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Abstract

Quantifying music genius, or Handel on the balance: A scale of musical merit from 1776

The December 1776 issue of the "Gentleman's Magazine," flagship of British periodicals, features an item unique in the history of 18th-century music: the “Scale to Measure the Merits of Musicians.” It comprises an evaluative chart of two-dozen composers, marking the first quantitative assessment of musical skill. This paper explicates the chart’s structure and content, traces its methodology to the founder of modern art criticism Roger de Piles, proposes Charles Burney as its likely author, and places it in the context of a rising music historiography in Britain.
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Evaluations of Handel and his music in the 18th century were typically verbal. Praise to his genius assumed the traditional form of poetic metaphor (Handel as modern Orpheus and, less often, returned David). More challenging was the breadth of appraisal he received in prose. This included public letters in support of his musical enterprises, passim references on him as the embodiment of progress in music, comparisons with canonical figures in other arts and sciences (Rubens, Shakespeare, Newton), and deployment of his music as dramatic setting (Fielding’s Amelia and Miller’s An Hospital for Fools). Beginning in the late 1730s, Handel was celebrated also in visual terms. His Vauxhall statue, and torsos of him became especially popular. Handelians seemed to be after a synaesthetic experience in their savoring of the master’s music along with reproductions of his image. Above all, the Handel memorial in Westminster Abbey (1762) stimulated reflection on his genius and music. Later in the century Handel would receive a different kind of appraisal, one far more congenial to the mercantile spirit of Britain: tabulation.

This experimental form appeared in 1776, annus mirabilis of music historiography thanks to Charles Burney’s and John Hawkins’ monumental histories. Monuments of historiography, though, tend to obscure their own historical presence and turn the attention away from their immediate surroundings. In the shadowy fringes of the two “General Histories” a document of just one page waits for recognition. Few know it exists, less than a handful have reported on it, and, to my knowledge, none has offered to explore it.¹ Confined to the cells of “amusing” and “extremely odd,” the document has yet to be evaluated. And for the study of Handel’s reception it offers a rare glimpse of the composer’s placement against musicians of recent generations.

A “Musicians’ Scale”
The “Scale to Measure the Merits of Musicians” appeared in the December 1776 issue of the Gentleman’s Magazine, the flagship of British periodicals.² Aptly signed with the alias “Justice


² The Gentleman’s Magazine 46 (1776): 543-44.
Balance,” it comprises a short introduction and a table [Figure 1]. Twenty-four composers, arranged alphabetically, receive marks on a 20-point scale in seven constituent categories of musical excellence.

The list of names offers a balanced mixture of old and contemporary musicians. Of the twenty-four nine were born in the 17th century, Blow (1648), Corelli (1653) and Purcell (1659) being the earliest. Thirteen were still alive in 1776, and seven were under the age of fifty, with Charles Dibdin (1745) just thirty one. Excluding Handel, half of them were foreign musicians representing mostly Italian or innovative styles (Scarlatti and Schobert3). Five had never experienced the English drizzle: Corelli, Marcello, Piccini, Schobert, and almost certainly Scarlatti. Their music, however, was either regularly performed or at least highly appreciated in London and elsewhere. Predictably, composers of instrumental and sacred music are outnumbered by those engaged in opera and secular vocal genres.

The seven columns present no less an interesting mixture of evaluative criteria. Much of Justice Balance’s introduction is spent in explaining them, though not always to the satisfaction of a modern reader. As he writes, “All the columns (except one) suppose 20 for the point of ideal perfection, 19 for the utmost pitch of human attainment, and 18 for the greatest height to which it has yet been carried.”4 Idealism being the engine of progress, Justice Balance prudently allows space for greater things to come in music.

The first three columns define natural aspects of musicianship typically understood as constituting genius. “Original” or “natural” melody refers to melodic inventiveness and fertility of ideas. The evaluation confirms the status of Handel (18), Corelli (18) and Geminiani (17) as masters. Arne (17) and Jackson (17) also receive confirmation as native masters of vocal genres. Next come Purcell (16) and Scarlatti (14) as old timers whose music valiantly survived stylistic changes. Interestingly, many fashionable figures in the 1770s receive very low marks (Abel, Bach, Dibdin, Fischer, and Piccini all receive “6”).

