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Telemann's Use of the Viol as a Solo or Concertant Instrument

Gordon J. Kinney

The initial intention in preparing this article was to offer a concise sequel to Alfred Einstein's dissertation of 1905 on the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century German literature for the viola da gamba, for which, of course, he set a terminus ad quem at 1700. The carrying out of this plan proved to be impracticable, not only because of the inaccessibility from here of that portion of the material that has survived wartime destruction; but also because of the vastness of its quantity — unforeseen when the survey was begun — which would call for a fair-sized book to do it justice. Therefore, this study was limited to the consideration of about fifty works by Georg Philipp Telemann: those instrumental compositions in which he employed the viol as a concertant instrument within the group, or as a solo instrument.

Inasmuch as Telemann's biographical data are generally less familiar than those of his younger contemporaries Bach and Handel, it is perhaps not out of place to summarize them briefly here.

Much of what is known of the composer's early life comes to us from three autobiographical writings: the first, dated September 14, 1718, was printed in 1731 by Johann Mattheson in his Grosse General-Bass-Schule (pp. 168ff.), to serve as a model for those of other composers he was planning to publish later; the second, dated December 20, 1729, is a letter to Johann Gottfried Walther, providing the latter with information he used in the article "Telemann" in his Lexicon of 1732; the third, longer and more detailed than the others, was written in 1739 and published the following year by Mattheson in his well-known collection of brief autobiographies and biographies, Grundlage einer Ehrengabe. From these, and from other contemporary sources, the following facts emerge.

---

1 The spelling concertant has been preferred here to the more common Italian form concertante because of the association of the latter with such terms as sinfonia concertante, which on this account might be misleading.
Georg Philipp Telemann, son of a Lutheran pastor, was born in Magdeburg in 1681. Not quite four years later his father died, leaving the boy in the charge of his mother and her piously straitlaced religious advisers.

He received his first education at what he called “little schools;” hole-and-corner establishments run by preachers to augment their meager salaries. There, Telemann tells us, “I learned the usual, namely: reading, writing, the catechism and some Latin.” Later he also taught himself to play the violin, the recorder and the cittern (not “zither,” as some translators have it; in the eighteenth century the cittern, popular in Telemann’s youth, was superseded by the guitar). With these instruments, as Telemann reports, “I entertained the neighbors without knowing that such things as notes existed.” At the age of ten he was sent to the Old City School, where he received more advanced instruction from the cantor, Benedict Christiani, and from the rector of the cathedral, N. Müller, whom Telemann credits with having awakened in him a love for German poetry.

He soon began composing and ventured so far as to compose an opera on a pilfered libretto, which he went on to produce with his schoolmates and to sing in himself. This deed incensed the strict religious advisers of Telemann’s mother, because opera, for them, was sinful, being associated with the theater, which they regarded as a den of iniquity. So the young musician’s mother deprived him of his musical instruments and sent him off to Zellerfeld to study the natural sciences and Latin with a celebrated scholar, Caspar Calvör. For Telemann this turned out fortunately, for Calvör was not only a scientist but also a competent musical theorist, who taught him the medieval theories of intervals and in doing so inculcated in Telemann a new and enduring reverence for music as an art, and not a mere pasttime.

Beyond this instruction and a very brief period in which he painfully endured lessons from an old organist who insisted on teaching him by the method of German organ tablature with outmoded fingerings, Telemann was, he tells us, entirely self-taught in music. He learned thoroughbass, for instance, by analyzing music to find out why things were done thus and so and then writing down his own rules accordingly.

We next find Telemann in 1697 at Hildesheim, where he added to his previous skills in the playing of the violin, the recorder and the clavier by teaching himself to play the oboe, the flute, the “Schalumoo,” the viola da gamba, the double bass, the trombone and other instruments. Thus we see from his own account that he had been familiar with the viola da gamba as a player since the age of sixteen.

In 1701, yielding once more to the entreaties of his mother, he again seemingly set music aside and entered the University of Leipzig with the declared intention of studying law. But he slyly made his abilities in musical composition known to his room-mate with a psalm setting he left lying about. The work was performed, was an immediate success, and eventually Telemann was given a contract to write a cantata for the church every fortnight. Three years later, having meanwhile persuaded his mother to allow him to abandon jurisprudence permanently in favor of music, he became musical director and organist at the New Church.

A year after that, in 1705, we find him engaged as capellmeister in Sorau to Johann Wilhelm, duke of Saxony. Himself an enthusiastic musician, the duke had acquired a fondness for the French style, in which, consequently, Telemann learned to write. The duke also took the composer along on trips to Poland, where he heard a great deal of Polish folk music, of which he gives vivid descriptions. Telemann later embodied the rhythms of this music in his own works, “dressed”—as he put it—“in an Italian coat.”

Then came war. To escape its dangers, Telemann moved to another of the Duke’s domains, Eisenach, in 1706. There, two years later, he met Johann Sebastian Bach, and they became friends. This is evidenced by the fact than in 1714 Telemann stood as godfather at the christening of Bach’s second son, Carl Philipp Emanuel.

In 1709 Telemann married. It was a love match, but all too brief, for his wife died fifteen months later after giving birth to a daughter.

\[2\] Telemann’s spelling of “chalumeau,” a precursor of the clarinet.
Telemann's next move, in 1712, was to Frankfurt-am-Main, where he was made musical director and given the title of "chapel-master at large" ([Kapellmeister von Haus aus]). This rank entailed responsibility for the music in several churches. In Frankfurt he also directed the collegium musicum, long-established, for a social club which met in an ancient edifice, the Frauenstein, from which it took its name. Ever the progressive, Telemann broke with tradition there by initiating the giving of concerts in the churches.

Shortly before 1721, when Telemann moved to Hamburg, he entered into a second marriage, from which, in due course, there issued eight sons and a second daughter. But this proved not to be a happy marriage — in one of his letters to a close friend Telemann refers to his wife as "my whimpering helpmate" — and it ended when, in the late 1730s, his wife absconded with a Swedish officer, taking the family savings with her and leaving Telemann in debt as a consequence.

With the exception of one important trip to Paris in 1737, (of which further mention will be made later) Telemann remained from then on in Hamburg, working there right up to the time of his death in 1767 at the age of eighty-six.

There is not space here to go into the details of Telemann's musical activities and the vicissitudes that he suffered during his forty-six years in Hamburg: it would take at least a whole volume. For now, let it suffice to say that these were the years of his maturity as a composer, during which his greatest works were produced.

And now to the music for the viola da gamba.

The forms of the works under consideration are the sonata, the suite and the concerto — the sonata being the form represented in most of the examples.

Telemann's sonatas and concertos are in the main derived from Italian models, as these captions would imply. Nevertheless, they already embody the spirit of the Enlightenment, with German Empfindsamkeit in the slow movements and a quality of gallantry in the dance movements. The latter is also evident in fugal move-ments, which are never "learned"-sounding, but always cheerful and vivacious. His suites, also, seem to be influenced as much by his German predecessors as by their French models.

The first work to be discussed here, for unaccompanied viol, is generally referred to as a sonata, although Telemann himself did not so caption it. It appeared first in a short-lived musical periodical founded by Telemann — probably the first of its kind to consist entirely of music — Der getreue Music-Meister, which he issued and in part engraved himself in Hamburg in 1728 and 1729. In keeping with its name, The Faithful Music Teacher was issued fortnightly in the form of "lessons," consisting of brief cantatas and short instrumental pieces which occupied a page or two each. The work for unaccompanied viol appears on pages 57 and 61, page 57 being captioned "Fifteenth Lesson" and page 61 "Sixteenth Lesson." Lesson fifteen consists of two movements, both in D major, marked Andante and Vivace. Lesson sixteen also consists of two movements, the first of which, in B minor, begins with a Recitativo. This introduces an Arioso with the marking Andante. The concluding movement, a rondeau in D major marked vivace, is a brilliant German dance in 3/8.

The treatment of the instrument in this work shows Telemann's great familiarity with the German style of viol technique, as exemplified in the solo works of his Seventeenth-century predecessor, Johann Schenk. The double-stops, chords, fugal writing, use of open-string pedals and the passage-work generally are all highly idiomatic and call for a performer with a virtuoso technique, especially the very difficult string crossings in the Andante of Lesson Sixteen. Indeed, one might well ask, considering its appearance in a publication of this kind, for whom it was intended. We find a hint in Telemann's foreword, where he says (speaking of Hamburg): "I find myself in a locality where Musica, too, seems to have her native land, where the most eminent and highly-regarded persons reward the art of music with their attention, where various noble families count virtuose among them ..." Doubtless Telemann, during his Frankfurt years, became acquainted with the gamba virtuoso Ernst Christian Hesse, who had been a pupil of both Marais and the elder Forqueray in Paris, and had at this time settled as Kapellmeister in nearby Darmstadt.
It is known that Telemann also composed and published a set of twelve fantasies for viol without bass in 1735, but these works are now considered to be lost.

Also belonging in the category of works without continuo are the duet sonatas for which viols are designated by the composer among the optional pairs of like instruments, the others being flutes, recorders or violins. Two of these duets are found in the Geistreue Music-Meister: the first in Lesson Three, the second in Lesson Twenty (items 10 and 61, respectively, of the 76 works in this series).

Six more duo sonatas, in the form of canons, were published as Telemann's Opus 5 in Paris in 1728. These charming works are largely unknown to, or at any rate neglected by, viol players. There are two possible reasons for this neglect. First: Telemann noted the earliest of these in the French violin clef for recorder players, with the explanation that violinists should read them in the treble clef, and gambists in the alto clef, using the same staff positions of the notes with appropriate changes of signature and other accidentals. Thus recorder players sound this work in B-flat, violinists in G, and gambists in A. Since few string players today practice transposition by clef, they tend to pass these works up. The second reason: since Bärenreiter (the publisher) has seen fit to publish both sets in the treble clef for flutes or violins, Telemann's prescription will not work for the notes printed in these staff positions. Thus violinists, in the first instance, play the work a minor third too high for them — in B-flat instead of G, as the composer intended. For viol players, the correct solution is to read this edition as though in the tenor clef, which — since many are reformed cellists anyway — ought not to be too difficult for them. The Sonata in G in Lesson twenty, however, sounds best on viols simply played an octave lower. For the six canonic sonatas there are two possibilities: (1) read the flute version in the tenor clef with appropriate accidentals, or — which lies better on viols — (2) play from the edition transposed a minor third higher for recorders, and read it in the bass clef with appropriate accidentals. The works then sound a minor sixth plus an octave lower than the recorder keys.

This whole question of clef transposition as a common Baroque practice, for which there is a great deal of documentary evidence, needs further investigation.

Next to be considered are three sonatas for viol and thorough-bass. Of these, the one in G major (also playable on, and perhaps originally intended for, the treble viol) was first published in the Geistreue Music-Meister series. It is fairly easy to play and was obviously intended for amateurs.

The other two, respectively in E minor and A minor, which are much more demanding technically, were issued by Telemann shortly after 1739 (thus after his contact with the younger Forqueray in Paris) in his series of sonatas and trios titled Essercizi Musici [his spelling]. The A minor sonata, which shows the influence of Corelli, displays an interesting poly-rhythmic configuration in the second movement, a double fugue, in which the two subjects not only appear simultaneously, but there is in one a measure of groups of four sixteenth notes [semiquavers] against eighth note [quaver] triplets in the other. This polyrhythm recurs consistently in invertible counterpoint with each double entry of the subjects. Telemann also employs this same rhythmic device of four-against-three in one of his two trios in E major (to be mentioned later).

Also in the Essercizi Musici series is a work which falls on the borderline between the solo and the trio sonata: a sonata in G major for viola da gamba, cembalo obligato and basso continuo. Since the continuo part is figured, two harpsichords are needed for performance. The obligato cembalo part, aside from the few chords in the second movement, is throughout in the two-voiced texture characteristic of the style galant of the Berlin school. The second movement, a Largo in E minor, is in the form of a solo arioso for the gamba in which the obligato cembalo is heard only in the thirteen-bar opening and its recurrence at the end, both

\[3\] Both will work also for Telemann's duet sonatas, Op. 2, for violins or flutes, which sound excellently on viols although in this instance Telemann did not include viols among the optional instruments listed on the title page.

\[4\] Jean Rousseau's Traité (Paris 1687), pp. 120-151, provides "Modelles" of clef transposition at various intervals.
times ending on the dominant of E minor. Telemann wrote several trios with obligato cembalo parts, each time with different melody instruments.

Of course Telemann composed a very large number of trio sonatas with the conventional Corelli scoring of two violins and continuo. He even acknowledges his indebtedness to the Italian composer in one set which he titled *Sonatas Corellianotes* (1734-35; now available in the *Telemann Ausgabe*). However, the trios of interest to us here are those in which he followed a German tradition, well established by Buxtehude, Erlebach, Reinken and others, in which a tenor instrument — in this case the gamba — is used instead of a second treble instrument.

I have identified eight trios by Telemann for violin, gamba and continuo.

Here a word of caution about methods of reference seems pertinent. In the case of so prolific a composer as Telemann, it is insufficient to identify such a work merely by key and instrumentation. One needs, besides, the captions of the movements and their meter signatures. Best of all determinations is the manuscript number of the source. Here, too, caution must be observed. The largest manuscript source is in the Darmstadt manuscript formerly numbered 3775, which contains well over eighty works. Apparently this manuscript caused the librarians in the Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek, where this manuscript is preserved, some trouble. On several microfilms I have observed that the old 3775 is crossed out and another number — this time different for each work — written alongside it. To the right of these numbers appears a still newer symbol, e.g. 1042/49, which appears to signify the 49th item in Ms. No. 1042, since the latter number appears on several different works.

The point of this digression will be seen in the fact that the first three of the trios now to be discussed are all in G minor. I edited the one marked 3775/677 some years ago from a manuscript copy in the British Museum, unaware at that time of the existence of the other two. When I saw advertised what seemed to be the same work, I was somewhat taken aback; but I ordered it anyway, and it turned out to be the one of Ms. No. 3775/637.

Subsequently, I obtained a published version of the third one, Ms. No. 3775/659, of which I learned from Floyd D. Funk’s dissertation (1954): a study which has been very helpful to me in identifying these works. The other five of Telemann’s known trios for this combination of instruments are all in major keys, respectively G, D, E, E and F. All of these are in the Darmstadt manuscript collection except the second of the two in E major, of which I have made an edition after the copy in the British Museum, Ms. Add. 33296 (which also contains a number of gamba works by other composers). The trio sonata in F has been published under the nickname “Darmstadt Sonata,” which, in view of what has just been said, does not seem very helpful as an identification. The other trio in E major has been issued by Peters in an edition by Christian Döbereiner with the title “Concerto für Violine und Viola da Gamba mit Cembalo.” The editing is in nineteenth-century style with countless added expression marks and a stylistically anachronistic keyboard realization.

