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EDITORIAL NOTE

The rich diversity offered in this issue extends from an interview with viol player/librarian Sydney Beck, undertaken by Alison Fowle and Judith Davidoff, to the conclusion of Tina Chancey’s look at the pardessus de viole and the duets of Barthélemy de Caix. Joining these authors are three of the Journal’s Editorial Board members: Mary Cyr, with the first part of her study of lyra viol ornamentation; Roland Hutchinson, with his translation of the Bach-Jahrbuch article on a Bach chorale prelude of interest to viol players; and Ian Woodfield, who faithfully keeps us informed of recent writings about the viol.

Our new Review Editor, Stuart Cheney, has brought in not only some fine reviews of relevant books and music editions, but also some first-time reviewers. The Journal is always looking for new authors and new ideas about our favorite instrument and its repertoire.

Above all, your Editor is grateful for the meticulous work of our Senior Editor, Jean Seiler, and for the VdGSA Board’s support for our endeavors. As we head toward the next millennium, the revival of interest in the viol should inspire an even broader diversity of topics and perspectives. Readers, be sure to share your thoughts with us.

Caroline Cunningham

INTERVIEW WITH SYDNEY BECK

Judith Davidoff and I went to visit Sydney Beck and his wife Blanche Winogron in their lovely home in the woodlands west of Brattleboro, Vermont. They had many stories to tell of the beginnings of the early music revival in New York, and we had a delightful time listening to them. We persuaded Sydney to talk on tape about his musical life and work, which began more than seventy years ago, and his continuing writing projects today. Sydney was born in 1906. He became the first curator of the Toscanini Memorial Archive, which he had established in Lincoln Center in 1965, and Head of the Rare Book and Manuscript Collections of the New York Public Library’s Music Division. From 1968 to 1976 he was Director of Libraries and faculty member at the New England Conservatory in Boston.

Alison: When did you start playing an instrument?

Sydney: When I was eight, my cousin interested me in taking violin lessons, and he introduced me to a fine teacher named Auerbach who came from Berlin. I just took to it like a duck to water. I made such rapid progress they all thought I was a prodigy. They thought I should go to Germany to study; in those days that’s where the young Americans would go if they were serious. (This was sixty or seventy years ago!) But I never went to Germany; my mother didn’t think I was mature enough to be left alone. I had been very sick when I was four—double pneumonia—and was thereafter an invalid for many years. My family pampered me.

Judith: Were you the only musician in the family?

Sydney: The only one who took it seriously. They were all music lovers (including both my parents), and my elder sister played the piano, but I was the only one of her three brothers who followed through. So I made very rapid progress with this teacher, and after two years I was playing Tartini’s “Devil’s Trill” sonata, and after three years the Mendelssohn concerto. I wanted to play...
in the school orchestra, so I auditioned with Mr. Wucherer, the conductor who was officially the physical education teacher. I remember playing the Kreisler Sicilienne and Rigaudon—the latter all sixteenths, perpetual motion—but I played it three times too fast! I was a house afire. They all thought I was wonderful and made me concertmaster. I was ten-and-a-half.

My high school years were spent at a prep school and at the Institute of Musical Art (forerunner of the Juilliard School) for the full curriculum, with violin under Louis Svecenski—later supplemented by courses at City College and Columbia University. When the need to earn my way became paramount, I joined the training program of the American Orchestral Society (under Chalmers Clifton), obtaining a graduate and postgraduate certificate in both violin and viola. Shortly thereafter I continued my studies in theory and composition at the Mannes College under Dr. Hans Weiss, concentrating on Schenker analysis. What I needed desperately at the time was to find some immediate employment in order to have private lessons with one of the leading violin teachers of the day.

I was still interested in becoming—God forbid—a virtuoso violinist. Well, I never did, because I was more intellectually aroused by things other than playing an instrument.

Alison: You went to work at the Public Library. How did that come about?

Sydney: Now, how did I become a librarian, of all things? Well, I made regular visits to the Public Library's music branch on East 58th Street, following the rehearsals of the American Orchestral Society's training orchestra held in the adjoining Liederkranz building. The library was headed by the ambitious and indefatigable Dorothy Lawton, who took personal interest in talented young people venturing into her domain. It was my good fortune to have been accepted as one of them. I had confided to her my desperate need to find temporary part-time employment in order to continue my studies.

After repeated inquiries about my progress she suggested I see the new chief of the Music Division at the main reference library on 42nd Street, Dr. Carleton Sprague Smith, and provided me with a helpful note to him. CSS, as we called him, was not as awesome as I expected; we plunged immediately into a discussion of Baroque performance practice. He was a flutist and a lover of Baroque music. He told me there was no position vacant at the time, but he asked me to do a personal job for him: to make a [continuo] realization of a Scarlatti cantata. He liked what I did so well, he created a job for me to work several hours a week at "this sort of thing." The Music Division, entombed as it was in an isolated corner on the upper level of the building with walled and balconied shelving completely surrounding the central reading room, had a cloistered, scholarly atmosphere. Though artificially ventilated, it was quite attractive to the serious researcher, as it was to the general reader. (Incidentally, that was where, some time later, Blanche and I met—she an eager student asking challenging questions.) It was by pure chance that my status as a staff member soon became legitimized when I had the opportunity to fill a part-time vacancy as a reference librarian, thus supplementing my meager earnings.

The special project consisted of scoring from original parts of selected items from a vast store of works unavailable in modern editions. We soon expanded the project to transcribing from tablature, transposing, reconstructing from missing parts, realizing the figured bass parts, and, eventually, editing scores and parts for concert use. Though the bulk of the source material was part of the library's rich collection, certain rare items were occasionally borrowed from the Library of Congress and the British Museum [now the British Library], the Christ Church Library at Oxford, and other institutions and private collections. By 1935 a list of sixty works was published in an annotated catalogue of music in Black Line Print—a method invented by CSS for duplicating music copied on transparent sheets, and reproduced in the manner of blueprints. It is still a popular method among composers and performers.

Alison: You had copied by hand the pieces in the library?

Sydney: Yes, but then we got help from the WPA Federal Music Project—this was the time of the Depression. I trained twelve copyists, and later was joined in this work by Dr. Hans

1Sydney married Blanche Winogron in 1943. She was the first harpsichordist of the New York Pro Musica, and published a revised edition of the Fitzwilliam Virginal Book in 1972.
David, a distinguished refugee musicologist. He was my colleague, my assistant.

Dr. Harold Spivacke became interested in the project, and he prepared the first catalogue of my work shortly before he became chief of the Music Division at the Library of Congress. He made a thematic index, price list, and full description of each item.

Judith: What were some of the prices?

Sydney: Let’s see . . . John Adson’s Courtly Masquing Ayres, (London, 1621): we published the 53-page score of the whole collection for $5.99! Holborne’s Pavans, Gailliards, and Almains . . . (1599), for viols, violins, and winds: the 132-page score for $12.92. Tobias Hume’s Poeticall Musicke . . . (1607): the 70-page score for $8.32. Gottfried Finger’s Twelve Sonatas for three and four strings with basso continuo, Op. 1: the 67-page score for $6.63. Then there were the Jacobean Dance and Masque Tunes, for which we had only treble and bass parts (but nothing was going to stop me; I made up the other parts!): the 55-page score for $5.29. In the 1941 catalogue there were ninety-five works available in score and parts, edited for performance.

Alison: So who was playing this music then? Did you play a viol at that time?

Sydney: My interest in these years was mostly in the broken consort, but I attended occasional playing sessions with Charles and Fanny Hughes, both of the Hunter College faculty, who were staunch followers of Arnold Dolmetsch, and had been in Haslemere in 1935. The enthusiasm and dedication of the players, including [the lutenist] Suzanne Bloch, was contagious. Being a violinist/violist by profession, I could hardly resist becoming a convert. I borrowed a tenor viol from the Van Buren collection and soon became preoccupied with the mysteries of tying frets and learning to cope with new bow techniques and articulation problems. It wasn’t long before I was able to hold a part. In a memorable program, “Music for Ancient Instruments,” given at the Library on March 10, 1941, I was bold enough to be a participant alongside Charles Hughes2 in a trio of viols. This fascinating new world proved to be well worth that effort. Fanny and Charles had purchased Dolmetsch instruments, and had brought back photostats of fantasies he had found in the British Museum; Jenkins fantasies for five viols and organ was one. We played these and other pieces I was working on.

Another activist in the thirties was Lotta Van Buren, a specialist in the restoration of early instruments and a seasoned performer on some of them. She operated a studio and workshop on Pomander Walk, a quaint enclave in mid-Manhattan which had become a favorite meeting place for the aficionados. She made some important contributions to the Music Division collection, and later Dr. Smith recommended her as a highly qualified candidate for [curator of] the Crosby Brown Collection of ancient instruments [at the Metropolitan Museum of Art].

Other people who were playing at the time were Blanche Winogron and Edith Weiss-Mann (keyboard), Hildegard Kolbe (pandora), Dr. Smith (flute), Fritz Rikko (violin), Janos Scholz (cello), Alfred Mann (recorders), and Ernst Victor Wolf (harpischord) who played recitals with Eva Heinitz, the only professional viol player at the time. Also involved were Arthur Mendel of Princeton University and the conductor David Randolph.

(I have to tell you an amusing story about Eva. As an army musician in 1945 I was stationed for a short while in Heidelberg. I was playing the baritone sax, but I also played the viola, competing with two sax players—I had an amplifier attached to the tailpiece of the viola so I could outplay two or three saxes! One night we were hired to play for the officers’ club in the Kurhaus situated high up the mountain overlooking the University. We got there early, and I was idly glancing through a big pile of music left on the piano when I came upon an odd-looking ten-inch record with a big hole in the middle. Curiously enough, the performer was Eva Heinitz, presented as a popular teenager playing some light salon pieces on the cello. I couldn’t resist “liberating” it and sending it home. Imagine the explosion when Blanche confronted her with it!)

Luigi Silva, the eminent cellist and teacher, was an important influence on my life. We became close friends from the moment we met in 1931 on his initial visit to the United States from Rome. After he took up permanent residence in New York in 1939, we

---

2Charles Hughes was Professor of Music Theory at Hunter College from 1927 to 1970. He received an M.A. in music from Columbia Teachers’ College, and went on to study in Paris with Nadia Boulanger and Paul Dukas.
spent much time together. Our common interest at the time was the early history of the cello and its interrelationship with the gamba and its literature. I introduced him to the Forqueray suites, which he effectively transcribed for his instrument. However it was not until the last three years of his life (he died suddenly in 1960) that he actually began playing the gamba, studying (along with some of his students) its characteristic bowing technique. But unlike his gamba-playing colleagues August Wenzinger and Janos Scholz, who treated the two instruments as belonging to two different worlds, he became increasingly convinced of their interrelationship. (The Bach cello suites, for example, were idiomatically written for bowing gamba-wise, he felt). I am exploring the early history of the cello’s beginnings as a solo instrument. I am still at it.