Less clear and potentially confusing is the category of “imitated melody.” To my understanding, it denotes the translation of poetical ideas or images into melodic formulas. This category, the author explains, stands inferior to original melody: “if natural and imitated melody were upon the same

4 The Gentleman’s Magazine 46 (1776): 543.
proportion, a composer who excels as much in the latter, as another in the former, might seem of equal rank; whereas natural melody is superior to imitated, at least, in the rates of 5 to 1, as I have put it.” A subcategory really of melody, its inclusion here upsets the table’s methodology, for its evaluative range is radically limited to only four points.

In “Expression,” the third column, modern composers get the upper hand, a clear marker of music’s progress in the past few decades. William Jackson of Exeter, celebrated at the time for his innovative settings of poetry, gets the trophy here (18). “Knowledge” and “Correctness” stand for the taught aspects of musicianship, theoretical understanding and observance of rules. Harmony should be understood as part of this cluster. One can easily observe the minimal fluctuation of scores for the same composer, an average of two points. As expected, the old masters fare much better than composers of recent times. Jackson is again the exception.

The last two categories are of special interest. “Performance,” to quote the author, “only notices such musicians as have appeared in public as performers.” Performers mainly of their own music, one might add. This category turns problematic, though, in the case of old masters. The author’s evaluation of Corelli (14), Scarlatti (16), and probably Schobert (18), could only have been possible on the basis of second-hand reports and their music, not on live performance. His methodology is thus compromised and the superiority of modern performers over those of the past suffers in credibility.

As for the seventh column, “Quality published or known,” Justice Balance is quick to assert that it is “of more consequence than may at first appear; for many productions shew a fertility of genius, and give a larger scope for criticism.” He illustrates the point as follows: “Handel seems by this balance to outweigh Geminiani but little, until you throw in the bulk of his works, and then the scale of the latter ‘kicks the beam.’” Indeed, a glance at this column may comfortably explain Handel’s crushing force in British music. Not only did he produce more, but his share in the music print market was vast. From song collections, methods for learning an instrument to full scores of oratorios and operas, Handel was the most easily available of composers in 18th-century Britain. Productivity, of course, is a concept much dear to a nation of traders. Accepting it as a parameter of excellence in music, Justice Balance forms a conceptual link whose utmost, if perverse, extension we encounter in the box-office charts of our times.

---


7 *The Gentleman’s Magazine* 46 (1776): 543.
Justice Balance leaves no doubt as to his innovative enterprise: “Musicians, he writes, have as yet been unweighed in the critical balance: but the time is now come for them, and I have undertaken the office.” The scheme itself, however, was anything but novel, as he readily states: “Some years since, an ingenious Frenchman, in his Lives of the Painters, gave us a scale to measure their different abilities.” Of the handful scholars who have reported on the document, no one identifies this author. Students of art criticism, though, may have little trouble recalling the name of Roger de Piles.

Origins

De Piles (1635-1709) was a French connoisseur, theorist and diplomat whose contributions helped usher in modern art criticism. Against the classicist aesthetics of the 17th century, he passionately championed color as a primary aspect in painting and promoted the separation of visual from intellectual content. These paralleled his efforts to canonize Rubens, one of his artistic heroes. In recognition of his work, De Piles was elected Fellow of the Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture in Paris. The last years of his life were spent in the production of two major works, L’abrégé de la vie des peintres (1699) and Cours des peintures par principes (1708). For this last he offered an appendix titled “Balance des peintres” [Figure 2]. Well-known painters are evaluated here on a 20-point scale on their mastery of Composition, Design, Coloring and Expression.

De Piles’ reception in England began in 1695, when John Dryden translated one of his first publications. The Art of Painting, and the Lives of the Painters appeared in 1706, and was

8 The Gentleman’s Magazine 46 (1776): 543.


12 [Charles-Alphonse Dusfresnoy], De Arte Graphica. The Art of Painting, by C. A. dy Fresnoy. With Remarks. Translated into English, together with an Original Preface containing a Parallel betwixt Painting and Poetry. By Mr. Dryden. As also a Short Account of the most Eminent Painters, both Ancient and Modern, continued down to the Present Times, according to the Order of their Succession. By another Hand (London: W. Rogers, 1695).
followed in 1711 by the *Dialogue upon Colouring.* It was in 1743 that “The Balance of Painters” became available to British readers as part of *The Principles of Painting.* According to Justice Balance, De Piles’ scale had already “been imitated and applied to poets, orators, and even to beauties.” I have been able to recover two such cases. *The Theatrical Review for the Year 1757 and Beginning of 1758* concludes with a “Scale of the Comparative Merit” of London’s Tragedians and Comedians ([Figures 3a-b]). The scale has still 20 points but the categories now reflect the unique dimensions of theater: “Action,” and “Voice,” for tragedians, and “Vis Comica” for comedians. The author acknowledges tragedy and comedy as separate domains in drama. Some actors appear in both scales, with David Garrick topping either. A more sophisticated version of these scales appeared as a


broadsheet in 1765, presumably relating to Garrick’s resuming his theatrical career after a two-year leave [Figure 4].

