EBENEZER PROUT (1835-1909) AND MESSIAH: AN OVERDUE ASSESSMENT

Luke Howard, Brigham Young University

“Prout shaming” has become something of a favorite pastime among Handel scholars of the last hundred years. But whatever Ebenezer Prout’s reputation has been (and will be), it should at least be based on something more substantial than snarky slights and anecdotes. A reassessment of Prout’s impact on Handel studies is long overdue.

Actually, an initial assessment of Prout is long overdue. There is little scholarly literature on this man, who was one of the most influential music critics and theorists of the late Victorian period. Prout’s 1902 edition of Messiah was really just a minor part in the career of a major musical figure, and yet it lingers as his most lasting and perhaps most reviled contribution to music. It has become too easy to consider Friedrich Chrysander’s study edition of Messiah as the truly scholarly edition, and Prout’s as the quaint “performance score” stuck in 19th-century practices. That both were published in 1902 merely makes the binary opposition even more compelling. But there is no doubt that Prout was Chrysander’s equal in knowledge of Handel’s music and baroque performance practices, and probably his superior when it came to manuscript studies and score analysis. As Prout reviewed the volumes released serially by the German Handel Society, he repeatedly pinpointed flaws in Chrysander’s readings and editorial decisions, identified manuscript sources that Chrysander had failed to consult, and pointed out—gently—that Chrysander was at a perpetual disadvantage as an editor, being neither an especially active performer nor a teacher of music. When Chrysander’s edition of Messiah was finally released, Prout was among the numerous Handelians who declared it

1 George Frideric Handel, Messiah, ed. Ebenezer Prout, (London: Novello, 1902). Prout’s edition of the vocal score has been reprinted numerous times, even as recently as a Boosey reprint from 2007.

REPORT FROM HALLE

Graydon Beeks

The annual Handel Festival in Halle, Germany took place this year from May 31–June 16 with the theme “Empfindsam, Heroisch, Erhaben – Händels Frauen” (“Sensitive, Heroic, Sublime—Handel’s Women”). I was able to attend the first week, and so this report will include snapshots of only some of the significant events. I especially would have liked to have heard the Gala Concerts featuring Sandrine Piau, Karina Gauvin, and Carolyn Sampson, as well as the performances of Agrippina with Ann Hallenberg, Susanna under the direction of Paul McCreesh, and Alcina at Bad Lauchstädt, but all but the first of these occurred during the second week.

The official opening of the festival on Friday evening, May 31, was marked by the premiere of a new staging of the opera Giulio Cesare by Peter Konwitschny, making a return to Halle where he was Intendant of the Opera House in the years leading up to the Reunification of Germany. In what may have been a regrettable example of Ostolgie (i.e., nostalgia for the old East Germany), the work was sung in a new German translation (with German superitles), and the male roles that Handel had written for castratos or for women were sung down an octave by basses and baritones. To make things worse, much of the staging seemed to me a travesty. The role of Sesto, written for Handel’s former prima donna Margherita Durastanti, was taken by a child actor who was given spoken lines, while what remained of his music was very well sung by Jake Arditti as the disembodied head

IN THIS ISSUE

Ebenezer Prout (1835-1909) and Messiah – Luke Howard
Report From Halle – Graydon Beeks
2019 International Handel Research Prize Winner
2019 Handel Aria Competition Winners
Call for Papers
Recent Publications
The J. Merrill Knapp Research Fellowship

continued on p. 4

continued on p. 2
a disappointment. He undoubtedly could have produced a superior critical edition himself.

Prout had been studying Handel’s music since his teens, and by 1890 was widely regarded as the most ardent and profound Handel scholar of his day. In preparing his performance editions of Handel, Prout added and changed as little as possible in order the facilitate practical use. His additional accompaniments were praised for their reticence, not their lavishness. If there were criticisms of Prout’s approach—and there were a few—they generally related to him being too literal, too truthful, exhibiting an “excessive desire to follow the master closely.”