[There follows a very interesting digression into the historical cello and into the articulation and slurs in Mozart. Perhaps this will make another essay.]

Alison: Did you play concerts in the Library?

Sydney: Concerts in the Library were inconceivable before 1935; the rule of silence was inviolate. But when I organized a group dedicated to “reading from the shelves,” and had to resort to rehearsing in the Library’s downtown warehouse, our difficult situation was ultimately recognised and permission was granted (after a long, painstaking search) to practice in the only feasible space in the Main Building—a room next to the cafeteria with windows facing an inner court. Our first chamber orchestra appearance was in the Lenox gallery in 1936, for staff only.

In 1939 we were asked to give a special performance for the distinguished international audience attending the first U.S. Musicalological Congress. The program, under my direction, included some of the Library’s publications in early American music of the Moravian School in Bethlehem. In later years I organized a series of public concerts of rarely heard music, usually having some connection with current exhibitions or lectures, all of which encouraged Dr. Smith to further his plan for a future “library-museum” and ultimately led to the creation of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts.

At this point I cannot refrain from mentioning the opening year, 1965, when Alice Tully came to the support of the Toscanini Memorial Archives—a cause which I had fostered and which is now flourishing. I never asked her for money, and we became good friends. We often met at her home on Central Park South. I’ll never forget her—a remarkable human being!

Alison: Tell us about the Morley Consort Lessons.

Sydney: Perhaps the most significant event of my first years at the Library was the finding in its Drexel Collection of two original partbooks from contemporary anthologies of the “broken music” of Shakespeare’s day. They were the treble viol part of Thomas Morley’s The First Book of Consort Lessons of 1599 and 1611, and the flute part of Philip Rosseter’s Lessons for Consort of 1609. This memorable discovery provided the groundwork for years of search for the missing parts (from a total of six in each case, calling for the same set of instruments: treble viol, flute, bass viol, lute, cittern, and pandora), which, in the case of the Morley collection, fortunately ended with its successful reconstruction, and, as a by-product, the determination that this uniquely specific instrumentation had a very special place in the history of music and the drama.

The survival of a fairly large number of pieces for the ensemble of mixed instruments is nothing short of phenomenal when one considers the number of contemporary collections available for a relatively haphazard variety of instruments. For the sake of comparison, some of these publications were scored from the original printed parts in the British Museum as early as 1934. They became part of the Black Line Print program of the Library. In the same year, a group of interested amateur musicians gathered informally to “try out” some of the hypothetical Morley reconstructions, including their highly questionable lute parts.

In 1935 Mrs. Jean Buchanan, one of the viol players, informed Charles Hughes about some fragments of the printed lute part of the Morley collection which she had discovered in the cittern partbook at the Bodleian Library, Oxford. Though they later proved to belong to the Rosseter collection, these fragments gave us the first inkling of the nature of the elusive missing lute part obviously meant to be the heart of the ensemble.
were quickly withdrawn when I protested the lack of allegiance to making of our project! Apprised of our find and taking advantage of my reconstruction, Thurston Dart proceeded to publish his version of two of the major pieces in the Morley collection. They were quickly withdrawn when I protested the lack of allegiance to our confidential partnership.

In 1959 my complete reconstruction was finally published, having gratefully received the necessary financial support. Its elaborate historical and critical apparatus, totally unexpected in some quarters, received glowing reviews here and abroad, including a highly favorable one from Dart himself!

Judith: What parts did you reconstruct besides the lute part?

Sydney: I had to write—make up—three or four parts, and many additional ones have been recovered from fragmentary sources by Warwick Edwards in his 1977 Musica Britannica edition. My conjectural parts were not too far off. CSS says in his introduction to my book that even if parts were found that could be proven to be original, mine might be seen to be plausible, as any player of the day might have created on his own for a missing part. I was very fortunate to have won the support and confidence of Dr. Smith. He made my career.

Alison: When did you go to Boston?

Sydney: In 1968 Gunther Schuller invited me to come to Boston to head the libraries at the New England Conservatory, and to share the director’s chair of the Early Music Department with Danny Pinkham. He offered Blanche a faculty position teaching harpsichord and heading her department.

I also did a lot of other things to further early music activities there, like making connection with August Wenzinger of Basel, an old friend, who was visiting lecturer at Harvard. At one time Professor Murray Lefkowitz at Boston University (whom I had many previous contacts) and I joined forces to have Wenzinger play and lecture at both New England Conservatory and Boston University. Other people who came to play for us were Thurston Dart [from the University of London] and of course Lefkowitz himself. Then there were several distinguished musicologists in the area who were good friends, like Otto Gombosi and John Ward at Harvard. Narcissa Williamson, curator of the instrument collection at the Fine Arts Museum, was organizing early music concerts in their big gallery. Annie Gombosi played, but you know she and Blanche gave concerts there in the 1930s. Joel Cohen, busy lutenist and director of the Boston Camerata, published a book on the revival of early music, but he didn’t know anything about, or deliberately ignored, what we had accomplished in New York years before.

Alison and Judith: Tell us about your instruments.

Sydney: I have a fine violin and viola, and for early music I used a variety of treble viols. Nobody knows the trebles I’ve seen! One of these treble viols was made by Mälgi in 1954. He was the expert repairman, and, on his own, an extraordinary violinmaker in Rembert Wurlitzer’s shop. From the Trapp family I was also able to acquire a Sprenger treble and tenor, which we later gave to the Brattleboro Music School (to my regret!). They were made in 1938. I also have a fine eighteenth-century viola d’amore, which I recently sold to Nobuko Imai, now living in Holland.

My first experience with the bass viol came in 1952, when I borrowed one from Nina Courant for a program of Dowland songs at the Folger Library with William Hess, tenor, and Blanche playing virginals. I had organized this concert in celebration of Shakespeare’s birthday, held in the replica of the Globe Theatre. I had to learn it pretty fast, but there was no one else to do it.

Later I was able to buy a fine early-nineteenth-century French bass from Landelle Trivette, which I reluctantly disposed of when

---

I had the good fortune to acquire the Hoffman bass in 1955. In the meantime the Leidolf jewel came my way. That was pure coincidence; the second violinist of the Busch Quartet heard about this instrument owned by Marie Popper, the daughter-in-law of the great cellist. He told me about it one night at dinner at their house. Well, Marie Popper in England was willing to sell it to me, and I bought it sight unseen. The cellist of the Amadeus Quartet brought it to New York when they came on tour. I also have a seven-string Dolmetsch bass given to me by Suzanne Bloch.

In conclusion I might add that most of my public appearances with a viol through the years have been tied up with some aspect or other of my work on the broken consort featured in my book. They include TV and Broadway shows; programs I devised for the Library of Congress, the White House, the Lyceum theater; concerts in connection with my lectures at Columbia University, the University of Chicago, the University of South Carolina, Grinnell College, Marlboro College, et cetera. Also an odd engagement for the 1957 Columbia recording of the “Star of Bethlehem,” using four of my viols, with Luigi Silva and myself among the performers. Columbia had already produced the first recording of my Morley reconstruction in a Masterworks album [KL5627], “The Consort of Musicke . . . as heard in the Stage Players of Shakespeare’s England,” with an all-star cast of vocalists and instrumentalists of which I was the director, in 1955. This was in collaboration with Basil Rathbone. The program included a Dumont prelude, some Dowland dances, and some lute songs with viol and lute.

Alison: What are some of your future projects?
Sydney: Well, I must confess that Blanche is after me. I’m such a complex personality; I’m interested in too many things—I always have been. I have a desk full of backlog. Blanche says, “You’ll be a hundred and twenty before you publish them!” You know, I get to these byways, these crazy ideas . . . . But what interests me is music.
GENDER, CLASS, AND EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY FRENCH MUSIC: BARTHÉLEMY DE CAIX’S SIX SONATAS FOR TWO UNACCOMPANIED PARDESSUS DE VIOLE

Part II

Tina Chancey


Barthélemy de Caix was born in Lyon, France in 1716, a member of an illustrious musical family of viol players. In 1730 his father, François-Joseph, transported his three daughters and two sons from their home in Lyon to Paris to enter the service of Louis XV. The father and sons played in the musical organizations associated with the king’s chapel and chamber; the three daughters played only in his chamber ensemble. In 1738, at the age of twenty-two and after eight years in Paris, Barthélemy de Caix participated in five concerts that his father produced at Marly, and then returned to Lyon. He revisited Paris in 1746 to give a concert on September 16; program and personnel are unknown. In 1748 the thirty-two-year-old de Caix was recalled to the king’s service in order to teach Princess Sophie the pardessus at the Abbey of Fontevrault, where she was attending school. When she came home to Paris in 1750 he accompanied her. De Caix’s younger brother Paul returned to Lyon himself in 1745 at the age of twenty-eight, and may be the de Caix who taught cello, pardessus, and bass viol there between 1745 and 1763, as listed in the Almanach de Lyon. We know nothing more about the circumstances of Barthélemy de Caix’s life or death. The Six Sonatas for Two Unaccompanied Pardessus de Viole is his only published work: engraved by Mlle. Bertin, it was published in Paris by Mme. Boivin and M. le Clerc, and in Lyon by M. Brolonne. We have not been able to determine the work’s date of composition, for whom it was intended, nor who performed its premiere, if there was one.

Knowing the sonatas’ date of publication wouldn’t necessarily tell us when they had been composed but would give us a terminus ad quem. According to publishers’ catalogues, the music was available by 1750, although the work may have been written closer to 1745. Many composers didn’t publish their music immediately. Some refrained because engraving was expensive—chamber music in general and a composer’s first opus in particular seldom recovered the costs of preparation and printing. Others worried that their best ideas would be copied, which did happen on occasion and left a composer with little

---


2 Léon Vallas, Un siécle de musique et de théâtre à Lyon, 1688-1789 (Lyons: P. Masson, 1932), 203.

3 Barthélemy may be the “M. de Caix” advertised as a pardessus teacher located on the rue du Sentier in 1775, in the same edition of the Mercure Galant as M. Doublet, the student of Mademoiselle Levi.

4 The only surviving prints are presently in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris Conservatory Collection) in Paris, and the British Library in London. The work’s full title is Six Sonates pour deux pardessus de viole à cinq cordes, violons ou basses de viole: En observant de remplir les endroits où l’extension de la main ne pourrait pas suffire (Six sonatas for two five-stringed pardessus de viole, violins or bass violas da gamba, taking care to fill in those places where the hand cannot extend far enough).

5 De Caix dedicated his sonatas to the king’s daughter Henriette, whom he may have known during his court sojourn. She was born in 1727 and would have been eleven years old when he left.
recourse in a court of law. Still others withheld their works from publication upon the request of a patron who wished the music to be available only to himself and his friends.