The next category to be considered consists of trio sonatas in which the viol is paired with a wind instrument: sometimes the traverse flute, sometimes the recorder, and sometimes the oboe. Four of them, respectively in F, g, C and d, are scored for treble viol, recorder and continuo. All of these have been published and the ones in F and C have been recorded. There are also five more, respectively in G, g, E-flat, d, and e, for treble viol, oboe and continuo. Treble viol players looking for something to play which does not involve assembling an English consort of viols, take note of these nine works! Three of those with oboe have so far been published. It should be noted in connection with these works that the Baroque oboe was a much softer-toned instrument than the modern oboe, consequently less prone to drown out the treble viol; so modern oboe players, in performing these works, must do so with the greatest discretion. There is also one trio, in F, for recorder, bass viol and continuo. It, too, has been published and recorded.

---

5 For information concerning these works I am indebted to J. Robert Flexer, founder of the Palo Alto Telemann Society, which has published his thematic index of all the trio sonatas by Telemann so far found.
Of Telemann’s five known trio sonatas for flauto traverso, viola da gamba and continuo — respectively in a, b, c, g and g (all minor keys) — only the first three have so far been published and none has been as yet recorded. My own edition of the one in A minor was made in 1967 from the manuscript copy in the British Museum. I have performed it several times since with various partners on flute and continuo, and we found it to be a charming work and its instrumentation effective. The one in C minor differs from the others in form. It has six movements: Andante, Allemande, Menuet, Aria Largo, Gigue and Rejouissance Presto; thus it partakes of the nature of Telemann’s kind of suite rather than of the sonata, properly speaking.

Continuing along the line of increasingly larger instrumental combinations, we come next to two quartet sonatas, both in G major, both for flute, two gambas and continuo. One of them has been recorded but, so far as I know, remains unpublished. I edited it from the British Museum manuscript copy and it was performed here in Lexington a few years ago. The scoring is for flauto traverso, two bass gambas and continuo. The other one has been published by Sikorski in Hamburg but, in a misguided measure of economy, the Gamba I part has been issued an octave too high, in the treble clef, to make it available to violinists. This procedure in itself would be justifiable if the Gamba II part had been treated the same way, since Telemann himself had presented this alternative, but to mix the two versions and above all not to issue a Gamba I part in the proper notation as it appears in the manuscript seems reprehensible because it is misleading.

Perhaps Telemann’s most successful efforts in the combination of flute with strings and continuo are to be found in his two sets of six each so-called “Paris Quartets,” now available in volumes 18 and 19 of the Telemann-Ausgabe, edited by Walter Bergmann. The scoring may well be unique. Telemann calls for traverse flute, violin, viola da gamba or violoncello, and continuo. The composer has supplied both a gamba part and a cello version of it. The fact that the latter is simplified by omitting some of the double stops, and also by putting some of the passages down an octave to avoid awkwardness on the cello shows that he originally had the gamba in mind for this part.

The first set of these works, composed in 1730, consisted of four “quadri,” as he called them, divided into two concerti, two balletti, and two sonate. The two concertos are three-movement works in the familiar fast-slow-fast design; the balletti are suites of dance movements in the French manner; the sonate are four-movement works in the Corelli–Handel slow-fast-slow-fast formula in which the fast movements have fugal expostions. These works proved to be so attractive to the French that Telemann was invited to come to Paris. He was unable to accept the invitation at the time, but finally, in 1737, the “long-planned journey” — as he characterized it — took place. His eight-month stay in Paris was a triumph for him and he was heard in several concerts of his major works, instrumental and vocal. He brought with him the second set (“six new quartets”) for the same instrumental combination used in the previous set and, taking advantage of the twenty-year royal privilege granted to him by the King of France, had them engraved and published in Paris. He tells of performing these works with the most eminent French artists: Blavet (flute), Guignon (violin), Forqueray the younger (gamba), and Eduard (violoncello). The superb playing of these artists, Telemann wrote in 1739, “made the ears of the Court unusually attentive, and earned for me, in a short time, an almost universal honor, which was accompanied with increasing politeness.”

Both sets have been recorded complete: the first, excellently, with gamba; the second, superbly, with cello.

Last to be mentioned are two works which involve the accompaniment of string orchestra and continuo. The first of these is the Suite in D major, for Viola da gamba and Strings. It contains seven movements, all in French style. The second is the Concerto in A minor for Alto Recorder, Viola da gamba and Strings. It is in the four-movement Italian church-sonata form, but with Telemann’s own stylistic adaptation of it well in evidence. Both of these works have received modern publication and both have been recorded — the concerto twice.

By way of conclusion it may be said that no other German composer of the eighteenth century has given us so many works featuring the viola da gamba in a solo or in a concertant capacity,
and none has written more idiomatically for the viol. The musical quality of these works is uniformly high and in this respect is rivaled only by the four instrumental works by J. S. Bach in which he employs the gamba: three sonatas for viola da gamba and cembalo obligato and the sixth Brandenburg Concerto, in which he employs two gambas in the two outer movements. The classified list, which follows, presents the works in the order in which they have been discussed above.

I. Works without basso continuo.

1. [Sonata] in D major for Viol Alone


2. Duetto a Flauti dolci o a Flauti traversi o a Viole di Gamba.
Source: Der getreue Music-Meister, Lesson 3. (In B flat, G, or A major, respectively, according to the choice of instrument and signature.)

Modern Edition: Dietz Degen, ed. Published in B flat in treble clef as “Sonata I” in No. 11 of the series Hortus Musicus, BA 1696 (Kassel: Bärenreiter-Verlag, 1949), under the title Vier Duette für Blockflöten oder andere Instrumente.

Source: Der getreue Music-Meister, Lesson 20.

Modern Edition: Published in G in treble clef as “Sonata in D-dur” in No. 11 of Hortus Musicus (see item 2 above). Playable on viols best an octave lower.


Modern Editions:

a. Günter Hausswald, ed., Telemann’s Musikalische Werke, (Band VIII), BA 2958, as Sechs Sonaten im Kanon, op. 5 (1738) für zwei Querflöten oder Violinen (Kassel: Bärenreiter-Verlag, 1955). Contents arranged by keys, thus: 1 (G), 2 (g), 3 (D), 4 (d), 5 (A), 6 (a). On viols read in tenor clef in keys of F, f, C, c, G, and g, respectively. The order varies in different eighteenth-century publications.

b. Edwin F. Kalmus (New York, n.d.). This edition for recorders is in the keys of B flat, F, c, f, C, and b flat. Numbers three and four are awkward on recorders, and work better one tone higher.


II. Works for solo viol and basso continuo.

10. [Sonata in G major for treble or bass viol and continuo.]
Source: Der getreue Music-Meister, Lesson 24.


Recordings:


b. Archiv Production: ARC 3043 (Koch, Gerwig [lute]).

c. Heliodor: H/HS-25006. Same artists as above but less well recorded.

11. [Sonata in A minor.]
Source: Esercizi Musici, “Solo 3°” (Hamburg; dated 1739 in MGG; elsewhere as “after 1720” and “after 1740.”)

12. [Sonata in E minor.]
Source: *Essercizi Musici*, “Solo 9.” (see Item 11 above).

III. *Work for solo harpsichord, viol, and basso continuo.*
Sources:
   b. Darmstadt MSS. 3775/26, 1042/92, and 3775/92 (in score).
   c. Marburg MS. 21785.
   d. British Museum MS. Add. 33296.

IV. *Eight trios for violin, viol and thoroughbass.*
14. [Sonata in G minor] From Six / TRIO / dont / ... / Le 5. est à Violon, Basse de Viole et Basse Chiffrée.
Sources:
   a. Darmstadt MSS. 3775/637, 1042/45.
   b. Marburg MS. 21785/5/(No. 5) (from *Sei Terzetti*).

Source: Darmstadt MSS. 3775/659 and 1042/71.

Sources:
   a. Darmstadt MSS. 3775/677, 1042/89; parts 1047/89.
   b. British Museum MS. Add 33296.

Sources:
   a. Darmstadt MSS. 3775/674, 1042/86.
   g. British Museum MS. Add. 33296.

Sources:
   b. Darmstadt MSS. 3775/643, 1042/55.
   c. Marburg MS. 21785.
   d. Brussels MS. 7115.
Modern Edition: None found.

Source: Darmstadt MSS. 3775/662, 1042/74.
music by adding not only an excessive number of bowing slurs but also exaggerated dynamics and tempo changes as well as heavy octaves in the keyboard part. He takes the title “Concerto” from the fact that this word appears as a caption to the first movement in one of the parts.


Sources:
   a. Darmstadt MS. 1042/85.
   b. British Museum MS. 33296.


Sources:
   a. Darmstadt MSS. 3775/661, 1042/73.
   b. East Berlin, Klingenberg Coll., in score.


V. Trio Sonata for alto recorder, bass viol and thoroughbass.


Sources:
   a. Essercizi Musici, Trio 7.
   b. Darmstadt, MS. 1045/1.
   c. Marburg, MS. 21785.
   d. Brussels, MS. 7115.


Recording: Nonesuch: H-71119 (Krause, Domnisch, Ristenpart, Hindrichs).

VI. Four Trio Sonatas for alto recorder, treble viol and continuo.


Source: Darmstadt, MS. 1042/26. [This manuscript has Dessus de viole instead of violino, and Musical Heritage Society recording number 1475 gives the instrumentation as “recorder, treble viol and continuo.” It is probable that both instruments were used in different early performances. The Italian title given above is quoted in Edgar H. Hunt’s edition as being “from an old manuscript.”]

Modern Editions:


Source: Darmstadt MSS. 3775/651, 1042/63.

Modern Editions:
   a. M. Ruetz, ed., Schott No. 3655 (Mainz: Schott, 1939). [This edition is the same as OFB 109 and RMS 212.]


Source: Darmstadt MSS. 3775/623, 1042/35.


Source: Darmstadt MSS. 3775/61, 1042/33.

VII. Four Trio Sonatas for treble viol and oboe with continuo.

27. Sonata [in G major] [pour] Hautbois, Dessus de Viole et Basse.
Source: Darmstadt MS. 1042/25.

Source: Darmstadt MS. 1042/22.
Modern Edition: None found.

Source: Darmstadt MS. 1042/24.
Modern Edition: None found.

30. Sonatina a 3, Dessus de Viole, Oboe e Basso Continuo.
Source: Darmstadt MS. 1042/9.
Modern Edition: K. Hoffmann, ed., Hortus Musicus No. 224 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1975). [This work opens with the traditional theme representing the making of the sign of the Cross employed by countless composers, including Bach, Handel, Haydn and Mozart— to name only a few.]

VIII. Trio Sonatas for flauto traverso, viola da gamba and continuo.

Sources:
a. Darmstadt MSS. 3775/675, 1042/87.

b. British Museum MS. Add. 33296.
Modern Editions:

Sources:
a. Darmstadt MS. 1042/43.
b. Marburg MS. 21785.

Sources:
a. Darmstadt MS. 1042/77.
b. Berlin E., Klingenberg.

34. Sonata [in G minor] a Flauto traverso, Viola di Gamba e Cembalo.
Sources:
a. Darmstadt MSS. 3775/634, 1042/46.
b. Berlin E., Klingenberg, 72.
Modern Edition: None found.

Sources:
a. Rostock.
b. Berlin E., Klingenberg.
c. Dresden MS. 2392/Q/57.
Modern Edition: None found.
IX. Quartet Sonatas for flute, two viols and thoroughbass.

Source: Darmstadt MS. 1042/68.
Recording: Archiv Production: ARC 73224 (Ulsamer, Haferland, Grebe, K. Koch).

Sources:
   a. Darmstadt MS. 1042/90.
   b. British Museum MS. Add. 33296.
[The editor remarks: “First modern performance of this work occurred in Hamburg, December 1968, under the direction of Karl Grebe.” The part for Gamba I is published in treble clef an octave too high. Telemann did give the option, however, of playing both gamba parts an octave higher on violins.]

X. “Paris Quartets” for flute, violin, viol or cello, and thoroughbass.

38-43. QUADRI / a / VIOLINO, FLAUTO TRAVERSIERE, VIOLA DI / GAMBO O VIOLONCELLO, / E FONDAMENTO; / ripartiti in / 2. CONCERTI, / 2. BALLETTI, / 2. SONATE, / e / composti / da / GEORGIO FILIPPO TELLEMAN. [Handwritten: “Anno 1730”]
[Reprinted in Paris by Le Clerc in 1736 in a deluxe edition which rectified the errors of the first edition, which was badly printed on bad paper (in Hamburg).]
Contents: Concerto Primo (G major); Concerto Secondo (D major); Sonata prima (A major); Sonata Seconda (G minor); Première Suite (E minor); Deuxième Suite (B minor).
Recording: Musical Heritage Society: MHS 1072/1073 (A. Harmoncourt, violin; L. Stastny, flute; N. Harmoncourt, viola da gamba; H. Tachezi, harpsichord).

Contents: Premier Quatour (D major); Deuxième Quatour (A minor); Troisième Quatour (G major); Quatrième Quatour (B minor); Cinquième Quatour (A major); Sixième Quatour (E minor).
Recording: Telefunken series Das Alte Werk: SAWT 9523-AEX and SAWT 9448 (Brüggen, flute; Schröder, violin; Bylsma, cello; Leonhardt, harpsichord).

XI. Suite for viola da gamba, string orchestra and continuo.

50. Suite, D dur, für Viola da Gamba concertato, Streich-orcheste und Continuo.
Modern Editions:
Recording: RCA Victrola: VICS-1272 (Johannes Koch, viola da gamba; with Collegium Aureum, Rolf Reinhardt, conductor).
XII. *Concerto for recorder, viola da gamba, strings and continuo.*

51. *Concerto a-Moll für All-Blockflöte, Gambe, Streicher und B. c.*

Modern Editions: Moeck 1064 (Celle: Herman Moeck Verlag, n.d.).

Recordings:


b. Musical Heritage Society: MHS 1601 (M. Piguet, recorder; Jordi Savall, viola da gamba; Jean-François Paillard Chamber Orchestra, Jean-François Paillard, conductor).

**ABBREVIATIONS**

Darmstadt = Hessische Landes- und Hochschule Bibliothek, Darmstadt, West Germany.

