



JOURNAL OF  
THE VIOLA  
DA GAMBA  
SOCIETY OF  
AMERICA

Volume XX 1983



INDIANA UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARIES  
BLOOMINGTON

**Journal of the  
Viola da Gamba Society of America**

**Volume 20**

ISSN 0507-0252

**December, 1983**

MUS  
ML  
1

**CONTENTS**

.V295  
V.20

On Letting the Music Speak for Itself:  
Some Reflections on Musicology and Performance . . . . . 6

Richard Taruskin

Purcell's Clock Tempos and the Fantasias . . . . . 24

Ellen TeSelle Boal

A Translation of the Preface to *Terpsichore*  
of Michael Praetorius . . . . . 40

Bruce R. Carvell

Grounds for Putting Simpson into Practice . . . . . 60

Gordon Dodd

Reveiw[s] . . . . . 68

Contributor Profiles . . . . . 81

Indiana University  
AUG 30 1984  
Library

*Viola de Gamba Society of America  
Journal of the Viola de Gamba  
Society of America  
1983, Vol. 20  
71-Music*

*Shelved in*

# Viola da Gamba Society of America

## PUBLICATIONS STAFF

Journal VdGSA (Annual) . . . . . Efrim Fruchtman, Editor  
Music Dept., Memphis State University  
Memphis, Tennessee 38152

John A. Whisler, Associate Editor  
Booth Library, Eastern Illinois University  
Charleston, Illinois 61920

Ann Viles, Review Editor  
Music Library, Memphis State University  
Memphis, Tennessee 38152

VdGSA News (Quarterly)     Newton V. Blakeslee, Editor  
11202 Rokeby Avenue  
Garrett Park, Maryland 20896

## OFFICERS

President . . . . . Phyllis Olson  
806 W. University Parkway  
Baltimore, Maryland 21210

Vice-President . . . . . Ellen Powers  
31 Kilburn Road  
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

Vice-President . . . . . Martha Bishop  
1859 Westminster Way NE  
Atlanta, Georgia 30307

Executive Secretary . . . . . John A. Whisler  
1536 Third Street, Apt. 6  
Charleston, Illinois 61920

Treasurer . . . . . George Bachmann  
71 Pennsylvania Avenue  
Westminster, Maryland 21157

10-25-70

## REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Rachel Archibald . . . . . 1125 E. Nielson  
Mesa, Arizona 85204

Martha Bishop . . . . . 1859 Westminster Way NE  
Atlanta, Georgia 30307

Marcia Fountain . . . . . Music Department  
University of Texas  
El Paso, Texas 79968

Shirley Marcus . . . . . 1366 Appleton Way  
Venice, California 90291

Elizabeth Potteiger . . . . . 1016 Tollgate Drive  
Oxford, Ohio 45056

Ellen Powers . . . . . 31 Kilburn Road  
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

Elliott F. Royce . . . . . 5210 Villa Way, Apt. 141  
Edina, Minnesota 55436

Gordon Sandford . . . . . College of Music  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, Colorado 80309

Frances Smith . . . . . 2823 Wilson Parkway  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17104

## OUT-OF-COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVES

Gordon Dodd ..... 7 Wychwood Avenue  
Canons Park, Edgware  
Middlesex, England HA8 6TL

Myrna Herzog Feldman ..... Rua Ipanema 173/1004  
Rio de Janeiro  
Brazil 22600

Albert Folop ..... Feldmark 23  
2940 Wilhelmshaven  
West Germany

Rhona Lever ..... P.O. Box 33045  
Christchurch 2  
New Zealand

Lee Mosca ..... Via Guastalla 10  
Torino 10124  
Italy

Margaret Sampson ..... 58 Hogarth Avenue  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada M4K 1K1

Michel Sicard ..... 27 rue des Carmelites  
86000 Poitiers  
France

Leo Traynor ..... 500th MI GP  
APO San Francisco 96343  
(in japan)

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Phyllis Olson, Chairman

Term Expiring 1984:  
Elliott F. Royce, Frank Traficante, John A. Whisler

Term Expiring 1986:  
Enid Sutherland, Richard Taruskin, Carol Marsh

Term Expiring 1988:  
Grace Feldman, Rachel Archibald, Peter Tourin

Publications of the Society are obtainable through membership. Inquiries concerning membership, circulation, advertisements, and availability of back issues should be directed to the Executive Secretary.

## SUGGESTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTORS

The editors welcome for consideration articles pertaining to the viols and related instruments, their history, manufacture, performers, music, and related topics. Articles should be addressed to the editor. Reviews and materials for review should be sent to the Review Editor. Authors should consult *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 13th ed., (University of Chicago Press, 1982) for matters of style. Further details are available upon request from the Associate Editor.

## On Letting the Music Speak for Itself: Some Reflections on Musicology and Performance\*

Richard Taruskin

The title of this article<sup>1</sup> may suggest that I will give a state-of-the-art report on the relationship between musicology and performance or else outline a program for the future development of that relationship. But neither would be worth my while to prepare nor yours to read. Things are going well. Never, it seems, have scholars and performers worked so closely and happily together or learned more from each other, nor have so many ever before combined the roles as successfully as now. Musicologically trained performers are proliferating in graduate programs around the country. Historical performance practice is now a recognized sub-discipline both of academic musicology and of conservatory curricula. When Mr. Henahan of the *New York Times* can devote a Sunday column to the merits of historical instruments, or when Mr. Rockwell of the same paper, in a glowing review of *Pomerium Musices*, can actually list among the group's assets that its director is a musicologist, we may all take some justifiable satisfaction in going at last off the defensive vis-a-vis the press and, let us hope, the public. May this trend of recognition continue. We've all worked hard for it, we deserve it, and everything I say here is meant to abet it.

But at the same time I should like, as it were among friends, to examine what Charles Rosen has recently called the "peculiar metaphysical and ontological assumptions"<sup>2</sup> that underlay much current thinking about musicology and performance, or musicology-cum-

---

\*This article is reprinted with permission from the *Journal of Musicology* 1 (July 1982): 338-349.

<sup>1</sup>This article was originally read as part of a panel discussion entitled "The Musicologist Today and in the Future," at the national meeting of the American Musicological Society in Boston, 13 November 1981.

<sup>2</sup>Charles Rosen, "The Musicological Marvel" (Review of *The New Grove*), *The New York Review of Books* (28 May 1981): 36.

performance, or even musicology versus performance. And if much of what follows sounds like an *apologia pro vita sua*, and therefore immodest, it is because I feel that the only way for me, as a musicologist performer, honestly to approach the question of musicology and performance, is to look within.

So let me take as my point of departure a little colloquy I had some time ago with a graduate student at Columbia. He claimed that performances of Renaissance sacred music by Cappella Nova, the choral group I direct, were arbitrary and overly personal, and that I would be better advised to "let the music speak for itself." Well, I can tell you that his remarks rankled in their implication of irresponsibility. I do my homework, after all. I edit the music we perform from its original sources, or at least from pedigreed *Gesamtausgaben*, I have read up on *musica ficta*, on text underlay, on proportions, and we do not gussy up the music with instruments. Yet I knew just what the fellow meant, and also realized that his view of our work was widely shared among scholars, or at least among graduate students. Debating the matter with him did me good. It made me examine my own premises with greater detachment than before, and made me attempt to separate my own musicological attitudes from my performer's attitudes—something I rarely do consciously, any more than I am separately aware of inhaling and exhaling.

It seems a curious request to make of a performer, to "let the music speak for itself." If a performer did not have the urge to participate in it and, yes, to contribute to it, why then he wouldn't have become a performer in the first place. The only time I could recall being told previously to "let the music speak for itself" was when I played the opening movement of Bach's B-minor French Suite to my piano teacher many years ago and ventured a few ornaments. Most of the time the idea of letting the music speak for itself implies hostility, contempt, or at least mistrust of performers. It is what Brahms had in mind, for example, when he declined an invitation to the opera saying that if he sat at home with the score he'd

hear a better performance. Or think of Stravinsky, with all his raillery against "interpretation," or Milton Babbitt, when describing his motives for adopting electronic media as a way of compensating for what he called the "low redundancy" of his music.<sup>3</sup> All three composers seem to share a view of performers as undesirable middle men, whose elimination would further communication between composer and audience. But only in Babbitt's case was letting the music speak for itself in this way a practicable alternative. Stravinsky, for his part, was moved by his mistrust of performers to become one himself, so as to document his music first in piano rolls and then in recordings and thus achieve the inviolable musical "object" he sought. The only trouble was that whenever Stravinsky documented his performance more than once he created quite different objects, particularly with regard to tempo, which was always the main object of documentation to begin with. Moreover, Stravinsky's recorded tempi were almost always faster than his indications in the score, sometimes by a truly bewildering margin, as in the case of *Zvezdoliki*, which I single out because Stravinsky referred to his recording of that piece as a particularly successful documentation.<sup>4</sup> So Stravinsky, sitting at home with the score like Brahms, heard a performance that was, if not better, then at least consistently slower than the ones he himself produced in actual sound. His efforts at documentation have only produced a confusing problem for those who would obey his wishes. But the problems he created are as nothing next to those created by such pianist composers as Debussy or Prokofiev, whose performances on rolls and records are so widely at variance with their notation that no one could get away with copying them (as I found out

<sup>3</sup> See "Who Cares if You Listen?" *High Fidelity* 8 (February 1958) and widely anthologized thereafter, e.g., in Elliott Schwartz and Barney Childs, eds., *Contemporary Composers on Contemporary Music* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967), 244-50.

<sup>4</sup> "Contemporary Music and Recording," in Igor Stravinsky and Robert Craft, *Dialogues and a Diary* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1963), 33. Also reprinted in Schwartz and Childs (see footnote 3), 56.

when I took a Gavotte by Prokofiev to another piano teacher). As for Brahms himself, even if we allow that his remark amounted to no more than persiflage, we may ask nonetheless whether the better performance he heard was better because it was more faithful to the music in some obscure way, or because it perfectly suited his tastes as another's rendition could not.

In short, music can never under any circumstances but electronic speak for itself. In the case of notated music there is always a middle man, even if it is only ourselves as we contemplate the written symbols. And if anyone still doubts this, let him drop in on any analysis symposium.

But even if impossible to realize absolutely, "letting the music speak for itself" may still be a worthy ideal toward which to aspire. What does it mean, though? For the moment, let us assume it means realizing the composer's intentions as far as our knowledge of them permits. What we are really being told, then, is to let the composer speak for himself. I will not rehearse here the familiar epistemological impediments to learning what the composer's intentions were, especially a composer as remote from us as Ockeghem, whose music it was that I was enjoined to let speak for itself. I wish to go a bit further and suggest that in many if not most instances composers do not even have the intentions we would like to ascertain. And I am not even talking about what are sometimes called "high level" versus "low level" intentions, that is, specific intentions with regard to individual pieces as opposed to assumptions based on prevailing conditions the composer took for granted.<sup>5</sup> No, I mean something even more fundamental: that composers' concerns are different from performers' concerns, and that once the piece is finished, the composer regards it and relates to it either as a performer if he is

<sup>5</sup> See Randall R. Dipert, "The Composer's Intentions: An Examination of their Relevance for Performance," *The Musical Quarterly* 66 (April 1980): 205-18.

one, or else simply as a listener. I'll give a few examples. One is Irving Berlin, who once said of Fred Astaire, "I like him because he doesn't change my songs, or if he does, he changes them for the better." Another is Debussy again. He said to George Copeland on their first meeting that he never thought he'd hear his piano music played so well during his lifetime. No question then that Copeland's playing realized the composer's intentions to the latter's satisfaction. On another occasion, though, Debussy asked Copeland why he played the opening of "Reflet dans l'eau" the way he did. Copeland's response was the old performer's standby, calculated to make any musicologist see red: "Because I feel it that way." To which Debussy replied that as for himself he felt it differently, but that Copeland must go on playing it as he, Copeland, felt it.<sup>6</sup> So once the pianist's credentials as a Debussy performer were established, his performances were accepted by the composer as being no less authoritative than his own. Debussy, as pianist, was in his own eyes only one interpreter among others.

My next example stems from personal experience. I once sat in as page turner at a rehearsal of Elliott Carter's Duo for violin and piano under the composer's supervision. He couldn't have been less helpful. Whenever the performers sought guidance on matters of balance or tempo, his reply was invariably, "I don't know, let's see..." and then he would join them in seeking solutions, as often asking their advice as they his. At one point, when the performers were having some difficulty with his very finicky rhythmic notation, Carter said (so help me), "For heaven's sake don't count—just feel it." At the end of the rehearsal he commented that every performance of the Duo was very different from every other one, but that "whichever one I'm hearing always seems the best." So much for intentions. If that was Carter's attitude, what do you suppose Ockeghem

---

<sup>6</sup> See George Copeland, "The First—and Last—Times I Saw Debussy," *Music, Preview Issue* (November, 1944): 6-9.

would have cared about Cappella Nova's ficta? We seem to be committing another "intentional fallacy" here, trying, just as Wimsatt and Beardsley said we should never do, to solve our problems by "consulting the oracle."<sup>7</sup>

It seems to me that much of what I will make bold to characterize as the "musicological" attitude toward performance is based on consulting the oracle in an even more spurious, because roundabout, way. We tend to assume that if we can recreate all the external conditions that obtained in the original performance of a piece we will thus recreate the composer's inner experience of the piece and thus allow him to speak for himself. In a lecture I recently attended on the staging of one of Verdi's operas in Paris, a great deal of fascinating detail was recounted on all of the vicissitudes encountered in the course of mounting the work and in making it conform to the special demands of the Paris Opera. The point was constantly reiterated that every aspect of the production was completely documented in surviving records, so that one could revive the work tomorrow just as it was being described. I ventured to ask at the end of the lecture why this would be desirable, and I was told, with eyebrows raised and voice pitched high to show how obvious the answer was, that in this way the composer's intentions would be realized. And this after a lecture in which it had just been demonstrated that the intentions realized in the original production had belonged to many, not just Verdi, and that in a large number of instances the composer's intentions had been overruled and frustrated.

So why do we consult the oracle? A simple answer, the usual answer, is that we want our performances to be authentic. But that is no answer. What is this thing called authenticity and why do we want it? While most of us would be now agree with the premise, so elegantly and humorously set forth by Michael Morrow in *Early Music*

---

<sup>7</sup> W.K. Wimsatt, Jr. and Monroe C. Beardsley, "The Intentional Fallacy," *Sewanee Review* 54 (July-September 1946): 468-88.

a few years ago,<sup>8</sup> that authenticity of the kind we usually have in mind when talking musicologically about performance practice is a chimera, most of us are nevertheless no more deterred by this realization from seeking it than was Bellerophon himself. Agin I ask, why?

We usually trace the origins of modern musicology to romantic historicism. But it seems to me that musicological ideals of performance style owe as much if not more to the modernist esthetic that rose to dominance out of the ashes of the First World War. We in music usually think of it as the "Stravinskian" esthetic, though it had been anticipated with astonishing, if cranky, completeness as early as Hanslick's *The Beautiful in Music*. It is often described, after Ortega y Gasset, as "Dehumanization,"<sup>9</sup> but since that word (though meant by Ortega with approval) carries such unpleasant overtones, I prefer to use T.S. Eliot's term, depersonalization, defined as "the surrender of [the artist] as he is at the moment to something much more valuable," that thing being Tradition, which, as Eliot warns us, "cannot be inherited, and if you want it you must obtain it by great labour."<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Michael Morrow, "Musical Performance and Authenticity," *Early Music* 6 (April 1978): 233-46.

<sup>9</sup> See Jose Ortega y Gasset, "The Dehumanization of Art," in *The Dehumanization of Art and Other Essays on Art, Culture, and Literature* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1968), 3-56.