François Couperin had another reason for delaying the publication of his first volume of Italian trio sonatas, Les Nations. Although he wrote the sonatas and had them performed in the 1690s, to encourage a better reception by the public he first pretended they had been composed by an Italian from Turin whose name he gave as an anagram of his own. Only when the music was received with enthusiasm did he lay claim to its authorship. He didn’t actually publish Les Nations until 1726, and by then it had undergone substantial revision.

We are no closer to ascertaining for whom the de Caix work was written. Most published music was intended to be played by the general public: aristocrats, members of the educated class and the upper bourgeoisie, and perhaps by the dedicatee. But these pieces, so much more challenging than the general run of pardessus duets, would have required two equally virtuosic players. De Caix’s dedication to Madame Henriette, one of the elder daughters of Louis XV, adds no further information: she had been an eleven-year-old bass viol student of his father’s when de Caix left Versailles, not a pardessus player. Indeed, the impression she daily overwhelms his family, encourage me to take the liberty of presenting to her the first fruits of my work—it is a feeble tribute, but if Madame deigns to look favorably upon it, she will excuse my weakness because of the ardent zeal that animates me, and the very deep respect that makes me Madame’s very obedient and respectful servant, de Caix.

The sonatas and their performance persuaded the king to recall de Caix to his service. If the sonatas had been written for the sisters Levi, their completion date would have been a year earlier, 1745, to correspond to Mlle. Levi’s appearances at the Concert Spirituel. However, if the sonatas were composed either for Mme. Haubaut in 1750 or for Princess Sophie around 1753 the audience

given is that Barthélemy de Caix hoped to use his past acquaintance with the young Henriette as a bridge to a new connection with the royal family. If that were so, we could see de Caix’s sonatas as exquisite demonstration pieces, written to display the creativity of the composer as well as to exhibit the virtuosity of the performers who premiered the work, for if these were demonstration pieces the ultimate demonstration would have been a performance.

We know of only two duos performing between 1745 and 1750 who could have carried off a debut with the required panache: Barthélemy and his brother Paul, and Mlle. Levi and her sister Mme. Haubaut. Princess Sophie was just beginning to play the pardessus in 1748, and even the most talented amateur player would have required a few years to become competent enough on the instrument to handle the sonatas’ technical demands.

Barthélemy and his brother were together in Lyons from 1745 to 1748 and could have performed the music in the 1746 Paris concert; this would support the theory that the excellence of both the sonatas and their performance persuaded the king to recall de Caix to his service. If the sonatas had been written for the sisters Levi, their completion date would have been a year earlier, 1745, to correspond to Mlle. Levi’s appearances at the Concert Spirituel. However, if the sonatas were composed either for Mme. Haubaut in 1750 or for Princess Sophie around 1753 the audience

she daily overwhelms his family, encourage me to take the liberty of presenting to her the first fruits of my work—it is a feeble tribute, but if Madame deigns to look favorably upon it, she will excuse my weakness because of the ardent zeal that animates me, and the very deep respect that makes me Madame’s very obedient and respectful servant, de Caix).

Suzanne Cusick has suggested that Mlle. Levi might have been connected in some way to one of the king’s daughters at Fontevrault, as either teacher, lady in waiting, or fellow student. Unfortunately, the archival records at Fontevrault are incomplete. According to George Peabody Gooch, Louis XV: The Monarchy in Decline (London: Longmans, Green, 1956), 70, the four youngest of the six princesses—Victoire, Sophie, Félicité, and Louise—were sent there in 1738, the year that Barthélemy de Caix returned to Lyon. They ranged in age from one to five years old at the time. Three of them left in 1750, when they were between thirteen and eighteen years old (Félicité died at Fontevrault in 1743 at the age of seven).
would have found them rather old-fashioned in style, compared to the galant music being written by most other composers at the century's mid-point.¹¹ Perhaps it will help us place de Caix's sonatas in a social context if we explore the composer's musical models and the influences upon his creative development.

Potential Influences

The quality of a composer's genius might be a gift from God, but how that genius is manifested throughout the composer's life has to do with a number of outside factors. First, let us consider the environmental influences, the impersonal, involuntary ones. We call them involuntary because an impressionable young musician in a musical household breathes music in like air. And just as air is not rationed or slotted for a particular person but free to all, so a musical environment is an impersonal thing, not existing to instruct or direct.

The art music being written in France between 1716 and 1736, the period corresponding to de Caix's youth and training as a viol player, included the keyboard works and chamber music of François Couperin (1668-1733), the keyboard works and operas of Jean-Philippe Rameau (1683-1764), the bass viol music of Marin Marais (1656-1728) and Antoine Forqueray (1671-1745), and the violin works of Arcangelo Corelli (1653-1713), Jean-Féry Rebel (1666-1747), Jean Pierre Guignon (1702-1774), Louis-Gabriel Guillemain (1705-1770), Jean-Jacques Anet (ca. 1661-1755), Jean-Joseph Cassanea de Mondonville (1711-1772), and Jean-Marie Leclair l'aîné (1697-1764). The French violinists went to Turin to study with Giovanni Baptista Somis (1686-1763), a student of Corelli, except for Anet who studied with Corelli himself.¹² This music from Paris and the court must have been complemented by a potpourri of other musical experiences: ballads sung on the street, dance tunes played at outdoor festivals, the latest vaudevilles at the Opéra Comique, grand religious motets of Lalande, Lully's old-fashioned but still popular violin band music, and a strong dose of Lyonnaise traditional music from the countryside. This long list can represent only a fraction of the musical influences upon de Caix while he was growing up, but it gives us a sense of his musical milieu.

Besides the environmental, social and collegial influences play a part in a composer's artistic development: the music of his friends and colleagues, both well known and obscure, and of musical visitors from major cultural centers whose presence lends their works a more personal impact. These influences are both involuntary and voluntary, for while a person can choose his friends, he often cannot choose his colleagues, much less determine which of them becomes famous and which dies unknown. And while he can decide what music to study and use as a model, he may also find himself influenced by something unexpected because of its sheer newness, perhaps, or its irritating cleverness, which goads him into the desire to make an equal impression.

Barthélemy de Caix's parents were colleagues, possibly friends, of the Leclair family. Antoine Leclair was a master lacemaker by profession and an enthusiastic, though perhaps not highly skilled, amateur musician who played the basse de symphonie (orchestral bass) around Lyon. He and his wife had eight children, six of whom played the violin. The eldest, Jean-Marie l'aîné, was born in 1697; the next son, Jean-Marie le cadet, was born in 1703; and the third son, Pierre, appeared in 1709.

Every year the city of Lyon celebrated the king's health and renewed its vows of fealty with a citywide festival called variously "Salut pour la Conservation du Roi" or "Voeu du Roi." Virtually every able-bodied musician in town took part, including

¹¹Of course it is conceivable that the sonatas were given their first performance by excellent players who are totally unknown to us today. Perhaps it is naïve to assume that the musicians described most often in journalistic sources were the most talented, particularly because the amateur underground of talented but uncelebrated men and women was so vast. Indeed, both Levi and de Caix disappeared into virtual oblivion after 1750, according to all of the archival sources I and other dedicated researchers have explored in the past thirty years.

all the symphony players from the Académie and the Théâtre as well as the singers from the Opéra. The lists of participants from 1727, 1728, and 1729 include not only Père de Caix and his wife, but also Père Leclair and his three sons, so although Jean-Marie l’aîné left Lyon for Turin in 1722 he seems to have revisited his birthplace regularly. It is possible that the de Caix family and Leclair l’aîné renewed their relationship in the 1730s; Leclair worked in Paris from 1733 to 1737 as Ordinaire de la Musique du Roi, coinciding with the de Caix family’s tenure at court. We shall compare the duets of de Caix and Leclair later in this article.

While the older Jean-Marie visited Lyon only occasionally during Barthélemy de Caix’s youth, his brother Jean-Marie le cadet lived in Lyon through 1732, at which time he was invited to take a position in Besançon. The Lyonnais city fathers loved him back the following year with a pension, a teaching position, and the concertmaster chair in both the theater and concert orchestras. He remained there, honored and respected, until his death in 1777. Thus Leclair le cadet was in Lyon during Barthélemy de Caix’s adolescence as well as upon his return to Lyon, from 1738 to 1748. Leclair le cadet wrote motets, symphonies, ariettes with orchestra, a book of violin sonatas with bass, and one book of six unaccompanied violin duos that was published around 1760.

Pierre Leclair, “qui s’intitulait symphoniste” (who called himself a symphonist), also lived and worked in Lyon his whole life, although he received neither the recognition nor the income of his brothers. He married the daughter of a tennis-court keeper, and wrote two books of unaccompanied violin duos. The first, published in 1764 (according to the Mercure Galant), is presently in the hands of a private collector; the second remained in manuscript and is now in the Lyon municipal library. Dedicated to a wealthy patron, this second volume of galant duos has a virtuosic first violin part and a very simple second violin part. One suspects that there was a practical rather than a musical reason for the discrepancy. As evidenced by his second book of duos, Pierre Leclair’s musical style has nothing in common with de Caix’s.

Another potential influence on Barthélemy de Caix was the composer Louis de Caix d’Hervelois, who may have been Barthélemy’s uncle; the similarity in name and closeness of birth date suggest that Caix d’Hervelois might be the brother of Barthélemy’s father François-Joseph. Born between 1670 and 1680, Caix d’Hervelois was brought up in Paris by his uncle Louis de Kaix, chaplain at Sainte Chapelle du Palais. He probably studied with Marais and/or Sainte-Colombe. Caix d’Hervelois was never a member of the royal ensembles but remained independent, supported by patrons until his death in about 1760. He would have been in Paris during his nephew’s sojourn in the 1730s. Whatever their relationship, however, their Sonata V with a first movement characterized by unusual portato bowing and double-stopped eighth notes. However, our discussion of the significance of these similarities can only remain incomplete at present, and in any event we can tell by Leclair’s periodic phrase structure and florid melodies that his duos were written after de Caix’s.
there seems to be little in common between the music of Caix d'Hervelois and that of de Caix.

Besides relatives and friends, visiting performers would probably have had a profound influence on a young musician in exile after eight years at court and hungry for musical stimulation. Although in France, as in Great Britain, the capital city was the dominant center of culture as well as government, Lyon was an important second-level city, particularly in the realm of music. A publishing center (much music was published and sold in both Lyon and Paris), Lyon was also a popular stop for international touring musicians on their way to Switzerland or Germany. Between 1738 and 1748, one particular series of visits strikes the eye. These are the concert tours of Guignon and Mondonville, who performed in Lyon in 1744, 1745 (Guignon alone), and 1746. In 1746 the two also played for that year's "Vœu du Roi." Guignon and Mondonville were the only instrumentalists we know of, other than Leclair l'aîné, who performed in Lyon while de Caix was there in the 1740s.  