The second instance appears in a long essay by the Honorable Daines Barrington, “Experiments and Observations on the Singing of Birds” [Figure 5]. Dated 10 January 1773, it was read before the Royal Society in the following spring and published in its “Philosophical Transactions.” The categories this time directly touch on musical performance: “Mellowness of tone,” “Sprightly notes,” “Plaintive notes,” “Compass,” and “Execution.” Barrington might have misread De Piles in claiming that “I make 20 the point of absolute perfection, instead of 16, which is his standard.” It was only a matter of time before someone would apply the model on musicians.

Values beneath numbers
Casual readers of such tables may well dismiss the recurring digits and abstract categories as compulsive taxonomy or Cartesian delirium. Beneath the quantitative surface, however, the careful observer will find plenty of ideology. In the heated debates of late 17th century French art, De Piles emerged as a central spokesman of the Rubenistes, who resisted the primacy of design over coloring. He published treatises, pamphlets and even wrote a biography of Rubens to support his cause. By including coloring along with design in his categories, he was boosting the status of his heroes Rubens and Titian, while checking that of painters hitherto celebrated for their design. A comparison of Poussin (Design: 17, Coloring: 6) with Rembrandt (Design: 6, Coloring: 17) illustrates the point.

A century later, English music would experience an ideological struggle of no less import. The fact that it reached its zenith in 1776 is not accidental. The year 1776 weighed heavily on the shoulders of Britain because of the loss of her American colonies. Their Declaration of Independence marked the end of British grasp of America. More than this, however, it torn apart the British soul. For a nation who had hitherto understood itself as the land of the free and the home of the brave America presented the ultimate crisis of identity: either allow filial disobedience to the Crown or restore order.

---

18 A Critical Balance of the Performers at Drury-Lane Theatre. For the last Season 1765 (London: C. Moran, [s.d.]).
through civil war. The King’s decision is well known. Still more so its outcome: America to England was lost.21

As if to heal the wounds from destructive policies, literature and science came to Britain’s rescue, protecting her fame as Europe’s most advanced nation. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, by Adam Smith, instituted modern economics.22 Edward Gibbon’s *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* brought European historiography to a sublime peak.23 With ink barely dried up on the manuscript of *A Voyage towards the South Pole, and Round the World*, James Cook was embarking on his third naval exploration of the globe in hope of new discoveries for the glory that Britain was.24

Even music, by no way a priority to a nation of seamen and traders,25 offered its best. The year 1776 saw the dazzling achievements of Charles Burney and John Hawkins. The scope, methodology, and sheer effort put into their General Histories of Music were without precedent: Hawkins’ five thick volumes of narrative were “the produce of sixteen years labour,” as he informed the reader.26 And Burney, with only one of his four volumes in print, touted his academic diligence: “I have frequently

21 For a broad summary of the events leading to the Declaration of Independence, see Lawrence Henry Gipson, *The Triumphant Empire: Britain sails into the Storm, 1770-1776* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), 313-72.


23 Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire...Volume the First* (London: W. Strahan, and T. Cadell, 1776); the preface is dated “Feb. 1, 1776” (viii).

24 James Cook, *A Voyage towards the South Pole, and Round the World. Performed in His Majesty’s Ships the Resolution and Adventure, in the Years 1772, 1773, 1774, and 1775*, 2 vols. (London: W. Strahan, and T. Cadell, 1777); in the conclusion of his introduction, dated “July 7, 1776,” Cook writes “as I am on the point of sailing on a third expedition, I leave this account of my last voyage in the hands of some friends, who in my absence have kindly accepted the office of correcting the press for me” (xxxvi).


spent more time in ascertaining a date, or seeking a short, and in itself, a trivial passage, than it would have required to fill many pages with conjecture and declamation.”27 Music scholarship was coming of age.