<sup>10</sup> "Tradition and the Individual Talent," in Frank Kermode, ed., *Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1975), 40, 38. Of course the modernist and historicist positions are in many ways congruent and to a considerable degree symbiotic in their influence on musicological attitudes toward performance. Were it not for the historicist precept, instilled in all traditionally trained historians today, that one's contemporary attitudes and values must be suspended when confronting the past, it is doubtful whether "authentic performance" would have become the musicological issue it has, or whether in fact there would have been much impetus toward the practical revival of old performance practices to begin with. But without the support of the modernist philosophy examined here, it is just as doubtful whether the "Aufführungs-praxis" movement would have achieved much resonance beyond the classroom and the Collegium Musicum. The thriving existence of *Early Music* magazine is in its paradoxical way the best testimony to the continued vitality of esthetic modernism. The "early music boom" represents the precise locus of the confluence of historicism and modernism in music.

And why do we in music want it? So that our performances may capture something of what the folklorist Jeffrey Mark so percipiently described half a century ago in an article entitled "The Fundamental Qualities of Folk Music," but which is actually the best characterization I know of the modernist esthetic as applied to music:

The performer, whether as singer, dancer, or player, does his part without giving any or much impression that his is participating in the act. And his native wood notes wild, far from giving the popularly conceived effect of a free and careless improvisation, show him definitely to be in the grip of a remorseless and comparatively inelastic tradition which gives him little or no scope for personal expression (again as popularly conceived). Through him the culture speaks, and he has neither the desire nor the specific comprehension to mutilate what he has received. His whole attitude and manner [is] one of profound gravity and cool, inevitable intention. There [is] not the faintest suggestion of the flushed cheek and the sparkling eye. And [the performance] is ten times the more impressive because of it.<sup>11</sup>

So here at last is the real challenge my critic issued me in the encounter I began by describing: "Let the culture speak for itself." Ah, would that we could, for this is what real authenticity is, the kind Eliot wrote about, not what Michael Morrow called the "contemporary cult meaning" of the word, which really amounts to little more than time-travel nostalgia. The trouble is that the artifacts of past culture with which Eliot dealt are still intact and available in a way that musical artifacts obviously can never be. Music has to be imaginatively recreated in order to be retrieved, and here is where conflicts are likely to arise between the performer's imagination and the scholar's conscience, even (or especially) when the two are housed in a single mind.

Verdi, speaking ironically about the aims of verismo, said, "it's fine to reproduce reality, but how much better to create it." In a similar spirit I would say, "it's fine to assemble the shards of a lost performance tradition, but how much better to reinvent it." Research alone has never given, and is never likely to give (again for obvious

---

<sup>11</sup> Jeffrey Mark, "The Fundamental Qualities of Folk Music," *Music and Letters* 10 (July 1929): 287-90 passim. Italics mine.



reasons) enough information to achieve that wholeness of conception and that sureness of style—in a word, that fearlessness—any authentic, which is to say authoritative, performance must embody. Here is a paradox: which is more “authentic,” an historical reconstructionist performance of, say, *Messiah*, or a Three Choirs Festival performance? Which, in other words, enjoys the commonality of work, performer, and (lest we forget) audience, the certainty of experience and of expectation that lends the proceedings the “cool, inevitable intention” Jeffrey Mark described? The Three Choirs performance surely speaks for a culture, not Handel’s perhaps, but that of the performers and their audience, certainly. It gives what Eliot called a sense “not only of the pastness of the past, but its presence.”<sup>12</sup> The modernist, avant-grade, historical reconstruction of *Messiah* can only evoke the pastness of the past, and will therefore appeal not to the esthetic sense but merely to antiquarian curiosity—unless it derives its sustenance not only from whatever evidence musicological research may provide, but also from imaginative leaps that will fill in the gaps research by its very nature must leave. Otherwise we will have not a performance but a documentation of the state of knowledge. As long as the reconstructionist performer holds himself to the same strict standards of accountability we rightly demand of any scholar, his efforts will be bent not on doing what the music was meant to do, but on simply “getting it right,” that is, on achieving what the mainstream performer takes for granted. He will end up, if he is lucky, with what the mainstream performer starts out with.

The most authoritative and compelling reconstructionist performances of old music, as well as the most controversial, have always been those that have proceeded from a vividly imagined—that is frankly to say imaginary—but coherent performance style. They provide themselves with Tradition, in the Eliot sense, and

---

<sup>12</sup> Eliot, *Selected Prose*, 38.

bestow authenticity upon themselves. Where such performers do not know the composer’s intentions they are unafraid to have intentions of their own, and to treat them with a comparable respect. I suppose I am thinking now of the performances of the Early Music Quartet and some recent ones by the *Concentus Musicus* among those I have heard, and among those I have not, of the radical reconstructionist performance of *Messiah* given in Ann Arbor under Edward Parmentier last year, which I know only by enthusiastic rumor, and by reports of the uproar it created among some of the scholars in attendance.

In this light, let me return now to the criticisms of *Cappella Nova*. What was mainly under attack was our approach to phrasing and dynamics, both of which are very sharply profiled in our performances, and which from the very beginning have always been singled out by our hearers either for praise or for blame. The origins of the approach lie, I have no hesitation in admitting, in my own subjective response to the nature of the lines in complex, melismatic and polyphonic textures. I know of no specific historical sanction for it, except insofar as subjective responses of contemporary hearers have been occasionally and vaguely recorded. In the absence of hard evidence I felt not only free but duty-bound to invent an approach. Or, to put things as they really happened, it was because this approach to phrasing and dynamics evolved in me during my period as director of the *Columbia University Collegium Musicum*, that I felt I had a statement to make about the music and was moved to form *Cappella Nova* to begin with. Although its origins lay not in certain knowledge but in imagination, the approach is very much an objective feature of *Cappella Nova*’s style. It is an element of what we take to be, and present as, the authentic sound of the music, and its presence is, far from an intrusion, quite necessary if for us the music is, yes, to “speak for itself.” Those whose scholar’s conscience equates silence with prohibition must invariably regard our performances as arbitrary. But what is arbitrary in my view is the flat dynamic and

the lack of phrasing, that is, of molding lines to their high points, which characterize so many so-called "objective" performances of Renaissance music. For these derive not from any demonstrable condition or feature of the music or of its historical context, but merely from the state of evidence, over which the performer can exercise no control. Strict accountability thus reduces performance practice to a lottery. It has nothing to do with authenticity. Authenticity stems from conviction. Conviction in turn stems as much from belief as it does from knowledge. Our beliefs—naive or sophisticated, to be sure, depending on the state of our knowledge—are what alone can give us the sense of assurance and of style possessed by those fortunate enough to have behind them an unbroken tradition of performance.

This brings me to a perhaps even more fundamental caveat. What, after all, is historical method, and to what kind of knowledge does it lead? If we were to reduce it all to a single word, that word would have to be generalization. Style criticism, often held up as the ultimate goal of historical scholarship in music, is above all the abstraction of contexts from cases, the establishment of generalizing criteria. Think of Riemann, for example, of whom we read in *The New Grove*, that "he was not interested in the individual case as such, but rather in discerning its typicality and its place in the entire system."<sup>13</sup> And of course most properly historical musicological work is either that or it is a preparation for that. But this is as far from the performer's mentality as it is possible to be. His concern is only with individual cases, taken one at a time. As George Perle remarked admiringly about Seiji Ozawa, who was performing one of his works at Tanglewood, "When he's playing it his whole repertoire consists of one piece—mine." And here is what Erich Leinsdorf has to say in a recent book which was actually meant as a polemic against

<sup>13</sup> *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, s.v. "Riemann, Hugo."

interpretive excess: "Every great work is first and last a meaningful musical utterance unlike any other. If it did not have its own unique meaning it would have come and gone and would not be part of our living repertoire." Leinsdorf's words are fighting words, and what he is fighting is what he calls the "sacrifice of the sense of music to a simplistic notion of period style."<sup>14</sup> For him, then, historical reconstruction is just another variety of interpretive excess. But one needn't accept his belligerent equation of style consciousness with simplemindedness to note the real enough danger of our sense of style becoming reductive owing to an insufficient appreciation or response to the uniqueness of individual compositions.

This is a very easy trap into which to fall. Our training as scholars gives us very precise and efficient ways of dealing with generalities. We have a vocabulary for them, and the process of framing them invokes reassuringly scientific methods and criteria, many of them quantitative and exact. We have no such aids in dealing with uniqueness. We have no vocabulary: words can no more give an exact representation of an individual piece of music than they can render an individual face. We have to draw the face and play the piece. But a scholar is never so insecure as when he is at a loss for words. And nothing is less scientific than the evaluation not of quantities but of artistic qualities, the specific details, the "divine details," as Nabokov would say. These must be apprehended by imaginative response, empathic identification, artistic insight—all euphemisms, of course, for intuition, which word embarrasses and antagonizes the scholar in us. Unwilling to claim intuition as a guide, both for the reason just given and for the reason given as while ago—that it violates our scholarly principles of accountability—we often tend to flee from characterizing the uniqueness of a piece in performance, and seek our refuge in our objective

<sup>14</sup> Erich Leinsdorf, *The Composer's Advocate: A Radical Orthodoxy for Musicians* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 88-89.

knowledge, which is in all cases a generalized one. Since it is never possible to talk about the unique with the same objectivity as one can about the typical, we are tempted to ignore distinguishing characteristics and instead parade our basic knowledge of style as if it were specific insight. The results are familiar, typified, if you will, by performances of choral materpieces by Bach or Handel that reduce them to demonstrations of dance tempi, A-415, and (*pace* Prof. Neumann!) *notes inegales*. There is corollary to this in the form of reliance upon authentic editions, authentic instruments, or authentic performance practices learned from authentic treatises, in place of careful and sensitive consideration of the music. An actual, if extreme, recent example was an advertising flyer sent out by a New York harpsichordist announcing that his would be the first New York performance of the Goldberg Variations from the Neue Bach-Ausgabe. This kind of thing is the performer's analogue to what is regrettably becoming a pair of recognizable types among scholarly papers—the kind that merely lists variants between versions or sources, and the kind that makes an exhaustive physical description of a sketch, both kinds purporting meanwhile to describe “compositional process.” This is preparatory work offered as the substance of scholarship. Similarly, a performance that merely sets out to demonstrate that Bach was baroque represents preparatory work, not the substance of performance.

But even at their best and most successful—especially at their best and most successful—historical reconstructionist performances are in no sense recreations from the past. They are quintessentially modern performances, modernist performances in fact, the product of an esthetic wholly of our own era, no less time-bound than the performance styles they would supplant. Like all other modernist philosophies, historical reconstructionism views the work of art, including performing art, as an autonomous object, not as a process, not an activity. It views the internal relationships of the work as synonymous with its content, and

in the case of music it renounces all distinction between sound and substance: to realize the sound is in fact to realize the substance, hence the enormous and, be it said, oft-times exaggerated concern today for the use of authentic period instruments for all periods. The aim of historical reconstruction is, as Ortega put it, “a scrupulous realization,”<sup>15</sup> and as Eliot put it, “not a turning loose of emotion, but an escape from emotion; . . . not the expression of personality, but an escape from personality,”<sup>16</sup> the emotions and the personality escaped from being, of course, those of the performer “as he is at the moment.”<sup>17</sup> The artist trades in objective, factual knowledge, not subjective feeling. His aim is not communication with his audience, but something he sees as a much higher, in Eliot's words “much more valuable” goal, communion with Art itself and with its history, and he enlists musicology's aid in achieving it. To return once more to the starting point, this is what is meant today by “letting the music speak for itself.” I am describing no monstrosity, no straw man, but an ideal of beauty that inspired many of the greatest creative minds of our century. And it is only in the nature of things that what dominated advanced creative minds half a century ago should be dominating advanced recreative minds today. The paradox and the problem—or is it just my problem?—is that this way of thinking about art and performance has no demonstrable relevance to the ways people thought about art and performance before the twentieth

---

<sup>15</sup> Ortega y Gasset, *The Dehumanization of Art*, 14.

<sup>16</sup> Eliot, *Selected Prose*, 43.

<sup>17</sup> The invention of sound recording has obviously been a tremendous spur to this tendency, since it offers the possibility of permanence to a medium that had formerly existed only “at the moment.” Most historical reconstructionist performances aspire at least tacitly to the status of document, of not that of *Denkmal*. When the performance is recorded, the aim usually becomes explicit (witness the slogan of the SEON series of historical recordings: “Document & Masterwork”). No less than the score, the performance is regarded as a “text” rather than as an activity, and this creates another pressure toward the elimination from it of anything spontaneous or “merely” personal, let alone idiosyncratic.

century. Applied to the music of the Renaissance and the Baroque, to say nothing of the nineteenth century, it all seems exquisitely anachronistic. And what seems to prove my point is that with the possible exception of the rather ambiguous case of continuo realization, the modern reconstructionist movement has produced many scrupulous realizers of musical notation but has yet to produce a single genuine master of improvisation, which we all know to have been nine-tenths of the Renaissance and Baroque musical icebergs.

Some may be wondering now who it is I'm really thinking of. But I am thinking of no individual; I am thinking of a little bit of each of us. We all share these attitudes to some extent if we are at all alive to our own time. Do I seem then to be generally skeptical of historical reconstructionism or of musicology as an ally of performance? Nothing could be further from the truth, as I hope my own activities testify. But I am skeptical of the complacency with which difficult issues are often addressed, and I do deplore the equation of modernist objectivity with scientific truth.<sup>18</sup>

To even the score now, and to return to a more personal note, let me attempt to list the assets my musicological training has given me as a performer. At the very top of the list goes curiosity, with its

---

<sup>18</sup> Having used the word, I feel I must say a thing or two about "scientific" attitudes, though I fear they will be the most controversial of all (perhaps that is why I am seeking the sanctuary of a footnote). Empirical science, as all the world knows, claims to be "value-free." But art is not, and performance must not be. The adoption of the doctrinaire empiricist, positivist, and unprincipled stance of scientific research when investigating performance practice can be pernicious, leading in extreme cases to an evasion of responsibility, something distressingly close to a musical Eichmann defense. I have in mind the perpetration of musical results the performer himself regards as unattractive, in the belief that that's how it was done, like it or not ("I was just following orders"). There have been notable recent instances of this in Bach performance, where the situation is exacerbated by the knowledge that Bach himself did not like certain aspects of his own performance practice, notably involving the size and quality of his choir in Leipzig. Still more disturbing is the "scientific" pressure to keep up with the state of research, whatever one's personal predilections. I know of more than one instance in which performers of Renaissance and Baroque music have followed practices of which they were not personally convinced either historically or esthetically for fear that otherwise they might be suspected of ignorance.

implications, so far as human nature allows, of openmindedness, receptivity to new ideas and love of experiment. It is in this spirit that I believe investigations of past performance practices should be conducted. Let us indeed try out everything we may learn about in every treatise, every archival document, every picture, every literary description, and the more adventurously the better. But let us not do it in a spirit of dutiful self-denial or with illusions that the more knowledge one garners, the fewer decisions one will have to make. Let us accept from the scholar in us only that which genuinely excites the performer in us, if for no other reason than because both the attractive and the unattractive finding are equally likely to be wrong. Above all, let us not be afraid, as Rose Rosengard Subotnik recently put it with respect to criticism,<sup>19</sup> to "acknowledge our own presence" in our work and to accept it, if for no other reason than because it is in the final analysis inescapable. The suspension of personality in a modernist performance immediately stamps the performance as such, and is therefore paradoxically tantamount to an assertion of personality. We impose our esthetic on Bach on less than did Liszt, Busoni, or even Stokowski.

The second great advantage musicological training confers is knowledge of what there is and where to find it. When one has mastered a scholar's bibliographical and paleographical skills, one need not be limited by the vagaries of editors and publishers. But here too there is an attendant pitfall in the form of an overly bibliographical approach to programming. I have in mind the kind of program that starts off with sixteen settings of "J'ay pris amours," followed by one bassadanza from each of five collections, and finally a Machaut ballade performed with two voices, then three voices, then four voices, as it is transmitted in three different sources. These are seminar reports in sound, not concert programs. And another didactic programming pitfall is the practice,

---

<sup>19</sup> "Musicology, Analysis, and Criticism," a paper read at the same panel discussion as the present one.

once far more widespread than it is now (as those who attended the Josquin Festival-Conference ten years ago may recall)<sup>20</sup> of presenting a kind of analysis of a piece in lieu of a performance of it—for example, changing the scoring of an isorhythmic motet on each tallea, or bringing out by hook or crook the cantus firmus of any mass or motet. In either event, the performer takes it upon himself to throw into relief something the composer in many cases took elaborate pains to conceal, and is being the very opposite of authentic, however the term is construed. We tend, many of us, particularly those of us who teach music history for our daily bread, to turn our concerts into classrooms, and I know from personal experience that no performer's bad habit born of musicology is more difficult to break. It is a case of the scholar's conscience once more, this time actually masquerading as the performer's imagination.