The repertoire for these concerts is not known, but the Lyonnaise press spent most of its energy arguing about the tremendous virtuosity with which the performers played. The question was raised whether such manifestation of virtuosity took attention away from the music itself: was it a distraction, or the purpose of the concert? De Caix could not have ignored this controversy, which was the talk of the town for months afterwards. One possible result of Guignon and Mondonville's visit and the resultant brouhaha may have been the unexpected technical challenges set for the performers of de Caix's duo sonatas. In general, most composers required virtuosity in the Italian manner—scale figuration, arpeggiation, and complex chordal patterns—in their solo sonatas, not in their duo works. De Caix extends this intensity of bravura playing style into a previously more conservative genre, with spectacular results. We can find no direct precedents for his innovation in the prior duo literature for pardessus or violin.

The final influences upon a composer are personal and private. He would be affected by his own choices and goals and by the response of his target audience, both listeners and players. The composer would want to please the buying public. But if he is also the performer, he would want to impress his listeners. Thus there is an inherent conflict: the more difficult the music, the fewer the amateurs who could play it, but the more impressive it would be for him to perform himself.

Of course, a composer is not just the sum total of his influences; his unconscious preferences are balanced by conscious choices. It can be disputed how conscious a choice it is to remain within one's milieu, the style of one's country at that particular time. Some composers, such as Telemann, wrote in a number of different national styles. Some, particularly in the 1750s, experimented with new forms and styles to a surprising degree. The practical composer who had to answer to a patron might restrain his experimental impulses, or write music on different levels of difficulty to suit various audiences. The composer trying to make his name with his first printed work might be more daring, more adventurous. If de Caix wanted to attract attention, what better way than to write something different?

This leads us back to our discussion of the circumstances under which the de Caix sonatas were written. De Caix could have written his sonatas without expecting them to be played, but I think it more likely that they were intended for two specific players who made a smashing debut. Some talented eighteenth-century pardessus players may remain unknown to twentieth-century researchers, but of those we do know, we have identified the de Caix brothers or the Levi-Haubaut sisters as our most probable suspects. Here are two short scenarios that combine the facts at hand and additional background information to illustrate these two possibilities. Of course, no one can say whether the

---

20 Vallas, Lyon, 262. Leclair l'aîné performed in Lyon in 1746.

21 Guignon wrote his first book of violin duos, Opus 7, around 1744, so selections from it may have been used in the program.

22 In reference to this concert Daquin remarked, somewhat enigmatically, in his Lettres sur les hommes célèbres, 134, "Les stras artistiemont montés n'ont-ils pas le coup d'œil diamans?" ("The jewelry made of paste so artistically set, doesn't it have the appearance of diamonds?"). In Vallas, Lyon, 262.
truth, when and if we uncover it, will be much less interesting that
we thought, or even stranger than we could have imagined.23

SCENARIO I: LYON, 1745
Stimulated by the performances of Guignon and Mondonville,
a frustrated Barthélemy talks to his more restrained brother
Paul.

"I must leave Lyon before I die of boredom. Ma foi, if I could
only go back to Paris, to court! Do you think they've forgotten
yet how well I played? Lord, but I could fiddle rings around
everyone, even that windbag Guignon."

"Do you think they've forgotten yet what you did? You were
lucky the king didn't throw you into prison. If Father hadn't
used his influence you'd be there now."

"Now Paul, I was only twenty-two, and it was really her fault.
But that's a good point. How do I convince old Louis I've grown
up? He knows I'm more talented than Father ever was. But he
doesn't know how well I compose now. I only started that here,
to soothe myself in my Purgatory."

"What work do you want to do for the king? If I were you, I'd
try for a job teaching one of his daughters. I hear from Mon­
sieur Mondonville that Madame Sophie is interested in playing
pardessus but the king has said she must get a firm grounding
in bass viol technique first.24 That was a few years ago; maybe
she's ready to change instruments now."

"That's perfect. How do I let Louis know I want the job?
Well, a person in that position has to write music as well as play
it. I think I'll compose something for Sophie and her new

23I am encouraged to include these scenarios by the words of Leon Edel, in
"The Figure Under the Carpet," Telling Lives, ed. Marc Pachter (Philadelphia:
University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 20, 22. He writes, "I have often said
that a biographer is a storyteller who may not invent his facts but who is
allowed to imagine his form," as well as, "Biography rarely possesses
conversation."

24Sourches et Luynes, La musique à la cour de Louis XIV et Louis XV
d'après les mémoires de Sourches et Luynes 1681-1758, October 6, 1745, vol.

pardessus. A few sonatas, like those wicked ones for violin that
Guignon played here last year."

"Will you dedicate them to Madame Sophie? On second
thought, I wouldn't if I were you: too presumptuous. You don't
know her—she was just a baby when you left Paris."

"You're so stuffy, Paul. But this time you're right. Her sister
Henriette was always nice to us; why don't I dedicate them to
her? She doesn't play the pardessus, but she's Louis's favorite
daughter; maybe she'll put in a word for me."

"Fine, but remember, if Madame Sophie is just a beginner
you can't write anything too difficult for her. But then, I suppose
if you don't publish something truly remarkable no one will take
notice."

"Absolutely. What I want to do is to write something for
pardessus that will take everyone's breath away, like Guignon's
violin duos; the papers are still talking about him and Mondon­
ville. My music should be just as impressive, but more conserva­
tive in style, I think; Louis hates the new galant music. He would
like a few character pieces like Rebel's Caractères, but I'll call
them sonatas so they won't seem too old-fashioned. I'll put
them together a little potpourri of some pleasant French dances: some
minuets, a musette, a sarabande, a few twirls. Why don't I
include an Italian cassio, and something that has the two parts
in two different meters, like Marais's gigue and allemande
combination?"25

"How will you get the king's attention? If you ask me, I think
music bores him."

"I'm hoping you'll help me with that, Paul. If Father can
arrange it, would you come up to Paris to play my duos for the
king? I know he'll love them when he hears them. And they're
going to be much too hard for anyone else; you're the only one
who can play as well as I can."

"Thank you for the compliment, I suppose. Yes, I'll come—as
long as you don't try to manipulate me into moving back to
Paris. I can’t abide the place. Remember, I suffered at court seven years longer than you.”

“Good, it’s settled. You know, if I get this position, Sophie will want to play these sonatas with me. It’s going to take her years to become good enough. Well, it gives her something to practice for. And I suppose the longer she takes lessons, the longer I’ll have a job. . . .”

SCENARIO II: LYON, 1745

A nervous eighteen-year-old Marie-Anne Levi receives comfort from her teacher, Barthélemy de Caix, on the eve of her departure for her first appearance at the Concert Spirituel.

“I hope they will like me.”

“They will love you, I promise. Remember, I know them.”

“You never told me why you left court.”

“No, and we won’t discuss it now. I did something to displease the king so father sent me home. I was furious. . . . Well, enough about that.”

“Is it very easy to displease the king?”

“It is very hard for most people, although it was all too easy for me. But don’t worry, you shall please everyone.”

(Musingly) “But then, I’ll be in Paris and the king is at Versailles. He will never hear me play.”

“I wouldn’t be so sure. The king knows exactly what goes on in Paris. He has agents everywhere. How do you think they discovered you?”

“I thought you mentioned me to someone.”

“I did, and then Guignon and Mondonville came here and auditioned you.”

“Auditioned me? You said they were your friends.”

“So they are. And they auditioned you, and you played well, so here you are! Going to Paris.”

“I still wish you were coming with me.”

“I can’t, not yet. But you’ll be fine. My mother will feed you until you burst, and my father will take you everywhere and introduce you to everyone.”

“You said if they like me at the Concert Spirituel they could ask me back?”

“Yes, and you know what music to play if they do. Between what I’ve written for you and what you’ve written yourself, and your Corelli and Leclair sonatas, you’ll have enough music even if you play there every day for a month. And don’t forget to start with one of the Vivaldi concertos—they love Vivaldi almost as much as Corelli.”

“But in the first concert I’ll play your duos. Claire writes that she’s been practicing. But I wish you could play them with me.”

“Now, Marie-Anne, you and your sister have been playing together for years. She’s a fine musician. Besides, she’s already in Paris.”

“Why can’t I stay with her?”

“It’s better if you stay with my family. They have the ear of the king. You don’t want to come and go in a day, do you? You want to become famous, marry a rich husband, buy your mother a house, move your brother-in-law to a bigger store. . . . Isn’t that right?”

“Yes, that’s right, and I know you’re teasing me. But if I do become famous and rich, first of all I’ll ask if you can come back to court. That’s the best way I can thank you.”

“Well, that would be grand, but don’t worry about it now. Have fun. Do well. Watch the D-string shift in the Musette, and the parallel thirds in the minor section of the Chaconne. And send word. God go with you.”

These two short dialogues offer two different, plausible scenarios describing the creation and debut performance of de Caix’s sonatas. Their texts draw on some common knowledge of the period: that music was not Louis XV’s favorite diversion, and that he preferred the tried-and-true to the avant garde; that the French were wild for Italian music, particularly Vivaldi and Corelli; and that Guignon was more than a little conceited, proudly placing his title, “Last King of the Violin,” on the front page of all of his published works. 26

These dialogues also draw upon some informed guesswork. It stands to reason that Mlle. Levi had a good teacher and some knowledgeable sponsors in the court, the salons, and concert series such as the Concert Spirituel; that one of Mlle. Levi’s goals might have been to marry well and send money home.

Both dialogues conform to what little we know about subsequent events in the lives of the protagonists; de Caix returned to court in 1750, and Mlle. Levi was still well known in 1777. The more information we uncover from archives and notarial records the more plausible our future dialogues will be.

The Music

In Part I of this article I asserted that de Caix’s sonatas are worthy of notice because of the provocative interplay of social, organological, and musical factors that governed the five-stringed pardessus’s invention and use, coupled with the excellence of de Caix’s compositional style as well as his unique vision of the instrument’s potential. To support this premise I must show him to be a first-rate composer, without requiring him to be the best (which would be a tenuous claim in any case). While he may have no peer among the composers for pardessus, it is among the more prominent composers for violin that his reputation for excellence must be established, and it is with their works that his œuvre must be compared.

Barthélemy de Caix’s unaccompanied treble duets are on a par with those of his colleagues Guignon, Leclair l’aîné, Leclair le cadet, and Guillemant. His style is individual, as is theirs. Some of his musical idiosyncrasies may be traceable to his partial isolation in Lyon, though we have shown that he had the opportunity to enjoy the society of both local colleagues and out-of-town visitors. The most noticeable thing about de Caix’s sonatas is that they embody the quintessential principal of les goûts réunis. They are constructed through two kinds of juxtapositions: of the French and Italian tastes, and of Baroque and galant styles. On a macrolevel he alternates French and Italian, Baroque and galant movements within each suite; on a microlevel he juxtaposes contrasting musical elements of melody, harmony, harmonic rhythm, phrase length, and surface rhythm within each movement.