Marburg = Westdeutsche Bibliothek, Marburg, West Germany.
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Hubert Le Blanc’s Concept of Viol Sound

John Rutledge

Hubert Le Blanc’s Défense de la basse de viole ... occupies a singular place in the literature surrounding the gamba. Le Blanc offers us less an exact method or tutor than a fanciful “appreciation” of the instrument. Although Le Blanc might be considered the Brillat-Savarin of the gamba, he is virtually unknown to the history of music. The Défense seems to be his only theoretical contribution to the field, though he surely had some practical effect as a virtuoso and connoisseur. Despite this relative neglect, Le Blanc remains an important chronicler of the change in aesthetic attitudes that took place in France in the first half of the eighteenth century.

The title page of the Défense tells us that Le Blanc was a doctor of law, yet we must wonder whether his degree was in civil and canon law, or only in canon law, for he was also an abbé, according to Michel Corette (Viole d’Orphée, 1780). The degree “docteur en droit” typically required an additional year of study, two examinations and a public “act,” although regional variations can be found. The degree was a mark of distinction of which Le Blanc was justly proud. The greatest significance of his having been a lawyer is surely the fact that his Défense has as its form a dramatic courtroom scene with each side presenting its arguments to be judged.

Le Blanc’s brief in support of the viol, the Défense, was published by Pierre (or Pieter) Mortier in Amsterdam. Although Fétis, who is practically our only source for Le Blanc, reports that Le Blanc was unable to find a publisher in Paris for his eccentric little work, this statement must be read with a measure of scrutiny.

Possibly the Paris publishers, who would have had a good sense of what would sell in the fashion capital of Europe, feared that they might not sell enough copies to justify printing, given the declining popularity of the basse de viole in 1740. The publication of the work in Amsterdam casts no aspersions on the quality of the writing: Mortier was quite a reputable publisher who specialized in editions of French works and in Bible printing. In the eighteenth century, many French books were published in Holland (or were given fake Dutch imprints!) to avoid French censorship, but that can hardly be the case with so unpolitical a work as the Défense. Moreover, the Dutch had long been known for the quality of their printing, so that it is no wonder that Le Blanc was “transporté de joie” as Fétis reports, when his manuscript was accepted.

In 1741 Le Blanc published a lengthy second work with Mortier entitled Le Czar Pierre Premier en France. Following the eighteenth-century penchant for the dialogue, Le Blanc here offers a sequence of fictive conversations among persons of varying persuasions on philosophical, ethical and social issues. For more than 300 pages, Czar Peter the Great, the ardent Westernizer of Russian culture, listens to arguments from cultural representatives such as Fontanelle, a Malebranche, partisans of Pascal and Mollière, a rich man, Harlequin, and many others. Le Czar is overburdened with Classical references as is the Défense. Musical topics occur infrequently and never as the main subject of interest, but rather as supportive examples and asides. The opinions expressed in Le Czar harmonize totally with those of the Défense and amplify Le Blanc’s ideas in certain instances.

The Défense then is our main source for Le Blanc’s concept of sound, and in reading it one watches with amazement as Le Blanc unfolds his various methods for describing the sounds he heard. Le Blanc has far more to say about the sound of the gamba than one

---


2 François Joseph Fétis, Biographie universelle ..., XV, p. 238. Albert Erhard in the Muckwurt to his translation of the Défense also questions the reliability of Fétis on this point (Verteidigung der Viola da Gamba ..., Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1951, p. 138.)


Le Blanc gives us one of the pithiest, most humorous and ironic descriptions of the sound of the gamba, revealing at once Le Blanc’s quixotic personality and his social circumstances. “The sound of the basse de viole, drawing upon the tone of a diplomat which is not loud and even somewhat nasal, is more appropriate for a gentleman . . .” 6 The simile summons up images of be-wigged ambassadors strutting around Versailles, pausing occasionally to strike an angular pose. Beyond its comic and connotative value, this description serves to remind us of the difference in attitude between those engaged in reviving the viols and those for whom viols were self-evident. Similarly, it serves as a caveat not to apply our standards to it. One should note also the implications of social status. By contrast, the violin is said later in the treatise to speak with the voice of an actor, a somewhat disreputable profession in Le Blanc’s day.

Elsewhere in the Défense Le Blanc gives a more systematic description of the sound of the viola da gamba. “The viol has a partly rounded sound, piercing but not shrill, with a nip to it — in comparison to the Cremonese instruments [i.e., the violin family]” (73). The penetrating quality of sound has been noted by other writers on the subject. The “nip” (“qui pince”) is perhaps another way of expressing a quality usually perceived as nasality. To understand the terms of this description, we must turn to Le Blanc’s statement on the nature of sound of musical instruments.

To imbue his opinions with the weight of authority, Le Blanc allows them to be spoken by Dame Music, who descends from Olympus for the occasion. She distinguishes three types of sound: “There are golden sounds, silver sounds and bronze sounds” (71). Le Blanc’s method is to borrow a symbolic and hierarchical system from the visual sphere and to apply it to hearing. It is delightfully complex, since in addition to their worth, one can also imagine a struck sound for each of the metals. Still, the primary importance of the image is its traditional cultural and poetical value structure, in which gold is associated with things perfect, silver with things different and perfect to a lesser degree; brass or bronze suggests something considerably more common.

A likely source for the gold-silver-bronze hierarchy is Ovid’s Metamorphoses, where the poet relates the four ages of the world, the Golden Age, the Silver, the Bronze and the Iron. As a well-educated eighteenth-century gentleman, Le Blanc certainly had read Ovid, and in fact, Ovid is mentioned in both the Défense and Le Czar. If it seems inconsistent that Le Blanc allows no “iron sounds,” perhaps it is because he did not consider iron sounds to be within the realm of music.

To add another dimension to his metallic metaphor, Le Blanc introduces the polarity of “round” versus “sharp” sounds. Nowhere does he define these terms except by association with then familiar instruments. Yet the choice of associations is particularly appropriate. Gold, standing for perfection, is symbolized in astrology and alchemy by a round disk. Silver is represented by a crescent, i.e., roundness with added sharpness. In the realm of literature, Le Blanc associates Virgil and Racine (poets) with gold, Fénélon, Bossuet, Pascal and La Rouchefoucauld (prosodists) with silver. 7

---

5 For other statements on the subject of viol sound see my article “How Did the Viola da Gamba Sound?” Early Music 7 (January, 1979): 59-69.

6 Hubert Le Blanc, Défense de la Basse de Viole contre les entreprises du violon et les prétentions du violoncella (Amsterdam: Pierre Mottier, 1740; Geneva: Minkoff, 1775), p. 80. Citations from this, Le Blanc’s principal work, will henceforward be given in the text in parentheses. We are fortunately in possession of two complete translations of the Défense. I have consulted both Barbara Garvey Jackson’s published translation in this Journal (Vol. 10, 1973; continued in Vol. 11, 1974) and Gordon J. Kinney’s translation, which is available from the VnCSC Microfilm Library. The contrast of the two translations often makes Le Blanc clearer than he is in the original!

7 Le Czar, p. 190. These opinions are offered by the character of Fontanelle, but may be taken as identical with Le Blanc’s own.
As a further means of conceptualizing sound, Le Blanc—again wearing the guise of Dame Music — draws the distinction between masculine and feminine harmony (the word is here best understood as “the musical effect”). (That Le Blanc, whose mother tongue has but two genders, does not conceive of a “neuter” harmony reflects the close interrelationship thought to exist between language and music in eighteenth-century aesthetics.) Masculine harmony sounds harsh close up, but round and mellow at a distance; it results from sounding bodies that are difficult to set in motion. The flauto traverso exhibits masculine harmony; it sounds unpleasant when one is close to the embouchure, but at a distance it has a round and mellow sound. By contrast, the flauto d'ore or recorder is an instrument of feminine harmony: tender and sonorous up close. Hence, the instruments of feminine harmony are more suitable for chamber music.

With a conceptual framework rich in traditions and associations, Le Blanc is well equipped to contrast the various instruments of music. Given the former importance of the lute in France and the similarities between lute and viol, it should come as no surprise that Le Blanc chooses the lute as the instrument par excellence of the round and golden sound. The intruding violin has a rounded, silver sound (73), or, elsewhere, a sound between Silver and gold (48). Unfortunately, Le Blanc never states precisely whether the gamba is more silvery or more golden. By the logic of his system, however, we are forced to place it (like its rival!) somewhere between gold and silver, since it is “partly rounded, partly sharp, with a nip to it” (73).

The viol and the harpsichord, Le Blanc explains, are instruments of feminine harmony. This is to be understood as the result of the relative thinness of soundboards and their delicate and fine strings. Hence, the viol is more suited to the chamber than to the concert hall. Le Blanc thus opts for moderation in locating the gamba's sound within his ideological framework. Indeed, a significant portion of his Défense is spent in arguing for the “moderate virtues,” gentlemanliness, reason, restraint. The moderate viol is thus partly rounded, partly sharp, an instrument of feminine harmony. The viol strikes the famous “jusqu’il milieu” (107).

It is perhaps simpler to describe the sound of an instrument by comparing it directly to other instruments, and Le Blanc employs this method as well. At several points in his Défense, he contrasts the viol with its arch-rival, the violin, without reference to the metallic hierarchy he has constructed. Le Blanc is not out to destroy the violin — a goal which would have been impossible in 1740 — but is rather more concerned with locating both instruments in flattering acoustical environments. While he clearly favors the viol, he is willing to grant certain positive characteristics to the violin. As a result of the high tension of its strings, it has “dazzling sound” (éclat du son), (147); but it has a “sharp sound” (81) which is abhorrent up close. Hence it is more suited to the hall than to the chamber. One of the speakers in Le Czar states that with the violin in the hands even of a Leclerc, one must still be fearful of a sour tone, especially in a chamber (123). By contrast, the sound of the viol is “purer and more resonant” (146), more “delicate” (27) and tendre (48) than the violin. He indict the violin several times for its lack of resonance, which of course the viol possesses.

At another point, Le Blanc speaks of the capacity of the violin to excite great passions (48), while the viol is a more reasonable instrument; it smiles the smile of Reason, it flatters and is said (by the violins) to be more suitable for accompanying pastoral plays or elegies than for expressing profound emotions (48). The violin produces a “big” sound in comparison to the viol; it speaks with a “loud voice” (90).

The violin is incapable of the tenderness of the viol. This term, which occurs several times in the text, is an essential element of the sound of the gamba; it is part of the standard description used by European writers of the period, and Le Blanc is no exception. Le Blanc contrasts the tenderness of the viol's melody with the harshness (le dur) of the violin's (67).

In his plaidoyer for the viol, Le Blanc adduces another superiority of the viol over the violin: the violin, unlike the viol, is not

---

8 Thinness of strings was evidently essential for proper gamba sound. Daunouville, in his method (1687), says that the viol should be furnished with thin strings, and Jean-Baptiste Antoine Forqueray offers the same advice to his royal correspondent, Frederick II of Prussia.
consistent throughout its range. In the upper range, the violin produces “sounds without resonance, whose tininess does not correspond at all to the roundness of the tones of the lower position” (84).

Resonance becomes a factor of paramount importance for the ideal gamba sound that Le Blanc has in mind. He can even speak of the “divine sweetness of gut strings stretched over a deep chamber” (72). The viol stands between the most resonant instruments, namely the lute and the theorbo, and the violin, the un-resonant. The moderate viol is able to “give voice without sacrificing resonance” (107).

Today we have grown used to comparing the gamba with the cello, possibly because of their similar size and outward playing features, possibly because the viol was for a time falsely considered to be the “ancestor” of the cello. This was not the case for Le Blanc, for whom the real rival of the base de viole was the violin. To enable the gamba to compete effectively, he indicates that the gamba player should learn sonatas written for the violin (117, 127).

Thus the cello does not take the brunt of Le Blanc’s attack, although he certainly makes negative references to the difficulty of pressing down the huge strings and the “impossibility” of playing in tune. The cello is an instrument of “masculine harmony” in Le Blanc’s terms: when heard from a distance, it sounds mellow and rich . . . like damask as it used to be made in Lyon, compared with the satin of today” (86). Although this description is offered by the viol, the viol accedes to it without contest.

The cello represents strength and boldness for Le Blanc. “Enlightened connoisseurs” will prefer the viol; for the cello is incapable, Le Blanc maintains, of playing the higher notes, which are of the essence of music (145). Yet Le Blanc admits that recent cellists are quite good, though they have to exert great effort to produce good sound and moderate the unruly forces of the instrument. The cello has only pretensions; the violin remains the real adversary.

Le Blanc’s feeling about the violin and cello are undiplomatically expressed in Le Czar:

Les Joueurs de Violoncels scient à bras allongés une poutre,
are to be held down and left vibrating while the bow is doing something else. Forqueray, who was in some ways the opposite of Marais, used the same stroke, evidently. Similarly, both were able to make a single held note interesting and sonorous (83).

Le Blanc prefers the sonata sound over the pièces. In the sonata style, one escapes the necessity of playing the gamba as if it were a harpsichord or lute, and is able to produce “continuous sound, which, like the voice, is masterfully shaped in motion” (23). At this the violin truly exceeds the viol (24). Yet Marais was able to overcome this by composing and playing in a style which stressed the resonance of the viol and its ability to play chords. (In a rare statement for any eighteenth-century writer on aesthetics, Le Blanc says that after hearing this sound from the gamba, one would not want to hear the same melody performed by the voice, thus stressing sequence and location, rather than making the voice or any instrument an absolute.) According to Le Blanc, Forqueray founded a unifying school of sonata playing in which they extracted a “sparkling sound of a mature taste, reconciling French resonant harmony with Italian vocal melody” (26).

It is in sonata playing that the gamba sound reaches its zenith:

One would be forced to “conclude that no one in the world played the sonatas of M. Michel [Mascitti] with such great taste — so pure, so correct — as Forcorre le père, and of a kind of sound more unconfined by wood — he seemed to know the golden lyre which Achilles seized…” (104).

In the “index” to the Défense, Le Blanc depicts Forqueray’s sound in a similar phrase: “a kind of sound which is the most free of wood” (154). Here we have Le Blanc at his most metaphysical. Here the maître succeeds in overcoming even the physical limitations of the instrument.

In the Classical mythological world to which Le Blanc refers, where the “golden” lyre of Achilles is the ideal, wood is a base material, something to be overcome. The Greek word for “matter” used by Aristotle is based on the word for wood or timber. It is possible to speak, as the Gnostics did, of “hylic” or “wood-bound” man, caught up in the materialistic life. To free the sound of an instrument from matter, then, is quite an achievement. To say that the viol is like the golden lyre of Achilles, or that it sounds “free of wood” gives us very little concrete information about how the gamba sounded. It does show the extent to which Le Blanc in his enthusiasm was willing to endow the sound he heard with metaphysical overtones.

