show a notational flexibility typical of the period and might be regarded as examples of what has been termed by Alan Howard "background variation"—that is, they exemplify the way in which contemporary notation reflected the collaborative nature of creativity at this time, in which many musicians, including composers and

EXAMPLE 3.4. "What shall I do?," mm. 41–56: (a) *A New song sung in the Opera*, from *Philomela, or the Vocal Musician* (London, 1692); (b) *The Vocal and Instrumental Musick of the Prophetess* (London, 1691), 68.

(a) *A New song sung in The Prophetess*, from *Philomela, or the Vocal Musician* (London, 1692)

(b) *The Vocal and Instrumental Musick of the Prophetess* (London, 1691), 68

(a)

(b)

(a)

(b)

performers, but also arrangers and copyists, contributed to constantly evolving musical content.⁶⁴ The proliferation of minor variants often found in

⁶⁴ See Alan Howard, "Understanding Creativity," in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Henry Purcell*, ed. Rebecca Herissone (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), 65–113, at 97; and Herissone, *Musical Creativity*, 245–58, esp. 251–54.

sources of Restoration music was thus a result of multiparty engagement with the music, rather than processes of “corruption,” “distortion,” or “degeneration” associated with the text-critical methods of literary scholars that still form the basis of modern critical music editing. Cross’s other theater-music prints contain remarkably similar examples, such as his version of “Dear pretty youth,” which Purcell provided for the 1695 production of *The Tempest*.⁶⁵ Although the changes are relatively small-scale, they are significant in cases like *The Prophetess* where—drawing on the evidence of Purcell’s anxious comments printed in the Advertisement at the back of his printed full score cited above⁶⁶—we have good reason to believe that Cross’s single-sheet prints were produced rapidly after the first performances and that they predate more authoritative sources. It is highly likely that in these cases their variants reflect directly the performers’ interpretations of the songs in these initial productions, despite or even because of the fact that they do not appear to relate stemmatically to more formal, authorized sources like Purcell’s self-published score.

Conclusions

346

Purcell’s self-published score of *The Prophetess* is the only complete copy of the music from his opera, and it is therefore understandable that this source has hitherto been used as the basis for all modern editions of the work and its constituent parts. In many respects this is an entirely logical decision: since the composer was directly responsible for the score’s publication and also hand-corrected several of the surviving copies, there can be no doubt that it is an authoritative source. But whether it reflects the way in which *The Prophetess* was actually performed in 1690 is an entirely different question. Purcell certainly did not produce the score with performance in mind, since it was published well after the production for which he had written the music had finished, with no prospect of others being mounted in the foreseeable future.⁶⁷ As I have argued elsewhere, his motivations for publishing such a lavish full score were complicated and rather confused, but the folio score format,

⁶⁵ Laurie presents this as a version distinct from the one published in 1696 in *Deliciae Musicae . . . The Third Book*, and in *Orpheus Britannicus*, but in fact the distinctions between them are relatively slight and include only three or four differences of melodic ornamentation (Cross’s print containing less written-out ornamentation than the other sources) and three or four in the thoroughbass part. See Purcell, *Dramatic Music III*, ed. Laurie, 221.

⁶⁶ See p. 308 above.

⁶⁷ London opera productions were confined to the United Company in this period, following the terms of their patent, and there were no theater companies outside London that were either legally or practically able to mount such lavish entertainments until the eighteenth century. See Herissone, “Playford, Purcell, and the Functions of Music Publishing,” 266n58.

comprehensiveness, and appearance of the publication is strongly suggestive of a role as a monument to and memento of the London stage production, not a record of its performances.⁶⁸

In comparison to Purcell's lavish and expensive score, Cross's single-sheet prints of songs such as "What shall I do?," "Let the soldiers rejoice," and "Let monarchs fight" (figs. 2, 4, and 10 above) look rather cheap and unimpressive. It is not surprising that such sources did not feature among those collated by Margaret Laurie in her edition of the opera made for the Purcell Society's complete works of Purcell in 1961.⁶⁹ This article has demonstrated that Cross's sources may have been much closer to the orchestral pit than first meets the eye and that there is good reason to believe that they in fact reflect the singers' performances "exactly engrav'd," as Cross claimed. However imperfect Cross's prints may be in terms of their accuracy, they should not be summarily dismissed if we want to improve our understanding of the performance practices of song in late seventeenth-century England.⁷⁰ This in turn underlines how important it is to ensure that we carry out deep investigation of the circumstances and contexts of production for even the most unpromising sources if we are to become truly historically informed musical editors.

347

ABSTRACT

Thomas Cross Jr. was the first music printer to capitalize on the growth of public musical performances in late seventeenth-century England by producing cheap, single-sheet editions of the newest and most popular songs, especially those from the latest theater productions, for audience members and others in fashionable society to buy. As England's first specialist music engraver, he was able to produce his simple prints of individual songs unusually quickly and to sell them at a fraction of the price of the larger movable-type anthologies that remained the mainstay of established London music stationers in this period. In the absence of intellectual property laws, Cross was free to print any music he could acquire, and he soon came to be seen as a threat by composers and music stationers alike. He clearly did not enjoy good relationships with contemporary composers, and we can safely assume that they did not supply him with his source materials. Given that his prints were nearly always the

⁶⁸ See Herissone, "Playford, Purcell, and the Functions of Music Publishing," 266n58.

⁶⁹ See note 1 above.

⁷⁰ Their significance will be acknowledged for the first time in the new edition of *The Prophetess* I am currently preparing for the Purcell Society, where, provided accuracy is not in doubt, they will be given as alternatives to the composer's own readings.

first published editions of the theater songs to appear in print, how did he obtain his musical texts? This article examines the hypothesis that Cross's engravings may have derived directly from the stage performances of the singers he names in the titles of his editions, and that they may reflect the singers' interpretations of the music "exactly engrav'd," as Cross claimed. Comparison of the variants in Cross's editions with readings preserved in sources that have known connections to contemporary performance demonstrates that his prints—despite their not undeserved reputation for inaccuracy—probably preserve contemporary performing practices more closely than has hitherto been acknowledged. Their significance as sources thus needs to be reevaluated, which raises broader questions about the criteria that scholars use when making judgments about the relative authority of sources from this period.

Keywords: English opera, early modern, print culture, historically informed editing, Purcell