

UNEQUAL NOTES

The Inégales Newsletter

Editor: John Byrt

No. 12

June 1997

**Editorial - *Cantate ineguale* - The Birmingham conference
Sol Babitz: loony or luminary? - Quantz's *Solfeggi*: an important
source - More from Miles Kington**

Editorial

This is a solemn moment. Having worked on *notes inégales* off and on for thirty years I have come to a crossroads. From now on I shall avoid using this French expression. Not because of its little awkwardnesses. I don't begrudge the problems and extra labour it caused - finding the acute 'e' among the alternative keys on the computer (130 is the magic number), highlighting the two words and then clicking the italic button - all this I took in my stride. I don't regret the times I have argued with people about how to pronounce it: was it INNégal or ANNégal? Though for an embarrassing period I was using the word incorrectly, spelling it '*inégale*' instead of '*inégal*' when it was in apposition to a singular noun, and needing correction from such francophiles as Colin Tilney and Roger Nichols, I remained very fond of this Gallic term. Indeed, I tried to follow Clifford Bartlett's example and add an 's' when using it in apposition to plural nouns - as in 'should minuets be *inégales*?' (or should it be *inégaux*)?' After all, the frequent appearance of this little italic motto on the page was like a trademark: a password among the little community of people working in this field. Was Neumann the first one to shorten it to '*inégales*' in his celebrated article 'The French *Inégales*, Quantz and Bach'?

I cannot go on using this expression because I no longer believe that the style is French. Few scholars today believe that inequality was confined to France and it is unreasonable to suppose that it came from France in the first place. So we must stop using a French term for this style. We can't go on assuming that any signs of inequality outside France are inevitably the results of French influence. Neumann was wrong to speak of 'the French

Inégales': Bourgeois and Fra Tomás, Caccini and Frescobaldi prove they were not.

But what can we use instead? 'Rhythmic inequality' is very dull. 'Swinging' is a bit over the top... Has anyone got any suggestions?

Cantate ineguale

In November 1996 I had a conversation with Stephen Daw in which he mentioned that a new complete recording of the Bach cantatas, directed by John Eliot Gardiner, is planned for the millennium. Never backward in coming forward I decided straight away that I must get something on tape. I invited a quartet of local singers to take part in the venture. They were **Catherine Bass, Heather Kedge, Guy Crossman and John Draisey**. We met on Sunday lunchtimes and worked at two cantatas. We had one rehearsal session and then an abortive recording session (my new Sony Walkman tape-recorder didn't come up to the mark). In the end I got Ian Dent, a local recording engineer who has done some fine recordings for me in the past, to come to my new house in Tiverton to record two extracts. The final session was on Feb 2nd 1997 and the extracts were

Cantata 21, 'Ich hatte viel Bekümmernis'

First chorus

and

Cantata 140, 'Wachet auf, ruft uns die Stimme'

Opening chorus, bars 1-53 and 134-156

In the chorus from Cantata 21 I set the tempo at crotchet = 52. I started, not with the unequal semiquavers, but by creating a pattern of accentuation for the quavers, with the strongest accents on the 1st and 3rd beats. In each half-bar we crescendoed through the four repeated quavers towards '-kümmernis'. I encouraged the singers to compete with each other for who had the worst 'Bekümmernis' (for 'Bekümmernis' we read 'hangover' - it helped to get away from over-solemnity). I tried to get them to sing it all with a kind of freshness and innocence, pouncing on any Victorian sentimentality or religiosity. We tried to make the chorus quite dramatic but in a naive sort of way. I found that the whole chorus worked at the same speed, even though there was a big change of mood in the middle. Once the crotchets and quavers were sorted out, the unequal semiquavers fell into place without difficulty. The inequality made the orchestral cadence figures sound delicious - even on the harpsichord.

The second part of the chorus, from the word 'aber' onwards, was the most spectacular part of the exercise. The unequal choral melismas on the word 'Seele' sounded like glosolalia. This was almost happy-clappy music. I seriously believe that this effect of unequal melismas may have delighted singers and audiences as early as the 16th century.

In the 'Wachet auf' chorus we settled to a tempo of crotchet = 72. Here the orchestra gets the excitement going and in the first section the voices move in quavers against this unequal semiquaver movement (which was masked much of the time in my harpsichord rendering). But in the second extract the voices take over the inequality and I think our singers show how easy and effective it is to sing divisions unequally. After you have been working with *inégaux* conventional performances seem insecure - they seem to rush over the beats while with inequality you sink down into them. This applies particularly to the syncopations in the string parts at the very beginning. In an unequal performance the second semiquavers are tucked in just before the following quaver in a tidy and elegant way.