Le Blanc’s concept of music is informed by a strong sense of parallelism between music and language. This was the pervasive attitude of his time. Thus he compares musical forms (sonatas and pièces) to poetical modes (poetry and prose); instruments are compared directly to the human voice. Similarly, his concept of sound is also based on a linguistic metaphor. However, he makes truly ingenious attempts to relate gamba sound to other aural phenomena, and in doing so he describes sound relative to things other than language. It is a non-scientific attempt, imbued with the traditions of Le Blanc’s strong classical background. It is not a quantifying approach — that is reserved for later centuries — but rather one that uses all the means at his disposal to portray a complex musical phenomenon. The reader will have to judge whether Le Blanc’s division and classification of sound into gold-silver-bronze, masculine-feminine, and round-sharp has validity and whether the system can be used to communicate about aural experiences. Le Blanc has given us much to ponder.
Saraband: Speed, Steps, and Stress

Ellen TeSelle Boal

The saraband seems continually to give rise to problems for musicologists. Because of conflicting references to the tempo and character of the dance, modern writers usually conclude that there were two, three, or four historically different dances called the saraband. Certainly all of the dances in the baroque or classical suite may be quite different from their prototypes, but the saraband is reputed to have undergone remarkable changes. Frederick Dorian says that “here we observe a metamorphosis so complete that its story borders on Ovidian fairy tales.”¹ Curt Sachs attests to the ambiguity of references to the steps and tempo of the dance, and concludes that the theatrical saraband of the eighteenth century had very little in common with the society dance of the seventeenth century.² Willi Apel gives the saraband a slow triple meter,³ while William Barclay Squire and Robert Donington caution us to play the seventeenth-century English saraband fast, the one in the classical suite slowly.⁴

The problem is that we find historical references to the saraband as both fast and slow, but that the surviving dance notations and actual tempo indications are for a fairly fast dance. I believe that the ambiguities can be resolved, and that at least up until the time of the classic suite, the saraband can be considered a fairly fast dance.

Origins of the Saraband

The sarabanda came to Spain originally from the New World. Sachs puts to rest the erroneous idea that its origin was Persian, describing several early references to the sarabanda, “a sexual panto-

⁵ Robert Stevenson in a more recent article documents the only reference to the dance actually found in New World literature, Fray Diego Duran’s Historia de las Indias de Nueva Espana of 1579.⁶ Duran describes an Indian dance, the cuecuecheycatl, which is similar to “that saraband which our own people dance with . . . lewd grimaces (esta sarabanda que nuestros naturales usan con . . . dishonestas monerias).”⁷

No music for these early sarabands has been found. In any case, it was apparently the manner of dancing and the explicit sexual pantomime (monerias are gestures or pantomime) that caused the oft-mentioned outrages against the dance by Giambattista Marino, Cervantes, and Philip II.⁸

The saraband was introduced to the French court in 1588 and was restored to respectability in the Spanish court in 1618.⁹ Nothing is known about the steps of the dance, except that the account of a traveler to Barcelona in 1599 mentions backward motions and twists, to the accompaniment of castanets.¹⁰

The Seventeenth-Century Saraband

In 1616, and again in 1625, Ben Johnson described the saraband as “bawdy.”¹¹ In 1623 a French history ranked the saraband along with the courante and volta as a fast and frolicsome dance, with the participants spinning, pirouetting, and circling in joy.¹² In 1635 Richelieu danced the saraband, castanets and all. At this point in history, the verbal descriptions do not seem to have changed any from those of the previous century.

Musical notations of sarabands from this period are extant,
so it is possible to see and hear music which may have been performed for these “frolicsome” dances. The earliest dated saraband piece is in Terpsichore (1612) by Michael Praetorius.12 There are three sarabands for four voices and three for five voices, all categorized under “courantes.” Some kind of dotted rhythm is typical to all the pieces, though the pattern varies. The patterns \(\d\d\d\d\d\d\) and \(\d\d\d\d\d\d\) might be considered typical. An accented second beat, typical of the later saraband, is found only at cadence points, where it can also be considered a hemiola (such as the \(\d\d\d\d\d\d\d\) of No. 114). In numbers 34 for four voices and 33 for five voices (with the same music), each four-bar phrase has two bars of three beats and two bars of hemiola. All the sarabands are actually very much like the courantes, with which they are classified.

Praetorius in Syntagma musici, III (1619) gives tempo indications; he calls for 640 tempora (breves) in an hour, his standard being perhaps an hour glass in a set of half hour, quarter hour, and half-quarter hour vials, since these are the times noted.13 Assuming that the modern edition of Terpsichore has transcribed \(C^2\) as \(\frac{3}{2}\) and the minim as a half note, the tempo of the saraband would be half note = M.M. 64 — enticing, perhaps, but hardly bawdy. Granted, the standard used by Praetorius is not very accurate. In order to test his proposition, he would have to play a piece exactly eighty breves in length, then check to see if it took seven and one-half minutes to play, using hour glasses which were notoriously inaccurate.

Marin Mersenne still describes the saraband as quick in 1636. He gives a guitar tablature for a saraband with the rhythm \(\d\d\d\d\d\d\) reiterated.14 Mersenne also mentions exact time values, but his explanations are almost useless: his ideal measure lasts one second, but he observes that composers who put thirty-two or sixty-four notes into a measure must be using a measure of two or four seconds, as “there is no hand so quick that it can play more than 16 times one or more strongs, nor any voice which can sing more than sixteen notes ... in a second’s time.”15 This would seem to indicate that one should always play at one’s own comfortable tempo.

The consorts of William Lawes end with sarabands — still apparently quick pieces. A writer in 1657 called the saraband that ended a suite “the life and spirit of all the rest.”16 The saraband in the Harpe Consort in G minor is somewhat hybrid, with unclear harmony and varying applications of the \(\d\d\d\d\) and \(\d\d\d\d\d\d\d\d\d\d\d\d\d\) figures. The second saraband of the Royall Consort in D minor is clear harmonically and rhythmically, with hemiolas at bars six to seven and fourteen to fifteen.17

The Dance Steps in England

The Oxford English Dictionary defines the seventeenth-century “toyish” saraband as light and frivolous, but also as wanton or licentious. The “toyish” saraband may still have been a dance of sexual pantomime. There is one saraband in John Playford’s English Dancing Master of 1651, but the steps given indicate only that the same country dancing steps were used to the saraband tune as to other tunes.18 There is some similarity to the description of the original sarabanda: there is stepping forward, stepping back, and a “turn single.”

The seventeenth century English saraband is always described as quick. Thomas Mace says that “Serabands” are of the “Shortest” triple time, more “Toyish and Light” than “Corantoes,” and he

13 Praetorius, Syntagma musici, III facs. rpt. in Documenta Musicologica 15 (Kassel and New York: Bärenreiter, 1958), 87-88.
16 MGG quotes the 1657 writings of Ligon.
gives several examples. The Playford Introduction, in editions to 1683, gives the saraband and the jig as examples of the "swifter" triple meter, using the signature "3" and three crotchets to a bar.

The Theatrical Saraband

Sarabands can be found in most of the French opéra-ballets of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. English semiorpas with sarabands include Henry Purcell's 

Arnphitrôn (1691),

and James Peasable's Lovers Strategem (pre-1701) and The Kind Imposter (1702). Though we have no idea of how many of the sarabands were danced, or whether they had anything more in common than the name, some sarabands by Louis Pécout survive in Feuillet notation.

Two of Pécout's dances in the 1704 Recueil were "not danced in the opera." One was danced by "M. Piffetot et M. Chevrier" in the opera Abide, and another uses music for the "Ballet des Nations" in the comédie-ballet in Jean Baptiste Lully's Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme. In the original production of Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme, the choreographer was Charles-Louis Beauchamps, who also danced in the production. No notation of steps survives from that production, but Pécout, who danced in Lully's Psyché in 1671, and in Cadmus in 1672, was a contemporary of Beauchamps as well as his successor. It is likely that both choreographers used some of the same steps.

Three of these four Pécout dances begin with two bars of one step each — two slow sliding steps in one case, two bending steps (demi-coupé) in another, and a demi-coupé with pointed toe in the third, in which one step is forward and the next backward. These are followed by a number of pirouettes, turning leaps, and jumps while crossing the legs back and forth. The number of jumping steps in the typical saraband indicates a fairly fast tempo — M.M. 80 per beat seems necessary. Is it possible that the saraband is sometimes referred to as a slow dance because the first two steps themselves are slow, though they each take up three beats of music?

Notation for two sarabands appears in The Art of Dancing by Kellom Tomlinson (1735). In these notations also, the first two bars consist of two slow steps, and again in one case the steps are sliding steps (coupé soutenu). According to Tomlinson, there are strict rules for conformity between music and dance steps:

As the Performer in Music, in playing of the Tune, prepares for beating Time by taking up of the Toe or Heel, so does the Dancer in making a Sink or Bending of the Knees to beat or mark Time to the Tune . . . whether it be done by a Rise upon the Toe, a Hop, or any other Step, . . . the Rise from a Sink beats Time in Dancing, as the Fall of the Heel does in Music.

In other words, the rise of the body in the dance equals the accented beat in the music. Interestingly, many of the rises and bends in the Bourgeois Gentilhomme dance correspond with the

---


20 John Playford, An Introduction to the Skill of Musick (London: John Playford, editions from 1655 to 1683), p. 30 of the 1683 ed.


25 In Recueil de dances . . . de m. Pécout (Paris: Chez le Sieur Feuillet, 1704).

26 Ibid., pp. 210 and 225.

27 Ibid., p. 154.


30 Christout, p. 121; note, p. 134.


33 Tomlinson, p. 146.
beats of the Lully music. Of special interest are the hemiolas, which usually are accompanied by a step with an extra rise or by turning steps which comprise two bars of music.

**Saraband Tempo Markings**

Several musicians and scientists of the early eighteenth century experimented with pendulums and metronome-like machines. Michel L’Affilard, in the 1705 edition of his *Principes très-faciles pour bien apprendre la musique*, describes his system of marking musical compositions with the number of *tières* (sixtieths of a second) in the duration of one beat. He includes entire musical examples of three sarabands, with the following time signatures, *tières* per beat, and resulting metronome marks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Tières per beat</th>
<th>Metronome mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>half note = 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Quarter note = 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Quarter note = 133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Louis-Léon Pajot also uses *tières*, and his one example of a saraband, listed in the *Mémoires de l’Académie Royale des Sciences* of 1732, is in 3/2, with 49 *tières* per beat for a metronome mark of half note = 73. All these “exact” tempos indicate quite a fast saraband.

Tomlinson calls the “movement” of the saraband “grave,” though it appears to be grave only in comparison with the next faster movements. Although his explanation is convoluted, his scale of slow to fast seems to be from courante (half notes) to saraband, passacaille, and chaconne (all with quarters) to minuet (quarters) to passepied (three eighth notes to a bar). He directs the dancer to count “one, one” (we would say “one, and”), but he later refers to a saraband as being counted “one, two, three,” which may indicate a moderate rather than an extremely slow tempo. He uses $\frac{3}{4}$ “slow” for one saraband (plate IV) and $\frac{3}{2}$ “very slow” for another (plate VI); one of Pécout’s sarabands also is choreographed to music with the 3/2 signature and marked “gravement,” though the number of leaping steps seems to preclude a tempo which we would call “gravement” today.

A fast beat for the saraband is also given by Johann Joachim Quantz; in his 1732 treatise he recommends M.M. 80 for the dance (one pulse beat per beat of music, with his own pulse of 80 per minute being given as the standard).

**Instrumental Sarabands**

Of special interest to the viol player are the sarabands in John Playford’s 1661 collection, *Musicks Recreation on the Viol, Lyra-Way*. The pieces are by John Jenkins, William Lawes, Christopher Simpson, and other composers of the period, and are fairly easy “Lessons” for the beginner at tablature. Accented second beats are found only in the cadence formulas.

Two of the suites in Georg Muffat’s *Florilegium Primum* of 1695 contain sarabands; both are marked “grave” in both violetta and basso continuo parts, though they are written in 3/4 with quarter note beats. His explanation is given in his foreword: 3/2 is his slowest signature (*lentissimum*), 3/4 gayer (*hilatorum*) though somewhat slow (*quodammodo gravem*) in sarabands.

The suites of Marin Marais’s *Livre I, Pièces à une et à deux violes*, 1686, are a treasure trove of sarabands. Marais uses a quarter note beat, very few dotted patterns, and a definite accent on the second beat of measure three in four-bar phrases.

---

34 *Receuil*, p. 154.
36 *Musicks Recreation on the Viol, Lyra-Way* (London: John Playford, 1661); there are nine sarabands, but see especially pp. 75, 86, and 89. (copy in Wc).
37 Georg Muffat, *Florilegium Primum* (Jacob Koppmeyer, 1695; copy in We); the Latin introduction is in the Basso Continuo part-book.
38 Marin Marais, *Pièces à une et à deux violes* (Livre I, vol. 1) (Paris: L’Auteur et Jean Huret, 1686; copy in Wc); see especially p. 41.
By 1787 a dictionary of dance defined the saraband as "grave, lent & serieux."\textsuperscript{41} By that time it may have been performed at a tempo which we could call "grave," as the saraband was at that time part of an instrumental suite and was no longer danced. A careful study does indicate, however, that the danced saraband may not have gone through as many changes as we have been led to believe.

---


---

\textbf{The Lyra Viol in Consort: An Example from Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket IMhs 4:3}

\textit{Ila H. Stoltzfus}

Seventeenth-century English music for the viola da gamba falls into three main categories: music for consort viol, division viol and lyra viol. Consort viol music is ensemble music based on the styles of sixteenth-century vocal polyphony or sixteenth-century dances. It is played on viols of three different sizes: treble, tenor, and bass. Division viol music, also based on sixteenth-century music, ornaments or improvises on a melodic line and is generally played on a small bass viol. This style is found in solo repertoire and occasionally in ensemble repertoire. Both consort and division viol music are written in staff notation.

The third style is known as lyra viol music or music played "lyra way." This music is closely related to lute music of the time, in that music for lyra viol and lute were both written in French lute tablature. The use of the tablature facilitated the reading of multiple stops, implied polyphony and broken chords that are characteristic of the style of lyra viol music. The tablature also made it possible for a variety of tunings to be used to facilitate the playing of chords.