Speaking of teaching and of classrooms reminds me that when thinking of the relationship between the musicologist and the performer we usually assume that the former teaches and the latter learns. But good performers can teach receptive scholars a great deal, and communication both ways is needed if a real symbiosis of musicology and performance is to occur. Sometimes one is lucky enough to have it happen within oneself if one combines the roles. It was the performer in me that taught the scholar in me the extent to which *modus*, the division of longas into breves, continues, though not explicit in the notation, to operate throughout the Renaissance period, at least in church music, as an organizer of rhythm. This is a feature totally obscured by modern editions which base their barring on the *tactus*—a feature of modern editorial practice which, as

---

<sup>20</sup> See the transcripts of the "Workshops on Performance and Interpretation" published along with the rest of the proceedings of the Festival-Conference in Edward Lowinsky, ed., *Josquin des Pres* (London: Oxford University Press, 1976), 645-719, and most especially, Ludwig Finscher's paper, "Historical Reconstruction Versus Structural Interpretation in the Performance of Josquin's Motets" in the same volume, pp. 627-32.

Lowinsky demonstrated over twenty years ago,<sup>21</sup> is perfectly authentic, but, for a final paradox, no less a falsification for that. For *modus* is, as I have come to believe, the operative factor in projecting the rhythmic life of much of Isaac, for example, or of Josquin. It is a matter I intend to pursue in the context of "pure research," but it was a discovery I made purely serendipitously as a performer.

I began this little essay by noting that musicologists and performers are on better terms now than ever before, and I wish to reaffirm this heartening fact in conclusion. It might not be amiss to recall that it was not always so. Dmitri Shostakovich once had a good laugh over a definition of musicologist he heard at breakfast one day from his piano teacher, and repeated it all his life. "What's a musicologist? I'll tell you. Our cook, Pasha, prepared the scrambled eggs for us, and we are eating them. Now imagine a person who did not cook the eggs and does not eat them, but talks about them—that is a musicologist."<sup>22</sup> Well, we're eating them now, and even cook up a few on occasion, as when we do a little discreet composing to make a fragmentary piece performable. Now, if we could only sell them . . .

---

<sup>21</sup> Edward Lowinsky, "Early Scores in Manuscript," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 13 (1960): 126-73.

<sup>22</sup> Nikolai Malko, *A Certain Art* (New York: W. Morrow, 1966). 180.

## Purcell's Clock Tempos and the Fantasias

Ellen TeSelle Boal

"You may tell. . . four in a Bar, almost as fast as the regular motions of a Watch."

In the twelfth edition of John Playford's *Introduction to the Skill of Musick*, "Corrected and Amended by Mr. Henry Purcell," there are two important changes from earlier editions on the subject of tempo. For beating time in "Common Time," Purcell gives the direction to "Stand by a large Chamber Clock, and beat you Hand or Foot to the slow Motions of the Pendulum, telling one, two, with your Hand down as you hear it strike, and three, four, with your Hand up;" and further on he says that each crotchet (quarter) in  $\text{♩}$  is "almost as fast as the regular Motions of a Watch."<sup>1</sup>

These references to absolute time appear more than a century before the invention of the first metronome for general use.<sup>2</sup> Is this perhaps the first reference to a dependable, mechanically produced beat? Is there any significance to the fact that the references to accurate clock time are not included in Playford's earlier editions?

---

<sup>1</sup> John Playford, *An Introduction to the Skill of Musick*, ed. Henry Purcell, 12th ed. ([London]: Printed by E. Jones for H. Playford, 1694), 26. This edition was printed by Henry Playford, who took over the publishing business following John Playford's death in 1686. Note that while the title page of this edition implies that the entire edition has been corrected by Purcell, the title page of the thirteenth edition carries his name only after Part 3, "The Art of Descant" (Introduction, 1697).

<sup>2</sup> See Rosamond E.M. Harding, *Origins of Musical Time and Expression* (London: Oxford University Press, 1938), 23-24 for particulars of the invention of the metronome by Johann Nepomuk Mälzel and for the history of other metronome-like devices.

Can the tempos actually be employed by performing musicians?

It is not a simple matter to apply these "clock tempos" to Purcell's music. For example, the fantasias for three and four viols appear at first glance to be fairly straight-forward in meter, and they are in common time, but the pieces present some thorny problems. Is the signature  $\text{♩}$  twice as fast as  $\text{♩}$ , or "a little faster," or the same tempo? Can we assume that the tempo should be "one, two," to each beat of a "seconds pendulum?" Does the "quick" section of a fantasia require a faster beat, or is it made up of quicker note values? What does the indication "drag" mean? These questions are compounded by the fact that Purcell's publications include differing charts of tempo meanings. Though the only solution may be to follow Francesco Geminiani's advice and play with "good taste," performers who want to know Purcell's intentions have a number of problems to solve.<sup>3</sup>

Seventeenth-century references to tempo consist of several elements: absolute or clock tempo; sign or signature; note value; and verbal indication. The validity of the clock indications will be examined; no thorough research into the validity of these indications has been done previously. The signatures, note values, and verbal indications are often incorrectly represented in modern editions, but fortunately an autograph manuscript of the fantasias exists.<sup>4</sup> As to the meaning of signatures, notation, and verbal indications, there was a lack of uniformity to the extreme in the latter part of the seventeenth century; so Purcell's idiosyncrasies will be examined, as well as appropriate general meanings.

Purcell's reference to the pendulum in the Playford *Introduction* of 1694 can be established as the first written indication by a renowned composer of an exact,

---

<sup>3</sup> Francesco Geminiani, *A Treatise of Good Taste in the Art of Musick* (London: 1749; reprint, New York: Da Capo Press, 1969). Unfortunately, Geminiani deals primarily with ornamentation.

<sup>4</sup> "The Works of Hen. Purcell," British Museum Add. MS. 30930.

dependable, small unit of time. Whether this unit of time can be applied to his music will also have to be established, but at least the clock itself, with an isochronous pendulum, can be a reliable factor for the first time.

Several earlier writers on music referred to the relationship between musical time and clock time; however, most of these references appear to be speculative, as they call for minutes and seconds before clocks had indications for such small units, or they cite equal beats before the invention of the pendulum clock. In about 1350 an Italian, Johannes Verulus, stated that "music receives its just and perfect time" from what he called an *uncia*; but unfortunately his times can not be applied to musical notation, as the divisions he named were not used in any known clock.<sup>5</sup> In 1533, Stephano Vanneo said, "this equal motion [battuta] ought to be equal like the motion of a clock."<sup>6</sup> The beats are not necessarily to be in the same time as the swings of the clock foliot, but equal, like the clock's motions. Though Vanneo may intend the *battuta* to be in time with the clock foliot, his direction could have had little effect on standard tempos, as the foliot's swings were erratic, and, since they depended upon the number of notches in the train of gears, varied from maker to maker and from clock to clock.<sup>7</sup> Hermann Finck, in *Practica Musica* (1556), and Johannes Oridryus, in *Practica Musicae* (1557), compared the *tactus* to the motion of a striking clock, that is,

---

<sup>5</sup> Edmond de Coussemaker, ed., "Liber di musica" in *Scriptorium de Musica Medii Aevi*, vol. 3 (Paris: 1869; reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1963), 130.

<sup>6</sup> Stephano Vanneo, *Recanetum de Musica Aurea* (Rome: 1553); reprint, Suzanne Clercx, ed., *Documenta Musicologica* 28 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1969), 54. The Latin text reads "Haec igitur mensura . . . est ictus seu percussio . . . cuius motus aequus qualis horologii motus esse debet."

<sup>7</sup> Interview with David Todd, clock restorer, Museum of American History (formerly Museum of History and Technology), Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., May 29, 1980.

the motion of the jack hitting the bell.<sup>8</sup> Since the intervals between chimes would have varied from clock to clock, this direction would give a sense of equality, but not of tempo. Other references written before the use of the seconds hand and the pendulum occur in the *Musurgia* by Othmar Luscinius (1536) and in Lodovico Zacconi's *Prattica di musica* (1592).<sup>9</sup>

The first experiments relating to the pendulum were done by Galileo Galilei, and the first references are found in his *Le meccaniche* (ca. 1600), which was translated into French by Marin Mersenne.<sup>10</sup> Mersenne also reported on further studies of the pendulum, including, in addition to Galileo's natural laws, charts showing the exact lengths needed for pendulums swinging in specific times.<sup>11</sup> It was Mersenne who recommended that a composer write in the margin of a composition the length of string necessary to make a pendulum giving the tempo for the piece, and that "if all the musicians in the world would communicate the different tempos of their measurers . . . in this way, they would know what movements are proper to give pleasure."<sup>12</sup> His ideal

---

<sup>8</sup> Hermann Finck, *Practica Musica* (1556); reprint, *Bibliotheca musica Bononiensis*, Sezione 2, no. 21 (Bologna: Forni, [1969]), sig. F<sup>iv</sup>. Renate Federhofer-Königs, *Johannes Oridryus und sein Musiktraktat* (1557); *Beiträge zur Rheinischen Musikgeschichte* 24 (Köln: Arno Volk-Verlag, 1957), 128.

<sup>9</sup> Othmar Luscinius, *Musurgia seu praxis musicae* (Straßbourg: Johann Schott, 1536); reprint, Klaus Wolfgang Niemöller, ed. (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1970). A copy of the 1536 edition is held at the Library of Congress. Lodovico Zacconi, *Prattica di musica* (Venice, 1592; reprint, Bologna: Forni, 1967), Fol. 22.

<sup>10</sup> Galileo Galilei, *On Motion and On Mechanics*, trans. Stillman Drake (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1974), 87, 88, 98.

Galileo Galilei, *Les mechaniques de Galilée*, trans. Marin Mersenne (1634; reprint, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966). The pendulum experiment is given on page 70.

<sup>11</sup> Marin Mersenne, *Harmonie universelle* 3 vols. (Paris: 1636; reprint, Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1963). Seven of the seventeen livres are translated by Roger E. Chapman as *Harmonie Universelle: The Books on Instruments* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1957). The description of the pendulum and its period are found in the reprint edition on the following pages: I, 135-137; III, [49-52] (originally numbered as fols. 45-46").

<sup>12</sup> Mersenne, III, 149; trans. Chapman, 201.

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; because "there is no hand so quick that it can play more than sixteen times one or more strings, nor any voice which can sing more than sixteen notes . . . in a second's time."<sup>13</sup> Note that he did not even consider the possibility that a measure might be of any time other than one second, or exactly two or four seconds. Mersenne was not only still thinking in terms of proportions (exactly two or four times the number), but also thinking in terms of a "second" as being the obvious and evident length of a measure. The suggestion to composers was apparently not put to use.

No further reference to the idea of using a pendulum for the time of a musical measure or beat occurred until Thomas Mace (1676) directed the musician to hang a weight by a string from the ceiling of his practice room, changing the length of string for different tempos.<sup>14</sup> Though he was accurate in saying that this is the "most Exact, Easie, and Infallible Way" to keep time, it is difficult to imagine anyone actually following his recommendations. Mace also suggests keeping time by moving the foot up and down "like unto the Ballance of a good Clock."<sup>15</sup> Though he could have known about a pendulum clock in 1676, since he specifically used the older term "ballance" in reference to a clock and the term "pendulum" in relation to a simple string and weight, he must not have been recommending a new and accurate pendulum clock, but the older weight-driven clock. In 1696 the first working model of a metronome, called a *chronometre*, was built and described by Etienne Loulie,

<sup>13</sup> Mersenne, III, 138; trans. Chapman, 190-191.

<sup>14</sup> Thomas Mace, *Musick's Monument* 2 vols. (1676; reprint, Paris: Editions du Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique, 1958), I, 80.

<sup>15</sup> Mace, 78.

a musician and theorist.<sup>16</sup> His machine had a weighted cord which could be lengthened and shortened by placing an attached peg in a hole marked with the desired length. This length could then be written on a musical composition.<sup>17</sup>

Christiaan Huygens, a Dutch mathematician and astronomer, was the first to perfect the principle of applying the pendulum to a clock.<sup>18</sup> The first clock constructed from the principle was made by Salomon Coster, a clock maker from The Hague, in 1657.<sup>19</sup> Because of the desire of Charles II to establish a Royal Observatory at Greenwich, the pendulum clock technology was taken from The Netherlands to England by John Fromanteel and perfected by Thomas Tompion, William Clement, and Joseph Knibb.<sup>20</sup> England became the leader in horology, a position it occupied until 1850.<sup>21</sup> In 1670 William Clement, an English clock maker, introduced the "seconds pendulum," 99.1 centimeters long, which beats seconds (its complete period is two seconds, back and forth).<sup>22</sup> By 1676 the seconds pendulum was a standard feature on English long-case clocks, and

<sup>16</sup> Etienne Loulié, *Eléments ou principes de musique* (Paris: Ballard, 1696), 81-88. Another edition (Amsterdam: Roger, 1698) is translated by Albert Cohen as *Elements or Principles of Music* (New York: Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1965), 84-90.

<sup>17</sup> Loulié, 88; Cohen, 90.

<sup>18</sup> Arthur Ernest Bell, *Christian Huygens and the Development of Science in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Edward Arnold, 1950), 36.

<sup>19</sup> Bell, 34-38. Excerpts from Huygens's *L'Horloge a pendule* (1656-1666), including a drawing of a 1659 clock, are in *Christiaan Huygens [Works]*, vol. 17 ed. J.A. Vollgraff (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1932), 104. A model of Huygens's design may be seen in the London Science Museum. There is a dial for seconds in the improved design of 1673, but not in the design originally published in 1658.

<sup>20</sup> Muriel Goaman, *English Clocks* (London: Connoisseur, 1967), 56; Frederick James Britten, *The Antique Collector's Club Edition of Old Clocks and Watches and Their Makers* rev. of 3rd ed. (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Antique Collectors' Club, 1977), 251.

<sup>21</sup> Carlo Cipolla, *Clocks and Culture, 1300-1700* (London: Collins, 1967), 32.

<sup>22</sup> See Bell, 40, and *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th ed., s.v. "clocks, watches, and sundials." The length of 99.1 cm. is for London.



many English chamber clocks were converted from weight-driven to pendulum-regulated clocks.<sup>23</sup>

Another horological invention of the period, the hairspring or balance spring, regulates the movement of the balance wheel in a watch. The mathematician and Royal Society staff scientist Robert Hooke claimed to have been the inventor, but the first usable balance spring was perfected by Huygens in 1675.<sup>24</sup>

Although the balance spring today has a frequency of one-fifth second or 18,000 per hour (in other words, a watch now ticks five times per second), the early watches have a slower beat. When Christopher Simpson directed the musician to beat eighth notes to the "little minutes of a steady going watch" in 1665, the frequency of the ticks was thirty-six to forty-six times per minute, so this would be twice as slow, rather than twice as fast, as the heart beat Simpson suggests for the quarter note, and thus an impossible guide.<sup>25</sup><sup>26</sup> Purcell also refers to the tick of the watch in the 1694 *Introduction*, saying that each crotchet (quarter) in  $\phi$  is "almost as fast as the regular Motions of a Watch." Duplication of the motions of his watch would produce a tempo of M.M. 240 for the quarter note in  $\phi$ .

Purcell certainly knew about the relatively new pendulum clocks in 1694, even though he may not have

---

<sup>23</sup> Ernest L. Edwards, *Weight-driven Chamber Clocks of the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Altrincham: Sherratt, 1965), 120-121; F[rancis] A. B. Ward, *Time Measurement* (London: Science Museum, 1970), 18.