We will be discussing six sets of sonatas: two by Leclair, two by Guignon, and one each by Guillemant and de Caix. In order of publication, they are: Jean-Marie Leclair l’aîné, Sonates à deux violons sans basse, oe. III (c. 1737); Jean Pierre Guignon, Six sonates à deux violons, oe. III (before 1740); Jean Pierre Guignon, Six duos à deux violons, oe. VII (before 1746); Barthélemy de Caix, Six Sonates pour deux pardessus de viole à cinq cordes, violons ou basses de viole, oe. I (c. 1746); Benoit Guillemant, Six sonates pour deux flûtes traversières, oe. II (1746); Jean-Marie Leclair l’aîné, Second livre de sonates à deux violons sans basse, oe. XII (c. 1747). For the sake of simplicity I shall refer to them as Leclair III, Guignon III, Guignon VII, de Caix, Guillemant, and Leclair XII.

The organizational plans of the six sets of sonatas are similar. Most earlier sonatas have three movements, but often the second or third movement is composed of a da capo pair of shorter, major/minor submovements or movement pairs. De Caix’s sonatas are structured in this manner. By the end of the 1740s, Leclair, Guignon, and Guillemant produced an increasing number of four-movement sonatas. In Leclair XII, all sonatas either include movement pairs or consist of four independent movements.

De Caix’s use of tonality is unusual for the period in that only three of the eighteen movements are in major keys. Three more are made up of paired submovements, only one of which is major. Also, only Sonata II has a middle movement in the relative major; the rest remain in the tonic minor or major. Guillemant and Guignon also keep to the tonic major or minor within a sonata. Leclair, however, writes two sonatas with middle movements in major keys and most are three-quarters major.

27 Refer to Appendix II for a descriptive chart of de Caix’s Six Sonatas.

28 All were originally published in Paris. Reprints of Leclair III and Leclair XII have been issued as Performers’ Facsimiles Nos. 88 and 89 respectively (New York, n.d.).

29 Of the other five works studied, all have at least half of their movements in major keys and most are three-quarters major.
the relative minor in *Leclair III*, and three sonatas with the same structure in *Leclair XII*, as well as one with a middle movement in an irregular mediant relationship (A major to F major).

De Caix organizes his sonatas by placing these eighteen movements in configurations designed to bring out the greatest contrast between them. The two stern outer movements of Sonata I surround a melancholy drone piece, a musette, named after the court bagpipe. Sonata II opens with an andante reminiscent of Pergolesi, continues with a pair of French *tambourins* (duple jumping dances), and ends with an Italian hunting song. Sonata III begins with an Italianate allegro in the “brilliant” style, followed by a delicate French sarabande and concluding with the unusual juxtaposition of a gigue and a *moto perpetuo*. Sonata IV starts with a march, continues with a gavotte, and concludes with the longest through-composed movement among all of the sonatas by about 100 measures, a 233-bar French chaconne. The first movement of Sonata V, slow and chromatic, is unusual in that it maintains a three- and four-voice texture most of the way through the piece; the second movement is fugal, and the third consists of a pair of French minuets. Sonata VI opens with an Italian andantino in galant style, continues with a brilliant Italianate allegro, and closes again with two contrasting minuets.

De Caix’s formal Italian designations for the eighteen movements give eight allegros (one titled allegro assai), two arias, two minuets, two andantes and one andantino, and three character movements: a *tambourino*, a *sarabanda* also marked adagio, and a *ciaconna*. In truth, despite the Italian markings, the movements are divided into Italian and French styles in the ratio of 10 to 7 (each sonata including at least one French dance movement), plus a mixture of the two styles in the pantomime III/iii with a 12/8 French gigue against a 4/4 Italian *perpetuo mobile*. Both arias are actually French dances: I/ii is a musette and IV/ii is a gavotte. The character dances and minuets are French as well.

While none of the other composers display this much variety in their movement order, the earlier works of Leclair come the closest, with a well-planned alternation of tempi and meter, though not of national style. Guignon III includes as many French dance movements as *de Caix*, but does not consciously order the movements to spotlight their contrast. Guignon VII, Guillemant, and *Leclair XII* consist of a preponderance of galant-style andantes, brilliant Italian allegros, arias, and Italian gigas and minuets, with an occasional siciliano, musette, or gavotte.

With all this variety, how does *de Caix* establish stability? He balances each sonata so that the movements are complementary and form a complete rhetorical unit; he maintains an intensely expressive, interactive duo texture in which both parts are equally important; and he limits himself to three movement types: binary, rondeau, and song form.

*De Caix*’s exploitation of the treble two-part texture is particularly masterly. His pardessus parts segue among all variations of two-voice textures: melody/simple “bass line,” two parallel melodies, melody/chords, melody/drone, parallel passagework, simple melody with ornamental figuration, contrapuntal imitation, two equal countermelodies, and a thousand other indefinable, fluid textures. Both pardessus share the leadership role.

*De Caix*’s textural variety runs contrary to the galant tendency of regular alternation between two or three textures—melody/accompaniment, two parallel melodies, and pseudo-imitation at the bar or half-bar that quickly disintegrates into either simple accompaniment or parallel melodies. In the other composers’ works, particularly Guignon VII and *Leclair XII*, the creative energy comes from the hypervariety of the melodic surface rhythm so characteristic of the second pre-Classical school. Too much textural variety would compete with and compromise the melodic freedom. Indeed, in *Leclair XII* the first dessus part remains the leader for most of the volume.

One way in which all four composers demonstrate their creativity is in their experiments within the binary/sonata-allegro continuum. During the eighteenth century this was the standard binary dance form:

---

30 I identify the *de Caix* sonata references with a capital Roman numeral for the sonata and a small Roman numeral for the movement. The two instrumental parts are designated “first dessus” and “second dessus” (“dessus” in this context being the general French term for a treble-range instrument or part).
where A consists of the main motive and B includes a variety of motivic and non-motivic music and perhaps a closing idea. I indicates the tonic key and V the dominant. Binary form proved to be a fertile testing ground for numerous idiosyncratic experiments involving the coordination of musical motives with harmonic patterns. The results of two experiments became standard in the next century. One was the creation of a second theme in the B section; the other was a multilevel, coordinated recapitulation in the second section—a return to the A theme in the tonic key. By the late eighteenth century, the schematic drawing might show:

\[\begin{array}{cc}
A & B \\
I & V \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{cc}
A & B \\
V & I \\
\end{array} \]

with the tonic return of the A theme often incomplete or ephemeral. It is in his play with this fledgling binary/sonata-allegro form, as well as in his ingenious treatment of the two other forms he employs—rondeau and song form (ternary), that de Caix distinguishes himself.

While de Caix uses only three musical forms, he varies them considerably. Seven of the movements marked allegro are bipartite, with two repeated sections and a conventional exposition—development—recapitulation structure. The eighth allegro has no repeats but conforms in every other particular. Five movements are organized as rondeaux in which a return is made to the opening section, which can be diagrammed A B A C A. When, as in four cases, the return is made to the opening submovement, the diagram varies with the individual piece. The final five movements can be described as being through-composed, or in song form, A B A. Occasionally the final A section will change somewhat; that change is indicated as A1.

A short description of each movement will demonstrate de Caix's compositional skill. Once a primary theme is created, the skill lies in what a composer does with it; if a piece of music is to last longer than a few bars, some development of the opening idea must take place. That development is effected through the creation of such dichotomies as similarity and contrast, interruption and continuation, question and answer. These polarities can be expressed at many levels: through rhythm, melody, harmony, general character, articulation, or some combination of these elements. Looking at the work of a single composer over time, we find that there is generally a consistent structure to his music that is as individual as a profile or a signature.

De Caix, however, exhibits an unusual inconsistency in the way he constructs his music. While the eight allegros share the basics of binary form as described above, de Caix's process of development varies. In I/i in G minor, the principle of contrast predominates; transitional sections, or episodes, consist of non-motivic material often constructed on the circle of fifths. The few harmonic resting points are in the keys of D minor, B flat major, and C minor. In I/iii (G minor) on the other hand, the opening two-bar rhythmic motive acts as an engine propelling the movement.31

II/iii (B minor) and IV/i (A major) gain unity through the continued expression of their rhythmic character, not of a particular rhythmic motive. The former is modeled upon a cassia or hunting song; the other is a march. Harmonic similarities exist as well: the development of both movements outlines a triad; areas of harmonic arrival include F# minor, A major, and D major in II/iii, and E major, C# minor, and A major in IV/i. But while the development of II/iii depends primarily upon its rhythmic character, in IV/i this element is combined with multime-locic motives and some of the motivic drive of II/iii, resulting in a composition of more depth and variety.

III/i and V/ii derive their distinctiveness from contrast. They are both multi-motivic with very quick episodes visiting a great number of keys. Both are virtuosic in their use of figuration, and

31While I/iii is about sixty bars longer than I/i, this is due in part to its shorter, 3/8 measures as compared to the first movement's longer ones in 4/4, rather than the actual addition of musical material.
travel extensively through the circle of fifths, although V/ii visits more exotic destinations than III/i.

III/iii and VI/ii are quite individual. III/iii takes its character from the juxtaposition of a periodic, distinctly phrased gigue over continuous sixteenth notes whose only nuance comes from minute variations in melodic shape and corresponding articulative changes expressed in slurs and staccato markings. While the perpetual motion part is through-composed, the first dessus's gigue is organized in sonata form. VI/ii, without repeat, also qualifies as sonata form, but the initial melodic motive is used in rondeau fashion; it returns frequently throughout the piece, most notably as a false recapitulation in bar 79.

De Caix uses the rondeau principle with subtlety in his five movements en rondeau. I/ii is one of two textbook rondeaux, with its AA B A C A form. Its distinctive characteristic is its virtually continuous four-part texture, maintained through open-string drones as well as double stops. While II/ii is actually a tambourin en rondeau, de Caix writes out an ornamented recapitulation so that the form appears tripartite and thus through-composed; its structure can be diagrammed A B A1. IV/ii, a gavotte, is the other conventional rondeau and one of the few movements where the two dessus parts maintain their melody/accompaniment polarity throughout the piece: the top is always the tune, the bottom is the accompaniment in continuous eighth notes. De Caix's two minuets demonstrate two versions of the multi-level rondeau. V/iii has the form AA B A C D C/ A, and its texture can be distinguished from that of IV/ii not only because its melody switches to the second dessus part in the second minuet, but because of the rhythmic fluidity of the accompaniment part. While the accompaniment consists of a preponderance of sixteenth notes, it often pauses, as if for reflection or poise, beautifully illustrating the Baroque principle of balance. VI/iii demonstrates even more dovetailing of phrase and line. The tune and accompaniment are both so well sculpted and they alternate at such irregular intervals that it is frequently difficult to tell which part should predominate. The form of this movement is AA B A C A/CC DD/A; the first minuet is a rondeau itself, and then it is repeated at the end.