The tempi on these recordings are slower than usual. This seems to me to be an adjunct of inequality, though I have only developed this idea in the last five or so years. I would argue that rhythmic inequality provides such rhythmic zest that the music works at a slower tempo and becomes more informal and relaxed.

I've sent the tape to JEG - no reply yet.

oOo

The Birmingham Conference

Birmingham Conservatoire, University of Central England, May 31 to June 1, 1997

This conference on J.S. Bach and Rhythmic Inequality was chaired by **Stephen Daw**, the Bach scholar. I was asked to speak on my specialism and also speaking was **Yo Tomita**, who is working on the sources of

Bach's 48, Book 2. He lectured very interestingly on Bach's errors and changes of mind.

On the first day I spoke to an audience of undergraduates, postgraduates and staff. I soon abandoned my script and discussion was so free that I only reached point 2 of my 8-point agenda. I had sent a tape of unequal harpsichord music in advance. Some were unhappy about my unequal version of Bach's A minor invention: this raised the question of whether disjunct movement of semiquavers cancelled inequality (more on this theme later on in this newsletter). I sat down and played some of the allemande from Handel's 5th suite. **Heather Slade-Lipkin**, a postgraduate student, found this too strict and off-hand. I felt perhaps that she was confusing inequality with rubato and was trying to build too much depth into the music. On the other hand, as so often on these occasions, some people were quick to claim that they used inequality before they were really clear what I meant by the term. It was touching that people wanted to belong to the inequality 'club', asking: 'this is how I play - is this inequality? Obviously the real nature and function of inequality needed to be clarified.

I met some fine musicians and some nice people. In a further conversation with Heather Slade-Lipkin, I found that she was an able pupil of Gilbert and Dreyfus and we talked about Louis Couperin and Froberger: she played a Louis Couperin allemande very sensitively. With **Martin Perkins**, a pupil of Lucy Carolan, I discussed the possible use of inequality in a Muffat passacaglia and the andante from Handel's 7th suite. The Muffat (Historical Anthology II, no. 240) starts with quaver movement and then at bar 45 semiquavers appear. Should the quavers at the beginning be unequal and then the inequality move to the semiquavers? **David Leadbetter**, who was visiting from the Royal Northern College of Music, argued that Hotteterre deals with this situation (1719, ch. 11): clearly the inequality should move to the semiquavers. In the Handel movement I tried to demonstrate that inequality only works if the tempo and the style is right. This is the movement with the strange appoggiatura notation which seems to imply equality or SL performance. Martin played the appoggiaturas short-long and this seemed to be a good foil to the long-short inequality of the semiquavers. Triplets were a point of contact with **Yo Tomita**, who was kind enough to take an interest in my work, e.g. the possibility of inequality in the F# minor prelude from Book 2. He hadn't heard of Collins' 1966 article in *JAMS* (no one had).

Later on on the Saturday a group of singers had a go at part of the first chorus from 'Wachet auf' and then **Charlotte Jones** (soprano) performed 'Ich folge' from the St John Passion, her friend **Sue** (second name?) ably playing the flute part on the violin. I played harpsichord and explained that a slower tempo and a fresher, less intense style would be required. I thought the first run-through was excellent - both girls picked up the style immediately and seemed to achieve most of my ideals, but they weren't entirely happy. Was it the lack of subtlety that worried them, the lack of that depth that we expect from Bach? **Peter Johnson** was listening and he suggested that the tempo be slowed down even more. We tried it like this but without conviction, reminding me that belief in what you are doing is essential to any successful performance.

It was Peter who kindly accommodated me over the Saturday night. He is the writer of an article (*MT*, June 1995) in which he complains that there is little scholarly recognition for the work of musical performers to match the current surge of interest in analysis. We discussed this and our discussions also embraced Taruskin and Beethoven's sketch books (Peter was a post-graduate at Oxford when Alan Tyson was working on these, and got to study the sketches for the Eroica - first movement). Peter also raised a question connected with Sweelinck's 'Mein junges Leben'. In variation 3 (bars 47-48) he put a case for grouping the sextuplets 2 + 2 + 2 instead of 2 + 2.