Until recently, music for the lyra viol had been largely ignored or misrepresented. Frank Traficante, one of the first researchers of lyra viol music, established in his dissertation, "The Mansell Lyra Viol Tablature,"\textsuperscript{1} that there is indeed a large body of music to be investigated. He also clarified the existence of an instrument known as a "lyra viol" with the following eight points which describe the physical characteristics of the instrument.\textsuperscript{2}

\begin{itemize}
  \item [(a)] It was essentially a member of the viola da gamba family
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
(b) It possessed six strings and seven frets
(c) Sympathetic strings were added for a short time
(d) The lyra viol was the smallest of the three bass sizes
(e) The strings were shorter and perhaps thinner than di-
vision or consort bass strings
(f) The strings were laid closer to the fingerboard
(g) The bridge (and also possibly the fingerboard) may have
been less rounded

Traficante included four musical and functional aspects of
lyra viol performance: 3
(a) The use of tablature (related to the use of many different
tunings)
(b) The prevalence of a quasi-polyphonic style
(c) The performance of solo music, ensemble music, and
solo-song accompaniment
(d) The use of plucking techniques in addition to regular
bowing

Although the lyra viol is associated with seventeenth-century
English music, references to this style of playing can be found in
a few sixteenth-century Italian sources. Silvestro Ganassi’s tutor
Regola Rubertina provides information about playing the viol
using variable tunings, 4 reading Italian tablature with examples
of ricercari in both tablature and notation, 5 and making an
appropriate accompaniment to a solo madrigal. 6 Howard Mayer
Brown discusses several performances of vocal music which were
accompanied by an instrument called a lira da gamba. 7 The style
of playing this instrument involved multiple stops, wide leaps and
fast runs. According to Willi Apel, the harmonic element of the

Ganassi treatise became the style of music associated with the lira
da gamba.

... The lyra viol probably developed as a hybrid between the
lira da gamba and the small bass viol; it borrowed its notation
(tablature) from the lute, its technique and form from the viol,
its variable tunings from the lira and its tessitura from the tenor
viol. 8

Music for the lyra viol exists in printed sources and in manu-
script. There are eighteen known printed works for the lyra viol,
both solo and ensemble. 9 The earliest printed edition to appear in
England was a publication in 1601 by Robert Jones, The Second
Book of Songs and Ayres. The popularity of the lyra viol con-
tinued through most of the seventeenth century until the last known
publication in 1682, Musick’s Recreation on the Viol, Lyra-Way,
by John Playford.

A larger amount of music exists in manuscript form. The
manuscripts contain music for solo lyra viol, lyra viol and voice,
various ensembles of two or three lyra viols, or one or two lyra
viols and a bass viol, and one lyra viol in consort with other in-
struments. It is the music in this last category that is of particular
interest for this study.

The lyra viol in consort with other instruments first appeared
in the Caroline times and died out shortly after the Restoration. 10
One of the earliest known extant manuscripts and the one that is
the focus of this study is a suite in G minor for violin, lyra viol
and theorbo written by the English composer George Hudson. (d.
1672). The suite contains six pieces: Pavan Alman, Alman, two
Courants, and two Sarabands. The manuscript is catologued in Upps-
ala, Universitetbiblioteket as IMhs 4:3 with a date of approxi-
mately 1640. The violin, lyra viol and theorbo parts are written

4 Silvestro Ganassi, Regola Rubertina, 1st and 2nd parts (Venice 1542
5 Ganassi, pp. 41-51.
6 Ganassi, p. 78.
7 Howard Mayer Brown, Sixteenth-Century Instrumentation: Music for
46-47.
IV, “The Age of Humanism, 1540-1630,” Gerald Abraham, ed. (New York:
9 Frank Traficante, “Music for the Lyra Viol: The Printed Sources,”
10 John Sawyer, “An Anthology of Lyra Viol Music in Oxford Bodleian
on three folios of manuscript paper, all with the same watermark throughout. The name of George Hudson follows the last piece of each part. Erik Kjellberg suggests that these are possibly autographs. Figured bass is included in the first two pieces of the theorbo part. The tuning for the lyra viol is D G d g b-flat d’ or the tuning referred to as “harp-way flat.”

The six pieces in this suite are all in binary form. Interior cadences are on the relative major, B-flat for the Pavan Alman, the Alman, and the two Sarabands. The Courants both have interior cadences on the dominant D. Harmonic vocabulary is limited to chords closely related to the keys of G minor and B-flat major. In several places the tonality vacillates between these two keys, creating areas in which chromatic alternations occur in close proximity. Some of the resulting chromatic inflections and cross relations characteristic of the English music of this period are shown in Example 1.

Example 1. Chromatic Alterations

Some imitation between the lyra viol and violin occurs in the first three pieces. In the Pavan, the opening motive heard in the lyra viol is imitated by the violin two measures later, but in an augmented form. The lyra viol opens the second section in a similar manner; however, the imitation in the violin is not as closely related. In the Alman, there are three short areas of imitation. In the first Courant, the last four measures before the final cadence are imitative between the lyra viol and the violin.

In the Pavan there is nearly continuous motion carried by the violin and the lyra viol; while one voice seems to anticipate a cadence or the closing of the phrase, the other voice continues the motion. In the other five pieces the phrase lengths are more clearly defined.

The melodic motion varies somewhat in the six pieces. In the Pavan, a frequent motive of repeated eighth notes appears. Some step-wise patterns occur, but there are frequent leaps, especially in the lyra viol part. In the Alman there are fewer leaps, more stepwise motion and a few up-beat motives. Stepwise motion is predominant in the remaining pieces, with the voices moving in parallel motion in the first Courant and in the two Sarabands, and generally in contrary motion in the second Courant.

One particular feature of the suite is the close relationship of melodic material among the six pieces. At the end of the Pavan there is a distinct five measure motion to the cadence. In the Alman there is a trace of this closing motive, and in the first Courant the motive is nearly repeated, but with rhythmic changes. These three related cadences are shown in Example 2, with different markings to indicate the related motives. In addition, the opening four measures of the two Sarabands are related to each other. In the first Saraband, the violin begins with a leap of a fifth, followed by a stepwise progression to the end of the phrase in measure four. In the second Saraband, the lyra viol begins with an octave leap followed by the same stepwise motion in the next measure. The material alternates between the two instruments until the end of the phrase. Example 3 shows the opening motives of the two Sarabands.

---

11 Erik Kjellberg (Ph.D. Musicology, Uppsala, 1979) made this suggestion to the writer in a letter of January 25, 1980. Commander Gordon Dodd compared these signatures with three signatures known to have been made by Hudson in 1672. While Dodd considers the two hands quite different, he suggested in a letter of April 6, 1980 that the manuscripts could have been signed by Hudson in his earlier years.

Thomas Mace discusses the role and importance of the lyra viol in a consort when he states that a good chest of viols should have three lyra viols.

Let Them be Lusty, Smart-Speaking Viols; because that in Consort, they often Retort against the Treble; Imitating, and often Standing instead of That Part, viz. a Second Treble.\textsuperscript{13}

In this suite the lyra viol unquestionably functions as a second treble instrument. It participates in melodic imitation, and it moves in thirds and sixths with the violin, especially in the two Courants and two Sarabands. Because it is capable of a quasi-polyphonic style, it is not limited to the role of a second treble, however. In the Pavan, it also frequently acts as a melodic and harmonic bass, doubling the theorbo line and frequently filling in the chords. In all of the pieces, the lyra viol plays chords of three or four notes at cadences and at points of repose.

In addition to its role as a second treble and a melodic and harmonic bass, the lyra viol adds a distinctive timbre to the ensemble. The frequent use of multiple stops and chords helps to compensate for the lack of sustaining power of the theorbo. This results in an ensemble with a denser texture. Because of the large range of the lyra viol and the melodic lines and wide leaps that move freely within this range, the lyra viol provides a continuity of registers as well as texture and timbre between the sustaining power of the violin and the plucking of the theorbo.

A comparison of this work with three suites for two treble instruments and a thoroughbass by Hudson, from the Christ Church Library MSS 1006-9, shows some consistent features. Two of the suites contain pieces titled Pavan Alman and these are also in binary form. One piece titled Pavan is in ternary form. In addition, movement in thirds and sixths between the two treble voices is frequent. Areas of imitation occur, but the motives are brief and the areas of imitation are short.

In a historical context, Hudson's suite falls in the latter part of the Caroline period, perhaps just before or during the early

part of the revolution. It is stated that Hudson was “sworn in as musician to Charles I in 1642, but did not take up his appointment until after the Restoration.” 14 Quite possibly Hudson was acquainted with William Lawes, who was a composer in the court of Charles I. A collection of pieces written by Lawes sometime between 1635 and 1645 for violin, bass viol, theorbo and harp, known as the Harp Consort, shares some similarities with Hudson’s suite. The use of the violin in both ensembles is significant, for although the violin did not achieve popularity in England until the 1660s, it was used in the Court as early as the 1620s. The presence of the fully written-out harp part compares with the fully written-out lyra viol part in the Hudson suite, and in both of these suites the theorbo plays the continuo part. Although some of the pieces in the Harp Consort contain divisions for the violin and bass viol, there are frequent doublings of the voices at the unison and the octave, as was seen in the Pavan of the Hudson suite. This doubling of voices adds to the thickness of texture and tone color created by the unusual combinations of instruments in both ensembles.

There are several curiosities about the Hudson manuscript that present interesting problems and questions. How this English manuscript came to Sweden is a matter of conjecture. Andrew Ashbee has made reference to other English manuscripts also catalogued at Uppsala: Two suites by John Jenkins, two suites by Benjamin Rogers, and four-part fantasias by John Ward. Ashbee said, “Possibly [the manuscripts] traveled with Bulstrode Whitelock’s party during his Ambassadorship to the Court of Queen Christiana at Uppsala between December 1653 and May 1654.” 15 An entry in Whitelock’s Journal on April 17, 1654, states that the Queen’s musicians came to Whitelock’s house to entertain him and “they played many lessons of English composition, which the gentlemen who were musical of Whitelock’s family brought forth upon them.” 16

Perhaps the conjecture that Ashbee has made could be extended to include the Hudson suite as well.

There exist three manuscripts which are related to the Hudson manuscript and need to be considered here. The first manuscript is written in German keyboard tablature and is included with the folios of the Hudson suite. A transcription of this tablature yields a score of the violin and theorbo parts for all six pieces of the Hudson suite. Because the use of German Keyboard tablature in association with an English composition from mid-century seemed unusual, the writer investigated the Catalogue critique et descriptif des imprimés de musique des XVIe et XVIIe siècles Conservés à la Bibliothèque de l’Université royale d’Uppsala 17 to determine if there were any references to other works in keyboard tablature. Eight printed foreign works are listed for which copies were made in keyboard tablature during the seventeenth century. Information from several sources provided historical background for this period of music in Sweden and for the use of keyboard tablature.

From 1620 to 1720, the Hofkapelle in Stockholm employed as Kapellmeisters members of a family named Düben. Beginning with Andreas Düben the Elder, who had studied in Leipzig, the position was handed from generation to generation, with much of the musical activity occurring during the term of Gustave Düben the Elder from 1663 to 1690. Music was composed by the Kapellmeisters, by foreign composers employed in the Hofkapelle, and music was commissioned from foreign composers. Much of the music was copied into German keyboard tablature, regardless of the original instrumentation. This collection of music, of which the Hudson manuscript is a part, is known as the Düben collection, and is now catalogued in the Uppsala Universitetsbiblioteket.

A recent dissertation by Jaroslav Mracek was a study of a large collection of dances written in keyboard tablature and catalogued at the Uppsala Universitetsbiblioteket. In his study, Mracek concluded that these pieces are actually instrumental ensemble dances that had been copied into keyboard tablature during the


17 Rafael Mitjana, *Catalogue critique et descriptif des imprimés de musique des XVIe et XVIIe siècles, Conservés à la Bibliothèque de l’Université royale d’Uppsala* (Uppsala: Imprimerie Aimquest and Wiksell, 1911).
seventeenth century. He considered this copying procedure to be for the purpose of preserving the music, and that the keyboard was not used in performing the music. Mracek’s dissertation provides a description and several examples of the keyboard tablature of this collection. A comparison of the keyboard manuscript of the Hudson suite with the description and examples of Mracek’s study show many similarities. Most likely the keyboard tablature included with the Hudson manuscript was done by a member of the Hofkapelle at a later time, and Hudson originally composed the suite for violin, lyra viol and theorbo, as is indicated in the title. One difference exists, however, between the keyboard tablature included in the Hudson manuscript and that of the collection which Mracek studied. According to Mracek, the keyboard copies of his study contain all of the parts of the ensemble. In the Hudson manuscript, the keyboard copy lacks the lyra viol part. The function of this keyboard part is still a question — it may have been used instead of, or in addition to the violin and theorbo to accompany the lyra viol.19

A second related manuscript catalogued as IMhs 4:3a1 contains three of the pieces of the Hudson suite: the Pavan, the first Courant, and the first Saraband. Only the violin and lyra viol parts exist in this manuscript. Erik Kjellberg believes that these pieces were copied in the 1660s by a member of the Hofkapelle.20 This manuscript contains many errors in the Pavan and in the Saraband, especially in the lyra viol part; but, because it is a copy, these errors are easily corrected.

On the same paper, on the bottom half of the two sides, is an anonymous collection that contains (1) three pieces for lyra viol: Allemand, Courant, and Saraband; and (2) two pieces for violin “ver Stimbi,” or scordatura: Allemand and Courant. This manuscript appears to have been written in the same hand as the above manuscript, IMhs 4:3a1, and it is catalogued as IMhs 4:3a2.

No tunings are indicated; however, a tuning of E A c-sharp a c-sharp’ or “common tuning flat” provides a convincing transcription for the lyra viol. A tuning of a ‘a’ e” for the violin gives the double stops a satisfactory harmony and the melodic lines a necessary continuity.

The manuscript remains a puzzle for several reasons. In the first section of the Allemand, the lyra viol has ten measures while the violin has only six. In the second section, the violin has eleven measures and the lyra viol has ten. Matching the two voices from either the beginning, backward from the cadences, or from arbitrary points from within yields unconventional parallel motion and a high number of unstylistic intervals. Although the two voices have an equal number of measures in the Courant, the same problems of dissonances occur when these parts are scored together. Example 4 shows a fragment from the Allemand and a fragment from the Courant that illustrate some of these problems.

Example 4. IMhs 4: 3a 2

This study of the suite in G for violin, lyra viol and theorbo by George Hudson is part of a doctoral research project in which ensembles containing a lyra viol in consort with other instruments are being examined. In this suite, the lyra viol has been shown to function as a second treble and a harmonic and melodic bass. It provides a thicker texture as well as an element of continuity to the ensemble. Hudson’s suite is stylistically consistent with his other known compositions and with other similar works from the seventeenth-century English repertoire. Another dimension of this study has been an investigation into the history of this and related manuscripts.