As a scholar who had literally written the book on orchestration, Prout was uniquely positioned to comment on Handel’s orchestra. His claim that Handel’s original orchestral sound was simply unattainable in the late 19th century was accurate, given the complete absence of the harpsichord and the scarcity of functioning baroque-period instruments. “Those who object to a certain amount of modernization of [Handel’s] scores,” he noted, “must be content to go without hearing his music at all.”

But for Prout, the bigger issue was one of balance, between winds and strings, and between orchestra and choir. The overall size of the ensemble could then be scaled accordingly. Using Handel’s Foundling Hospital score and parts as evidence, Prout believed that Handel wanted a strong wind section: on average, one oboe and one bassoon for every three violins. He also believed, along with Bach and Handel, that the balance between orchestra and choir should be about equal, with perhaps a few more singers when working with a less-efficient amateur chorus. “The swamping of the orchestra by the chorus is a thing of quite modern growth,” he lamented, and he worked tirelessly to reform it.

This is why Prout could praise the 1784 Handel commemoration performance of Messiah—it retained the balance that Handel employed—while lambasting the overblown “monster” performances of his own day. Even though the total number of performers in each case might be similar, the modern performances were a “mere caricature of the works of the great composers,” as he put it, when the chorus overwhelmed the orchestra. Prout bemoaned to his fellow musicians that the audience was primarily to blame. “The simple fact is, that our audiences know no more about the proper balance of orchestra and chorus than a cow knows about double counterpoint... and unless the chorus completely overpowers and swamps the instruments, they immediately jump to the conclusion that the orchestra is too loud.”

In suggesting a remedy for the blight of choral gigantism among the suburban and provincial choral societies, Prout was guardedly hopeful. But for the Royal Albert Hall Choral Society or the Handel Festival Choir, it was a lost cause; “they are beyond praying for,” he mourned. Prout was especially critical of the Handel Festival, calling Sir Michael Costa a “lover of vulgar noise.”

George Bernard Shaw’s call to abolish the Handel Festivals and hear Messiah performed on a small scale has often been cited as evidence of a reactionary shift towards authenticity in the late 19th century. What is not repeated quite so often, however, is Shaw’s actual review of the Handel Festival, penned only six months later in July 1891, when he declared, “No host could be too mighty for the Hallelujah Chorus, or See the Conquering Hero.” Shaw described some of the choruses from Israel in Egypt as “magnificent. One felt after them that the Festival had justified its existence beyond all cavil.” Clearly Shaw was talking out of both sides of his mouth. It was Prout, not Shaw, who was the unflinching champion of authentic Handelian practice.

Prout wrote in 1891 that “a perfectly satisfactory score of the Messiah still remains a desideratum,” but he knew that bucking 19th-century Messiah traditions would not be popular. Numerous music critics, especially the Daily Telegraph’s Joseph Bennett, were so invested in maintaining current performance traditions (based principally on Mozart/Hiller) that they promised any move by Prout to “clean up” the score would be met with fierce opposition. But Prout offered very reasonable justifications for why it was untenable to play Messiah “as Handel wrote it,” and not just because of the absence of a good harpsichord. He pointed out the scarcity of 18th-century wind instruments, the impracticality of returning to baroque tuning and unequal temperament, the lack of expertise with figured bass, and the need to replace the continuo with some other harmonic voicing. “If the harmony,” he concluded, “be filled up—no matter by whom, it will not be by Handel himself—the principle of ‘additional accompaniments,’ however modest they may be, is conceded at once, and it becomes a question, not of whether, but of how they are to be written.”

Around the turn of the century, Dr. Arthur Mann and Sir Frederick Bridge began to stage more “historically-informed” performances of Messiah. Mann’s performances of 1894 and 1906 at Cambridge, and Bridge’s of 1899 in London, are most frequently cited by recent Handel scholars as evidence of a new trend toward authenticity, in direct opposition to Prout. This is a false inference, however, because it was actually Prout who promoted the return to reduced, “authentic” performance practices.