In this context of national affirmation through intellectual achievements, the protection of cultural heritage became especially important. This found expression in music as a radical antiquarianism, which scored major victories with two events. In February 1776, a group of noblemen headed by John Montagu, Earl of Sandwich, instituted the “Concert of Ancient Music.” Functioning as a socially exclusive club, it regularly performed music that was at least twenty years old,28 a stricture that certainly upset leading connoisseurs: “I never heard or read of anything so completely absurd as the Concerti you tell me of,” Thomas Twining wrote to Burney:

If the institution had been to mix old pieces with new – to have a concerto of Corelli, Geminiani, &c., every night, &c., I shou’d not have been angry; for I confess I think compositions of that age & stamp do not deserve to be quite discarded; the less so, as there is nothing of the same kind (I mean full concertos not obligati) to be substituted for them in modern music. Nor shou’d I have grumbled if solo pieces had been limited; for I have found myself cloyed with a concert composed of such performances, tho’ excellent; one likes, sometimes, to hear music, as well as to hear playing. But to exclude modern music, &c., is such an absurd piece of childish retaliation, such a sulky bouderie! – never heard anything like it! ’Tis upon the true Egyptian & Prussian principle!29

The militant attitude behind this embargo on modern music ran parallel to John Hawkins’ long-standing conservatism. Entering the world of this art through the Academy of Ancient Music and its pedantic leader Johann Christoph Pepusch, Hawkins came to appreciate the vocal polyphony of two centuries before. In 1760, at the time he was beginning work on the History, he made a most revealing statement in the unlikely venue of the Compleat Angler: “I will tell the reader a secret; which is, that Music was in its greatest perfection in Europe from about the middle of the sixteenth to


the beginning of the seventeenth Century; when, with a variety of treble-instruments, a vicious taste was introduced, and harmony received its mortal wound.”\textsuperscript{30} The statement would be used as ammunition in 1777 for attacking the credibility of his \textit{History}\.\textsuperscript{31} Hawkins further promoted antiquarianism in his short \textit{Account of the Institution and Progress of the Academy of Ancient Music} (1770), where he dismissed objections to ancient (i.e. 16\textsuperscript{th}-century) music as “the result of a vicious taste and a depraved judgment.”\textsuperscript{32} It was more than evident what direction his \textit{History} would take: the celebration of 16\textsuperscript{th}-century masters of polyphony is matched by a total ban on living composers. By default, then, \textit{A General History of the Science and Practice of Music} supported the agenda of the “Concert of Ancient Music.” And if the latter boosted British nobility as a guardian of musical tradition,\textsuperscript{33} the \textit{History} was sanctioned by no less an authority than the King. Well-known for his conservative taste, George III was all too happy to accept the dedication of the work. On 14 November 1776, during an audience of more than an hour, he received from the author the first volume of \textit{History}, “professing his decided taste for what is called the old school.”\textsuperscript{34} Musical antiquarianism was scoring high in 1776.

The “Scale of Musicians” could not have been further away from Hawkins’ views. No 16\textsuperscript{th}-century composer appears in the chart and at least half of the listed musicians were alive and creative in 1776. Opera composers find representation with Piccini and Sacchini and modern virtuosi with Giardini, Fischer, and Abel.\textsuperscript{35} Still more, a chronologically arranged table shows that certain categories tend to favor modern composers [\textbf{Figure 6}]. The problematic rubric of “Imitated melody” shows a clear trend. In “Expression,” too, modern musicians reach easier the base of 10; and top scores in

\textsuperscript{30} Izaak Walton and Charles Cotton, \textit{The Complete Angler: Or, Contemplative Man’s Recreation. Being a Discourse on Rivers, Fish-Ponds, Fish and Fishing...in Two Parts} (London: Thomas Hope, 1760), 1:238n (continues from previous pages).

\textsuperscript{31} \textit{The Monthly Review; or, Literary Journal} 56 (January-June 1777): 137.

\textsuperscript{32} [John Hawkins], \textit{An Account of the Institution and Progress of the Academy of Ancient Music. With A Comparative View of the Music of the Past and Present Times. By a Member} (London: [?], 1770), 14.

\textsuperscript{33} Weber, \textit{Classics}, 143-46.


\textsuperscript{35} For a discussion of their careers in London, see Heartz, \textit{Galant Style}, 920-27.
performance go to current instrumentalists. It appears as if the “Scale” is balancing ideology no less than musical merit.