19 Erik Kjellberg, correspondence of June 2, 1980.

20 Ibid.
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The Decline of the Viol in Seventeenth-Century England: Some Observations

Patricia Olds

At certain periods in the history of music, a style which appears to be stable is suddenly undermined by a new idea. A musical fad may sweep a country or a continent with such speed and power as to warrant comparison with hula hoops or roller skating. Such a time and place was late sixteenth-century Italy. The madrigal had evolved into a supple and versatile genre in the hands of many masters such as Maranzio, Gesualdo, and Monteverdi. In less than twenty years the polyphonic madrigal was almost completely replaced by monody.

Another such dramatic change occurred almost as quickly in the middle third of the seventeenth century in England. The viols were being made obsolete by a comparable change of taste. In England, however, the change was primarily one of medium and secondarily (and more gradually) a change of compositional style. Most musicians are now aware that the viol family and the violin family of instruments had separate histories and different periods of ascension and decline. The replacement of the viols by the violin family among professional musicians took place after about 250 years. At any time between about 1550 and 1800, both families were known and, to some extent, were used. Italy was the first, and England and Germany the last to give up the viols completely or nearly so, but the period from about 1630 to 1670 is the one in which the war between the gambists and the cellists was fought in England.

The Golden Age of English music coincides with the Golden Age of English drama; Shakespeare and Byrd were contemporaries. The style of Byrd’s great masses and anthems and the lighter, but still polyphonic style of the English madrigal composers was abandoned by the mid-seventeenth century. In instrumental chamber music, however, English composers of the eras of James I and Caroline continued to develop the contrapuntal genres of the Italian Renaissance.

By the time of Charles I (r. 1625-1649), the viols had become so favored by the aristocracy that a consort of viols were commonly found in use for chamber music in stately homes. Nearly all English instrumental composers of the seventeenth century composed for the viols, and the matched sound of the members of the viol consort inspired compositions for the medium.

What was the sound ideal of the generation of Charles I? Inasmuch as such ephemeral concepts can be reconstructed, and allowing for later alterations in the surviving instruments of the viola da braccia family since 1650; that sound ideal was very different from the bowed string quality familiar to most twentieth-century listeners. In spite of the efforts of students of historical performance practice, a string sound appropriate to Tchaikovsky is still used for Buxtehude and Jenkins in some public performances. John Rutledge has written a good introduction to the subject of viol sound.¹ His quotations of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century writers on the timbres of various instruments seem to agree that the viol da gamba sound was versatile, appropriate to many different styles of articulation, similar to the human voice, but soft. Le Blanc describes the viol sound as being soft and somewhat nasal like the voice of a diplomat.² It was this softness that contributed most to the absence of the viols from concert halls and salons for two centuries.

The seventeenth century was a period of transition in creating distinction between chamber and orchestral styles. In 1600 in England the sound ideal of the madrigal, with one performer for each part, was also present in the consort of viols. Evidence would suggest that musicians of the period of Charles I seldom doubled parts. Lully’s twenty-four violins were very influential on the music of Western Europe, however. Roger North, writing in 1728, put his finger on one of the main causes of the decline of the viols:

But now to observe the steps of the grand metamorphosis of


musick, wherby it hath mounted into those altitudes of esteem it now injoys. I must remember that upon the restauration of King Charles, the old way of consorts were laid aside at court, and the King made an establishment after a french model, of 24 violins, and the style of the musick was accordingly.8

North’s poignant reflections document the change:

It will now be asked how it can consist that the musick of Mr. Jenkins ... should be now so much laid aside, or rather contemned as it is, when the art is thought to be arrived at a perfection. This would be harder to answer, if it were not a great truth, and notorious, that every age since Apollo did not say the same thing of the musick of their owne time. For nothing is more a fashion than musick; no not clothes, or language, either of which is made a derision to after times.9

Chamber music is most satisfactory when each part can be distinguished. The most significant change caused by the replacement of the viols by violins, violas and cellos was the lessening of clarity in polyphonic lines. That “diplomatic nasal tone” Le Blanc remarked on allows each voice in even a six-part polyphonic texture to be heard. Quite subtle adjustments of timbre, dynamics, and articulation can call attention to the beginning of a point of imitation so that the listener picks out the sound of the leading voice even if it is in the middle range. The individual viol consort player is more apparent in the crowd.

How enviable, then, were Jenkins, the Ferraboscos, the Laniers and their contemporaries from the point of view of most present day string players. They were relatively well paid and appreciated by the King. They composed and played music of polyphonic complexity in which all were equally important. But in just a generation this condition was lost in the general trend toward larger groups and greater anonymity for individual musicians.

These viol players were among an elite who, because of ability and/or family connection, secured positions in the King’s Musick or with private patrons. But at least while the music was sounding they were equals or prima inter pares. Almost any fantasy by Ferra-

bosc, Coprario, Jenkins, or Ives illustrates this independence of parts.

Gerald Hayes points out that composers and performers were identical and that they operated within a relatively intimate society. Writers of “how-to-play” books addressed themselves directly to their readers and invited them to see the authors and discuss anything which might be unclear.

They composed directly into their instruments, and thereby so indissolubly wedded the medium to the music that translation into any other instrument does infinite damage to their intent.5

For the modern viol player this, indeed, was the golden age, when, “in the reign of King Jac. (James) I, and the paradisical part of the reign of King Charles I, many musick masters rose up and flourished. Their works lay most in compositions for violls.”6

Music had begun to move out of the churches and homes and into opera houses and concert halls, the size of which required a greater volume of sound. The violin had been, like its predecessor the rebec, a folk instrument unsuited to and not favored by the aristocracy. Roger North expresses his own clear value judgement:

The violin was scarce knowne tho’ now the principal verb, and if it was any where seen, it was in the hands of a country clodder, who for the portability, served himself of it.7

A study of some of the violists of the King’s Musick under Charles I might shed some light on the changes in musical taste and the introduction of the violins. I shall consider a few of the men born between 1575 and 1625: Thomas Brewer, Thomas Ford, and members of the Lanier and Ferrabosco families.

Thomas Brewer was a viol player during the “paradisical part of the reign of Charles I.” Born about 1610 and educated at Christ’s Hospital in London, his compositions for viols appear (according to the Dictionary of National Biography) in most of the printed

9 North, pp. 78-79.
10 North, p. 80.
collections of Playford and Hilton, published in the mid-seventeenth century. The Dictionary of National Biography states flatly that nothing is known as to his biography, except for his fondness for alcohol. Van der Straeten says his seven fantasies are excellent. Other references to Brewer, presumably the same Thomas Brewer, can be found in the Norfolk and Norwich Record Office: Le Strange Accounts, page 7. Here we find records of payments to Brewer for instruction on the viol, and to his wife for her skill in the manufacture and repair of stockings. Apparently Brewer was the teacher of one of the most famous of amateur viol players, Roger Le Strange. Gordon Dodd lists no published works by Brewer and only six unpublished four-part works. One wonders if these six are among the seven mentioned by Van der Straeten.

Thomas Ford (ca. 1580-1648) is widely known on the basis of one song, “Since First I Saw Your Face.” He was one of Prince Henry’s musicians, at a salary of £40 per year. In 1625, on the accession of Charles I, he was appointed to the King’s Musick with a doubling of his salary. The following year his pay was raised again, and his services as a singer and lutenist earned him £120. When the King’s financial troubles began, his salary was reduced, and in 1640 he received £80.

Apparently the only work published during Ford’s lifetime was “Musick of Sundrie Kindes, set forth in two booke, the first whereof are ayres for four voices to the Lute, Opharion, or Basse Viol, with a dialogue for 2 voices, and 2 Basse Viols in parts, tunde the lute-way. The second are Pavens, Galiards, Almaines, Figgs, Thumpes, and such like for 2 Basse Viols, the liera-way, so made as the greatest number may serve to play alone, very easy to be performed.” It was published by John Browne of London in 1607, and has been reprinted in facsimile.

This is his only publication apart from two pieces in William Leighton’s Tears or Lamentations, but other works by him survive in manuscript. Music of Sundry Kinds, like Jones’s Second Book and those by Hume, Corkine and Maynard, reflects the growing importance in the early seventeenth century of the lyra viol and the bass viol played ‘liera way,’ the music of which was chordal and intabulated like that of the lute.10

The vocal pieces, with the exception of the “Dialogue,” (no. 11) are published. 11 The first two instrumental pieces can be found in Jacobean Consort Music (Musica Britannica IX) nos. 126 and 127. Dodd lists six unpublished and two published works for viols in two, four and five parts, besides the pieces for lyra viols in the Musick of Sundrie Kindes. Burney republishes two of Ford’s vocal canons in his History of Music.

Ford was buried November 17, 1648, less than three months before the beheading of his former employer on January 30, 1649.

The lives of Brewer, Ford, and their colleagues were, in many ways, very privileged in “Bad King Charles’s Golden Days.” G. A. Philips points out that in that period people “had quite different ideas from ours about employment and patronage, as well as the propriety of supplementary sources of income and conflict of interest.”12 In addition to the income for musical services rendered, musicians often were the recipients of favours in the gift of the Crown, i.e., exemptions, annuities, monopolies, licenses, leases, and outright gifts. Salaries were ample, several times as high as stipends paid to cathedral musicians, who often lived on £10 a year or less, a wage comparable with that of a farm laborer. ... In 1618 lutenists each earned £60. ... By 1635 the level of musicians’ salaries had risen greatly (but almost half in arrears). Some musicians received generous salaries: Nicholas Lasier, Master of the King’s Musick, £200; Thomas Ford, £120.13

---


13 Philips, p. 30.
Both the Lanier and the Ferrabosco families enjoyed commercial licenses which must have greatly supplemented their professional incomes.

In 1604 Alfonso Lanier, a recorder player in the King's Musick, was granted the office of weighing hay and straw brought into London and Westminster. Weighing hay became the Lanier family prerogative.\(^{14}\)

Members of the family figured in several law suits, the records of which show them, especially Nicholas, to have been unusually greedy and unethical courtiers of Charles I.

In 1619 the hay-weighing Innocent Lanier and another favoured musician, Alfonso Ferrabosco, received license to dredge the Thames, levy fines and annoyances in the river, and collect an import of one penny per ton on strangers' goods imported and exported at London. Ferrabosco wisely sold out his share to one William Burrell, but Lanier caused much trouble to shipping and loss of capital by actively participating in the scheme and, during the course of his business, accidently cutting the ropes of the ballast engines.\(^{15}\)

Members of the King's Musick were immune from arrest, service on juries, and taxes. Contemporary accounts refer to the insolence of Nicholas Lanier, who invoked his privilege against arrest more than once.

The insolence of Lanier can doubtless be attributed to the exclusiveness and isolation of the King's Musick, an organization much infected with nepotism and inbreeding, and almost inaccessible for a musician from London or the provinces, whatever his gifts.\(^{16}\)

Among the violists of the seventeenth century, the Laniers and Ferraboscos are the most obvious examples of this nepotism and inbreeding, although the Bassanos and the Lupos also continued to be favored over nearly a century. Perhaps it was his business activities which prevented Nicholas Lanier from inscribing violin fantasies. We have many works by the Bassanos, Lupos, and Ferraboscos, but nothing by the Laniers (Andrea, Clement, Innocent, Jerome, John, Nicholas, Thomas, and William were all members of the King's Musick) in Gordon Dodd's list.

However, Nicholas Lanier did write vocal music.\(^{17}\) His recitative in Italian style, *Hero and Leander*, was greatly admired by North and Pepys. Lanier made trips to Italy to buy paintings for Charles I and, while there, learned to compose in the new style of accompanied monody.

And after his Returne he composed a Recitative, \textit{wth} was a poem \textit{being ye tragedy of Hero and Leander, \textit{wth} for many years went about from hand to hand, even after the Restauration, and at last Crept out wretchedly drest among Playford's Collections in print. The King was exceedingly pleased with this pathetick Song, and caused Lanneare often to sing it, to a Consort attendance while he stood next, with his hand upon his Shoulder. This was the first Recitative Kind that ever graced ye English language . . . \(^{18}\)

The Italian trips were in the 1620s and Emslie dates *Hero and Leander* in 1628.

The state papers note that Lanier, on January 6, 1629, "was one of a group who caused a disturbance at the Exchange, hit a constable and were 'reduced to reason by restraint of their persons'."\(^{19}\) Pepys met Lanier at musical gatherings in 1665-66 and Lanier later visited Pepys's house.

Members of the Ferrabosco family were important figures in the royal musical establishment for over a century.

It is to the men who have so unjustly been forgotten that we are indebted for the finest music ever produced in England. Perhaps more than to any other it is owing to Alphonso Ferrabosco, the son of a father of the same name who came to England some time before 1562.\(^{20}\)

Alphonso Ferrabosco I had published compositions in Venice

\(^{14}\) Philipps, p. 35.

\(^{15}\) Philipps, p. 35.

\(^{16}\) Philipps, p. 38.


\(^{18}\) Emslie, quoting Roger North, pp. 15-16.

\(^{19}\) Emslie, p. 17.

before emigrating to England. In 1567 a pension was conferred upon him by Queen Elizabeth. His most famous descendant, Alfonso Ferrabosco II, was born at Greenwich in 1575. His career coincided with the greatest flowering of viol consort music during the reign of James I. Gordon Dodd’s recent article is an excellent brief introduction to the work of Ferrabosco.21 His works are well represented in the Dodd list; they include solo and consort works in four, five and six parts and works for lyra viol, of which no less than sixty-seven are published.

Burney was most unkind to this master of the King’s Musick. He said his fancies appear now very dry and fanciless, in spite of the general title of these pieces. Indeed, it would be difficult to select one of them that would afford any other amusement to my readers, than that of discovering how ingenious and well disposed the lovers of Music, during the former part of the last century, must have been, to extract pleasure from such productions.

Infinite pains, however, seem to have been taken in collating and correcting these books; which only prove that however insipid and despicable we may think their contents, our forefathers were of a different opinion; and that, contemptible as they now seem, they were the best which the first musicians of the age could then produce.22

At the death of Alfonso Ferrabosco II, his place in the King’s Musick was filled by his sons. On March 29, 1627, the entry appears in the account book:

Warrants to swear Alfonso Ferrabosco, a musician to his Majesty for the Violls and winde Instruments in the place of his father Alfonso Ferrabosco, deceased; and Henry Ferrabosco a musician in ordinary to his Majesty for the voices and wind instruments, in the place of his father Alfonso Ferrabosco, deceased.

NOTE: — Their father enjoyed four places, viz., a musician’s place in general, a composer’s place, a viol’s place, and an instructor’s place to the prince in the art of musique. The benefit of all which places did descend unto his sons by his Majesty’s special grant.
L. C. Vol. 738, p. 3.23

Alfonso III and Henry Ferrabosco continued in the King’s Musick well into the latter part of the century. Alfonso III was replaced by Thomas Bates in 1662,24 and Henry Ferrabosco by Dr. William Child in 1679.25 Whether these two sons of Alfonso II spent any time playing viols or whether they were confined to the "windy instruments" is a question still unanswered. Perhaps they sensed the decline in prestige of the viol and abandoned the instrument of their father and grandfather.