On the Sunday I played the cantata recording mentioned earlier. **Lucy Carolan**, some of whose students I had already met, was showing a friendly interest in my theories, but felt that inequality rather blurred the *Affekten* of these movements. Stephen Daw saw the semiquaver melismas of our performance of no 21 as bringing it rather closer to Purcell than he expected - I would say that this resemblance may reveal a truth about the notation of that time.

In the final round-table debate the question of uniformity of tempo came up. Did crotchets always go at roughly the same speed? Yes, it was felt, but only in any given time-signature. A burning issue still was the question of inequality ratio: 3:1 was considered too crude. Some, I felt, would only accept inequality if it was kept in the background, moderated so that it did not interfere with the seriousness of the music. They did not welcome the possibility that inequality might interfere with their

'interpreter's rights' over the piece. But is this a period where modern style interpretation, especially involving rubato, is appropriate?

Sol Babitz: loony or luminary?

A scholar whose work is too often poo-pooed is Sol Babitz, an American violinist who published articles in the 50s and 60s encouraging the use of inequality in Bach and other non-French composers. Apparently he advised Wenzinger and the Schola Cantorum Basiliensis in unequal performance, though he felt that

very few of them could immediately master my 3:2 ratio, most playing 2:1, 3:1 etc. When a piece was recorded in this manner it did not sound chaotic in the playback because despite the imprecision of attack on the 2nd and 4th notes every 1st and 3rd note was together. All agreed that this approximateness produced a shimmering effect which sounded much more alive than the excessive modern precision.¹

His first important article was published in 1952 and a group of wise musicians had been assembled to vet his research. Arthur Mendel was one, and the others were Putnam Aldrich, David Boyden, Manfred Bukofzer, Sidney Beck and William J Mitchell. In a letter I received from Mendel in 1967 he referred to Babitz in these words

To claim in print, as Babitz so often does, that one way sounds so much better than another seems to me futile, since the claim is so easily answered by the equally futile "No, it doesn't".

a remark that I have always thought was rather flippant though it may just express the despair that Mendel felt at the failure of his postivist methods to solve the inequality problem. Babitz has always been easy to dismiss with a shrug - or a wink - but I think his work deserves another glance.

'A problem of rhythm in baroque music', *Musical Quarterly*, vol. 38, pp. 533-565.

Early on Babitz writes

I have for several years experimented in applying this convention in performance.

¹ Sol Babitz: "Concerning the length of time ...see p. 34.

This endears me to him straight away - here is a man who bases his theories on empirical research. Soon afterwards comes a remark that sticks in the mind - clearly it marks an important moment in Babitz's career. He is talking about Quantz's *Versuch*:

(p. 535) It seems astonishing to 20th century eyes that this statement, which vitally affects practically every measure of Baroque music, should be dismissed with a mere 'remark' buried among other material ... Other writers also 'toss off one or two sentences about it' or forget to mention it entirely. But clearly it was 'so well known that it was taken for granted'

This last sentence is a blatant example of negative evidence, that must have drawn disapproval from old Mendel, who in the letter to me (quoted above) advised me that

it would be dangerous to assume that the reason German and Italian writers did not discuss playing the violin upside down is that "the convention was universally understood".

Babitz brings up Walther's 'extrinsic' and 'intrinsic' length, refers to Arnold Dolmetsch's work and considers that *Affektenlehre* can be helped by inequality. He is not afraid to plunge into jazz, contrasting the *saccadé* manner of ragtime with the 'triplet ratio' style of modern jazz.

There is a passage (p. 540) in which he quotes C.P.E. Bach as saying "dass man bey dem Punkte etwas weniger anhält" (that you hold on slightly less when there is a dot). He says that this is evidence that "the note after the dot need not invariably be played late", but I wonder if Bach is not referring to the length of the silence that the dot implies.

Babitz has a theory which explains how the Italians turned against inequality while the French embraced it.

Thus at the very moment when rhythmic alteration was elevated in France to replace free ornamentation as one of the chief means of expression, it was being smothered in Italian adagios under a load of ornaments, while the new aggressive Italian allegros with their leaps and fast reiterated notes did not lend themselves to the long-short phrasing which thrives in calm scalewise melodies. However the short-long of the Lombard snap rose to prominence in this atmosphere... But Italy, thanks to florid vocal and violin styles, had gone far beyond simple rhythmic alteration and was, for better or worse, about 50 years ahead of the rest of Europe.