What reinforces this connection with Hawkins’ History is the temporal proximity of the two documents. The December 1776 issue of the Gentleman’s Magazine appeared in early January 1777. The “Scale of Musicians,” however, had been originally submitted for the November issue, as the following note attests: “To our CORRESPONDENTS ... The Musical Scale signed J----ce B-----e, will appear in our next.”³⁶ The note indicates at least two things: either lack of space or late submission made impossible its inclusion in the December issue; and the author might have been important enough to merit public notification. In any case, the piece was submitted no later than the end of November. And it was November 23 that Hawkins’ History became available. The ideological disparity and temporal coincidence of the “Scale” with the latter work lead to the question of its authorship. Who could have produced the table? Who was better suited to undertake this task? Above all, who was especially motivated at the time to mount resistance against Hawkins’ antiquarianism?

**A Burneying ambition**

When it comes to ephemera from 18th-century Britain, it is often impossible to establish authorship. The volume of publications is so high and the number of contributors so large that the quest seems nothing less than futile. Music writings, however, comprise only a fraction among hundreds of thousands of prints. And the chief participants in musical debates were few enough to escape from partial detection. Among them no one was as agitated in November 1776 as Charles Burney.

We know that since the early 1770s Burney had been anxious over Hawkins’ History (“when I first heard of his having Embarked in the same Business, my Courage was somewhat abated”).³⁷ At the same time, he recognized in him an ideological opponent:³⁸ “Modern Music & Musicians are likely to have little Quarter from such a writer...If S[i] John had ever had any Taste, the reading such a pack of old rubbish as he seems most to delight in w[oul]d have spoilt it.”³⁹ By 1775 Burney had already

³⁶ The Gentleman’s Magazine 46 (1776): 492.
³⁷ Charles Burney to Thomas Twining, 28 April 1773: Burney, Letters, 125.
begun to confront musical antiquarianism in public. In *The Present State of Music in Germany, the Netherlands, and United Provinces* he highlights the attachment of King Frederick to Quantz’s “taste of forty years ago.”

Burney’s anxiety turned, however, into obsession in 1776 and 1777. Fervently anticipated for months, the rival *History* was immediately and voraciously excerpted in newspapers and periodicals. Few could disregard its monumental scope and erudition. Burney’s driving fear was that it would compromise his reputation as the top music scholar of the age. Alas, this fear led him to actions that eventually did compromise his moral integrity and marred his posthumous reputation. Even though he had beaten the clock and published his first volume early in 1776 and to positive reviews, he started re-advertising it just days before Hawkins’ *History* came out. To highlight his professional superiority over Hawkins’ amateurship, he hastily composed, also in November, *Four Sonatas or Duets for Two Performers on One Piano Forte or Harpsichord*. In the preface to the work Burney touted the innovative character of such arrangement (“the following pieces are the first that have appeared in print, of this kind”). During 1777 he found the time and energy to compose a long satirical poem of 1000 lines, “The Trial of Midas the Second or Congress of Musicians. A Poem in three Cantos.” There he put Hawkins (i.e. Midas the Second) to trial for attacking composers of merit. Burney’s thoughts of directly attacking Hawkins in print were thwarted by his friends. This did not prevent him, though, from nudging some of them to take the pen on his behalf and supplying

---


44 Charles Burney, *Four Sonatas or Duets for Two Performers on One Piano Forte or Harpsichord* (London: the author, [1777]), “Preface.”

them with critical ammunition. A true defamation campaign was weighed against Hawkins in early 1777, including satirical attacks and negative reviews. Of these last, William Bewley’s three articles in the Monthly Review delivered a heavy blow to Hawkins’ reputation and the sales of his work.\footnote{The Monthly Review; or Literary Journal 56 (January-June 1777): 137-44, 270-78; and 57 (July-December 1777): 149-64; for the background of this literary assault and Burney’s role in it, see Lonsdale, Burney, 209-18.} If Burney was charged enough to “defend” his reputation in so diverse ways, would it be unthinkable that he could make use of De Piles’ scale as well? Aside from motivation, is there anything that strengthens the possibility of his authoring the “Scale”?\footnote{See his letter to Giardini, 21 June 1772: Burney, Letters, 116-17.}