<sup>24</sup> Hooke may not have been the inventor of all his experiments, since as chief staff scientist of the Royal Society (for forty years) he was required to produce a new experiment each week. The list of his inventions is certainly impressive. See J.G. Crowther, *Founders of British Science* (London: Cresset, 1960), 181.

<sup>25</sup> According to investigations at the British Museum, a watch with a hairspring, made about 1680 by Tompion, has 14,400 beats per hour, or four beats per second. Simpson's suggestion of the heart beat for the quarter note is on page 23 of the 1665 edition.

<sup>26</sup> A watch in the British Museum, ca. 1620, with no hairspring, beats 2,160 times per hour (M.M. 36); another beats 2,611 times per hour (M.M. 43.5). Simpson's direction is in *The Principles of Practical Musick Delivered in a Compendious, Easie, and New Method* (London, 1665), 23.

owned one. Frances Purcell's will mentions only one clock, an "alarum" clock.<sup>27</sup> Almost any kind of clock could be equipped with an alarm, but the clocks referred to specifically as "alarum" clocks in England appear to have been small "lantern" or "bracket" clocks, the bell being the dome of the clock.<sup>28</sup> These were often converted to pendulum clocks after 1676, but the conversions would have been to short "bob" pendulums (also called "half-second" pendulums, though they had six and seven-inch pendulums which therefore had rates of from 153 per minute to 142 per minute).<sup>29</sup> Purcell says to "stand by a large Chamber Clock," a term applied in the seventeenth century to a bracket clock, which, in spite of the term "large," would have been converted to a bob pendulum if converted at all.<sup>30</sup> However, he goes on to direct the student to beat the hand or foot "to the slow Motions of the Pendulum, telling one, two, with your Hand down as you hear it strike, and three, four, with your Hand up." A bracket clock with a bob pendulum beating at M.M. 153 or 142 would certainly not be used for the "slow Motions of the Pendulum;" and "telling one, two" during one "strike" would produce impossibly fast quarter notes (i.e. M.M. 306 and M.M. 284). Since Purcell is referring us to his slowest type of "Common time," marked with the  $\text{C}$ , there seems to be no doubt that he is directing us to stand before a "long-case clock" with a seconds pendulum, to beat the hand or foot to its slow motions, and to tell one, two, with the hand down during each half cycle (each time "You hear it strike"), resulting in minims (half notes) at M.M. 60, or two crotchets

---

<sup>27</sup> Franklin B. Zimmerman, *Henry Purcell, 1659-1695: His Life and Times* (London: Macmillan, 1967), 315.

<sup>28</sup> Ernest L. Edwards, *The Grandfather Clock*, 3d ed. (Altrincham: J. Sherratt, 1974), 17, 79.

<sup>29</sup> Alan Smith, *Clocks and Watches* (London: Connoisseur, 1975), 91, 175.

<sup>30</sup> Britten, 343-344.

(quarters) at M.M. 120 each. Even this tempo is not "slow" by modern standards. Because he is not really describing a clock with a seconds pendulum, and because his resulting tempo is not very slow, one is tempted to speculate that he never actually experimented with his suggestion. Did he merely take the clock references from earlier treatises, which as we have already seen are inaccurate, and superimpose references to the newest kind of clock?

The clock tempo of  $\text{♩} = \text{M.M. 120}$  does produce a good performance tempo for use in the fantasias. Since the clock references are to particular signatures, the signatures and other indications in the fantasias must be examined. Purcell uses only the signatures  $\text{c}$  and  $\text{c}$ , which is fortunate, as the interpretation of the triple signatures is much more difficult. He also uses the verbal indications "swift," "brisk," "slow," and "drag."

Although the  $\text{c}$  signature originally indicated *alla breve*, or halving of the note values in mensural notation, for Purcell and most seventeenth-century writers it was merely the sign for "a little faster." Even before 1475 Johannes Tinctoris said that it was proper to show the "speeding up" of the measure by drawing a line through the middle of the circle or semicircle.<sup>31</sup> This implies a performance decision rather than a mandatory *alla breve* or two-to-one relationship. In 1547 Heinrich Glareanus said to "accelerate the *tactus* . . . in order to remove weariness," by drawing a line through the circle or semicircle, so that the hearer would not become "fatigued."<sup>32</sup> Since the faster stroke is intended only to relieve fatigue, the reference implies a somewhat faster tempo, but not a stroke twice as fast.

<sup>31</sup> Coussemaker, ed., "Proportionale Musices" in *Scriptorum*, IV, 156.

<sup>32</sup> Heinrich Glareanus, *Dodecachordon* (Basel: 1547); reprint, trans. Clement A. Miller, *Musicological Studies and Documents* 6 ([Rome]: American Institute of Musicology, 1965), 234.

In the seventeenth century in England, the  $\text{c}$  signature seems to have been almost completely abandoned in favor of  $\text{c}$ . In publications of John Playford we find  $\text{c}$  used consistently for duple meter. In the first through eleventh editions of Playford's *Introduction to the Skill of Musick* (1655 to 1697),  $\text{c}$  is given as the duple or "Common time" signature, with  $\text{c}$  added beginning in the sixth edition (1672) for a common time "as swift again."<sup>33</sup> Christopher Simpson's *Principles of Practical Musick*, beginning in 1665, cites the use of both  $\text{c}$  and  $\text{c}$ , or "no Signe," for Common Time. Simpson defines  $\text{c}$  as "properly a Sign of Diminution: though many dash it so, without any such Intention."<sup>34</sup> The "Ayres Designed for Learners" at the end of the book contain only  $\text{c}$  for common time. Simpson's sign for "twice so quick" is  $\text{c}$ .<sup>35</sup> In other words, in seventeenth-century England,  $\text{c}$  and  $\text{c}$  were both signs for a moderate common time.

But both Purcell's *Choice Collection* and the Purcell-Playford *Introduction to the Skill of Musick* say that  $\text{c}$  means "very slow" and  $\text{c}$  "a little faster." The same designation is also given in the "Instructions for Beginners" contained in the third edition of Purcell's *Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinnet*, but this may not be relevant, as the *Lessons* were published after Purcell's death.<sup>36</sup> The list of signatures in the *Lessons* does not include references to clock tempo, describing  $\text{c}$  only as "very slow" and  $\text{c}$  as

<sup>33</sup> Some editions are entitled *A Brief Introduction to the Skill of Musick*; all published by John Playford until 1687, then by Henry Playford; the 1655 edition is in the Royal College of Music, London, the others in the British Library. Many of the editions are in the Library of Congress, and the 1674 and 1694 editions are available in facsimile reprints.

<sup>34</sup> Christopher Simpson, *The Principles of Practical Musick* (London: William Godbid for Henry Brome, 1665), 39.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>36</sup> First edition (London: for Mrs. Frances Purcell, sold by Henry Playford, 1696); "The Third Edition with Additions & Instructions for beginners, for Mrs. Frances Purcell. . . to be sold at her house in Great Deans Yard, Westminster," n.d. Copies of both editions are owned by the Library of Congress, the latter also by the Royal College of Music, London.

"brisk and airy;" and the signature "3" is added to the list of triple signs. In spite of the detailed list, the *Lessons* themselves contain only the signatures  $\text{c}$  and 3, with the exception of two pieces with the  $3/2$  proportion signature.

The explanation of the  $\text{c}$  signature as "slow" and  $\text{c}$  as "somewhat faster" can also be found in seventeenth-century writings elsewhere in Europe. One or more of these may have been the source for Purcell's explanation in the 1694 Playford *Introduction*. Mignot de La Voye (Paris, 1656) explains  $\text{c}$  as *lentement*, and  $\text{c}$  as *legerement*, with the figure "2" as a possible substitute for either signature.<sup>37</sup> Wolfgang Caspar Printz (1666) defines  $\text{c}$  as *Langsam*,  $\text{c}$  as *geschwind*.<sup>38</sup> In 1668 Printz uses *adagio* for  $\text{c}$  and *allegro* for  $\text{c}$ .<sup>39</sup> Giovanni Maria Bononcini says in 1673 that  $\text{c}$  is used as  $\text{c}$  "by the moderns," only *piu presto*.<sup>40</sup> Michel L'Affillard's *Principes* (1694) defines  $\text{c}$  as the mark of the *mesure* of four *tems graves* (slow beats), and  $\text{c}$  as the mark of the *mesure* of four *tems legers* (quick beats).<sup>41</sup>

Purcell's use of the signatures in his compositions is very similar to Bononcini's use. A study of Purcell's autograph manuscript of the fantasias reveals some interesting idiosyncratic preferences. First, in looking at

<sup>37</sup> Mignot de La Voye, *Traité de musique* (Paris: Ballard, 1656), 12; there is an English translation by Albion Gruber, *Musical Theorists in Translation* 11 (New York: Institute of Mediaeval Music, 1972), 21.

<sup>38</sup> Wolfgang Caspar Printz, *Kurtzer Bericht Wie man einen jungen Knaben auf das leichteste nach jetsziger Manier könne singen lehren* (Zittau in Ober-Lausitz: Johann Caspar Döhne, 1666), 13. Unique copy, Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung, N. Mus. ant. theor. 69.70.

<sup>39</sup> Printz, *Compendium Musicae* (Guben: Christoph Grubern, 1668), sig B.v. Unique copy, Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung, N. Mus. ant. theor. 69.70.

<sup>40</sup> Giovanni Maria Bononcini, *Musicò pratico* (Bologna: Giacomo Monti, 1673); reprint, *Monuments of Music and Music Literature in Facsimile*, 2d ser.: *Music Literature* 78 (New York: Broude, 1969), 11.

<sup>41</sup> Michel L'Affillard, *Principes tres-faciles pour bien apprendre la musique* (Paris: Christophe Ballard, 1694), 17, 83.

the "Sonnatas" (six of the *Ten Sonatas in Four Parts* of 1697, and portions of two more), written at the back of the volume, we find that Purcell uses the signature  $\text{c}$  at the beginning of every sonata. Four are marked *adagio*, one *vivace*, and the others are unmarked. The *vivace* theme moves in quarters and eighths, in contrast to the halves and quarters and eighths, in contrast to the halves and quarters found in the other first movements, suggesting that the word *vivace* refers to the interior "movement" rather than the tempo of the beat. The same signatures were copied into a contemporary manuscript of three of the sonatas (in Christ Church, Oxford), indicating that this manuscript was possibly copied from the autograph.<sup>42</sup> The only  $\text{c}$  in the autograph is used to mark the canzona of the ninth sonata, the only sonata in which a return to duple time is necessary after a triple section. The movement of the canzonas is predominantly in eighths and sixteenths.

In the "fantasias," found in the first part of the autograph, the signature  $\text{c}$  is the only signature written into the score at the beginning of a piece. The  $\text{c}$  signatures are written in the margin, as if they were added later. This is true through the first eleven pieces, with the pattern changing only at number 12, the "August 31. 1680" fantasia. This piece and the "Feb. 24th 1682/3" fantasias both do have  $\text{c}$  marked on the score.<sup>43</sup> Did Purcell add the  $\text{c}$  signs later, possibly after August 31? The other distinguishing factor about the fantasias marked  $\text{c}$  is that they all move with a large number of eighth notes, while those marked  $\text{c}$  move in quarters and half notes. The fantasias of June 23, June 30, and August

<sup>42</sup> Oxford, Christ Church, MS. 620, fols. 47-53.

<sup>43</sup> "The 3 Part Fantazias," pp. 1-24 of British Museum Add. MS. 30930 reversed. In the "Commentary" to *Fantazias and other Instrumental Music*, vol. 31 of *The Works of Henry Purcell*, Purcell Society ed. (London: Novello, 1959), editor Thurston Dart does give the original signatures, indicating  $\text{c}$  after the clef sign and  $\text{c}$  before, though still on the printed staff and with no explanation.

31, marked  $\text{♩}$  in the margin, all begin with movement in half notes and quarters, but eighth note movement is added later with no sectional marking. The G minor fantasia (no date) has no signature, and, unlike the others, begins with a whole note and moves in half notes.

Purcell's signatures can, therefore, be interpreted as follows.  $\text{♩}$ , or  $\text{♩}$ , or no signature, gives the clock tempo, quarter = 120. When he uses  $\text{♩}$ , "a little faster," the movement within the measure is a little faster, but the clock tempo is the same as that of the  $\text{♩}$  signature. The tempo of quarter note = 120 is a possible tempo for the fantasias, including those marked with the  $\text{♩}$ , and one would not want a much faster tempo than that at the "quick" section of the first fantasia, since it has a predominance of sixteenth notes. What, then, does he mean by "quick" and "brisk?" Every time one of these terms is used, the movement quickens automatically, by the addition of sixteenth notes to the previous eighths, or of eighths to the previous quarters. Every time "slow" is used, the movement slows automatically through a change to quarters and half notes from the previous eighth-note passages. The term "drag" may mean to slow the basic tempo, as no change in note values occurs when it is used in the August 19 fantasia.<sup>44</sup>

Other examples of "quick" and "slow" being added where they seem superfluous to the modern performer occur in a sinfonia "in the autograph of Matthew Locke" presently housed in the British Museum (Rosamond E.M. Harding's thematic catalog names these spurious works, but this is nevertheless an interesting use of "quick" and "slow" in an English manuscript).<sup>45</sup> Giovanni Maria Bononcini's early works show a similar use of *allegro*

<sup>44</sup> Michael Tilmouth, in his introduction to the *Twelve Sonatas of Three Parts*, vol. 5 of *The Works of Henry Purcell*, Purcell Society ed. (Kent: Novello, 1976), xii, suggests that *ritardando*, "even had it been in use at the time, was perhaps beyond the limit of Purcell's Italian," and implies that "drag" does mean *ritardando*.

<sup>45</sup> Rosamond E.M. Harding, *A Thematic Catalogue of the Works of Matthew Locke* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 134.

and *adagio* with the  $\text{♩}$  signature. This is especially true in the *Primi frutti del giardino musicale* (1666), where we find consistent use of  $\text{♩}$  with *allegro* to denote sixteenth-note movement, and  $\text{♩}$  with *adagio* to denote slower note values.<sup>46</sup>

Since the fantasias contain no  $\text{♩}$  signatures, we have no opportunity to use Purcell's "four in a Bar, almost as fast as the regular Motions of a Watch." There is one  $\text{♩}$  signature in the autograph manuscript, however, occurring in the [boree] fragment of the suite in G which follows the fantasias.<sup>47</sup> In Purcell's time the "regular motions," or at least the ticks of a watch, were four per second (rather than the five per second suggested by Arnold Dolmetsch's *Interpretation*).<sup>48</sup>

Just as a pendulum clock beating seconds was a fairly new invention in 1694, a spiral hairspring watch beating four times per second was also new. The spiral hairspring, invented by Christiaan Huygens in 1675, was then being applied to watches made by Thomas Tompion in England. There is no way of knowing whether the "silver watch" mentioned in Frances Purcell's will had a hairspring.<sup>49</sup> It is of course possible that Purcell knew about the new technology and knew that a watch with a hairspring would tick about four times per second, producing a quarter equal to M.M. 240 if used with his  $\text{♩}$  signature.<sup>50</sup> Christopher Simpson's reference in 1665 to the "little minutes of a stedly going watch" could not

<sup>46</sup> Giovanni Maria Bononcini, *Primi frutti del giardino musicale* (Venice: Magni, 1666). Manuscript copy Modena, Estense, MS.F 105.

<sup>47</sup> British Museum Add MS. 30930, p. 32.

<sup>48</sup> Arnold Dolmetsch, *The Interpretation of the Music of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries Revealed by Contemporary Evidence* (London: Novello, [1915]; reprints, London: Novello, 1946; Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1969), 31.

<sup>49</sup> Zimmerman, 315.