Mann planned his groundbreaking 1894 performance of Messiah to reflect Handel’s original orchestration, as far as is possible to ascertain and reproduce. Mann wrote to Prout, asking for his advice and assistance in preparing the concert, which Prout enthusiastically offered. Prout and Mann together spent the day at the Foundling Hospital, where they carefully examined the newly-discovered scores, and of course this led to the orchestration Mann employed in the concert later that year. But Mann’s performance, though it restored Handel’s orchestration, was nothing like Handel’s practices in terms of balance, with a choir of 200 and an orchestra of 63. He also used piano for the continuo accompaniment. So if one is to hold up Mann’s 1894 performance as evidence of a new trend, then Prout needs to at least be credited alongside Mann, not situated as an antagonist.

Bridge’s 1899 performance, also labelled an “interesting experiment” in the press, is even more problematic. It also restored Handel’s orchestration, but in a gargantuan festival-sized
performance with 842 in the choir, accompanied by more than 100 orchestral players and the organ of the Royal Albert Hall. In fairness to Bridge, he did keep the ratio of winds to strings as Handel (and Prout) had earlier suggested. One reviewer noted, however, that once the choir approached anything like a forte and the organist pulled out the pedal stops, it did not matter whether the orchestra was authentically “Handelian” or not—it was totally swamped by the organ and choir.¹⁴

In 1906, Mann tried another experimental Messiah at Cambridge, this time reducing the overall number of performers in an attempt to create “an actual reproduction” of the 1759 Foundling Hospital performance, with a chorus of 24 and an orchestra of 32. Mann had taken to heart Prout’s suggestions about balance and size, and adopted Prout’s—and very likely Handel’s—practice of placing the singers in front of the orchestra. The reviewer noted the revelatory impact: “The prominence thus given to the accompaniments is at times very striking, to say nothing of the fact that all kinds of interesting Handelian effects and contrasts are brought to light.” And then, significantly, the review added that “something of a similar kind was given a season or two ago by Professor E. Prout at the Queen’s Hall”—a reference to Prout’s conducting of the premiere of his new edition in 1902.¹⁵ This critic, at least, regarded Prout’s Messiah edition as a groundbreaking experiment in the restoration of Handel’s intentions, not a perpetuation of established traditions.

If Handel scholars are looking for a seminal event in the efforts to restore baroque instrumentation and performance practices, it may not be found in Messiah at the turn of the century, weighted as it was by 150 years of tradition. It will be found, however, in Prout’s and Mann’s performance of Alexander Balus in 1901 for the Incorporated Society of Musicians. With a chorus of 24 and an orchestra of 39, including (significantly) a harpsichord on loan from the Broadwood company, it was very likely the first performance of Handel’s music in well over a century that did not use additional accompaniments, piano continuo, or a modernized orchestration. Prout, who played harpsichord in this performance, had been the first to suggest this revival, and was deeply involved in its preparation. “I felt a very special interest in the success of the experiment,” he recounted. By all reports, the performance was a resounding triumph, exceeding all expectations. Prout himself observed that “A far more adequate and satisfying rendering of Handel’s music was heard from that small body of performers than is obtainable from our large festival societies, with their overgrown choruses and utterly inadequate orchestras.”¹⁶ This is not the rhetoric of a vacillating Shaw, nor of someone who has been plagued by a festival mentality, too beholden to tradition, or trapped in the overblown blandness of Victorian performance aesthetics, as numerous Handel scholars have suggested of Prout.