Some interesting facts: Half of the living composers in Justice Balance’s chart happened to be subscribers to Burney’s History: Fischer, Jackson, Piccini, Garth, Giardini and Boyce; and of those who did not some had, it is known, financial problems at the time (Arne, Bach). Giardini, whom Burney knew personally,\footnote{Charles Burney, The Present State of Music in France and Italy: Or, The Journal of a Tour through those Countries, undertaken to collect Materials for A General History of Music (London: T. Becket, 1771), 76; also 68, 299; and Burney, Germany, 2:128.} had opened many doors for him in Italy and Germany. His name is frequently mentioned in the “Travels” as Burney’s referee (“I had a letter...from Signor Giardini, which procured me a very agreeable reception”).\footnote{Burney, France and Italy, 344.}

More substantial, the evaluation of most composers in the “Scale” coincides with the one we find in Burney’s “Travels,” History, and private correspondence. For example, his enthusiasm for modern virtuosos like Abel, Giardini and Fischer matches the top score (18) they receive as performers: “I find all over Italy that Giardini’s solos, and Bach’s and Abel’s overtures, are in great repute, and very justly so, as I heard nothing equal to them of the kind, on the continent.”\footnote{Burney, France and Italy, 344.} In a letter from 1771, he lauded Abel not only as a remarkable composer (“[he] has composed excellent symphonies & Quartets for violins”) but also as “the most perfect player of the Viol de gamba I have ever heard. Indeed his taste is the most exquisite & refined, & his judgment & learning the most perfect that I have ever met united in one performer.”\footnote{Charles Burney to Christoph Daniel Ebeling, November 1771: Burney, Letters, 102.}
Domenico Scarlatti, represented in England with just one publication, was another favorite: “I was early a great admirer of [his] original Fancy, boldness, delicacy, & Fire.”  Burney never lost his enthusiasm for him: “This is the only favourite Composer, for keyed Instrum[en]t" perhaps, whose works may be truly called inimitable.”  His pieces “were the wonder and delight of every hearer who had a spark of enthusiasm about him, and could feel new and bold effects intrepidly produced by his breach of almost all the old and established rules of composition.”  This could explain the low “10” Scarlatti gets for “Correctness” in the “Scale.”  No less enthusiastic is Burney for Schobert, whom he finds to be “well entitled to a niche in an English history of Music, his pieces for the harpsichord having been for many years the delight of all those who could play or hear them....In 1766, I was the first who brought his works to England from Paris.”  Not only that but he also introduced them in his pedagogical practice.  In the “Scale,” Schobert receives the top mark as a performer (18) and the second highest one (14) in the modernist category of “Expression.”

The comparable scores of Corelli and Geminiani fit Burney’s discussion of them as a pair of geniuses who shaped modern music. Even the modest marks they receive as performers (“14” and “15,” respectively) reflect the stories of “Corelli’s Inferiority in Execution to the Neapolitans of his Time,” and Geminiani’s employment difficulties in Naples, as “he was so inferior to the performers of that place.”

The “Scale” is unusually generous to William Boyce, who stands near the top in “Knowledge,” and “Correctness” (17), and on a par with Scarlatti in “Original melody” (14). This may be less of a surprise, though, if his close friendship with Burney is taken into account. Calling him “my late worthy friend” in 1789, Burney goes on to praise him as “one of the few of our church composers who neither pillaged nor servively [sic] imitated [Handel]. There is an original and sterling merit in his productions, founded as much on the study of our own old masters, as on the best models of other countries, that gives to all his works a peculiar stamp and character of his own, for strength, clearness,

---

51 Charles Burney to Thomas Twining, 14 December 1781: Burney, Letters, 330.
52 Burney, Letters, 11, n10.
55 Burney, Letters, 273, n5.
56 Charles Burney to Thomas Twining, 30 August 1773: Burney, Letters, 145, 146.
and facility, without any mixture of styles, or extraneous and heterogeneous ornaments.”

So appreciative was Burney of Boyce that he assigned him the role of judge in “The Trial of Midas the Second,” the creative outlet of his rage against Hawkins.

On the negative side, the chilling score of John Blow in modernist categories (Original melody: 4, Expression: 4) coincides with Burney’s harsh criticism of him: Blow is “confused and inaccurate a harmonist” who indulges in “licentious harmony and breach of rule” and uses “crude discords unprepared and unresolved.” Aware that he is treating one of Hawkins’ venerable masters, Burney makes a foray to sadism by providing “Specimens of D. Blow’s Crudities” for several pages.