Barthélemy de Caix's through-composed movements are either French dances or Italian songs. III/ii is a sarabande where the parts share the tune. Its melodic structure and ornamentation are purely French, but its phrase structure is uncharacteristically irregular and serves as an expressive device in itself. Except for bars 34 and 35, the texture remains two simple lines without double stops or chords. IV/iii is a chaconne—by far the longest movement in the set, with 233 measures. While its harmonic macro-structure is tripartite, imitating that of a rondeau—it travels from A major to A minor and back—the impressive number of melodic and rhythmic motives that march through the circle of fifths not once but twice reveal the piece's true, through-composed character. Formally, the composer makes all three sections into mini-song forms by creating a recapitulation at the end of each (A B A1), although in fact the last A1 recapts the melody of the very first A section for a more final ending.

While ternary/song form (A B A) is used for some of the world's simplest folk melodies, de Caix's Italianate through-composed movements in song form, all marked Andante or Andantino, are some of the most complex works in the publication. II/i, though conventional in structure, manifests some of de Caix's most intricate combinations of articulations, bowings, and melodic figuration. Here, as well, the texture remains in four parts for virtually all of the piece. In this movement the composer single-mindedly exploits the triplet/duplet polarity. The andante V/i derives its emotional character from a rhythmic and articulative motive, six repeated eighth notes in one bow. Its other distinction lies in its chromatic climax: an inexorable upward crawl in rising half steps for six bars, culminating in falling "organum"—parallel triads seldom used in polyphonic writing after the Middle Ages. The andantino IV/i is a dialogue, a conversation between the two dessus, and its interest lies in the spontaneity with which the irregularities of conversation are imitated through repetition and phrase extension.

This bewildering variety of developmental approaches is unique to de Caix; it is much easier to summarize the compositional techniques of the other three composers in a few sentences. For example, in both Leclair III and Leclair XII, the
composer’s creative impulse is primarily expressed in two realms: melodic and harmonic. Particularly attractive to our twentieth-century ears is the organic way in which Leclair uses his melodic motives; he doesn’t just repeat them as de Caix sometimes does, but isolates short thematic fragments and then develops them. Leclair changes musical intervals, alters melodic rhythm, inverts and augments, and generally plays with melody in the same way that de Caix plays with texture. The other notable expression of Leclair’s creativity is in his use of unexpected chords and modulations as punctuation, not only in a structural sense within the pattern of the movement but in conjunction with sudden, dramatic melodic nuances. De Caix is similar in that respect, coordinating his harmonic diversions with changes in figuration and unexpected melodic episodes, although he is less adventurous and seems to have a more narrative sense rather than a dramatic one.

While the breadth of creativity and powers of invention of de Caix and Leclair are on a par, the music of Guignon and Guillemant shows a more typical limiting of creativity to conventional outlets. Guignon apparently had significant influence on mid-eighteenth-century audiences in general and de Caix in particular, but his work does not impress when scrutinized analytically. Harmonically and formally traditional, his duo sonatas primarily manifest a concern with the surface rhythm of the melody as expressed in grand musical gestures in the most extroverted, virtuosic manner. The bravura character of Guignon’s music, coupled with his evident ability to perform his own work to maximum effect, speak to his talent as a showman rather than as a composer. Guillemant’s music, much less ambitious than the work of the other three composers, owes its charm to the composer’s witty, gracious, and reasoned exploitation of typical Style à la Grèque techniques.

We might summarize our characterization of the composers’ styles by saying that Guignon and de Caix retain their grounding in the Baroque/galant continuum, although Guignon’s work owes more to the Style Louis XV while de Caix’s often refers back to the Style Régence; Guillemant’s musical style remains within the boundaries of the Style à la Grèque; and Leclair’s work spans all three pre-Classical styles. In any event, although a more cogent comparison is beyond the scope of this paper, this analysis demonstrates that, while there are correspondences between the compositional styles of de Caix and Guignon as well as between that of de Caix and early Leclair, de Caix clearly creates a coherent, well integrated, and expressive style all his own.

Performing The De Caix Sonatas

For the performer, the Six Sonatas of Barthelemy de Caix presents some of the most technically advanced literature written for any size of viola da gamba, rivaling the legendary Forqueray suites. The de Caix sonatas are carefully tailored for the pardessus’s distinctive tuning; while playable on violin, many of the high, quick runs are easier on the pardessus with its high G string. The pieces are idiomatic but not indulgent: passagework and chords lie under the fingers, but practice is required. Some problems with the music are conceptual; viol players do not expect to play in keys such as F# minor. Other problems (common to any pardessus playing, not just the de Caix) involve some unexpectedly basic physiological issues, such as how to stop the instrument from slipping through one’s knees, as well as the challenge of keeping all related equipment and accessories functional.

The physical logistics of playing the pardessus render some of a player’s simplest actions problematic. Most particularly, the very small fretted fingerboard makes it difficult to play many single notes in tune, and almost impossible to tune quick double stops and chords. The third- and fourth-finger notes on the bottom G string are especially tricky on my instrument. In order to have a fighting chance, one must hold the instrument high enough to be able to reach straight across, with the forearm fairly parallel to the floor rather than angling down from elbow to fingers. This motion would have been easier in the eighteenth century simply because chairs were lower and skirts, with many underskirts of stiff materials, supported the instrument in a higher position in relation to the player’s torso. The offending pinkie would have been right in front of the chest rather than level with the stomach. I tried to solve the problem by sitting on a specially-made low stool. My duet partner, Catherina Meints, used a chamois on her
lap to anchor the pardessus higher. Unfortunately neither solution was definitive, and we continue to explore other alternatives.

Other concerns are the sound and durability of the strings used on the instrument. Generally, viol players use sheepgut for their top strings, but the required gauge for the top pardessus string was so thin that its tone was raucous and screechy, and the string broke every two or three days. For a few months we flirted with the idea of employing silk strings, which had been used in the eighteenth century and continued to be used for violin E strings until as recently as 1920. We abandoned the thought, finally, because silk strings are difficult to procure, and while they might have improved the sound, silk is not known for its superior durability over gut. After experimenting with different brands and gauges of gut, we each found something that suited our own instrument: I used Italian-made Baroque violin strings, and Cathy used generic gut strings made in Oregon. However, every viol player knows that gut is particularly unstable (which is why it is used in Swiss cuckoo clocks as the connective belt attached to the wheel of little figures appearing at the clock’s door—the gut responds to infinitesimal changes in temperature and humidity to bring out the shepherdess when the day is fair, or the witch when it rains or snows).

The instruments themselves matched well. In 1985 I had purchased a pardessus made by Louis Guersan in 1740, and Cathy owned a Guersan pardessus from 1745. However, finding the right bow for the pardessus required some thought. In the eighteenth century, bows were not labeled as to intended instrument; often five or six were hung together on a hook on the wall, or one would be placed indiscriminately in the closest instrument case. When we first started to play the pardessus we did what most eighteenth-century players must have done—we used our treble viol bows. It soon became obvious, though, that the treble bow was too short for the long Corellian slurs, and experiments proved a violin bow was too heavy. For a decade both of us employed bows made to my specifications by Philip Davis. Never having seen a pardessus bow, I designed one that was as long as a Baroque violin bow but lighter than a treble bow, with a thin, springy, fluted stick and a wide frog. Cathy still uses one of these bows. In 1995, I acquired an eighteenth-century bow found in a pardessus case by a French antique dealer who believed it to be a pardessus bow. It was very different from what I had imagined: the length of a violin bow, it had a round, rather heavy stick with a small frog. Surprisingly, it proved to be the perfect bow for the manner in which I play my instrument, no matter what its provenance.

All of these physical and practical problems exacerbated the main challenge we faced in the de Caix sonatas: the music was very, very hard. My duet partner and I addressed this challenge in different ways, influenced by our very different training and styles of approach that, we realized, mirrored the dichotomy between the eighteenth-century professional musician and the amateur. Cathy was trained as a specialist; she had been a child prodigy on the modern cello, had studied with Janos Starker at the Eastman School of Music, and now plays with the Cleveland Orchestra. She was attracted to the de Caix because of its difficulty, and committed herself to the project because of its quality. She had a matter-of-fact and energetic response to setbacks, and her excellent bowed-string technique easily supported her through most crises.

My early background was strong in music theory, composition, counterpoint, and ear training. Although I had had extensive orchestral experience as a violinist and violist before I entered college, I was more of a multi-instrumentalist by temperament. Introduced to the viol at the age of nineteen, I developed an approach to early bowed string instruments that owed as much to the Alexander Technique as to conventional viol pedagogy. Attracted to the de Caix because of an intense affinity with the pardessus, I was consciously looking for a partner like Cathy, with a strong technique. My response to technical setbacks was more intuitive, and I often surprised Cathy with unexpected solutions having to do with a light bow arm and a delicate, well-articulated hand in the playing of French Baroque ornaments.

---

32Alexander Technique is the study of how to use the body freely and easily in both daily activities and specialized pursuits, without developing tension.
Cathy and I also had different responses to the intensity of the rehearsal process. In the ideal playing situation the performer, her instrument, and the music work together in synchronicity, communicating kinesthetic, visual, and aural information in a kind of round-robin. French Baroque music offers the possibility for even more information exchange since it is highly annotated, not only with detailed ornaments, articulations, dynamics, and slurs, but also fingerings, the position of note swells, speed of chord arpeggiation, and suggested variations upon repeat. With two performers the amount of information doubles. Cathy quickly digested the visual input from the score and almost immediately produced a musical interpretation that made sense of the macrostructure of the work. It took me longer to absorb and process information from all three levels, and my interpretation focused more on rhythmic and melodic nuances.

Our approaches were complementary, and our performance clearly benefited from the merging of our experiences.

Since our approaches were so different, we decided to add variety to the musical texture by alternating first and second dessus parts by sonata, with me on first dessus in Sonata I. Though the parts cross frequently, the first dessus generally plays more of the higher melodies. Although we had not analyzed the exact result, this alternation provided both of us with a balance of pretty tunes and finger-twisting passagework, while adding an aural fluidity to the recording.