So what happened to sour Prout’s reputation, and how did he become posthumously associated with the performance practices he himself despised? After the release of his Messiah edition, and the groundbreaking performance of Alexander Balus, the reputational needle did not move very much. Prout’s obituary mentions only a couple of sentences on his Messiah edition. The Dictionary of National Biography Supplement from 1912 states that Prout’s “modernized edition of Handel’s ‘Messiah’ (1902) had little success.”¹⁷ Then, after World War I, presumably when Edwardian values and cultural forms were to be repudiated, and Prout himself could not answer his critics from the grave, it was open season. Thomas Armstrong, Hugh Gardner, and others wrote at length on Prout’s perceived deficiencies, often with the same lack of research and detailed understanding of Handel’s scores that infuriated Prout when he was alive. During the 1920s and 30s, Prout’s detractors never cited Handel as the authority to override Prout’s editorial decisions—they cited changes in circumstances, personal tastes, the cultural fashions of their more modern times. Prout may have been a dutiful scholar, they suggest, but he was insufficiently modern. Consequently, the pattern was set for future scholarship on Handel and Messiah, and before too long Winton Dean and Paul Henry Lang were the final nails in Prout’s reputational coffin.

But they were in error. Prout was a decisive pioneer in returning performances of Handel’s music more closely to the spirit of baroque tradition. Whatever today’s scholars might think of the shortcomings of his Messiah edition, it was more historically informed than anything that had come before, and many editions that came after. Prout and Robert Franz were among the first editors to actually scale back additional accompaniments from performances of Messiah. He was the first to collate his edition directly from Handel’s and John Christopher Smith’s manuscripts instead of early published editions. He paid scrupulous attention to the autograph manuscript’s rhythm and notation. And he admitted to making no attempt to try and recreate the orchestra of Handel’s day, because that was literally impossible at the time. Rather, he attempted to get close to Handel’s sound with the modern instruments at his disposal. If Prout’s biggest failing was that he did not foresee the harpsichord revival of the early 20th century, that was hardly his own fault.

Prout despised the festival mentality. He argued repeatedly for smaller performing forces. And he presented the first concert of Handel’s music in well over a hundred years that approached anything like true early-music authenticity. Perhaps the time has come to stop perpetuating a Prout reputation based on bias, anecdote, and rampant presentism, and give him some credit for promoting serious Handel scholarship when so few others were invested in real historical accuracy.

of the dead Pompey. Movements were transferred to unexpected places in the score, with the most surprising example being the duet in which Sesto and his mother Cornelia should have bewailed their fate at the end of Act I; this was instead sung by Cleopatra and Cornelia at the end of the opera to mourn the fact that all of the male characters had departed, apparently intent on conquering the world.

Musically, things were somewhat better. The Handel Festival Orchestra, under the direction of Michael Hofstetter, played well for the most part. The presence of a harp in the pit—called for by Handel in the Parnassus Scene at the beginning of Act II but used extensively as part of the continuo group—meant there was no room for an organ. Unfortunately, there was room for more than the usual number of inappropriate percussion instruments, which were employed with abandon. The singing was adequate, with the exception mentioned above, but the basses and baritones were generally defeated by the rapid passages in their music, and Vanessa Waldhart failed to convey Cleopatra’s growing maturity as a character. On the whole, I had the impression that they would all have been able to sing and act more effectively had they not been given so much stage business to accomplish, and if a number of the scenes—most notably Caesar’s visit to Ptolemy that includes the great aria “Va tacito e nascosto”—had not been “reimagined” to such an extent. It was inappropriate to label this as Handel’s opera, and it was doubly misleading to imply that it was based on the new forthcoming HHA volume which Hans-Dieter Clausen has edited with immense skill and care.