These violist and many others in the first two thirds of the seventeenth century contributed to a very high level of music making. While many of their peers emigrated because of religious beliefs or to escape the upheavals of the Civil War, Ford, Brewer, the Laniers and the Ferraboscos remained in England and contributed to the musical pleasure of many who otherwise may never have heard a consort of viols.

Reviews:

Austrian Court Music, 1680-1780. Oberlin Baroque Performance Institute, August Wenzinger, Musical Director. Gasparo GS-206 (Gasparo Co., P.O. Box 90574, Nashville, TN 37209). $7.98.

Following their release of an album of Marais music (favorably reviewed in these pages last year), Gasparo offers another recording of performances by Oberlin's renowned Baroque Performance Institute. This much should guarantee the album a receptive audience, and it is not surprising that the present album is a worthy successor to that group's numerous previous recordings. What is more, the present album is a worthy addition to any collection of Baroque music merely by virtue of its contents.

Perhaps the most welcome recording is that of the Sonata no. 2 in A Minor from Johann Schenk's L'Echo du Danube. Schenk, although not of the stature of Couperin or Marais, was nonetheless a composer of significant talent. Not only does his music possess an undeniable gift of melody and harmonic mastery, but also a fondness for larger forms such as extended rondeaux and sets of variations. Of significance for the gamba performer is the richness and sureness of technique Schenk's music demands, which is only to be expected from a man considered one of the greatest virtuosos of his age.

Schenk was a native of Amsterdam and spent his greatest years with Johann Wilhelm II, the Elector Palatine, but the six sonatas of L'Echo du Danube do, as the title implies, have definite connections with the Viennese court. Schenk had visited that court, and a manuscript of the work exists in the Austrian National Library. Although this manuscript differs considerably from the contemporary prints — one sonata in the manuscript is replaced by another in the prints, and one sonata appears in radically altered form — the present sonata is not affected. The work exists in a modern edition, complete with the variant sonatas in the Vienna manuscript, in Volume 67 of Das Erbe Deutscher Musik, edited by Karl Heinz Pauls.

This A Minor Sonata is a quite straightforward work in five movements: Adagio, Giga, Corrente, Adagio (in the curious key of F major), and Vivace. The last movement is especially notable for its elaboration of the second voice. The gamba that had been serving in the ranks of the continuo is given material at times independent of the continuo bass line, and so elaborate that it becomes an equal partner with the solo gamba. This movement is a rondeau in form, and 144 measures in length.

It is with this last movement, however, that a prickly question of editorial rectitude arises. This movement is a rondeau because its opening ten-bar theme recurs twice later in the movement without modification, although separated by lengthy episodes. In the recording, however, this rondeau ends neither with a repetition of the opening theme nor on a tonic chord. Composers of that age simply did not end final movements on dominant harmonies. Furthermore, rondeaux end with restatement of the opening section.

The score is unclear on this matter. The only indication of repetition is a repeat sign at the end of the movement. One cannot unquestioningly trust critical editions (let alone old prints), but I cannot help concluding, as did Karl Heinz Pauls, that a da capo return for a final repeat of the rondeau theme is the only satisfactory solution. The facsimile copy of the Amsterdam print is hardly infallible with such matters as repeat signs, double bars, and distinctions between vero and vero subito indications. Writing out the final repeat would have caused page-turn difficulties in the next sonata— the Amsterdam print leaves four of its forty-six pages blank in order to avoid such predicaments — but claiming that this must also have been the case for the earlier Vienna manuscript and the later Paris print, without having examined either of them, would be presumptuous.

The Oberlin players end on that problematic dominant harmony. Except for this matter, however, Catharina Meints's solo playing is of first quality, and especially welcome is her expressive embellishment of phrases and figures upon repetition. Second section repeats are uniformly ignored, and I raise no objection.

The remaining four works are easier to discuss. The latest work on the record is a Trio in E Major by Andreas Lidl. (The album and notes refer to him as Anton, preserving an old error.) Lidl
was a baryton virtuoso and member of Haydn's orchestra at the Esterhazy court. In her program notes, Mary Ann Ballard reminds us that it was (and is) the duty of performers of music of Lidl's age "to render the inflections which completed the musical discourse and moved the audience." I have no idea how much, or exactly what, has been added to Lidl's music in the present performance, since a score was unavailable to me. Its three-movement design (Vivace, Andante, and Tempo di Minuettto) is representative of preclassical sonata movement grouping.

H. I. F. Biber's Sonata no. 6 in C Minor (from his collection of 1681) is the oldest work on the album. As opposed to the Lidl work it precedes by about a century and a side-break on the album, this work eschews formal poise for a multimovement structure best summarized as grab-bag. Of the six movements, three are quite arguably formless, and, more significantly, the work neatly divides itself in half. Following a prelude and passacaglia, the violist is instructed to retune his instrument. Scordatura tuning was indeed one of Biber's trademarks, but this is the only case in which a new tuning has to be made within a piece. I would not go so far as to suggest, as does Ms. Ballard in her notes, that the two halves of the sonata could stand independently, for the first two movements following the retuning are in G Minor.

This curious sonata is fascinating, but its pervasive formlessness keeps it from equalling the sum of its parts. I'm happy the Oberlin players chose to record it, however, because curious music also needs exposure, and Marilyn McDonald's playing possesses all the virtuosity and finesse the music needs. The continuo realization, as might be expected, owes nothing to Guido Adler's dated but charming effort in Volume 12 of Denkmäler der Tonkunft in Österreich.

The last two works (actually both on side one) are both extracted from large-scale vocal works: an aria, "Caro mio Ben," from J. J. Fux's opera Gli Ossequi della Notte (1709), and a recitative and aria, "Prole tenera," from Attilio Ariosti's oratorio La Professore d'Eliseo (1704). (The album, notes and record label all list these two works in reverse order.) The Ariosti selection, a mother's lament and song about having nothing to feed her child in a besieged city, is fairly typical for the age, and quite pleasingly melodious. More noteworthy is the use of two viols, a frequent occurrence in operas and oratorios written for the Viennese court. Penelope Jensen's solo singing is beautifully expressive but, considering the topic, thankfully not too much so; and if one understands Italian, her diction will make the printed text unnecessary.

Surely J. J. Fux needs no introduction, at least as a theorist. As a composer he has been overlooked, and the perfectly lovely aria recorded here serves eloquently to show up this injustice. One can only hope that giving Fux's music an opportunity to be heard will lead to its acceptance by the music-loving public. Certainly one could not ask for better justice than that served by the present performance, and by tenor Max von Egmond in particular. Von Egmond probably deserves a gambist's ultimate compliment: surely there are few, if any, singers today who complement, and are so well complemented by, the sound of viols as he. Vibrato is sparingly but sensitively employed, and volume is sacrificed for a more subtle expressive representation. One thing about the performance, however, does seem incongruous. With all the concern the Oberlin group lavishes on authentic performance practices, it seems strange that the viola d'amore part in Fux's aria should be performed here on a baroque viola.

Finally, Gasparo's product. I was struck by how much I did not hear, as well as the quality of what I did hear. Surface noise is entirely, miraculously absent. The music is preserved in true sound (produced by Nashville's finest), lacking entirely the pointless and perverse microphone pyrotechnics that have made inroads even in Baroque music. Who would need fifteen-dollar audiophile recordings, usually full of ticks and pops anyway, if such products as this were the norm? Only an occasional high-frequency shatter during the Ariosti and Schenk works mar the absolute perfection of the disc. Satisfactory notes, by the aforementioned Mary Anne Ballard, are provided on a sturdy insert. In sum, this recording is highly recommended, with one reservation.

Stephen F. Luttmann

Günther Hellwig is the dean of German gamba makers and a pupil of Arnold Dolmetsch. His long-awaited monograph on Joachim Tielke is a contribution of the first rank to the literature on the gamba. One is tempted to compare Tielke to Stradivarius and Hellwig to the Hills or Sacconi, but the latter comparison is not wholly appropriate, since the principal emphases of Mr. Hellwig's study are organological and iconographic. It is a book to be slowly savored and returned to frequently. The hundreds of photographs are of uniformly high quality and are well placed to illustrate the text. Drawn from some fifty sources, they are similar enough to give the impression of having been produced for the present volume. The format of the book is quite pleasing, and its author, sponsors, and producers (especially the Hamburg Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe) are to be congratulated.

Biographical information about Tielke (1641-1749) is in short supply, due in part to the Great Fire of Hamburg in 1841 and to the destruction of several Hamburg libraries in the Second World War. In the first section of the book Mr. Hellwig presents the results of his meticulous biographical research on Tielke, and provides a genealogical table of four generations of the Tielke family. Tielke was born in the German Königsberg, now Lithuanian Kaliningrad, in a middle class family. His was not a family of instrument makers, although his brother Gottfried trained in Brescia and made a few instruments which have survived. On the basis of stylistic similarities between Gottfried's instruments and early pieces by Joachim Tielke, Mr. Hellwig speculates that Joachim may have travelled to Italy with his elder brother to study the craft. At age twenty-four (in 1666) Tielke went to Hamburg, where an important musical culture flourished; the following year he married the daughter of an instrument builder. Fortunately for the musical world, Tielke was actively producing instruments for the next fifty years.

In his fifty-three years of production Tielke created an impressive array of instruments. His known oeuvre include seven lutes, six theorbs, one angelica, twenty-five guitars, eight Hamburg Cithrinchen, five violins, three pochettes, eight viole d'amore, seventy-one viole da gamba, two barytons and two bows. Most of the surviving instruments still bear a maker's label by Tielke. In the second major section of the book, Mr. Hellwig discusses these instruments by type. Generally, he first speaks to the nature or history of the instrument, then places Tielke's work in that context. In dealing with the instruments by type, Mr. Hellwig tries to make generalizations about size, construction, appearance and ornamentation. A very helpful feature of this section is the numbers in the margins, which refer the reader to the thorough description of the individual instruments in the "descriptive index."

Social context is particularly important for the Hamburg cittern (Cithrinchen), a thin-bodied plucked instrument resembling the cross section of a bell, double string with five courses in metal. It seems to have enjoyed some popularity among amateurs, but never achieved the status of a serious musical instrument—rather the ukulele of the German Baroque. Nevertheless, Tielke built no fewer than eight of them and embellished them lavishly. This fact raises questions about Tielke's concept of himself and his profession. Was Tielke anything more than a musical furniture maker to the rich? Have later generations aggrandized and romanticized the instrument builder? Why, indeed, does Tielke command our attention?

About half of Tielke's instruments are viols, all of them basses. The dimensions of these instruments vary greatly, leading Mr. Hellwig to conclude that Tielke did not have a standard model. Nor did Tielke use a constant relationship between length and width of the belly. After about 1683, Tielke began to abandon the traditional flat gamba back and to substitute a slightly arched back. Most Tielke gambas have arched backs, although some of his later instruments show that he did not reject the former practice. Early gamba necks by Tielke tended to be longer; after 1695 he achieved a near-constant figure of 30 centimeters, regardless of the length of the body of the instrument. The average height of the ribs is between 11.5 and 13.5 centimeters. Until about 1694 Tielke used C-shaped soundholes; then he changed to flattened crescents, which he employed almost exclusively until 1699, when he reverted to the C shape. Rosettes were used only until 1685; following which they appeared only on the most elaborately decorated instruments.
All of Tielke's gambas have figureheads, some of which are not by Tielke himself. One must also ask if Tielke did not have apprentices who carried out some of the more routine and time-consuming work of decoration. If, as Mr. Hellwig suggests, the rosettes are sometimes not by Tielke, then may not some of the intarsia work have been done by others as well? Are we to conceive of Tielke as the maker/genius, too busy with essentials of design and construction to be concerned with decoration, or merely as a gifted craftsman, without greater pretensions? Or is he an artist working in precious woods and ivory?

Since the violin sets the standard in subtlety and complexity for Western instrument building, one wonders why Mr. Hellwig tells us so little about Tielke's violins. Do they differ from those of contemporary makers in sound, design or in ornamentation? The treatment of the lute, on the other hand, is quite thorough, and after all, Tielke is primarily known for his lutes and gambas.

It is regrettable that Mr. Hellwig, who has surely heard more Tielke instruments than anyone in this century, does not tell us more about the sound of these gorgeous antiques; for surely it is excellence of sound that distinguishes the instrument builder from the furniture maker. Yet he devotes hardly more than one page to the sound of Tielke's instruments taken as a whole, and none of that reflects his personal experience. (He quotes some period sources which praise the Tielke sound.) Did Tielke have a tonal ideal for his gambas, and what has been the effect of age on their sound?

No known gamba by Tielke lacks a figurehead: he evidently never used scrolls. Of the figureheads discovered by Mr. Hellwig, three are men's heads, eight are Moor's heads, two show the god Mercury, nineteen portray lions, and five represent dragons. The thirty-one figureheads of women prove this form to be the favorite. Within this stylized form, Mr. Hellwig discerns an artistic development which by 1694 had reached its maturity. In the later female figureheads, the smile on the face becomes more pronounced, a fact that titillates the imagination. Lion heads, also numerous and capable of great variation, do not display any recognizable development, but later lions are more finely drawn and more dynamic.

Floral ornamentation is the most frequent embellishment used.
soundholes, purfling and construction), the ribs, the back, the figurehead, the peg box, the neck, the fingerboard, the tailpiece, the hook-bar, and the varnish. All of these parts are given a concise narrative description, depending on the peculiarities of the instrument and what alterations may have befallen it over the years. Where parts of an instrument are not by Tielke they are labeled as not original.

Precise measurements in centimeters are usually given for the following, when the original parts are present: total length; body length; body width (at top, middle and bottom); plate measurement; height of ribs; length of neck; length and breadth of fingerboard. Mr. Hellwig is very conscientious in describing the condition of each work, including its present condition and history of repairs. To assemble such an amount of information on 139 instruments is a Herculean task. It was clearly impossible to provide the same information on all the gambas, and Mr. Hellwig was forced in some cases to rely on the measurements made by others; indeed, some of the instruments are now known to be lost or destroyed. Thus the amount of information given varies considerably, making it occasionally difficult to compare instruments. The information given about an instrument would not be sufficient to allow a builder to construct an exact copy. The thickness of the belly is never given, even though this contributes as no other factor to the production of sound. Tielke's varnishes, another sound-affecting factor, are not discussed and are meagrely described. Since there is only one color photograph in the book, one is hard put to form an opinion of Tielke's varnishes.