Another fact that should not be overlooked here is Burney’s life-long interest in astronomy. Back in 1769 he had published an essay on comets “for the use of such only as give mathematicians credit for their calculations of the orbits, or paths of Comets in the heavens.” Perusal of astronomical calendars must have made him familiar with tabulation [Figure 7].

All of these are, to be sure, intriguing observations. What infuses them with indexical qualities is, however, the fact that Burney knew of De Piles and his scale all too well. One of the subscribers to the History was his friend Daines Barrington, who in 1773 had used De Piles’ method to evaluate bird singing. His paper was read at the Royal Society in three sessions, the last of which was on May 13.

---


58 See also Burney, Letters, 287, n12.

59 Burney, History 3, 447, 597, 448n. In case Blow’s scores in “Knowledge” and “Correctness” seem to be rather high to some readers, one should take into account the temporal distance between the two documents. By 1789, when Burney published Blow’s “crudities,” Handel had been formally crowned the supreme composer of sacred music: one would much easier dispense with Blow’s archaisms. Similarly, Burney himself had been upgraded into a royal chronicler and a celebrated Handelian: he could care much less about exposing Blow’s mistakes. In 1776, however, and given Hawkins’ praise of him as a master, the scores of Blow in these “traditional” categories are indeed substantially low.

60 Burney, History 3, 449-52.

61 Lonsdale, Burney, 80-81.

62 [Charles Burney], An Essay towards a History of the Principal Comets that have appeared since the Year 1742 (London: T. Becket, and P. A. de Hondt, 1769), [39].
On the 20th, Barrington formally proposed Burney to be admitted to the Royal Society. And from the latter’s correspondence we do know he was aware of Barrington’s research activity.

Not only was Burney aware of De Piles, but in the “Essay on Criticism” that prefaces volume 3 of his History, he offers unequivocal support to his scheme:

> It is not unusual for disputants, in all the arts, to reason without principles; but this, I believe, happens more frequently in musical debates than any other. By principles, I mean the having a clear and precise idea of the constituent parts of a good composition, and of the principal excellencies of perfect execution. And it seems, as if the merit of musical productions, both as to composition and performance, might be estimated according to De Piles’ steel-yard, or test of merit among painters....But as all these qualities are seldom united in one composer or player, the piece or performer that comprises the greatest number of these excellences, and in the most perfect degree, is entitled to pre-eminence: though the production or performer that can boast of any of these constituent qualities cannot be pronounced totally devoid of merit. In this manner, a composition, by a kind of chemical process, may be decompounded as well as any other production of art or nature.

It is in the same third volume, too, that Burney confesses his “having for many years been examining and comparing old authors, without neglecting the modern, in order to discover their intrinsic worth, and the rank they held with cotemporary [sic] composers, as well as the respect that is due to them from posterity.” Indeed, his German travelogue includes an index entry “On the comparative musical merit of the Germans and Italians.” And in an undated notebook on the history of German music, Burney regrets the difficulty in comparing Hasse and Handel on equal terms as each was little known in the resident country of the other: “How is it then possible either for the generality of English or Foreigners to form a Comparative Judgm[en] Concerning the Merit of these great Composers?”

This is exactly what Justice Balance seeks to achieve, but with composers adequately represented in England (which may explain why Burney favorites like Hasse and C.P.E. Bach are not included in the

---
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66 Burney, History 3, 605.
67 Burney, Germany, 2:340.
“Scale”). Above all, the recurrent concept of comparative merit shows Burney to be in full conceptual alignment with De Piles. In late 1776, Burney was certainly thinking of painting, for he concluded his preface to the *Four Sonatas* mentioned earlier with a direct analogy of the two arts: “It is hoped...that something analogous to *Perspective*, *Transparency*, and *Contrast* in painting, will be generally adopted in music, and be thought of nearly as much importance, and make as great a progress among students, as they have lately done in the other art.”

If Burney advocates the transfer of pictorial qualities in music, why should he not do the same with De Piles’ chart? I propose then that, among a small cluster of potential authors of the “Scale of Musicians,” Burney is the leading candidate.

**Handel**

Authorship is just one of many things to be said about the “Scale of Musicians.” The Burney connection, however, forces this hitherto obscure document out of the shadows. And its tabulated form provides a stark contrast to the narratives of Burney and Hawkins. By no means a tool of canonization, it offers a realistic appraisal of Handel in 1776 before ideology appropriated his image. What exactly this image is?