Perhaps the only performance issue we didn't address was whether our performance would be authentic enough. When discussing actual instruments it can be said that our eighteenth-century pardessus and my eighteenth-century bow are authentic, and that the use of gut strings was an authentic practice. When discussing performance these days, though, the term authentic is usually replaced by historical and then further qualified, as in historically informed or historically influenced. This change is not an avoidance or a cop-out, but instead a reflection of a deeper understanding of authentic that indicates not a historical correctness but a personal authority or integrity in performance. Since we are not in the past it is futile to try to reproduce it, and such an aim can actually destroy whatever authenticity a performance may have. On the other hand, an honest attempt to understand a work's musical, social, and cultural context, the humility to learn from one's instrument, a close study of the written text and an inner listening to the unwritten text—these are elements that create authenticity because they create a well integrated performance.33

Practicing and recording de Caix's oeuvre gave me an enriched perspective impossible to achieve through a visual study of the score. As I experienced its musical and technical demands and rewards, I began to develop a strong sense not only of the technical abilities but of some aspects of the personalities of the original performers, for while we have no direct proof of their identity, the technical challenges of the sonatas are of a consistent kind and profile a distinctive pair of performers. Though they may not have been professional musicians, they must have been extremely well trained, with that completeness of preparation that results from work begun at an early age and sustained by frequent performances. They were probably well versed in both French and Italian musical styles, including the French dances popular during the first quarter of the century as well as the "new" Italian virtuoso concerto. Their hands needed to be large enough to span the interval of a ninth on adjacent strings, and practiced enough to play series of double trills, but agile enough to execute the quick passages convincingly.34 And, most of all, during a performance they must have had the skill to subsume the many technical details so the genius of the music could speak for itself.

When I say that the performers' hands must have been large, this is not to imply that the performers for whom the work was intended must have been male. Some men have small hands, some


34Although we assumed that since the composer was a performer he wouldn't have published anything he couldn't have played, in a few instances we were convinced that the original performers must have been either giants or sorcerers to be able to execute certain octave double trills and sustained unisons that move into expanding double stops.
women have large ones. The question is, rather, could a person with hands large enough to reach the stretches be agile enough to toss off the passagework? Perhaps, but the opposite is not true; a small-handed but agile person cannot significantly increase her hand span without risking Schumann-like injury. The ideal hand is one with a large palm and long but thin fingers; in this manner the hand can reach far enough and the fingers can also execute such digit-twisters as chords in lute position, which require all fingers to nestle sideways on the same fret on different strings. Cathy's hands were large enough to manage the stretches but at first were not agile enough for the passagework. She ended by doing both creditably. I had no choice but to cut out some of the stretches, but the passagework came more easily to me. While we have no proof that the de Caix was performed, or that its composer was one of the intended participants in any debut performance, we can find support for the assertion that a composer/performer would have been able, even expected, to play anything he published. Indeed, many performers advertised their skills as a player, composer, and teacher by publishing their own compositions, and thereby attracted students who wanted to learn their performance secrets.\(^3\)

**Conclusion**

Here we have an anomaly: an instrument whose rise and fall were affected by peripheral social and political events; an instrument whose short life span could be taken to reflect a lack of artistic impact, no matter what its etiquette value might have been. And yet, the pardessus de viole was the prime vehicle of musical expression for a generation of aristocratic and middle-class women, as well as for such talented composers as Barthélemy de Caix, whose only surviving opus was written most specifically and idiomatically for this particular small, fashionable instrument.

There is a great deal of talk these days about whether the discussion of a composer's work should situate it in its social and political context. In the case of de Caix, no other approach can convey the significance of his music—a significance that may well have been lost at the time of the music's publication when performers published not for posterity but to establish their virtuosic credentials. "After all," the public would say, "if he can play *that* he must be good." It is our luck that de Caix's music is not only challenging but also well crafted and engrossing. While some modern ears may find it "light" compared to some ideal of nineteenth- or twentieth-century depth, none can call it boring, nor crude, nor obvious.

In any event, the music of de Caix is truly unusual because it has given all of us what we want. At the time that it was written, it appears to have given the composer a second chance at court and a reputation that continued to help him garner students well into his sixties. For his most able students and associates, it provided repertoire unlike any other written for pardessus, music to challenge their capabilities. And for twentieth-century musicologists looking for ways to make the past present, de Caix's music engages us so immediately as to create the impression that there is no other way to play it, that we are one with the past. That is a gift indeed.

APPENDIX I: CHRONOLOGY

1697  Jean-Marie Leclair I is born
1703  Jean-Marie Leclair II is born
1709  Pierre Leclair is born
1711, 1725  De la Barre's flute duos are published
1712, 1715  Hotteterre's flute duos are published
1716  Barthelemy de Caix is born
1718  Philidor's flute duos are published
ca. 1720  Mlle. Levi is born
1722  Leclair I leaves Lyon to work in Turin
1723  Leclair I returns to Paris to live
1724  Boismortier's flute duos are published
1725  Boismortier's first duos for unaccompanied violins are published
1726  Leclair I visits Turin again to study with Somis
1727  Telemann's sonatas for two flutes are published in Hamburg
The Leclair brothers and Francois-Joseph de Caix play together in the Lyonnaise "Voeu du Roi"
1728  Leclair I makes his debut at the Concert Spirituel
The Leclair brothers and Pere de Caix play again at the "Voeu du Roi"
Blavet's flute duos are published
1729  The Leclairs and Pere de Caix play together one last time at the "Voeu du Roi"
1730  Leclair I writes his first book of duos for unaccompanied violins, opus III
De Caix comes to Paris with his family, remaining until 1738
1737  Leclair I leaves Paris
1738  De Caix leaves Paris, living in Lyon until 1748
1744  Leclair I returns to Paris
Guignon and Mondonville play in Lyon
1745  Mlle. Levi plays at the Concert Spirituel
Guignon performs in Lyon
ca. 1746  De Caix writes his duos for unaccompanied pardessus, dedicating them to Mme. Henriette
1746  De Caix plays in Paris
Guignon and Mondonville play in Lyon
1747  Leclair I publishes his second book of unaccompanied violin duos, opus XII
1748  De Caix leaves Lyon to teach Sophie in Fontevrault
ca. 1750  Leclair II publishes his treble duos
1750  De Caix comes to Paris with Sophie
Mme. Haubaut plays at the Concert Spirituel

APPENDIX II: DESCRIPTIVE CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Designations</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Meas.</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonata I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (musette)</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>rondeau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro assai</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andante</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liere Tambourino. Presto/2e. Minore/1e. Majore variato.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>rondeau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia. Allegro</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarabanda. Adagio</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantomime. Allegro</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>over 4/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria. Gratoso</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>rondeau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciaconna</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andante</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>binary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo di Minuetto I /Minuetto II (majore)</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>rondeau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andantino</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>binary/no repeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo di Minuetto /Minuetto Majore</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>rondeau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORNAMENTATION IN ENGLISH LYRA VIOL MUSIC

Part I: Slurs, Juts, Thumps, and Other "Graces" for the Bow

Mary Cyr

The intricacy of ornamentation in French viol music is widely recognized, but few viol players are aware that ornamentation in English lyra viol music presents equal or even greater challenges. The variety and individuality with which the circumstances surrounding the transmission of sources were noted in lyra viol music leave modern performers with many unanswered questions. As Martha Bishop rightly observed, ornamentation remains "the thorniest problem of all." Part of the difficulty of interpreting ornament signs arises from the circumstances surrounding the transmission of sources. On one hand, English lyra viol music is preserved largely in manuscripts that contain a profusion of different, and sometimes conflicting, ornament signs. There are only a few printed sources, but they present a problem of a different sort, since for the most part they lack ornamentation altogether. Moreover, there is a significant gap of more than thirty-five years, from 1615 to 1651, when no lyra viol music was published at all. Interpretation therefore rests primarily upon evidence from the voluminous manuscript sources, and previous studies have concentrated especially upon those sources that contain tables of ornaments, most of which date from the 1660s and later. In this two-part study I intend to expand these investigations by drawing some comparisons between ornamentation in the early and late sources, and I shall also explore various ways of performing several of these "graces." Finally, I shall suggest guidelines for how players might add ornamentation in pieces where none is indicated.

The first part of this study is devoted to a discussion of ornamentation that was performed with the bow, or as an alternative to bowing. It may appear unusual to modern players to find that ornamentation included different types of bowings; however, such techniques as the "shake with the bow," pizzicato, striking the string with the bow stick, and various types of slurs were all considered to be graces that enhanced one's playing. We begin with a brief general discussion of the notation of ornamentation in tablature.

1For the present discussion, I use the term lyra viol music in its broad sense, meaning music noted in tablature for the viol tuned either in the normal way or in a variant tuning. Frank Traficante argues convincingly for using such a broad working definition in his article "Lyra-Viol Music? A Semantic Puzzle," in John Jenkins and His Time, Studies in English Consort Music, edited by Andrew Ashbee and Peter Holman (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 330.

2Martha Bishop, ed., Tablature for One (Atlanta, 1982), ix.


Ornament Signs versus Written-Out Ornaments

Ornamentation in English lyra viol music is not limited to graces that can be indicated with an abbreviation or ornament sign; in many cases, ornamentation is fully written out using letters and specific rhythmic values. Examples of this type of ornamentation can be found in both printed and manuscript sources throughout the period that lyra viol playing flourished (from about 1590 until 1680 or thereabouts), with the majority of written-out ornaments occurring in the earlier part of this period. Indeed, written-out trills (also called "relishes") are the only type of ornaments that are indicated in the early printed sources; no ornament signs were used at all. Ornaments of the written-out type tend to be cadential, and they usually feature a trill as part of the ornament, although the preparation, length, and termination of the trill may vary considerably. Following are typical examples of written-out trills from two early sources:

Example 1. Written-out ornaments ("relishes") from early sources of English lyra viol music.

(a) Anonymous, final cadence from "A Galliard," William Ballet manuscript (c. 1590–1620), Dublin, Trinity College, Ms D 1.21, p. 37. Tuning: ffefh.8

(b) Tobias Hume, cadence of the first strain of "I Am Melancholy," from The First Part of Ayres, French, Pollish, and Others (London, 1605), no. 106. Tuning: efdef.

Most early examples of written-out ornamentation such as those shown above do not include slurs; however, the frequency of relatively long slurs on similar ornaments in the later sources raises the question of whether slurs may be appropriate earlier in the century as well. Written-out relishes from the Manchester lyra viol manuscript10 (mid-seventeenth century) often include six to eight notes within a slur, and there are also examples of detached slurs of ten to thirteen notes, as shown in Example 2. Note that this example of written-out ornaments also shows a more unusual placement of the ornaments before the final cadence:


The use of a slur to cover an entire written-out trill can be found in manuscripts from the mid-seventeenth century on, and by this time the ornament sign for a cadential trill is also prevalent (usually marked • or #). The latter ornament implies the use of a single bow stroke, as in mm. 1 and 2 of the following example:

---

9I employ the dating of manuscripts assigned by Frank Traficante in his article "Music for Lyra Viol: Manuscript Sources," 4–22.
10The entire galliard can be found in Mary Cyr, ed., Toyes, Thumpes, and Ayres (Montreal, 1986), 7–8.
5Lyra viol tunings were shown with letters to indicate how unisons were used in tuning the instrument, and always from the top string down. Thus jefh (normal tuning) indicates that when the top string is played open, it is a unison with the note on the "f" fret on the next lower string. (In tablature notation, "a" refers to an open string, "b" to the first fret, "c" to the second fret, and so on.) One can quickly identify lyra viol tunings by intervals too; for instance, ef/h represents major third–fourth–fifth–fourth–fifth.