I can agree with much of this, especially the 'aggressive Italian allegros'. It is certainly clear from Corrette that inequality went out of fashion sooner in Italy than it did in the rest of Europe. I can also agree with Babitz that

indications like *croches égales* etc., together with the large amount of French instruction books, have provided us with a plethora of concrete evidence of rhythmic alteration and a basis for the legend that the lengthened *nota buona* was a French innovation of the Lully period.

The word 'legend' implies that he doesn't believe the latter statement. Babitz goes on to talk about fingering and here he gets his fingers burned, as it were. Some years ago, leafing through *New Grove* I found this passage at the beginning of the 'fingering' entry:

...some scholars have tried to link concepts of inequality with fingering patterns and have ridden roughshod over the many inconsistencies that appear from a close examination of the evidence.

I believe this was written by Peter le Huray.

'Concerning the length of Time that Every Note Must be Held', *The Music Review* Vol. 28 No 1 (Feb 1967), pp 21-44.

The title of this article comes from the first sentence of Quantz's celebrated 'Remark' (1752). Here Babitz begins by expounding his view of how notes whose value is longer than those 'eligible for inequality' may also conform to a kind of inequality of their own. For instance, in C time a series of crotchets could be played like this

I believe this is what is called 'durational' inequality as opposed to the 'swinging' kind, which is called 'proportional' inequality. Babitz calls this "equal long-shorts" and "unequal long-shorts" respectively. He disarmingly apologizes for failing to mention this in his 1952 article:

This information, infinitely more important than that on unequal notes, I had completely overlooked in 1952 because I was then still under the influence of the modern anti-metric prejudices.

He develops this theory showing how, without this kind of treatment of longer notes, the listener to a piece of organ music cannot tell what beat the player is on, particularly if there is a long anacrusis, as in the fugues to Bach's BWV 539 and 565. He expresses the subject of the D minor fugue like this

This is a mixture of three kinds of inequality:

1. The first beat of the bar is emphasised above all the other beats
2. The fourth and second beats are given slightly less emphasis
3. Semiquaver inequality is superimposed on to this

This is really a very subtle expression of the principle of quantitative accents, in which an accented note receives more time than an unaccented one. This is important for instruments like the organ and harpsichord, which are not capable of dynamic variation. I recall that Kenneth Mobbs and Clifford Bartlett have said that inequality seems to them to belong particularly to such instruments.

Babitz goes on to make his position clear on inequality: "slightly unequal ratios were used in every country including France"... "the difference between France and the rest of Europe lay not in *inégaies* but in the ratios of inequality which for a time were sharper in France, or at least sounded sharper because of the lighter articulation"... "around 1600 extreme 7:1 dotting was used in Italy, and it was this which was probably carried by Lully to France".

I can't see how he can know all this, especially the bit about 7:1 dotting, though I can believe that Lully may have brought Italian practices with him to France.

He claims that Quantz, Leopold Mozart and CPE Bach "all suggest dotting of 16ths in figures of 8ths and two 16ths." (I have suggested earlier that CPE Bach may be talking about silence rather than dotting ratios in this passage). (p. 33) Babitz defends his advocacy of inequality in Bach, arguing that it would be valid even if it were proven that no inequality were used in Italian music. Bach did not play in the Italian style but in the 'mixed' style, "a style so far from the Italian that Corelli thought that Handel played the violin in the 'French' style".

Babitz finishes by castigating modern performers for their rubatos. He feels that baroque performance was "the polar opposite of the modern style". This was in 1967 - would he be pleased with our progress in 1997?

'Notes inégales' a communication in JAMS vol. 20 No 3 (1967).

Babitz criticizes Neumann for making Quantz appear like a virtual Frenchman: "he prohibited extreme dotting, which no Frenchman does". (p. 12) Babitz goes on to stress the Italian influences on Quantz, which I would confirm, having recently found a surprising weight of Italian influence in *Solfeggi*.²

Babitz gives the impression that inequality went in and out of fashion and I think this is very plausible. Inequality must have been like hemlines: it controlled the sexiness of the music. Italian correntes of the middle baroque show that unequal semiquavers were out of fashion and brought the equal quaver sound to the fore. Even the Corelli movements quoted by Hotteterre (e.g. the vivace of op. 5 no. 11 in E) have few semiquavers. If there was a plethora of unequal semiquavers in Italian music of the early baroque, perhaps people were tired of them.