Handel clearly belongs in the founding generation of modern music, which includes Corelli and Geminiani. Among the old masters, he has no equal. Actually, the sheer volume of his works turns him into a master’s master. It is no coincidence that he gets top marks in the first and last categories. Eight years prior to the Commemoration Festival, his melodies were still popular, his reputation as organ player fresh in memory and the availability of his works stronger than ever. These are crucial indicators of posthumous endurance.

On the other hand, Justice Balance retains a critical distance by giving Handel a medium “2” in imitated melody, and a modest “16” in correctness. It is in expression, though, that Handel seems to have lost its primacy, as he gets a low “12,” and placed below composers like Bach, Schobert, Giardini and Jackson. Reigning supreme in the conventions of old music, he has to yield space to more recent composers and a new style of music. This veneration for the master combined with the acceptance of his outdated style confirm that in 1776 Handel was still belonging in history.

---

69 Burney, *Four Sonatas*, “Preface.”
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Figure 1

“Scale to Measure the Merits of Musicians,” The Gentleman’s Magazine 46 (1776): 544.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Musician</th>
<th>Original Melody</th>
<th>Imitated Melody</th>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Correctness</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Quantity Published or Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arne</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avison</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bach, John</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyce</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corelli</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croft</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibdin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garth</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geminiani</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giardini</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcello</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccini</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purcell</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacchini</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarlatti Domencio</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schobert</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2

Roger De Piles, *The Principles of Painting... To which is added, The Balance of Painters. Being the Names of the most noted Painters, and their Degrees of Perfection in the Four principal Parts of their Art:* (London: J. Osborn, 1743), 297-99.
The Scale of Tragedians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tragedian</th>
<th>Genius</th>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Voice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quin</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrick</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffop</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havard</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparks</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Cibber</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Bellamy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Pritchard</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Macklin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Woffington</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3a

The Theatrical Review: For the Year 1757, and Beginning of 1758...To which is added, A Scale of the Comparative Merit of the above Performers (London: J. Coote, 1758), 45.
* This gentleman's talents are so much out of the common road, that I cannot at present settle what his excellence is in each particular, and will therefore leave every reader to rate his merit according to his own feeling.

---

* Figure 3b

The Theatrical Review: For the Year 1757, and Beginning of 1758...To which is added, A Scale of the Comparative Merit of the above Performers (London: J. Coote, 1758), 46.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Grace</th>
<th>Spirit and Humour</th>
<th>Sentiment</th>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Love</th>
<th>Humours</th>
<th>Gesture</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Dignity</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ackman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baddeley</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baddeley, M.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bransby</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradshaw M.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet M.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cibber M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havard</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoppisley M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keen M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Wm.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packer M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Mrs.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parson M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pym M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyke, T.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slack M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yates M.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yates, Sir</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4

*A Critical Balance of the Performers at Drury-Lane Theatre. For the last Season 1765* (London: C. Moran, [s.d.]).
Figure 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>Dibdin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Bach</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>Schobert</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Sacchini</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>Piccini</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>Garth</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Giardini</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Boyce</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Arne</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Avison</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>Paradies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Geminiani</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Marcello</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Handel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Scarlatti</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td>Croft</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Purcell</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Corelli</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Blow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6

[“Scale to Measure the Merits of Musicians,” The Gentleman’s Magazine 46 (1776): 544.]
### Table of the Several Revolutions of Halley's Comet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Appearance</th>
<th>Place of the Ascending Node</th>
<th>Inclination of the Orbit</th>
<th>Place of Perihelion</th>
<th>Log. of the Perihelion Distance</th>
<th>Passage thro' the Perihelion, mean time at Paris</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Orbit by whom Calculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1 18 30 c 17 56 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.767540</td>
<td>June 8 22 10 Retr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pingré</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>1 19 25 c 17 56 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.753583</td>
<td>August 24 21 27 Retr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Halley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1 20 21 c 17 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.768490</td>
<td>October 26 3 59 Retr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Halley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>1 20 48 c 17 42 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.765236</td>
<td>Septem. 14 21 31 Retr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Halley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>1 23 49 c 17 39 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.768329</td>
<td>March 13 13 41 Retr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>La Caille</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7

[Charles Burney], *An Essay towards a History of the Principal Comets that have appeared since the Year 1742* (London: T. Becket, and P. A. de Hondt, 1769), 62.
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