The annual Membership Meeting of the Georg-Friedrich-Händel-Gesellschaft (HG) took place on Saturday, June 1. It was preceded by the Festvortrag (“Festival Lecture”) given by Prof. Silke Leopold of Heidelberg University on the topic “Von A(thalia) bis Z(enobia): Händels Galerie der starken Frauen” (“From A(thalia) to Z(enobia): Handel’s Gallery of Strong Women”). Following her lecture and a brief concert of Handel’s arias impressively sung by soprano Margriet Buchberger with the Ensemble il Giratempo, Prof. Leopold was presented with the Handel Prize of the City of Halle. At the Membership Meeting, Klaus Froboese, the former Intendant of the Halle Opera and longtime member of the Vorstand of the HG who died in January 2019, was remembered especially for his commitment to the music of Handel and his role in the establishment of the Handel Festival Orchestra. He has bequeathed his Halle apartment to the Society. The meeting was followed by the election of the Vorstand and the selection of Officers. Both remained largely unchanged, with Prof. Wolfgang Hirschmann continuing to serve as President. Prof. Wolfgang Ruf, his immediate predecessor, decided not to stand for reelection to the Vorstand and his wise counsel will be missed.

This year’s first Gala Concert took place on Saturday evening, presented in the Georg-Friedrich-Händel-Halle by mezzo soprano Vivica Genaux and countertenor Lawrence Zazzo. The program consisted of arias and duets from operas by Handel and his younger contemporaries Lampugnani, Hasse, Porpora, Vivaldi, Galuppi, Wagenseil, and Traetta, interspersed with instrumental movements by Handel and Hasse. The theme of the program was “Gender Stories” and the bulk of Genaux’s repertoire consisted of music written for male characters and originally sung by both male and female singers. Several of Zazzo’s selections depicted female characters disguised as men, and they were all originally sung by women. Having a man sing these roles would not have been done onstage in Handel’s time—except, perhaps, in Rome—but it was a timely reminder that arias in concert settings were always fair game. The Handel numbers were generally familiar, with the selections from Siroe and Deidamia being the least well known. Zazzo’s first encore, “Yet can I hear that dulcet lay” from The Choice of Hercules, was especially striking in its simplicity. The pieces by Handel’s contemporaries were all worth hearing, and I was particularly impressed with the long, slow, expressive aria “Risponderi vorrei” from Hasse’s Achille in Sciro. The singing by both artists was stellar. The Lautten Compagney Berlin (without extra percussion) played very well under the direction of Wolfgang Katschmer, although I had the feeling that the instrumental numbers by Hasse were rushed. In sum, a truly gala concert.

Sunday, June 2, brought an excursion to the Goethe Theater in Bad Lauchstädt for a performance of the 1712 version of Il pastor fido, which presents a relatively straightforward pastoral story. The nymph Amarilli is in love with the shepherd Mirtillo who is in love with her. However, Amarilli was betrothed as a child to Silvio, who is only interested in hunting. Eurilla, another nymph, is also in love with Mirtillo and plots to destroy Amarilli. The shepherdess Dorinda is in love with Silvio, who only notices this fact near the end of the opera when he accidentally wounds her while out hunting. The plot is formulaic but the emotions portrayed are real and Handel’s music is both appealing and moving.

For his staging, however, Daniel Pfluger added an unnecessary layer to the story. In his version, Amarilli—who was the only one of the nymphs and shepherds not wearing a stylized classical costume—is also having a turbulent relationship with an unnamed dancer, played by Davidson Jaconello—also in modern dress. I found this unhelpful and distracting, but perhaps I missed something deep and subtle. As Amarilli, soprano Sophie Junker, who is clearly a rising star, coped well with both the music and the drama, solving some initial intonation problems along the way. Philipp Mathmann, also billed as a soprano, is no actor, but his earnest portrayal of Mirtillo was appealing and he sang beautifully, though with increasing intonation lapses as the opera progressed. Rinnat Moriah, a third soprano, was suitably villainous as Eurilla, and countertenor Nicholas Tamagna was appropriately clueless as Silvio. The [oh!] Orkiestra Historyczna played well under the direction of violinist Martyna Pastuszka and harpsichordist Marcin Świątkiewicz.