Quantz's *Solfeggi*, an important source

This manuscript combines technical exercises with difficult passages from flute pieces of the day. Since some of these pieces are by well-known German composers like Telemann, CPE Bach and Quantz himself, it has

² J. J. Quantz, *Solfeggi pour la flute traversiere*, [1729-41] ed. Michel and Teske (Winterthur, 1978). See my *Notes inégales - a European style*, chapter 5.

considerable importance for students of performance practice. It is also valuable as a gloss on Quantz's already famous *Versuch*, which contains some of the clearest evidence for rhythmic inequality of any age.

The manuscript of *Solfeggi* was discovered in the Royal Library, Copenhagen and restored in 1958. Its inequality aspects were described in an article by Claire Fontijn, in *Early Music* (February 1995) and it is referred to by Stephen Hefling in his book, (pp. 43-44). This collection of teaching material seems to have been assembled by the great flute teacher for a single pupil. It has been edited for modern use by Michel and Hermien Teske,³ who have coped well with the difficult publishing problems of such a document. Do they issue a facsimile, which would be quite obscure to many potential customers? or do they provide a cleaned-up version, shorn of all the oddities which are particularly valuable to the scholar? In the end they have produced a modern, printed text, but they have avoided the temptation to tidy up Quantz's frequent inconsistencies.

The editors believe that the *Solfeggi* must have been written for the Crown Prince Frederick, later to become Frederick the Great. They consider that it may have been in use between 1729 and 1741, when Quantz took up residence at Potsdam as the royal flute teacher. Apparently Quantz joined the Court Orchestra at Dresden in 1728 and in 1729 was given permission to go to Berlin (Ruppin or Rheinsberg) twice a year to teach the prince.

I believe that this is one of the most useful sources for the study of inequality. The evidence comes partly from the use of the words 'unegal' and 'ungleich' and partly from tonguing indications, which are in the tradition of Hotteterre and other writers of wind tutors. The chief syllables used are

ti, ti and di, di	for equality	(Hotteterre: ⁴ tu, tu)
ti ri and di ri	for inequality, starting on a 'bad' note	(Hotterre: tu ru)
and ti dl or di dl	for inequality, starting on a 'good' note	

Two 'tis' often occur together when a phrase ends and another begins e.g.

³ J. J. Quantz, *Solfeggi pour la flute traversiere*, ed. Michel and Teske, Winterthur, 1978.

⁴ Jacques Hotteterre-le-Romain: *Principes de la flute traversiere, de la flute a bec et du hautbois* (Paris, 1707).

p 39 penultimate line

A word he is fond of is 'valeur'. This seems to mean: give the note its full value, in other words hold it right through to the end. Could 'valeur' mean 'equal'? I don't think so, because in one place Quantz writes 'valeur und unegal' (page 89, bottom).

If you approach this work against a background of inequality research, certain things strike you. Some of the inequality does not match Quantz's own instructions in the *Versuch* (or those of other the major theorists). For instance, the quaver inequality implied in the **C** time Presto on page 35 (3rd system) does not agree with Quantz's recommendation of unequal *semiquavers* in **C** time. Similarly unequal quavers in 2/4, as indicated on page 44 (6th system), go against normal practice, and against Quantz's own advice in the *Versuch*. (The 2/4 example on page 65 seems to conform to the norm). Maybe another kind of inequality is indicated here, such as durational inequality, in which some value is taken away from the end of the '*nuota cattiva*'.

In the *Versuch* Quantz advises the use of unequal quavers in 3/4 time. This is a French usage and appears in the *Solfeggi* in connection with a minuet from a duet by Simonetti (p. 77) where he instructs that quavers should be played unequally, even though they are extremely disjunct. But there are plenty of 3/4 examples in which the Italian practice of unequal semiquavers is clearly more appropriate. (See p. 13: allegretto and arioso; p. 41, 8th-10th systems) It is interesting that Quantz indicates that in 6/8 some semiquavers slurred in pairs should be '*nicht gar zu ungleich*' (not too unequal) but remarks that they could be more unequal if they weren't slurred. I find this confusing, since I have long since stopped believing that slurring in pairs has any effect on inequality, believing instead that inequality followed the note-value that was normally unequal in a certain time-signature. As for the puzzling 2/4 allegro on p. 44, I wouldn't agree with Fontijn's supposition that the slurring can have any effect on the inequality of the quavers here.