<sup>50</sup> Calculations based on early watches with and without hairsprings were made for the writer by Elliot Nixon of the Horological Students' Room, British Museum, 29 June 1976.

have been to a watch with a hairspring, but only to an earlier watch beating much too slowly for his "quavers" (eighths), since the result would be eighth note = M.M. 36 to 46.<sup>51</sup> There are, however, a few examples of seventeenth-century watches with second hands.<sup>52</sup> Dolmetsch may have made an error in assuming that both Simpson and Purcell were referring to the ticks of a watch. Since second hands were still extremely rare, Simpson and Purcell were even more likely referring to the motion of the balance wheel. The balance wheel was sometimes called the "pendulum" though it was not one, and its motions can be seen through an opening in the case in some watches of Purcell's time.<sup>53</sup>

Can we know Purcell's tempos exactly? "Almost as fast" and "a little faster" do not dictate exact tempos; however, since the period was one of new inventions and strides in horology, it is possible that Purcell was using the new technology as a guide to musical time. There is no way of knowing if his tempos were adopted by performing musicians, though the clock and watch references were mentioned again in 1721 by Alexander Malcolm (*Treatise*).<sup>54</sup> Michel de Saint-Lambert (*Principes*, 1702) and Johann Joachim Quantz (*Versuch*, 1752) both

---

<sup>51</sup> Simpson, 23. Calculations at the British Museum show that watches with no hairspring, of about Simpson's time, beat between 36 and 46 times per minute.

<sup>52</sup> The British Museum has an English "Chaise-Watch," ca. 1660, with a seconds dial (separate, not concentric).

<sup>53</sup> F.R. Maddison and A.J. Turner, *Watches*, Museum of the History of Science Catalogue 2 (Oxford: The Museum, 1973). One by "Nat Chamberlaine London" is Number W8 in the collection of watches, and is shown on page 15 of the Catalogue.

<sup>54</sup> Alexander Malcolm, *Treatise of Musick* (London: 1721; reprint, New York: Da Capo, 1970), 407-408.

discounted the validity of the mechanical devices, preferring the human pulse (in the case of Quantz) or stride (Saint-Lambert).<sup>55</sup> Since the modern performer does depend upon the mechanical metronome for his guide to tempo, Purcell may well have been the most adventuresome of composers in regard to the use of exact time-keeping devices. He was the first composer to lend his name to a scientifically correct means of establishing tempo, and the most illustrious composer to do so until Beethoven marked his symphonies with the numbers from the new invention of his friend Johann Nepomuk Mälzel in 1815.

---

<sup>55</sup> Michel de Saint-Lambert, *Les Principes du clavecin* (Paris: Ballard, 1702), 10. Johann Joachim Quantz, *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen* (1752); trans. Edward R. Reilly as *On Playing the Flute* (New York: Free Press, 1966), 283.

**A Translation of the Preface to Terpsichore  
Of Michael Praetorius**

Bruce R. Carvell

Whereas the music contained in Michael Praetorius's *Terpsichore* (1612) is well known to performers and scholars of Renaissance instrumental music, the Preface to this collection is less familiar, despite the fact that it contains much specific information pertaining to the performance of this music. In addition to offering remarks on matters of transposition, notation, the use of accidentals, and the background of the melodies, Praetorius also discusses the complicated subject of the relation between *tactus*, mensuration, and tempo. The information found here is important in the understanding of performance practices of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

This translation is based on the text given in facsimile by Friedrich Blume in Volume 15 of his edition of the complete works of Praetorius (Wolfenbüttel and Berlin: Georg Kallmeyer Verlag, 1929). I wish to express my gratitude to Peter Holman for the initial inspiration for this project, and to Sharon Robertson, who provided advice in matters of translation.

*Michaelis Praetorij, C.*  
**TERPSICHORE,**  
Musarum Aoniarum  
QVINTA.

*Darinnen*

**allerley Französische**  
**Dänze vnd Lieder/**

- Als 21. Branslen:  
13. Andere Dänze / mit sonderbaren Namen.  
162. Couranten:  
42. Volten:  
37. Balletten:  
3. Passameze:  
23. Gaillarden: vnd  
4. Reprinzen.

Mit 4. 5. vnd 6. Stimmen.

**Wie dieselbige von den Französischen Dänz-**  
**meistern in Frankreich gespielt / u. vnd vor Fürstlichen**  
**Taffeln / auch sonst in Convivijs zur recreation vnd**  
**ergötzung gang wol gebraucht werden**  
**können.**

— : —

**C A N T V S.**



**ANNO 1612.**

Michael Praetorius's **Terpsichore, The fifth Muse of Aonia**; wherein are contained diverse and sundry French dances and melodies in the form of 21 Bransles, 13 other dances with curious and droll names, 162 Courants, 48 Voltas, 37 Ballets, 3 Passamezzos, 23 Galliards, and 4 Reprinses. For 4, 5 and 6 parts. As the French dancing-masters in France play them and which can be well used to entertain and delight Princely tables and at banquets. In the year 1612.

**To the Radiant, August Prince and Lord, Lord Friedrich Ulrich, Duke of Braunschweig and Lüneburg, etc. My gracious Prince and Lord.**

Radiant and Right Honorable Prince, Your Royal Highness, to Your Grace my humble obedient services are known. At your gracious command, Your Grace's humbly obedient dancing-master Antoine Emeraud has brought these assorted French bransles, dances, and melodies from France, as well as some descant parts for the same, all of which had been given over to me to be arranged for four or five parts, as I see fit.

Although I had initial doubts about publishing these same dances for the public, especially since it might not please several parties to communicate them and make them accessible to everyone, nevertheless, the fact that your gracious command carries more weight than other opinion seems reasonable to me. Even if one ignores that, it is said that "omne bonum esse communicatum sui" (all good things make themselves known), and my disposition, from the earliest days, was so directed that, with my affairs and that which God granted me in grace and placed in my hands, I gladly serve and accede to everyone, that I might not be stingy, ill-disposed, and envious. For this reason, I have intended to publish this French music not for instrumentalists alone, but also particularly for noble aristocratic patrons and others in France who are skilled in these and similar dances. God

willing, volumes of Italian and English dances, with related matter, will follow in the remaining volumes of the *Muses of Aonia*.

Since Your Royal Highness has given both the gracious command and the occasion for the composition and publication of this work, I herewith should not fail to humbly offer and dedicate this work to Your Royal Highness, which I humbly beseech Your Royal Highness to notice and receive this work and to be and remain well-disposed and devoted to me as your humble servant. To this end, I commend myself herewith to Your Grace.

Dated Wolfenbüttel, March 4, 1612.

Your Royal Highness.

your humble, obedient  
servant

M[ichael] P[raetorius]  
C[reuzburgensis]

Certain suggestions and admitions: which are necessary to be communicated to the musical readers of this work.

### I.

**Wherefore the author has undertaken to publish at this time several secular and political musical compositions under the title of the Muses of Aonias, as he has published previously a collection of sacred compositions under the title of the Muses of Sion.**

Just as I have completed, by God's Grace, the nine sacred *Muses of Sion* as well as masses, hymns, grand concerted pieces (*Megalynodian*), and *Eulogodian*, in addition to my Latin *Leiturgodia Sionia*; so both at the request of aristocratic music-lovers as well as at my own inclination I have found it not unseemly and indeed necessary before I published the remaining three graces

(of which nevertheless the *First Grace*, in which are found the noblest German sacred psalms for six parts, should appear within the year) to take the secular *Muses of Aonias*, in so far as decorum and honor allow it, and to perform my willing service of honor likewise for them: In consideration of the fact that one usually presents not only at princely banquets but also at the honorable assemblies, feasts, weddings, and other such joyous occasions of other respected persons, a secular work and permits it to be included not without singularly annoying entertainment. "For," as Quintillian has said, "the soul is renewed and restored by diversity, and men take pleasure in variety."

## II.

**Wherefore it is fitting for every man to prepare and publish in order to honor God and to promote the common good, and for the benefit of his neighbor, be it in music or other areas, consistent with his profession, and why he should not allow himself to be deterred or prevented from doing so by the unconsidered and insignificant comments of others.**

And how I was inclined to publish first the first *Muse of Aonia* including various *Praeambula* and *Tocaten* (as know in Italy), as well as other matters suitable for organists, for reasons; That even as an excellent orator, when he wishes to discuss some weighty matter and has planned an imposing conclusion for his speech, avails himself of a suitable and well-constructed introduction, regardless of the fact that it does not belong to the main work at the beginning, in order to make the kindly listeners attentive and well-disposed to the subject and to make them more enthusiastic. Thus, in the same fashion, can an organist summon together the listeners and the entire company of singers and instrumentalists with his *praeambules*, preludes, and *tocatas*. Further, the organist can provide time for the musicians to take up

their instruments and their parts, to tune their instruments, and to prepare themselves for performance, so that when the organist has ended his *tocata* or *fantasia*, the whole company may then play a good concerted piece, *motet*, *madrigal*, or *pavan* (or some such composition) to the greater glory of God. I still have some doubts at this time, however, since it has already come to my attention that several persons greatly disapprove of the fact that I have permitted such and similar things to be published with all good intention in the preface to the seventh part of the *Muses of Sion*. Whereas they feel that I would make everything too accessible and to put it within the reach of every organist and also amateurs how one thing and another should and could be done and organized suitably and with distinction and duration. The reason that I should have and bear nothing more than cleverness, hatred, jealousy, and ingratitude, which is nothing new to me, for all my efforts, work, and experience, can be identified. It is nothing but the vicious jealousy and envy that permits nothing to offer good companions (who do not have fortune and luxury) to give much money and accounts for a small elaborated [*colorirtes*] or embellished [*diminuirtes*] composition. To these persons I am disposed and eager to give aid from the bottom of my heart without recompense and even at expense to myself and to communicate all that I, through God's grace, know and am able to do with the best intentions in an hour. This is much more fitting for us, the Germans, in general (we who are called *Germani* since we live as brothers together and should not let such incivilities be said of us). Meanwhile, other peoples allow their things to be published for the benefit of their nation without any misgivings. As one often finds in Italy the *tocatas* of Claudio Merulo of Rome on copper plates, also the works of Hieronymus Diruta, Andrea and Giovanni Gabrieli, and other excellent organists and composers openly published; thus they treat matters in great detail and as mentioned in the beginning, publish



openly for the good of their nation. And such esteemed musicians as Giovanni Maria Arduſi (*sic*), Petrus Pontio, Tigurini, and other accomplished experts have published ſplendid treatiſes on compoſition and counterpoint, good and bad treatment of conſonances and diſſonances, imitation [*fugis*], the proper treatment of the beginning, middle, and ending of ſongs, and the neceſſary rules of compoſition.

And becauſe each of us Germans keeps his art to himſelf; ſuch has been more than a little damaging to me in my published works to date: and an account of that, deſtitute of riches and pretentions, I have had to be content with God's grace and the talents He has beſtowed. And I want conſequently with theſe talents, ſmall though they may be, and which I have furthered by conſtant, careful exerciſe and diligence, (diſregarding all others who will obſcure and incorrectly explain it) for my fellow man and for moſt worthy Germany as my beloved fatherland as benefit, to publiſh not only an *Opus Melopoieticum* of Italians and other authors in the fourth volume of my *Syntagma Musica*, but alſo other muſical compoſitions, provided God lets me live and, alſo, as I pray and hope, grants me the grace, bleſſing, and ſtrength neceſſary. I want to communicate to the lovers of eſteemed muſic for their benefit that which I lacked in the beginning, and include my own thoughts in the hope that there will ſtill be found ſome Germans of good heart who underſtand and recognize with graceful diſpoſition my labor and the fact that I have taken ſuch great work and expenſe upon myſelf alone from my good true heart in order to ſerve and help my fellow man (but not from ambition or to achieve fame or a great name). In this regard, Sethus Calvius, the pre-eminent hiſtorian and muſician of Leipzig, has taken upon himſelf to publiſh in this *Melopoija* (based on Zarlino) ſomething concerning the rules neceſſary for the beſt compoſition. Therefore, I alſo wiſh to expend my talents and energy in the effort to ſerve and do good, even though I may gain no thanks from thoſe who would impede my well-meaning, Chriſtian

design. Furthermore, the very famous compoſer and organiſt Claudio Merulo of Coreggio wrote: "One ſhould not fail to bring to light every thing which is to the common good."

### III.

**Concerning the arrangement of the Muses of Aonias and why the author of the dances refers to them under the title of Terpsichore: alſo what more might follow as part of the Muses of Aonias.**

As I mentioned in the ſeventh part of my ſacred *Muses of Sion* ſomething of the *Muses of Aonias*, which have been introduced and deſcribed by Natali Comite in *Mythology*, thus do I deem it neceſſary to give a further explanation to cultured muſicians in this preſent ſecular *Muses of Aonias*.

Although I hesitated in the beginning as to the proper arrangement of the *Muses of Aonias*, ſince the authorities diſagree in this and each obſerves a different order, nevertheleſs, it has pleaſed us to imitate the excellent ancient hiſtorian Herodotus and to uſe his order as conſidered in giving titles to theſe hiſtories in this work: in addition, the other Mantuan in Book Eight of his *Sylvarum* has retained this ſame order.

Namely:

- |            |                |             |
|------------|----------------|-------------|
| 1. Clio    | 4. Melpomene   | 7. Polymnia |
| 2. Euterpe | 5. Terpsichore | 8. Urania   |
| 3. Thalia  | 6. Erato       | 9. Calliope |

I have referred to theſe aſſorted French dances—bransles, courants, voltas, ballets, etc.—not ſo inappropriately, as it ſeems to me, under the title of *Terpsichore*, the fifth Muse of Aonias, ſo that the title might agree with the content. The etymology and derivation of this name has been taken from the Greek *ap tou terpein tous chorous*, that which amuſes the chorus of the Muses; and it may be ſaid by the quickly moving line of the exulting Muses: I am amuſed by the dance to muſic [*choreia*], the ſolemn dance [*tripudium*], and the

dance [*saltatio*]: whence may have been the invention of certain kithara players [*citharistria*]. It is because of this that the harp or psaltery is often portrayed in the hands of the Muse. Thus, I plan to publish English and Italian pavans, dances, and galiards, etc. under the title of *Euterpe*, the second Muse of Aonias; my toccatas and other compositions [*Canzonen*] with figuration [*coloraturen*] and diminutions, to be played on viols [*Violen*] and harpsichords [*clavicymbeln*], under the title of *Thalia*, the third Muse of Aonias; German secular compositions under the sixth Muse, *Erato*.

**The interpretation or enlightenment of the French words and titles of the following dances.**

What bransles, courants, voltas, ballets, etc. are and why they are so called. This topic is to be examined in greater detail in the third book of my *Syntagma Musica*. Furthermore, additional explanations are necessary since these bransles and courants are put forth under many different names.

1. *Bransle simple*: This is a type of dance that is plain and straight forward, simple without any peculiar, large movements. It is called "simple" because it is simpler than the following dances. It has eight steps.
2. *Bransle gay*: This is a merry dance: gay means *laete* [joyfully]. For this reason, it may be measured [*mensuriret*] as a proportion [*properts*] and a *Tripel*, or indeed, as a very rapid *Tactum aequalem*.
3. *Bransle de Poictou*: Poictou is a province and earldom [*Graffschaft*] in France and since this dance originated in this province, it has been named after it. This dance contains nine steps [*pass*]: The double [*dobbelte*] contains, however, twelve steps.

4. *Montirande*: Carries the name of the master who has composed it.
5. *Gavotte*: This is a region wherein proud peasants dwell and from whence this dance has originated. These dances fall under the name of bransle simple since they are danced one after another in series.
14. *Bransle de Villages*: These are village dances, because *Villa* means village [*Dorff*].
15. *Bransle de la Torche*: This is a dance with lamps or torches which is the reason that it is called a torch dance because a *Torche* is a torch [*Fackel*].
16. *La Bohemiene*: A Gypsy or Egyptian dance: it is half way between a volta and a courant.
17. *Bransle de la reyne*: The Queen's dance: because this dance was composed for the nuptials of the present Queen.
18. *Bransle de Lorraine*: This originated in Lorraine [*Lothringen*].
19. 20. *Bransle de la Schappe and de la Grenee*: Have names of the masters who composed them. The latter is occasionally known as *la Bourgoigne* because he first came from Burgundy.
21. *De Picardie*: From Picardy.
22. *Philou*: This is like a gavotte and was sung in the evening by young lackeys [*Lackeyjungen*] in the street and there is nothing but horseplay [*Cuionerey*] therein.
23. *La Robine*: is a peasant dance.
24. *Les Passepiedz de Bretagne*: From Brittany. Known as *Passepiedz* because in such a dance one foot must be thrust forward and set over the other.
26. *Spagnoletta*: Comes from the Netherlands and was danced very rarely in France.
29. *La Pavan de Spaigne*: is from Spain and is, indeed, a noble, splendid, and very solemn dance.
31. *La Canarie*: From the Island of Canaries.
36. *Courante*: Of a Lord de Terme and it is known for

the courant, thus it is understood in the King's Ballet.