The scholarly conference, on the topic “Between Alcina and Theodora: Female figures in the works of Handel and his contemporaries,” took place on June 3–5 and featured speakers from Germany, Austria, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Croatia. After a musical introduction presented by students from the Music Pedagogy Department of the Martin Luther University and greetings from representatives of the state government and the university, Natassa Varka was presented with the International Handel Research Prize for 2019 in recognition of her Cambridge University doctoral dissertation on Charles Jennens’s collection of Handel’s sacred oratorios. Dr. Varka, who spoke on the topic of her dissertation in response to receiving her award, also presented a second paper during the conference. Members of the AHS giving papers included John Roberts, Donald Burrows, Matthew Gardner, Ellen T. Harris, Wendy Heller, Ivan Ćurković, Ruth Smith, and myself. Other presenters included Reinhard Strohm, Berta Joncus, and Suzanne Aspden. Almost all the papers generated lively discussion.

On Monday evening, June 3, I attended the Gala Concert featuring Czech soprano Hana Blázíková in the Freylinghausen-Saal of the Franckesche Stiftungen. The program featured music dealing with the character of Arianna and included arias and instrumental music from eponymous operas by Monteverdi and Handel and a serenata by Benedetto Marcello. In the course of the proceedings, Teseo’s aria “Quì ti sfido” from Handel’s Arianna in Creta was performed with an oboe taking the vocal line, a practice that was not uncommon at concerts in Handel’s time. The orchestra Les Passions de l’Ame from Bern, Switzerland played well under violinist Meret Lüthi’s direction.
Blázíková sang with evident commitment but with a curious lack of line, and her voice seemed out of control in some of the rapid passages.

The last concert I was able to hear took place on Tuesday evening, June 4, in the Ulrichskirche and featured soprano Anna Prohaska with Il Suonar Parlante Orchestra under the direction of Vittorio Ghielmi. On the first half Prohaska sang arias from Cavalli’s Gli amori d’Apollo e di Dafne and Handel’s Alcina and Rinaldo, and Ghielmi was the soloist in Johann Gottlieb Graun’s virtuosic Concerto for viola da gamba in D minor. For the second half Prohaska was joined by the baritone Fulvio Bettini in Handel’s cantata Apollo e Dafne, which featured some distinguished oboe playing by Xenia Löffler. It is always difficult to judge singers in this venue, but from where I was sitting, Bettini seemed to be more successful in projecting character while maintaining a sense of line than was Prohaska.

Next year’s Handel Festival will take place from May 29–June 14, 2020 with the theme “Musikalische Malereien” (“Musical Pictures”). According to the preliminary program, the operas to be performed will include Teseo, Alessandro Severo, Giulio Cesare, and Ottone. The oratorios will include L’Alegro, il Penseroso ed il Moderato, Israel in Egypt, Messiah, and Il trionfo del Tempo e del Disinganno, the latter from the new HHA volume edited by Michael Pacholke. In addition, there will be Gala Concerts by Valer Sabadus, Iestyn Davies, Nathalie Stutzmann, Sophie Junker, and Daniel Behle, as well as numerous other concerts of chamber music and orchestral music, and even a recreation of the June 20, 1883 concert in the Crystal Palace. Concert tickets should be available from the end of November. The Conference, on the related topic of “Handel images—iconography, aesthetics, compositional practice,” will take place on Monday and Tuesday, June 8–9, 2020. More details will be forthcoming.

THE J. MERRILL KNAPP RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP

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

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

The deadline for applications will be March 2, 2020. There is no application form. Each applicant should submit an outline of the project, a budget showing how and when the funds will be used, and a description of other funding for the same project applied for and/or received. In addition, applicants should have two letters of recommendation sent directly to the Knapp Fellowship Committee. Electronic submissions are preferred; letters of recommendation as well as the application itself can be emailed to Ellen T. Harris (eharris@mit.edu). Paper submissions can also be mailed to Professor Ellen T. Harris, Massachusetts Institute of Technology 4-246, 77 Massachusetts Ave. Cambridge, MA 02139. All applications must arrive by March 2, 2020.