Another place where Quantz's advice in *Solfeggi* goes against his own recommendations in the *Versuch* is in his own Trio (p. 63). Here he marks some continuous semiquavers in 3/4 'etwas kurz und egal' (somewhat short and equal). Or does this a special effect only apply to the leaping semiquavers?

(to be continued in the September issue)

More from Miles November 7th, 1967.

My correspondence with Miles Kington continues.

I got rather a start when you mentioned C.P.E. Bach because when I was writing the original Times piece I almost said that he should be more attractive to jazz musicians than his father - the reason I decided not to was that I didn't know enough of his music and would only have based my opinion on an intuitive deduction from what I had heard. And I think I actually know the source of your quotation about lips drooping, brow sweating: on the one occasion that I dipped into the learned Burney, he described a visit to C.P.E. Bach's home in almost exactly those terms ...

I hadn't noticed the pitch alteration of the Parker tracks, probably because my piano is an indeterminate distance from concert pitch. (The tuner said that if he raised it to concert pitch, half the strings would probably break)... The remark on the Tristano LP about 'no use is made of ... tape sepeeding' was undoubtedly caused by the fact that on a previous LP he had experimented with superimposing several tracks on one another, one or more of which had been played at twice the normal speed. It caused a certain amount of head-shaking among the head-shakers at the time, so presumably the remark was to reassure them.

I certainly don't think that it was done to make them seem incredibly fast, because Parker and Gillespie sometimes played numbers appreciably faster even than that, though mainly out of bravado. (I once heard Ronnie Scott play a number at a ridiculous tempo and announce to the audience afterwards: "Well, it may have been rubbish, but you've got to admit it was bloody fast." Do you think the day will come when conductors treat their audience to that sort of running commentary? It reminds me of the - presumably - apocryphal story about the conductor who was just about to lead the orchestra into Dvorak's New World Symphony. Just as he had his

arms upraised for the first note, a sudden thought struck him - he put his arms down again, turned to the listeners and said: "Stop me if you've heard this one".)

I'd be interested to hear what you think of the counterpoint that emerges from the collectively improvised ensembles on the Armstrong record - some of the interlay between clarinet and trumpet I find very fine, even if a little harsh sometimes at first ... Yes, jazz violin is not the most satisfying sound in the world, which probably explains why there are so few jazz violinists. What with the Bach pantomime (Grappelli & co) and the Ellington record you have now heard fully half of all of them.

NEXT ISSUE

Overdotting - a volatile issue. An attempt to make sense of the hottest of hot potatoes. Was Neumann right to decry Dart's 'jerky' style? Or is overdotting an obsession that has got out of hand? I shall refer to the two recent Early Music articles by Dirst and Abravaya (February, 1997).

NOTES INÉGALES, A EUROPEAN STYLE: The 1996 summary of my conclusions on *inégaies* is continuously brought up to date. It is a 37,000 word document with a 40,000 word appendix. "He sets out his arguments here with clarity and force ... I like the consultative nature of this project." Clifford Bartlett, Early Music Review, November 1996.

BACH CASSETTE - Notes inégales, a breakthrough? - contains recordings of 15 pieces by JS Bach, including allemandes from the suites and partitas, preludes and fugues from the 48 and two chorale preludes. On its own it costs £6, including postage and packing.

UNEQUAL NOTES -the NEWSLETTER

The Unequal Notes newsletter is a quarterly in which I include samples of my research and give news of articles, lectures and conferences on *notes inégales*. If you would like to receive the Newsletter regularly, kindly send me an annual subscription of £2.00 payable on 1st September. Cheques made out to John Byrt please. Back numbers of UNEQUAL NOTES 50p each.

Inégalité in Purcell and Handel for voice and harpsichord by Catherine Bass and John Byrt. Cassette: price £4. **Purcell** - Hark how all things /

Hark the ech'ing air / Bid the virtues; **Handel** - O had I Jubal's lyre / As when the dove / Rejoice greatly.

Bach *inégal*. Extracts from Cantatas 21 and 140. Cassette: price £3. These are recordings made for academic purposes of experimental performances using inequality. They are intended to show the effect that inequality has on vocal runs and divisions and particularly on tempo.

**Dr John Byrt, 26 St Andrew Street, Tiverton, Devon,
EX16 6PH.Tel: (01884) 256806. Please note new address!**