37. 60. *Courantes de Perichon* and *la Durette*: Have the names of their master and Perichon is known as a first-rate lutenist.
41. *La Mouline*: is taken from the ballet abroad and which is arranged as windmills. The Duke [*Herzog*] of Vendosme performed this same dance.
42. *La Moresque*: is like a Moor's dance.
46. 48. *De la Guerre, de la Bataglia*: are courants in the fashion of a battle.
79. *Courant de la Motte*: has the name of the master.
199. *Volte de Tambour*: is a volta made after the fashion of an army drum.
247. *Ballet de Monsieur Vendosme*: was performed by a Lord called Vendosme at the King's Palace and resort at Fontaine Bleau.
248. Is a Ballet or dance called a Bransle abroad and arranged in the fashion of a Bransle
249. Is the last Ballet of the Duke of Namur (Nemours).
250. *Meister Guilhem*: is King Jacques's Jester and, since there is usually horseplay [*Cuionerey*] and tomfoolery [*Narrerey*] therein, this dance has been named after him.
252. This is a Frog dance: because all the persons who come in procession in this dance are dressed in green and in the manner of frogs.
254. The Rooster's dance.
256. *Trois ages*: is the dance of the three ages.
257. The Flask dance.
262. The Magician's Dance: which must be played before the King's ballet as 269 must be played after the King's ballet.
270. Has the name from the warlike women known as Amazones which did combat with Alexander the Great and this procession [*Auffzog*] was arrayed in such women's dress.
277. Is a dance in which many princesses have come in procession.

278. *Bacanales*: Frequently has been danced during Lent.
279. Ballet or dance which was performed with fire and torches.
280. The Ship's Boys's dance.
281. The Procession of the Blind or Invalid People.
388. *Passametzes*: which may be played on krummhorns or other instruments.

## V.

### The authors of these French dances.

In addition it should be noted that the melodies and airs, as they call it, of these dances were composed by French dancers who were at the same time for the most part good violinists [*Geigers*] (Known in their language as *violons*) or lutenists, and arranged according to their steps in dances, courants, ballets, and processions [*Auffzogen*]: when they instruct in dancing their students, the great Lords, Earls, and other persons of rank, they play these same dances on the violin or lute.

Among these are four who are at present in the King of France's Violins or dancers and who are also very good composers. 1. de la Motte, who earned 20,000 Crowns [*Kronen*] by teaching dancing. 2. de la Fond. 3. de la Grenee. 4. Beauchamp. In addition, Richehomme, and Le Brot, who hold no royal appointment, but are no less excellent in dancing and composing. Further, there are three hundred masters in Paris dancing and, in some part, composing, but they are not up to the level of the above-mentioned.

Thus, the melodies and airs of these masters and other such composers of these dances have been communicated to me by Anthoine Emeraud, dancing-master of my gracious Prince and Lord, Friedrich Ulrich, Duke of Braunschweig and Lüneburg. To these melodies, I have humbly added a bass and inner parts and signed

my name to them. Several were composed years ago by a musician Francisq Caroubel with five parts: this name I have always written in the correct places.

Where the word *Incerti* appears, I have received only the cantus and bass and have supplied the remaining inner parts since all of these (save 45, 51, 56, 60) were not thereby set by the author and as such must be indicated.

## VI.

### How these dances must be tactiret and mensuriret.

#### *Bransle simple*

I have notated the *Bransle simple* with minims and semiminims in a suitably slow *Tactus* and, for this reason, I have marked them with *C* at the beginning, the sign for a very slow *Tactus* [*Signum tardioris Tactus*]. Others have previously notated these bransles with semibreves and minims and then they must be measured [*mensuriret*] with a faster *Tactus*. The sign for a very swift *Tactus* [*signum clerioris Tactus*] *C* is reasonably to be prescribed. However, where the sign *C*<sub>2</sub> [*Diminutionis Diminutio*—double diminution] is found marked, an even faster *Tactus* [*viel schneller*] is obliged or a very rapid [*gar geschwinde*] *Tactus* is to be observed.

#### *Bransle gay*

The bransle gay is usually written by the musicians of France so that three types of *Tactus* can be used in the following ways: 1. As a *Triplam*. In this manner, I have allowed the two bransles gays in the fourth bransle simple in no. 4 and those also in no. 10 to remain thus. 2. As a *Sesquialtera*. In this case, two rests — must be sent before the first note or else should be imagined as being there, so that the first note, which is usually a minim, is given a *Tactus*. 3. While the two *Tactus* in the bransle gay are difficult to be observed, and the French

dancing-masters generally have deemed to use a *Triplam* to an equal *Tactus* in their galliards, voltas, and these bransles gay (although the galliards are slow and the bransles gay fast), to measure with the foot, so this has given me cause for further consideration and I have finally found that it is better and easier to accomodate bransles gay, as well as some voltas, with minims and semiminims to the equal *Tactus*, as may be seen in nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, and 12.

Since it is my opinion that these matters might be arranged better to aid understanding, I have set down several examples to demonstrate:

#### BRANSLÉN GAY.

These must be very fast / rapid to the *Tactus ala Breve* or still could be measured [*mensuriret*] in the following manner:

This is the fashion in which nos. 20, 24, and 25 should be *tactiret*.

## Voltas

In the same manner, voltas, which are marked with the sign C3, as is the case with Nos. 199, 200, 202, 204, 205, 206, 209, 214, 216, 217, 218, 220, 221, 224, 225, 227, 232, 233, 234, and 241, should be regarded. Otherwise, it is difficult to indicate the *Tactus* for these pieces, so I have set forth another example to illustrate my meaning.

Num. 214.

This *Tactus* pleases me the most and appears to me to be the most correct. I also feel that the two initial rests may be omitted and one should begin the *Tactus* with the first note because this is much better.

I have notated No. 217 in all voices in this way. Thus, anyone can write about and use these different kinds of pieces as it is deemed most appropriate.

### VII.

**How these dances have been notated.**

The French notate their courants with white notes ◊ ◊ the English, however, commonly use black notes ◆ ◆; as a minor hemiola, which is more agreeable to me. Whereas the courant must be measured [*mensuriret*] with a very rapid *Tactus*, and thus it is most appropriate that it should be measured [*mensurire*] as a kind of sextuplet [*Sexduplen*] in an equal *Tactus*. However, I have notated some with white notes and some with black notes without distinction, thus leaving everyone free to interpret them as he may wish.

### VIII.

**Why so many Dieses ✕ have been indicated.**

It must be diligently observed and considered where the *Dieses* are marked initially in F and occasionally also in C. Thus, all notes on the same row, which stand on that line or space must be held and considered as if each had a ✕ written before it.

However, when a flat [*b - b rotundum*] is notated on these same pitches [*Calavibus*], either F or C, then the

correct pitch must be sung — F, not F sharp [fis] and C, not C sharp [cis].

Furthermore, in those compositions where two Dieses **XX** in F and C are marked initially and the entire song stands in the transposed hard hexachord, it has not been felt necessary to mark every Diesis, as may be seen in No. 41 and others like it. Nevertheless, I have wished to notate all such occasions for the sake of those who are unfamiliar with the custom of modifying notes, so that they might not think that one must sing *fa* instead of *mi* as is otherwise the case where the song goes no higher.

### IX.

#### How transposition is taken into consideration.

Since the French use the modes of the *Hypo Myxolidium* and the *Hypo Ionicum* for the most part, and because these are in the hard hexachord, it is the custom to transpose a whole tone, and a second, or a fifth higher.

Although this seems strange and difficult to those who don't know it and haven't mastered it, it can result in a more charming and refreshing resonance when played on an organ or by other instruments than it does when played in the original *Ton*. To achieve this, one could write out the entire piece in the transposed version or one could make the transposition in his head as if another key were indicated. I have marked several pieces, such as Nos. 33, 35, and 131, which benefit from this treatment, and have here below shown the method for making such transpositions.

The image displays musical notation for three modes: Hypo Ionictus, Hypo Myxolydium, and Aeolius. Each mode is presented in its original form and then in various transpositions. The original forms are marked with a double asterisk (\*\*). The transpositions are marked with a single asterisk (\*). The modes are shown in their original form and then in various transpositions (in Secunda, Quarta, and Quinta superior and inferior). The notation includes clefs, notes, and rests, with some notes marked with asterisks to indicate transposition points.

Nos. 101, 186, 199, and 145 have the same cantus, but differ in the bass.

Thus, the four bransles simples and the two bransles gay have been set a tone higher: since they might have been found to be very difficult, I have transposed them down a tone.

Just as one can transpose a *Cantus* written in the treble clef [*Clave signata g*] down a fourth or a fifth, thus can one also transpose a part marked with a C clef ( $\text{C}$ ) a fourth or fifth higher by following the advice that I have already given. In any event, I shall elaborate on this topic in the fourth book of my *Syntagma Musica*.

## X.

**Concerning the short and long lines whereby the Tactus has been differentiated in the courants.**

I have made lines below representing the sextuplet [Sexduplen] 6/1 which are rather difficult. The spaces between the long lines | | | represent the meaning of an equal Tactus, with the downbeat [depressione] falling on the long lines and the upbeat [elevatione] falling on the short lines. When one wishes to approach unequal Tactus, as with a Sesquialtera, the Tactus should be understood to fall between each of the lines, whether long or short. This can be easily seen and understood, and avoids troublesome and annoying variations in the up and down movement of the hand.

## XI.

**Concerning the alternation of slow and fast Tactus.**

When playing dures, sarabandes, and ballets, a desirable sense of charm and grace may be achieved by changing the repetitions within a dance by playing one loudly and strongly, and another quietly and in an understated fashion, which one can easily do on bowed [geigenden] and wind [blasenden] instruments.

However, a ballet is a rather special case since it is sometimes a very fast dance and sometimes is a very slow dance. I could find no better way to show this clearly than to make use of the signs of major or minor Tactus [Signis Tactus minoris vel majoris], of which I shall deliver more in the fourth book of my Syntagma Musica, God willing. These signs are  $c$   $\mathcal{C}$   $\mathcal{C}_2$  and  $\mathcal{D}$ . Where one finds  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_2$  the notes are to be halved in value [per duplam] and must be measured according to Tactus a la Breve (as the ancients called it), so that two semibreves  $\diamond \diamond$  or four minims  $\diamond \diamond \diamond \diamond$  comprise a single Tactus, or else an extraordinarily fast Tactus must be used.

## XII.

**Apology of the author for the many admonitions that he has set before his works.**

I am aware that some have not been pleased by the many suggestions and admonitions in my works, and that I have been unable to avoid in this work. I take comfort from the precedent set by the admirable and well-known organist from Italy, Claudio Merulo of Correggio, who first placed a preface to the reader in a book of organ tablature of Hieronymous Diruta three years before the former died. I here render his words into German from his Italian:

In all the skills and arts, because they are particular professions and have their own particular principles and terms, it is customary to preface works with special observations which may seem strange to one who does not fully understand these skills. For that reason, when I allowed my first book of French songs to be published, I wanted to give everyone all helpful advice so that one could better understand and learn several things which must be observed in the songs. These observations, although modest and contemptible, will provide those who have little of the knowledge that is essential to derive satisfaction and pleasure from my songs to approach them comfortably, etc.

Thus has this admirable and most accomplished organist of our time expressed himself on this subject without hesitation and to his honor. I fervently hope that my insignificant, yet well-intentioned works, on account of the unpraised but considerable diligence expended therein, be received in the way in which they were intended. I hope that one will accept them and remain well-disposed toward me. Vale & utere bene. [Farewell and use them well.]

## Grounds for Putting Simpson into Practice

Gordon Dodd

### The Grounds

In her article "Putting Simpson into Practice," Sheila Marshall explained Simpson's procedure for improvising divisions with up to two violists and a keyboard player, and observed that

The discovery of a figured ground (or indeed of any ground divorced from written divisions and clearly intended for extemporisation) would be enlightening.<sup>1</sup>

Although I have seen practically all the known bass viol books, I have not found figures on any standard ground-for-divisions; the few figures that I have seen, on such things as prelude-grounds, hardly come within the scope of the present enquiry. But I have noticed several unfigured grounds, written on spare pages or in the flyleaves of bass viol books and thus "divorced from written divisions." Twenty grounds of this sort are documented in the Viola da Gamba Society of Great Britain's card index and are listed on following pages.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sheila Marshall, "Putting Simpson into Practice," *Journal of the VdGSA* 6 (1969): 9-10.

Fifteen of the grounds appear singly. Although they could have been used for accompanying written divisions, they could equally well have been used for solo improvisation, and therefore qualify for inclusion in the list.

The last five grounds are much more interesting, as each appears in two part-books of a set; the inescapable conclusion is that collective improvisation was their specific purpose.<sup>2</sup>

All twenty grounds are presented in full so that Simpsonians may enjoy authentic practice with grounds on which their forebears apparently improvised. Their sources are tabulated, together with brief details of representative written divisions on the same grounds. At once it can be seen that written divisions survive for only nine of the grounds — were the other eleven made up on the spot?

The grounds exhibit plenty of variety: some have one strain, some two. They visit related keys and have melodic as well as harmonic interest. Number 14 is the "Passamezzo Moderno,"<sup>3</sup> swinging nicely along, provided that the extemporizer can get "John Come Kiss Me Now" or "Les Bouffons" out of his head. To my mind the two finest grounds of all are "Polewheelee's Ground"<sup>4</sup> and "La Follia" (with confirmation from Marais, Corelli, Vivaldi, Rachmaninoff); both are here present, at number 11 and 19.

---

<sup>2</sup> Older hands will call to mind Benny Goodman's definition of swing: "Collective improvisation rhythmically integrated."

<sup>3</sup> In the course of a lecture to the Viola da Gamba Society of Great Britain, Peter Holman tentatively suggested that the twelve-bar-blues formula might be regarded as a *Passamezzo Modernissimo*.

<sup>4</sup> See VdGS (GtB) Supplementary Publications Nos. 90 and 140.



## GROUNDS FOR IMPROVISATION

### I: GROUNDS IN ONE BOOK

1.   
 2.   
 3.   
 4.   
 5.   
 6.   
 7.   
 8.   
 9.   
 9 cont.   
 10.   
 11.   
 12.   
 13.   
 II: GROUNDS IN TWO BOOKS :   
 14.   
 15.   
 16.   
 17.   
 18.   
 19.   
 20.

## THE GROUNDS - Sources, and representative written sets

	RT	V <sub>d</sub> S	SOURCES:												
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
			No	No	P	P	P	P	P	P	No	f	P		
<b>I - GROUNDS IN ONE BOOK</b>															
GROUND 1										63 :1					
GROUND 2										63 :2					
GROUND 3										63 :3					
GROUND 4										63 :4					
GROUND 5										63 :5					
GROUND 6	375									68 :1					
Divisions-Butler	375	14			94, 112								106 A		6
GROUND 7	25									68 :2					
Divisions-Simpson	96 -25	27												5	
GROUND 8	278									68 :3					
Divisions-Anon.	278												142		
GROUND 9	403														
Divisions-Anon.	403								end of 'Viol. 2' book						
Divisions-Simpson	403	17							87 A						
GROUND 10	373														
Divisions - R. L.	373	2							end of 'Viol. 2' book						
GROUND 11	371														
Divisions-Simpson	371	23							72					front of B book	6 A
GROUND 12															60 A
GROUND 13															60 A
GROUND 14	40														60 A
Divisions-Anon.	40								109 A						
GROUND 15															7 A
<b>II. GROUNDS IN TWO BOOKS OF A SET</b>															
GROUND 16															
GROUND 17															
GROUND 18															
GROUND 19	762														
Divisions-Anon.	762								35 A					20 A	
GROUND 20	382														
Divisions-Morcombe	382	30							end of 'Viol. 2 & Bc.						19

'RT' denotes a theme number from J.M. Richards, 'A study of bass viol music written in England in the C17' (B. Litt. Oxford, UK, 1960-1).  
 'A' = 'anonymous'.