CALL FOR PAPERS: INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARLY CONFERENCE, HANDEL FESTIVAL IN HALLE (SAALE)

“Handel Images—Iconography, Aesthetics, Compositional Practice”

June 8–9, 2020

Händel-Haus, Halle an der Saale
https://www.haendel.de/scholarly-handel-conference/?lang=en

The International Scholarly Conference during the Handel Festival in Halle an der Saale on June 8–9, 2020 will focus on “Handel images,” following the festival theme “Musical paintings.” This subject can be interpreted in different ways: on the one hand there is the topic of the paintings in Handel’s collection and the visual worlds that surrounded him at his various places of work; on the other hand, the subject will also explore the visual imagination that he generated in his artistic work. The question will also be addressed about which pictures of Handel were created to classify the figure and the works of the composer in different cultural, aesthetic or political value systems.

The conference thus aims to comprehensively explore the role of visual ideas for Handel’s artistic output as well as for the reception history. With the three keywords “iconography,” “aesthetics” and “compositional practice,” we hope to outline a stimulating topic in which investigations into both the pictorial sources of Handel himself and the “pictorialness” of Handel’s music and references to the visual arts in contemporary music aesthetics will be considered. We also wish to reflect on how the different manifestations of the composer (from the 18th century to the present day) can be explained and compared with each other.

The organisers invite interested scholars to take part in the conference with a 25-minute presentation and ask for proposals for topics and an abstract by September 15, 2019. Travel costs and accommodation expenses from June 7–10 will be covered.

Contact: Dr. Annette Landgraf (landgraf@musik.uni-halle.de); Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Hirschmann (wolfgang.hirschmann@musik.uni-halle.de); gesellschaft@haendel.de

Organizers: Georg-Friedrich-Händel-Gesellschaft e. V., Internationale Vereinigung; Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Institut für Musik, Medien- und Sprechwissenschaft, Abteilung Musikwissenschaft; Stiftung Händel-Haus zu Halle.

MESSAGE FROM THE EDITOR

Renew your membership for 2019 today!

Go Green! Opt to receive the Newsletter electronically! Please contact the editor at minjik@gmail.com.
The first prize in the 7th annual Handel Aria Competition on June 7 has been awarded to Morgan Balfour. Morgan is an Australian soprano who recently received her Master’s Degree from the San Francisco Conservatory of Music. She sang “Spietati, io vi giurai” from Rodelinda and “Mean as he was, he is my brother now … Author of Peace” from Saul.

Second prize went to soprano Emily Yocum Black of Paducah, Kentucky, who sang “Art thou not Zaphnath? … Prophetic raptures swell my breast” from Joseph and His Brethren and “Credete al mio dolore” from Alcina.

Bass-baritone Jonathan Woody, a regularly featured member of the Choir of Trinity Wall Street in New York, won both third prize and audience favorite with his arias “Oh memory, still bitter to my soul! … Opprest with never-ceasing grief” from Belshazzar and “Why do the nations so furiously rage together?” from Messiah.

In addition to the cash prizes offered to all three winners, Morgan Balfour will be invited to perform a noon-time recital next spring in St. George’s Hanover Square, which was Handel’s parish church. This opportunity is courtesy of esteemed colleagues at the London Handel Festival.
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Membership – Georg-Friedrich-Händel-Gesellschaft / Göttinger-Händel-Gesellschaft*†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular (with Göttinger Händel Beiträge)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (with Göttinger Händel Beiträge)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Membership – Georg-Friedrich-Händel-Gesellschaft / Händel-Gesellschaft Karlsruhe*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple Membership – Georg-Friedrich-Händel-Gesellschaft / Göttinger-Händel-Gesellschaft / Händel-Gesellschaft Karlsruhe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular (with Göttinger Händel Beiträge)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (with Göttinger Händel Beiträge)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

Online payment options are available at www.americanhandelsociety.org/join

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