The book renders an enormous service to the connoisseur, the collector, and the art library, and also to the builder. One hopes that builders will be inspired to match and surpass Tielke's spectacular instruments, players to perfect their taste in instrument design and decoration. Mr. Hellwig's monument to Tielke is thus entirely in keeping with his philosophy of building: we should proceed from historic dimensions, but not copy antique instruments slavishly. The mere assembling of the photographs alone is a meritorious service, and there is a richness in the study which will take a very long time to exhaust.

John Rutledge


We may as well begin with the verdict: John Hsu's edition of Marin Marais's Pièces à une et à deux violes, along with the Faber-Viola da Gamba Society editions of Jenkins and Lawes consort music, is the most important modern edition of viola da gamba music to have as yet appeared. Unlike the Faber publications, however, it will not attract queues of eager purchasers from among the ranks of practicing gambists, for reasons that have to do less with its intrinsic merits than with the facts of life and the nature of its appeal. For one thing, it is damnably expensive. So are Jenkins and Lawes, for that matter. But the music in the present instance has long been accessible to serious students and professional gambists (the only ones who would attempt it anyway), and even were the price no object, it seems unlikely that many players will give up their facsimiles in favor of the new edition.

This will come as no surprise to Prof. Hsu, I'm sure, for although he has been generally considerate of the player in such matters as page turns, and although this handsomely produced volume delights the eye, it is obvious that its intended destination is the library shelf and the scholar's desk, not the music stand. It is the first installment of a projected complete edition of Marais's instrumental works in seven volumes (five books of Pièces de viole, the Pièces en trio and La Gamme). A standard of textual criticism and bibliographic control is maintained that matches the best in modern scholarship, and no doubt the Marais Edition will in due course take its place in the prestigious company of the standard Gesamtausgaben. It is of course unutterably gratifying for us gambists to see one of our own honored so, for many of us have harbored a secret regret that such a great composer as Marais wrote for an instrument whose current "specialist" status has impeded his universal recognition as a major master on a par with Couperin or Lully. Now that recognition may take place, for which the world will be the richer.

But a bulky library edition like this one is not practical for performance. The music is laid out in score (for which accompan-
ists may already be grateful, especially in the préludes!, but no continuo realizations are given. It is true, of course, that an increasing number of practicing keyboard players despise realizations anyway, but these are precisely the ones who could have managed from a partbook. No, it is to the community of scholars rather than that of performers that Prof. Hsu has directed his labors, and so from here on I shall don my mortarboard and respond in kind.

Marais’s “First Book” of 1686 (he actually began numbering them with the second) stands alone in the literature of the instrument. It was the first publication anywhere of suites for solo bass viol (plus two suites for two solo viols) with continuo, and thus represented a notable advance in the instrument’s status. The playing technique it embodies is of a very high level of development: taken as a whole, the first is probably for modern-day players the most demanding of Marais’s five books. And this is because (along with De Machy’s solo suites) it represents at its very pinnacle the “bowed lute” style of writing for the viol, full of contracted hand positions, bowed arpeggios and wide string crossings — in short, the redoubtable “jeu d’harmonie.” Already in the Second Book (1701) notable compromises were made with the “jeu de mélodie,” under the impact, on the one hand, of a growing market of amateur players, and, on the other, of violin music. This latter style lends itself much more easily to hands trained on modern bowed instruments, and most players nowadays get better results with it. Then, too, the First Book contains relatively fewer amiable character pieces than the later ones, and a proportionately greater number of severe and highly elaborated compositions. Two of the préludes are huge works in a tripartite French overture format that Marais never attempted again (and which are found to my knowledge in no one else’s work, either — they are unique). And there are backward glances at earlier styles of gamba music which were even in 1686 growing obsolete: witness the huge set of divisions on a ground that out-Simpsons Simpson (the theme, Marais tells us, was “given to me by a foreigner” — no doubt as to his nationality, or his age!) The book contains Marais’s longest single pièce, the chaconne from the D Major Suite. And there is the remarkable “Tombeau de Mr. de Meliton,” which stands by itself at the end of the volume, Marais’s most extended free-form composition, and (in the not-unbiased opinion of the violist Nikolaus Harnoncourt) the model for the opening chorus of the St. Matthew Passion. In a word, Marais’s first book uniquely shows him in a fully fledged “baroque” light (as opposed to “rococo”), and the music it contains, in its lofty breadth and ambitious scale, makes unique demands on player and listener alike. Afterwards, this style seems to have passed out of French viol music, to resurface only in the publications of the Germans Haffner, Kühnei and Schenk. But these men were hardly composers in Marais’s league. Thus, the Marais Edition has started out with a peak, not a foothill. And it is a pleasure to report that the scholarly presentation does full justice to the contents.

John Hsu has been one of our leading players and pedagogues for some fifteen years. To his formidable skills he has now added those of expert bibliographer and textual critic. (In these capacities he was considerably aided by Dr. Bonney McDowell, to whom he makes graceful acknowledgement, and whose contributions — though their exact nature cannot be determined from the book itself — should be given their due here as well.) Although it comes at the end of the volume, the best place to begin evaluating Hsu’s editorial performance is with his Critical Report. Approaching the task of establishing Marais’s final intentions with respect to the text with commendable rigor, the editor collated no less than eleven copies of the solo part-book, and six of the continuo part-book, and — by dint of very canny dating techniques requiring a sophisticated understanding of methods of seventeenth-century bookmaking and research into Marais’s successive residences — came up with some interesting findings. The First Book exists in two authentic editions, which differ mainly in the amount of editing (fingering, ornaments, bass figures, etc.) provided by the composer. A whole treatise (or a doctoral thesis — are you listening out there in academia?) could be written about performance practice on the basis of these differences. The result of all this meritoriously tedious work is an edition that reliably transmits what Hsu calls the “terminal state” of Marais’s notation, and consequently (in the editor’s view) his final performance intentions. As a demonstration of textual criticism, the Critical Report is a most impressive piece of work. Its implications for performance are a matter to which I shall return.

Following the Critical Report is a list of all minor emenda-
tions the editor has introduced into the text for the sake of consistency in notation, or to correct “obvious errors.” Not many editors would have been so patient and conscientious, nor would they all have been as laudably modest as Hsu in recognizing that the “obviousness” of an error is a matter of interpretation. The list seems almost too compulsively dutiful (there are one or two instances where after intense scrutiny I confess I cannot tell the difference between the original and the emended versions—e.g., piece #82, second viol part, meas. 14, as noted on p. 172). But all of this reverent care reflects additional honor on its object, i.e., on Marais, and so one can hardly complain.

Proceeding backwards, we come to the music itself. The Editorial Policies are spelled out in two-and-one-half large, closely printed pages, and they are mainly exemplary. They range from the numbering of suites and pieces for purposes of reference — why have we never thought of that before? Now we can talk about “Marais’s Fifth” — to all sorts of niceties involving the modernization of Marais’s notation. The main purpose of the explication of policy is to prevent the intrusion of editorial “interpretation.” Well and good, except that the complete effacement of the editor’s presence is a chimera, and one can always find things to quibble with. Here are mine:

1. In common with most modern editors, Hsu makes a god of consistency. Behind this notion is the assumption that consistency is what we all strive for and have always striven for, only deviating from it because we are human and fallible, and that the editor’s task is to rectify human fallibility the nearer to approach godly perfection. Well, on the matter of consistency I side with Emerson, and protest Prof. Hsu’s handling of repeat signs, da capo markings, and the like. It seems that Marais, who otherwise was rather compulsively complete with respect to all aspects of notation, was notably sloppy with respect to the placement of repeat signs. He sometimes has them at the end, say, of prélude, and sometimes fails to provide them at the end of binary dances (though never in the middle). Prof. Hsu has “silently” standardized the placement of repeats: never at the end of préludes or fantasies, always at the end of dances — which may have been precisely Marais’s intention. Then again, a capricious asymmetry may have occasionally been his wish. We can never know, but Prof. Hsu has prevented us from considering the latter alternative. He obviously does not regard it as a proper alternative, but on what objective grounds? As a matter of fact, an interesting article has recently been published, in which the presence or absence of repeats at the end of binary movements has been surveyed as a key to the emergence of the Classic style. So perhaps we should be allowed, if we wish, to make such a survey in Marais. It seems to me that here the editor has arrogated to himself a decision that properly belongs to the performer — i.e., did Marais mean what he wrote (or failed to write)?

2. In a bold move, the editor has printed a facsimile of the first page of the two original part books facing the first page of his edition — a seeming challenge to find fault. I hope I am not merely rising to the bait when I note what appears to me a regrettable intrusion of modern policy. The first section of the Prélude in question consists mainly of a steady flow of eighth-notes in cut time, in a kind of style brise affect. In most instances Marais beams all eight eighths in the measure together. But Hsu, following modern practice, consistently breaks them up into two groups of four. A performer reading from Hsu’s edition would probably not achieve as even a flow as one reading from the original, especially since of late modern performers of Baroque music have taken to the “Amsterdammable” habit of throbbing vulgarly on the first note of every regular grouping. It would appear then that intrusions and “interpretations” are pretty much unavoidable in any transcription — which is another reason why most performers will continue to use their easily obtained, inexpensive Ruedy Ebner or James Caldwell facsimiles.

Coming at last to the first, the Introduction and the Notes on Performance, we may commend the former for providing in short space a great deal of pertinent information about Marais’s biography and milieu, and for providing up-to-date bibliographic references for those who wish to pursue the subject further. The Notes on Performance, however, suffer from an occasional blurring of the boundaries between Marais’s teachings and Hsu’s. Those

---

familiar with Prof. Hsu's decided ideas on violin technique will recognize many familiar themes (e.g., the starting point in Hubert Le Blanc's classification of Marais's bowing technique into "six different kinds of strokes"). Most of Hsu's advice is sound (though one wonders to whom it is addressed, since scholars will not need to take sides on controversial matters of wrist motion or fingers-on-the-hair, while players will hardly turn to the Marais Edition for basic training). Occasional idiosyncrasies there are, however, against which the unwary might well be warned. I list four:

1. Prof. Hsu properly calls attention to Marais's slurring practice at cadences, where most often a tremblement lié is followed by a detached anticipation (though very few players still distort the bowing in the way Hsu illustrates). One may take exception to his instruction to follow the long slur with a "fast and light down-bow for the anticipation." For myself, I prefer to lift the bow and to replace it almost as far as the tip during the "ring" of the lifted note, playing the anticipation as a very short bow at the very tip. Not only does this prevent accenting the anticipation, and not only does it give an anticipation of infinitely flexible length, but it accords well with Le Blanc's description of Marais's playing as being "tout en l'air." I do not claim that my way is Marais's, necessarily, nor do I object to Hsu's preferring something different. I do, however, very much object to his passing his way off as Marais's.

2. Prof. Hsu states that in performing the coulé de doigt, the "finger should . . . stress the second note clearly when it is reached." Again, he has no authority for this assertion, and others may prefer (as I do) a slow slide and an indefinite arrival.

3. The comments on flätement vs. plainte are subjective and circular. There is no evidence that the two vibratos had "different expressive effects," and most players agree that Marais appeared to regard them as two varieties of a single device. "Expressive effect," in any case, varies with the context, context, mood and temperament of the player. The flätement in particular is one ornament I wish I could have heard Marais play, so as to form a correct idea of how he meant it to sound. None of us today can claim to know. The flätement as produced by modern players (I name no names) runs the gamut from the beating of angels' wings to the braying of donkeys.

4. Hsu's discussion of tempo and its relationship to meter (largely based on the work of his Cornell colleague Neal Zaslaw) is far too confident and assertive, given the present state of knowledge. Not only is he (or anyone) unjustified in prescribing metronome settings, he is guilty of misleading the reader with bland and unqualified generalizations like "In Marais's time, extreme tempos were not used." Not only does this statement demand a host of definitions to be meaningful, it overlooks the numerous occasions where Marais specifies (on top of a meter or signature, which for Hsu tells the whole story) "très lent," "très vite," or "très gai," which can mean nothing other than an "extreme tempo"—i.e., one faster or slower than those normally employed by dancers.

To conclude, I hope I may be forgiven for voicing what may appear to be an heretical unease with the whole business of establishing "authentic" texts for old music. Having its origins in Classical and Biblical philology, modern textual criticism has widened its purview to encompass, first, all of literature, and then drama and music, the performing arts that rely on "texts." In Biblical matters, where issues of doctrine are involved, and where life and death or war and peace can hang in the balance, one can easily grant the need to spare no pains in quest of the One True Version of the Word. But is not the situation a bit different with music? Need we emulate Moses in bringing down the Urtext from Mt. Sinai? In the case of Marais's Book I, in fact, as Prof. Hsu demonstrates, there are two Urtexts, and is it really sensible to maintain that Marais's later views on his own music invalidated his earlier ones? Did he in fact replace one inviolable text with another, or did his perpetual editorial dickering reflect instead his fluid performance practices, which no doubt were reflected in actual performance, too? In other words, if Marais was playing the pieces he published in 1686 a bit differently in 1689 (and took the opportunity presented, as Prof. Hsu hypothesizes, by the belated publication of the continuo book to revise the solo part to reflect his current practices), may we not assume that he continued to modify his performances in 1702, in 1703, and so on, as long as he
lived? And consequently, that if you or I are moved in 1980 to add a pincé here or a flatement there, we are acting legitimately within the traditions of Marais's performance practice? In Marais's own avertissement to the First Book, reprinted with translation in Hsu's edition, he condones practices (simplifications, etc.) that no one would be permitted to get away with in public today. Are we to take him at his word? Compared to these, it seems a small matter to add a petite reprise where none is written out or "signed," or even to vary it (or even repeats?).

And how about the enfler? Marais did not begin sprinkling the little Es around until his Third Book (1711). Does that mean the swell was not part of his technique or style until then? Or that he simply had not yet come up with the means of notating it? Are we justified in swelling in Book I or Book II? These are questions, admittedly, for the performer, not the editor. Acting as a responsible twentieth-century editor, Prof. Hsu has discharged his duties honorably and skillfully. But his success at meeting the demands of his job should not allow us complacently to ignore the many thorny, vexing questions even the best edition cannot answer. And we must all, editor and performer alike, guard against confusing the roles, or confusing the notation of music with its performance. The undeniable gains that modern musicology has won in ridding editions of old music of anachronisms and arbitrary intrusions of editorial taste are attended by the danger of inhibiting spontaneity in performance. And the more zealously we pursue the chimerical ideal of the authentic text, the more threateningly that danger looms. Knowing Prof. Hsu's own excellent performances, I can attest that he has avoided the pitfall. It is now up to the users of his excellent edition to do the same.

Richard Taruskin
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