## Table of Sources <sup>5</sup>

- A: Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MU MS 647  
B: Durham Cathedral MS D.2  
C: Durham Cathedral MS D.10  
D: Oxford, Bodleian Library MUS 184 c.8 (printed book)  
E: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mus Sch C.53  
F: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mus Sch C.59  
G: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mus Sch C.60  
H: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mus Sch C.61  
I: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mus Sch C.71  
J: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mus Sch C.77a, b  
K: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Mus Sch F.573  
L: Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket MS Instr Mus i.h.s.  
79.1  
M: New York, Public Library at Lincoln Center MS Drexel  
3551

### Sources of the Grounds

Source B, carrying four of the grounds, was owned by Prebendary Philip Falle. It consists of three books which allow for the combinations violin, bass viol, continuo; two violins and continuo; or two bass viols and continuo. Falle may well have been the Simpsonian who used then, but other names come into question, and one occurs on the flyleaf of the Viol II book: "for the honorabl. Sir John St Barbe Bart. neare Rumsey in Hampsheer."<sup>6</sup> Was he another Simpsonian? And could it have been he and Falle who, perhaps after a rewarding technique class, said to the tutor "We enjoyed that very much, and you obviously have more to teach us: where can we contact you?" and noted the reply in the flyleaf of the bass book of Source B;

In the old Jorry  
Belo the Church  
att a barber  
Mr Steffken.

<sup>5</sup> See Gordon Dodd, *Thematic Index of Music for Viols* (London: Viola da Gamba Society of Great Britain, 1980, 1982).

<sup>6</sup> Margaret Urquhart, "Prebendary Philip Falle (1656-1742) and the Durham Bass Viol Manuscript A.27" *Chelys* 5 (1973-74): 7-20.

This in turn calls to mind Huygens's letter to Utricia Swann, dated 23 February 1648:

I come to tell you for some mortification, that in your absence, Lady, we are not altogether out of tune, but that Mr Stofkins and I are doing a kinde of wonders upon two leereway viols . . . and that in time of necessitye I have hands enough to play a wofull *Lachrimae* and such other stufte upon my organs, to have that wonderful bow rowle upon my bases. See if you will make hast to hear our miracles.<sup>7</sup>

Although that may have been a somewhat different exercise, Simpsonians will perhaps credit it with the right spirit, and see Steffkens as one of those who could have instigated some collective improvisation.

In Source B, Ground 19 ("Follia") was written in pencil, and Ground 20 in what looks like orange crayon. Ground 20 follows the plan of "Follia" in its first eight notes.

Source E is a set of part books for two trebles, bass, and continuo, containing several sets of dances in the autograph of the composer, Christopher Gibbons. Whether Gibbons also wrote the grounds at the back end of the inverted treble books, I cannot tell, but here is clear evidence of Simpsonian practice at Oxford.

Sources F and G, with eight of the grounds, together make a pair of part books, C. 59-60, containing works for two bass viols by Simpson, Jenkins, John Withy, and others. They are kept separate in the table because each has different grounds entered at the end. The books were compiled by Francis Withy, composer and performer, and his initials on Ground 3 seem to mark him out as a potential Simpsonian. Grounds 4 and 5 show the signs of first and second attempts: which version would have been preferred?

Source K, MS F.573, showing strong connections with the Netherlands, is the source, among other things, of fifty-five airs, apparently for unaccompanied violin, but

<sup>7</sup> Jacob Adolf Worp, ed., *De Briefwisseling van Constantijn Huygens, 1608-1697* (The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1911-17), Letter No. 4762.

evidently arrangements from lyra viol solos including some by Steffkens.<sup>8</sup> Ground 15 is written in pencil on the verso immediately preceding the violin pieces. It has obvious affinities with the ground (RT 401) of Simpson's "great" E minor set, VdGS (Richards) No. 10.

Source L contains two sets of fancies, airs, and corants for treble, bass, and organ by Jenkins.<sup>9</sup> Ground 11 (Polewhee's) appears at the front of the bass book.

Source M consists of manuscript leaves bound at the end of a first edition (1659) of Simpson's *Division Violist*. Although I have seen microfilm of the manuscripts, I have seen neither the book itself nor film of it. However, I understand the book to be unannotated, and thus lacking anything by which the owner may be identified. Information on this point would be most welcome, in view of the remarkable coincidence between ten dances of Steffkens in tablature in Goess MS 'A' dated "19 Octobre 1664" and the same ten dances in staff notation in Source M, the first five being there headed "A Suite of Mr Steffkins he gave me October yr. 1664."<sup>10</sup> Here is another road leading back to that potential Simpsonian, Steffkens.

#### Dr. Covell's Book

Having now commented on the sources of the grounds, I wish to mention only one of the sources of the written divisions, and that is Source D, also a layer of manuscript leaves at the back of a 1659 Simpson, owned by Dr. Covell who eventually became Master of Christ's College,

---

<sup>8</sup> See Gordon Dodd, "Matters Arising from the Examination of Some Lyra Viol MSS," *Chelys* 9 (1980): 23-27, continued in *Chelys* 10 (1981): 39-41.

<sup>9</sup> Dodd, *Thematic Index*, JENKINS-13.

<sup>10</sup> Dodd, "Matters Arising from the Examination of Some Lyra Viol MSS," *Chelys* 9 (1980): 24.

Cambridge.<sup>11</sup> Fifteen sets of divisions in Source D are attributed to "R.L.," "R.L.E.," or "R.L.S." (presumably Sir Roger Lestrangle), Jenkins, and "anon." One anonymous item proves to be Simpson's divisions on "Polewhee's Ground" followed by a set of Polewhee's own ("PW's own follow").<sup>12</sup>

Source D brings together some of the most illustrious names in the violist's world, including that of the Grand Master himself. Not only does it set forth divisions written by these composers, but it also makes use of four grounds which, as discussed above, were probably selected as being especially suitable for extempore practice. Simpsonians at Cambridge, as well as those at Oxford, had the personnel and the material ready at hand. It would be agreeable to entertain the notion that Simpson's printed instructions had their origin in the proceedings of that talented company.

#### The Organist

Finally, I have not seen anywhere a ground written in three books of a set, thus allowing for the full complement of two viols to the organ, but I can imagine Simpson's organist, like many of us nowadays, being expected to play it by ear.

---

<sup>11</sup> John Wilson, ed., *Roger North on Music; Being a Selection from His Essays Written During the Years c 1695-1728* (London: Novello, 1959), 58.

<sup>12</sup> Dodd, *Thematic Index*, R. LESTRANGE-1.

## Reviews

Carl Friedrich Abel. *Six Sonatas for Unaccompanied Viola da Gamba*. Edited by Murray Charters. (Viola da Gamba Series). Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1982. \$5.50.

William Young. *Two Sonatas for Violin, Viola da Gamba, and Basso Continuo*. Edited by Donald Beecher and Bryan Gillingham. (Baroque Chamber Music Series). Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1982. \$5.50.

I have recently received two remarkably different editions of viol music, one composed in mid-seventeenth century by an Englishman who spent part of his life on the continent, and the other written approximately one hundred years later by a German who spent nearly thirty years in London. It is not surprising that William Young's music retains so much of what is often called "the English style." However, despite all those years in London, there is certainly nothing very "English sounding" about the music of C.F. Abel. Written at the very end of the period of viol dominance, it has a *galant* affinity to the music of his close friend, J.C. Bach, and was even mistaken at times for early Haydn.

Perhaps it is easiest to start with a general comment or two about Dovehouse Editions. When I looked again at "What the critics and players are saying about Dovehouse Editions" in their handsome flyer, I thought, "Why didn't I write something like that?" I am one of several, I am sure, who have put myself on the standing-order mailing list to be sent all editions as they come off the press. Actually, I *did* have occasion to write to Donald Beecher and Bryan Gillingham recently, and I told them, "It always makes my day when I find a package from Dovehouse in the mail." For very reasonable prices, they are providing a valuable service—easily-read, well-printed editions of the music of "established composers and lesser-known worthies." It is a joy to find clear printing, good-quality paper, and parts for all with reasonable page turns. All editions have copious introductions. In this case, I found out what there is to know about the rather obscure William Young, and I

was reintroduced to C.F. Abel, subject of Sara Joiner Wynn's article in the 1973 issue of this journal. I am certainly one of many Dovehouse fans.

I am happy to see the Abel sonatas. I was teaching with Murray Charters, the editor of this edition, in a summer workshop a few years ago and remember his lecture/demonstration on Abel and his music. He played a snatch of it and talked about his editing job. I was amazed by the technical demands of this solo music, as I was familiar, at that time, only with the easily-available Hortus Musicus editions (nos. 39 and 40) purportedly written for amateurs. I have also felt fortunate to live so near the Huntington Library in San Marino, California, where the magnificent Gainsborough portrait of Abel fills up nearly half a wall in the gallery, and whose bookstore offers splendid reproductions which make wonderful presents for friends and students. The Huntington has also, in its collection of British cartoons, a comic sketch of Abel and J.C. Bach by Thomas Rowlandson (1756-1827). Mr. Abel clutches his bow in a curious manner and plays a vaguely strung instrument. He looks annoyed by the music and the composure of Bach, playing what appears to be a Baroque oboe.

The source for this edition is a New York Public Library manuscript (Drexel 5871), and Charters believes that it may be "a small compilation of Abel's improvisations" along with some studies, and that it was written for Gainsborough. He has organized his selections into sonatas and has chosen carefully. I have a photocopy of a facsimile of what Charters calls Sonata II, but the prelude—composed entirely of arpeggiated chords—is not there. Perhaps it was not in the manuscript, which evidently was full of errors. The complete works of Abel have been published by Knape, but these editions are hard to find and expensive. I was told by one dealer that they are out of print. Charters says that they are filled with errors also, so we owe him a debt of thanks for his efforts and for providing us with a workable edition. He has printed the music in clefs more

familiar to many than the original treble clef read down an octave. He is consistent and careful in notating what is original and also what is in the Knappe edition. I might disagree slightly with his performing version of the fugue in Sonata III, but he prints it above the original, so he certainly can't be accused of cramming his own interpretation down our throats.

I once spent an entire evening with a borrowed copy of the Knappe edition, volume 16—27 *Stücke für die Gambe solo*. Intrigued by a style of viol music which was unfamiliar, I set out eagerly to read from start to finish. By the end of my session, I felt slightly as if I'd been swimming through a sea of treacle! All of those endless sequences of triplets in D major and repetitive, predictable harmonies did not wear well. Charters has, I am sure, selected what will wear best. Many players will enjoy the considerable technical challenges and the opportunity to explore something quite different from English and French viol music. There are many contemporary references to Abel's fame as a virtuoso and master of elegant playing. The music in this edition gives us a chance to explore the less familiar and appreciate another style. I still have a slight "I-didn't-know-you-were-allowed-to-do-that" attitude about all those roller coaster *roulades* of thirty-second notes, so I am happily practicing them with the Abel reproductions on my wall looking alternately benevolent and stern.

According to the editors, William Young's music exists only in manuscript, and his career is documented only after he was employed by Archduke Ferdinand Karl of Innsbruck in 1652. They go on to say that he was considered a virtuoso violist *da gamba* and that his music reflects his continental wanderings while maintaining its essential "Englishness." The two sonatas are taken from a 1653 publication which includes eleven sonatas and nineteen dances for various groups of instruments. This was evidently the first work by an English composer to use the designation "sonata." To find out how the music sounds, I was fortunate to have a brief sight

reading collaboration with a Baroque violinist and musicologist. We felt, indeed, that both sonatas had a definite Italian flavor, with their canzona-like, episodic sections. The editors discuss this at length in the introduction. We also agreed to a similarity to early Jenkins, and the "fusion of national styles" which the editors mention. The viol part has many double stops and the sort of octave and tenth skips in sixteenth-note passages that challenge bow arm and left hand alike. The violinist does not seem to have to work as hard; it was obvious to both of us that Young was a viol player, whose music enhances both the harmonic and melodic qualities of the instrument. The editors say the tempo and movement designations are original, but I wondered about the realization of the bass line, which is not discussed. What is here seems conservative, which is generally preferred to overblown, but my keyboard friends usually want to know what is original and what is editing. The sparse harmonies and note values in Sonata II particularly, suggest that an organ might be used. Also, I wondered about doubling the bass line with another viol.

The editors seem to have done a careful job with this Durham Cathedral Library manuscript except for a couple of tooth-rattling dissonances which I question. Although this sort of thing certainly crops up in English music of the period, I would be tempted to change what seem to be a very few errors. What conclusions do I draw regarding these new additions to the violin/viol repertoire? First, that Sonata I is more interesting to me than Sonata II because it is longer, more episodic, and more harmonically rewarding. Secondly, that this music is, as my violinist friend and I agreed, "nice but not thrilling." I am sure that I am spoiled by the inventiveness of Simpson and the remarkable creativity of Jenkins, to name only two from that rich period of English viol music. If I ride lightly over the efforts of William Young, perhaps it is because I already have a fat collection of Dovehouse editions of those two gentlemen, just waiting to be programmed.

Carol Herman

John Coprario. *Twelve Fantasias for Two Bass Viols and Organ. Eleven Pieces for Three Lyra Viols*. Edited by Richard Charteris. (Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era, Vol. 41). Madison, Wisc.: A-R Editions, 1982, \$21.95.

John Coprario. *The Six-part Consorts and Madrigals*. Edited by Richard Charteris. Kilkenny, Ireland: Boethius Press, 1982.

Richard Charteris reminds the reader in the introduction to his edition of John Coprario's six-part consorts and madrigals of the great popularity accorded to Coprario's instrumental music during the seventeenth century, as evidenced by the ninety-one manuscript and seven printed sources of the period which contain his music. Coprario's sizeable output includes a large number of works for viols: 8 two-part, 10 three-part, and 7 four-part fantasias; 52 five-part pieces, 8 six-part fantasias; 16 fantasia-suites for violin, bass viol, and organ; 8 fantasia-suites for two violins, bass viol, and organ; 2 works for one lyra viol; 3 works for two lyra viols; and 11 for three lyra viols. As in the seventeenth century, Coprario's music can once again enjoy wide dissemination through the several modern editions of significant portions of his repertoire, the four most recent all produced by Mr. Charteris: all the fantasia-suites, in *Musica Britannica*, vol. 46, 1980 (reviewed in the 1981 issue of this journal); the five-part pieces, in *Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae*, vol. 92, 1981; and the subjects of this review, the fantasias for two basses and organ and the works for three lyra viols, and the above-mentioned six-part consorts.

Mr. Charteris's comprehensive study of Coprario is impressive. His dissertation, "John Coprario (Cooper), c. 1575-1626: A Study and Complete Critical Edition of His Instrumental Music" (University of Canterbury, New Zealand, 1976), includes an edition of the composer's entire secular instrumental output. A year later Charteris published *John Coprario: A Thematic Catalogue of His Music with a Biographical Introduction* (New York: Pendragon Press, 1977), which updates Ernst Meyer's 1934 catalog on Coprario sources and presents

the first complete thematic index of the composer's vocal works. In the preface to this catalog Charteris addresses questions concerning the likelihood of Coprario's Italian sojourn and the composer's autograph sources. This preface contains the most detailed biography on Coprario outside of Charteris's dissertation. During the past decade the editor has also produced several articles about Coprario, including two in *Music and Letters*: "Autographs by John Cooper," 56 (1975): 41 and "John Coprario's Five- and Six-part Pieces: Instrumental or Vocal?" 57 (1976): 370. Most recently, he has published "A Postscript to 'John Coprario: A Thematic Catalogue of his Music with a Biographical Introduction,'" *Chelys* 11 (1982): 13-19.

The two editions under consideration here illustrate two aspects of Coprario's instrumental oeuvre: the six-part consorts and the fantasias for three lyra viols reveal the composer's Italian connection while the duos for basses and the remaining lyra viol pieces reflect the later influence of dance forms on English instrumental chamber music. In his extended introduction to the A-R edition, Charteris explains that Coprario likely wrote only twelve bass duos with organ, not fourteen as maintained by many writers, because two of these fourteen are actually corrupt versions of fantasias three and four in the A-R edition. Charteris suggests a date of between 1610 and 1615 for these duos in light of their Baroque trio sonata texture and more expressive harmonic vocabulary than found in the multi-voiced fantasias. An independent organ part, used to fill out harmony and participate in the imitative texture of the viols, made one of its first appearances in English music with these duos. While Coprario called these works "fantasias," they are actually bi-partite dance movements, with an internal cadence approximately one-third of the way through, followed by a second half written out twice in most works, sometimes with slight modifications or exchanged parts on the repeats. Charteris explains that he has suppressed the double bars which in the original sources

marked these central cadences, since their only function seemed to be as an indicator of the works' sectional character. One wishes he had retained these double bars to help elucidate the movements' structure.

According to Playford in 1682, John Coprario was among the "very best masters" of the *lyra viol*. Of the eleven works for three *lyras* in this edition—consisting of three fantasias and eight dance movements—three are anonymous in the sources, but based on stylistic and bibliographic considerations Charteris justifiably attributes all eleven pieces to Coprario. These three fantasias resemble the composer's multi-voiced fantasias in their imitative texture, yet surpass them for harmonic richness, while the eight works in dance form—seven *almains* and one *corant*—are again representative of popular English instrumental dance forms of the period. This edition presents these works for *lyra viols* in conventional notation in score in the volume proper, with another copy in tablature in a supplementary, optional book.

This edition of bass duos and *lyra* compositions is on a par with other volumes in A-R Editions' superb series *Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque*. The preface contains abundant information about the composer, the music, performance issues, source materials (including three facsimiles of manuscripts), and a clear explanation of editorial methods, including a detailed listing of variant readings for each piece. The physical features of the edition are commendable: the notation is quite legible and the paper of good quality and well bound, making the price a fair one in this reviewer's mind. However, the optional tablature supplement costs an additional \$8.00 (the user does not have the option of buying the *lyra* pieces only in tablature and not in conventional notation) and is not bound as sturdily as is the main volume. In any case, to perform from this edition one must either indulge in photocopying or buy two copies of the book, since no parts are included. Nevertheless, the volume is certainly a welcome addition to a library of English music.

The existence of so many polyphonic fantasias by Coprario lends weight to the theory that in the earlier part of his life the composer did travel to Italy or at least was strongly influenced by Italian composers and musical styles. As evidence of this Italian connection, all but one of the five-part and one of the six-part fantasias bear Italian titles, some of which are also the titles for known madrigals and canzonets by Italian composers, suggesting also that Coprario's fantasias, if not actual transcriptions of vocal works, were vocal in inspiration, apt for viols and/or voices. Of the eight six-part works, two survive with fully underlaid texts, included here in Charteris's edition. Additional evidence for the vocal origins of these six-part consorts is their inclusion in some sources of largely vocal compositions. Charteris suggests that these five- and six-part works were composed between 1590 and 1610.

This Boethius Press edition of the fantasias is a better performing edition than is the more scholarly A-R edition. The editor's introductory and concluding commentary is briefer and directed more to issues of performance than to bibliographical or editorial questions. Also, the edition includes seven paperback partbooks, the seventh being an organ score of three works, as well as a hardback score: all of which are carefully assembled to withstand extensive use by performing musicians. The manuscript hand of the Boethius Press edition is large, bold, and easily legible, but less handsome than the engraved format of the A-R edition. In these times of high production costs of printed materials, one might question why the Boethius Press copyist used such large notation, particularly for the score, the number of pages of which could have been considerably reduced by including more than the two systems per page required by this larger notation, and also why he or she did not better plan the layout of both score and parts to eliminate the half-empty pages at the end of nearly every piece in the volume.

This reviewer recommends both of these editions, for they present in a clear and scholarly manner music which occupied an important place in the repertoire of a

prolific and influential composer. Through his comprehensive investigation of Coprario's life and works and with his careful editorial methods, Richard Charteris presents a more nearly complete view of an important segment of viol music of our past.

Barbara Coeyman

Three recordings from Gasparo Co., P.O. Box 120069, Nashville, TN 37212. \$9.98 each:

Georg Philipp Telemann. Oberlin Baroque Performance Institute (1980), August Wenzinger, Musical Director. Gasparo GS-228.

Music of the Berlin Court. Oberlin Baroque Performance Institute (1981), August Wenzinger, Musical Director. Gasparo GS-220.

Telemann. *Sonata in D Major for Unaccompanied Viola da Gamba*. Scarlatti. *Four Sonatas for Harpsichord*. Handel. *Mi Palpita Il Cor. Il Gelsomino*. Cleveland Baroque Solosists. Gasparo GS-213.

The first two recordings reviewed here are further releases by Gasparo of music from the Oberlin Baroque Performance Institute, directed by August Wenzinger. The first was recorded at the 1981 session of the institute, which was dedicated to the works of Georg Philipp Telemann (1681-1767). The selections on this recording are his *Sonata in A Minor for Oboe and Continuo* from *Der getreue Music-Meister.*, *Sonata in E Minor for Viola da Gamba and Continuo* from *Essercizi Musici*, *Quartet in G Major for Flute, Two Violas da Gamba and Continuo* from the Darmstadt MS. 1042/90, and his cantata *Du aber Daniel, gehe hin*.

The oboe sonata is a well-known student work, easily taken for granted and therefore often somewhat perfunctorily performed. That is certainly not true here. James Caldwell displays great musicianship and masterful interpretation throughout the work. The first movement is in a good, lilting tempo which, with the beautiful phrasing of Mr. Caldwell, conveys a real *siciliano* spirit lacking in other recordings of this work. Telemann labeled the second movement *spiritoso* rather

than the usual *allegro*, and Mr. Caldwell plays it in a bright, brisk, spirited tempo which is very appropriate. The final two movements are typical of Telemann's sonata form and are performed equally well. Mention should also be made of the masterful job done by the continuo players, Catharina Meints, violoncello, and Lisa Goode Crawford, harpsichord, who achieve a perfect balance with the soloist.

The viola da gamba sonata reveals more of the composer's theatrical style. The opening *cantabile* is obviously influenced by the vocal idiom, and the third and fourth movements resemble an opera scene. The third is designated *Recitativo-Arioso*, and the fourth, a *vivace*, is similar in style to an Italian aria. The performance, by Catharina Meints and James Caldwell, violas da gamba, and Lisa Goode Crawford, harpsichord, maintains the high standards achieved by this same group in the oboe sonata.

The Quartet in G Major exists also in a version for two violins. As Mary Anne Ballard comments in her program notes:

Knowing which version is earlier is unimportant because the whole piece is written in the brilliant Italian idiom as if for violins. The Darmstadt Library version for two gambas was probably intended for the use of the famous gamba virtuoso Christian Hesse, who lived in Darmstadt during Telemann's years in nearby Frankfurt.

Telemann was known among his contemporaries as an excellent contrapuntist, and evidence of his skill is present in this work. In the opening *dolce*, the flute is answered by the two viols; this style is continued to a lesser degree in the following *allegro*, which also displays Robert Willoughby's virtuosity on the Baroque flute. The third movement, *soave*, demonstrates the superb balance and intertwining of voices that Telemann describes as his trio-sonata style.

Telemann's church music style is a mixture of his contrapuntal genius with Italian operatic melody. It is in this genre that Telemann has been most severely criticized by succeeding generations. In *Du aber Daniel, gehe hin*, his setting of the text, choice of instrumentation,



and expressive melodies are typical of his sacred style and deserving of a careful hearing.

The rich sonorities of the original instruments used throughout this recording make it worth hearing, even without the masterful interpretations of the artists. Included in the slipcase is the script of a lecture on Telemann delivered by August Wenzinger at Oberlin in June of 1981, and the text of the cantata in German and English.

The second album, *Music of the Berlin Court*, comprises recordings drawn from the 1980 Baroque Performance Institute, despite the 1981 date on the cover. Included are Johann Gottlieb Graun's cantata *O Dio, Fileno* for soprano, viola da gamba and strings; Johann Joachim Quantz's Trio-sonata for Flute, Recorder, and Continuo in C Major; and Franz (Frantisek) Benda's Sonata for Violin and Continuo in A Major.

Johann Gottlieb Graun was one of a family of German musicians, including his brothers August Friedrich Graun and Carl Heinrich Graun. Born in Wahrenbruck (near Darmstadt) in 1703, he studied first with J.G. Pisendel and later with Giuseppe Tartini. In 1732, he entered the service of Frederick of Prussia and moved with him to Berlin when he became King Frederick II in 1740. Graun served as *Konzertmeister* of the royal orchestra until his death in 1771.

His cantata, consisting of two arias introduced by two recitatives, is typical of the period. The text is a lament by Irene occasioned by her lover's return to war with the coming of spring. August Wenzinger copied the score used in this performance from the one held in the music department of the Berlin Staatsbibliothek. The first modern performance was at the Schola Cantorum of Basel in 1943; the second is this performance, recorded at Oberlin in 1980. The instrumental accompaniment and viola da gamba obbligato are handled in the flawless manner for which the soloists at Oberlin have become known. The soprano soloist, Penelope Jensen, gives a very expressive, dramatic rendering but is a little difficult to understand in places.

The next work is a trio sonata by Johann Joachim Quantz (1697-1773). It was probably composed sometime before his employment began with Frederick II in 1741, while he was still connected with the Dresden court. It is in the form of the Italian sonata *da chiesa* as standardized by Corelli and adopted by many later composers. Especially notable is the character of the final two movements. The third is written in the triple meter of the middle movement of Legrenzi's early sonatas, but is slower and retains the sarabande quality characteristic of the third movements of many of Corelli's trio sonatas. The fourth movement also has a dance-like quality, which distinguishes this work from the pure "chiesa-type" trio sonatas typical of other non-Italian composers of the time.

Franz Benda (1709-1786) was also employed by Frederick the Great and eventually succeeded Graun as concert master of the royal orchestra. His sonata is very demanding in the variety of ornamentation—including rapid cadenza-like passages, trills, and myriad other embellishments—particularly in the highly ornamented *Adagio*. The solo violinist, Marilyn McDonald, does a remarkable job with the solo ornamentation; it is crisp and precise, although overpowered at times by the accompaniment.

Except for the addition of harpsichordist Doris Ornstein, the third recording again features the same performers as the first two. It contains the Telemann Sonata for Unaccompanied Viola da Gamba, four harpsichord sonatas by Domenico Scarlatti, and two Handel cantatas.

This recording of Handel's Italian chamber cantata, *Mi palpita il cor*, is particularly important because of its rarity. As Doris Ornstein points out in her program notes:

---

Because the soprano-oboe version was published as "incomplete" in the Handelgesellschaft, it has received few if any modern performances. The performance is based on the complete autograph (R.M. 20e.4) in the Royal Music Library, London, and on a study of the other versions.

Domenico Scarlatti's "sonatas," originally called *Essercizi per Gravicembalo*, are among the most original works of the period, neither derived from nor showing any particular influence of the other styles and forms popular at the time.

The four Scarlatti sonatas include K. 87 in B minor, K. 401 in D major, K. 238 in F minor, and K. 239 in F minor. The Telemann sonata from *Der getreue Music-Meister* was written in response to a growing demand for unaccompanied string music. Arpeggios, broken melodies, and occasional double-stopping give the impression of accompaniment. The third movement, a recitative and aria, illustrates the operatic qualities of Telemann's style.

This recording also displays the high standards of the performers and of Gasparo in the extremely high quality of performance, recording, and pressing, resulting in one more valuable addition by Gasparo to any record collection. All three are highly recommended.

Philip M. Smith

## Contributor Profiles

**Ellen TeSelle Boal** received her bachelor's degree from the University of Colorado, and has continued her formal education at Washington University in St. Louis, where she received her master's degree and has recently completed her doctoral dissertation, from which the present article is adapted. She has previously published *Concepts and Skills for the Piano* (Canyon Press, 1970), articles in *Educational Media* and *American Music Teacher*, and feature stories for the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*. She has performed with the Washington Bach Consort, the Early Music Ensemble of St. Louis, the St. Louis Chamber Orchestra and Chorus, and with keyboard performer Dean Boal. She has taught music history, theory, cello, and viol at Washington University, St. Louis Conservatory, Peabody Conservatory, and Hastings College. She is currently employed by National Public Radio, where she administers government and foundation grants.

**Bruce R. Carvell** received his bachelor's and master's degrees from the University of Michigan and his Ph. D. from Washington University in Saint Louis. Currently, he is the director of the Collegium Musicum at Washington University and is very active in early music performance in St. Louis, both as a singer and an instrumentalist. In addition, he is engaged in on-going research concerning performance practice in the Renaissance.

**Barbara Coeyman** is currently completing her doctoral dissertation in musicology from the Graduate Center of the City University of New York on the stage music of Michel-Richard Delalande written for the French court between 1680 and 1725, the research for which she completed as a Fulbright scholar to France

during the 1981-82 academic year. As a viol player, she specializes in Baroque solo and ensemble literature for the bass viol, and has performed extensively in the New York, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh areas. Ms. Coeyman has also studied and performed French Baroque dance. She has taught music history and theory at Brooklyn College and West Chester State College, and currently teaches and performs in Pittsburgh.

**Gordon Dodd** served in the Royal Navy from 1941 to 1975. He specialized in navigation, and commanded the frigate HMS Rhyll from 1960 to 1963. Since his retirement from active service in 1975, he has written admiralty sailing directions for the Ministry of Defense. He became interested in early music after World War II—first in keyboard and vocal music, later in recorders and viols. Since 1965 he has been the General Editor of the Supplementary Publications of the Viola da Gamba Society (Great Britain), and has compiled its *Thematic Index*. He has contributed articles to this journal as well as to *Chelys*, the journal of the VdGS (Gt. B.). Commander Dodd has served as this Society's representative in the United Kingdom since 1979.

**Carol Herman** is a graduate of Pomona College, with advanced study in cello at Drake University and in viola da gamba with Adam Skeaping and Wieland Kuijken. She is instructor of viols at the University of California, Riverside, and California State University, Los Angeles. As violist da gamba and Baroque cellist, she is a regular member of several early music workshops, and she performs with the Arianna Ensemble, the Anolta Trio, and Philharmonia: Baroque Orchestra of the West. She has recorded on the Musical Heritage Society and 1750 Arch labels.

**Philip M. Smith** has received the B.M.E., B.M. in music history, and M.A. in musicology degrees from the University of Kansas and a Master of Library Science

degree from Florida State University. He is currently a doctoral candidate in the Humanities program there, with emphases in musicology and medieval studies. He has worked as a flue voicer for the Reuter Organ Company and is currently the Assistant Head, Catalog Department, and Music Cataloger at Memphis State University.

**Richard Taruskin** is well known as a faculty member at the VdGSA Conclaves and other workshops around the country. He has taught at Sarah Lawrence College, and is currently on the faculty of Columbia University. Taruskin is General Editor of *Ogni Sorte Editions* and has written articles and reviews for the *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, *Musical Quarterly*, *Early Music*, *Journal of Musicology*, and other periodicals. In addition to his interest in the viol, he is a recognized authority on nineteenth-century Russian music and the music of Stravinsky. He has recently published the book *Opera and Drama in Russia as Preached and Practiced in the 1860's* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1981). His performing experience includes regular touring with the Aulos Ensemble and guest appearances with the Waverly Consort, the Marlboro Festival and other groups. He has made recordings with the Aulos Ensemble, Cappella Nova, and the Nonesuch consort. He was the recipient of the American Musicological Society's Noah Greenberg Award in 1978.