Manchester Public Library (Great Britain), shelf number Brm/832 Vu 51.

Because slurs can be shown precisely, fully written-out trills permit quite a variety of bowing, and players should consider the bowing carefully and not merely assume that the ornaments must be performed entirely with separate bow strokes. Throughout the seventeenth century, players probably varied them by using slurs, although there is some evidence that long slurs were more often associated with lyra viol music of the mid-seventeenth century and later. In the early repertoire, therefore, players may wish to consider slurs of not more than two to four notes within a written-out trill, for example, as a way to vary the articulation of separate strokes. Even though long slurs are found more often in sources from the mid-seventeenth century on, written-out trills without slurs can still be found. Perhaps the best guide, then, is that when performing written-out ornaments, the use of separate bow strokes is a good starting point, for it demonstrates the player's skill and agility and maintains a clarity of articulation. Passages such as those shown in the foregoing examples of written-out ornaments may also be used by players to develop a repertoire of appropriately decorated cadential trills that can be added when none are indicated.

Holds

The technique called the "hold" is actually not an ornament at all, although it could be written with a sign (usually I or L) and was therefore often included in tables of ornaments. The hold, or the practice of holding down a finger until another note was played (or even while another note was played), was considered essential for a good sonority. Thomas Mace indicates that holds were considered a necessity to the viol player's technique rather than an optional grace or ornament:

[It is] a General Rule, (both in lute, and Viol-Play) That you never take up any Stopt Finger, (after you have struck it) till you have some necessary Use of It, or that your holding of it so Stopt, may be inconvenient for some other performance; And when you do remove, (or unstop It) let it be so very little from the String, as One can scarce perceive your Finger, to have unstopt It; which Custom, will teach you to Play Close, and Quick, Near, and Fine: But if (on the contrary) at the First, you use your self, to Lift, or Toss your Fingers High, (as too many use to do) you shall never Play Handsomely, Quick, or Well.11

More than simply providing a smooth connection between notes, the hold also enhances the implied harmony in certain passages, and it is therefore important for players to determine how long certain notes ought to be held down after they are played. For this reason, composers and players sometimes notate holds, especially when they are essential for harmonic reasons. In the following didactic passage, Mace shows all of the holds with a straight line from the note that is to be held down:

Whether holds are indicated or not, it is the player's responsibility to determine where they are required and to use them as often as possible. They are rarely indicated in the early lyra viol sources at all, and even in later prints and manuscripts they are not consistently marked. Players should examine passages with leaping or polyphonic motion in particular and add holds whenever possible. The following example shows a passage from a Coranto by Alfonso Ferrabosco (Lessons, 1609), in which no holds are marked in the printed edition; however, they should be added in the manner shown below:

Example 5. Alfonso Ferrabosco, "Coranto" (Lessons, 1609), p. 20. Tuning:fh/hf. (Implied holds added.)

Holds are often used in conjunction with chords, in which some notes must continue to sound as the bow moves through the other notes of the chord, although these holds are rarely indicated. Chords should be arpeggiated by first holding the bass note slightly, holding all chord notes down carefully, and adjusting the speed of arpeggiation to the tempo and melody of an individual piece. Just as the lyra viol creates the illusion of polyphony by the judicious use of holds, it is also capable of performing a melody and accompaniment simultaneously through the artful arpeggiation of chords.

Bowing

Although slurs, detached bowings, and pizzicato are not usually thought of today as ornaments, in the seventeenth century they were considered to be "graces" because they added nuance and expression to one's playing. Various types of slurs were therefore often included in tables of ornaments, as were pizzicato and several other techniques that will be described below.

Slurs and other bowings were extremely scarce in printed sources of English lyra viol music, although a few written indications in Hume's music show that expressive use of the bow and plucking the strings were techniques that were used at least by the early seventeenth century. Despite the lack of slurs in the printed sources, good bow control and the ability to add nuances, slurs, and dynamics were considered a necessary part of playing well. Christopher Simpson's well-known passage concerning bowing is worth quoting, for it describes the variety of strokes expected of a good player:

Gracing of Notes is performed two wayes, viz. by the Bowe, and by the fingers. By the Bow, as when we play Loud or Soft, according to our fancy, or the humour of the Musick. Again, this Loud or Soft is sometimes express'd in one and the same Note, as when we make it Soft at the beginning, and then (as it were) swell or grow louder towards the middle or ending.\(^{13}\)

Playford adds a general rule that the strong stroke starting at the tip of the bow should fall on the accented note at the beginning of a piece:

Lastly, Observe, That if at the beginning of a Lesson there be an odd Note, then you strike it with drawing the Bow backward; but if

\(^{12}\)Mace also gives advice about holding the lowest note of a chord: "Be sure to give the Lowest String a Good Full Share of your Bow, (Singly, by It self, before you Slide It upon the Rest) and Leave it likewise with a little Eminency of Smartness, by swelling the Bow a little, when you part with That String. This will make your Play very Lovely." (Musick's Monument 249)

\(^{13}\)Christopher Simpson, The Division-Viol (London, 1659), 10.
there be no odd Note at the beginning, then with putting the Bow forward.\textsuperscript{14}

Simpson includes slurs in his discussion of ornamentation, implying that the player may introduce them to vary the nuance:

To these [nuances] may be added that of Playing two, three, four, or more Notes with one motion of the Bow, which would not have that Grace or Ornament if they were play'd severally.\textsuperscript{15}

A few manuscripts that include signs for bowings indicate the direction of stroke and slurs on two or more notes. A dot (for push-bow) or a vertical line (for pull-bow) appears in Cambridge University manuscript Dd 6.48(F), for example, where one also finds the slur with crosshatch marks (to be discussed below).\textsuperscript{16}

A second type of slur is one in which two or more notes are articulated, or slightly detached, within the same bow stroke. In the Manchester lyra viol manuscript, this is called a slur “with jobbings or juts at every letter,” indicated by the mark \( \overline{\mathbb{J}} \) or \( \mathbb{J} \). This detaching of notes within a bow stroke can be done by intermittently stopping the bow briefly and applying a little pressure with the fingers of the right hand to begin the motion again. The articulation may be either gentle or pronounced according to the character of the piece, the tempo, and whether the notes leap across one or more strings (see Example 2).

A rare type of bowed ornament is the bowed shake, which Roger North calls the “tremolo.”\textsuperscript{18} Simpson describes it as an ornament to be used discreetly:

Some also affect a Shake or Tremble with the Bow, like the Shaking-Stop of an Organ, but the frequent use thereof is not (in my opinion) much commendable.\textsuperscript{19}

Mace provides one specific example of the bowed shake demonstrating that notes are taken in a single bow stroke while pitches (in this case, chords) are articulated separately:


(Note: The error in the second double stop is in Mace’s original.)

Simpson’s description of the organ shake as a “tremble” with the bow suggests a stroke that wavers slightly, which can be produced by slightly dropping and raising the bow hand several times within one stroke. Although it is not specifically indicated as a bowed shake, Example 7 shows a slur (as a straight line, which is Playford’s sign for a slur) on repeated pitches, suggesting that a similar effect is desired. Here, the unusual effect of a bowed shake may be intended to imitate bird calls.

Pizzicato: The Thump

As an alternate to the usual manner of bowing, the player is occasionally required to pluck the strings (called a \textit{thump}), or to strike the strings with the wood of the bow. The term \textit{arco} does not appear in lyra viol sources; instead, the notes that are to be plucked are usually marked individually, most often with a dot under the letter (\( a \)). String players today are often surprised by the various ways pizzicato was employed in lyra viol music, for either the right or the left hand, on single notes, double stops, and even on chords.

\textsuperscript{15}Simpson, \textit{Division-Viol}, 10.
\textsuperscript{16}Traficante, \textit{The Mansell Lyra Viol Tablature}, vol. 1, 123.
In fact, composers do not usually indicate which hand is expected to pluck the strings, but the context generally provides a clue.\textsuperscript{20}

Extensive use of plucked notes (more than three or four successively) usually implies that the right hand is used. This is the preferable manner of performing pizzicato, since it allows the full range of notes and chords to be used in the usual way. There are even reports that certain amateur and professional players were in the habit of plucking the viol as if it were a lute. Roger North reports that his grandfather, Francis, was “a musician in perfection who used his base or lyra-viol (which he used to touch lute-fashion upon his knee), to divert himself alone.”\textsuperscript{21} North also reported that John Jenkins used the viol in lute manner,\textsuperscript{22} and in a manuscript of 1659, Sir Peter Leycester notated several pieces that were intended to be plucked entirely in lute fashion.\textsuperscript{23} In the accompaniment to the song “Fain Would I Change That Note,” Tobias Hume also specifies that “you must play one strain with your fingers, the other with your Bow, and so continue to the end.” Another well-known example of a passage of right-hand pizzicato is Tobias Hume’s “Harke, harke,” from The First Part of Ayres (1605), where he directs the player to “play nine letters with your finger.” Using the right hand may require a moment for the player to adjust the bow grip so that the thumb or first finger can be used for plucking. In both of Hume’s pieces, the alternation of phrases that are bowed and plucked precludes putting the bow down. Even players who are familiar with the modern technique of holding the bow and plucking the strings while anchoring the thumb on the side of the fingerboard may find that returning to an underhand bow grip carries a risk of dropping the bow. One solution is to begin the passage by lifting the right hand while turning the bow downward and then use the thumb or first finger to pluck the strings (without anchoring the thumb on the fingerboard). This method allows the normal underhand bow grip to be resumed quickly and with minimal risk of dropping the bow.

For left-hand pizzicato, the symbol most frequently employed is one, two, or three dots under the letter to which it applies. In some cases, the number of dots indicates which finger of the left hand is to be used for plucking the strings, as in Thomas Ford’s Musicke of Sundrie Kindes (1607). A table of ornaments in the Manchester lyra viol manuscript (“Graces on the viol,” folio 1) also illustrates three signs for plucking with different fingers of the left hand:

\begin{itemize}
  \item a thumpe w\textsuperscript{th} y\textsuperscript{th} forefinger
  \item a thumpe w\textsuperscript{th} y\textsuperscript{th} middle finger
  \item a thumpe w\textsuperscript{th} y\textsuperscript{th} ringe finger
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{20}Woodford (“Music for the Viol in Tablature,” 25) proposes that the thump must have been a left-hand ornament only; however, there are numerous contexts in which this is impossible. It does require some ingenuity in repositioning the fingers of the bow hand, but especially in chordal passages, the thump must have been performed by the right hand.

\textsuperscript{21}Wilson, ed., Roger North, 3 and 258.


Playford gives a similar definition for the thump; however, he does not specify which finger is to be used:

*Note: When the Character v is placed under the letter a, that must be struck with the Finger of the left Hand, and not with the Bow, which is called a Thump.*

Playford employs the thump in four pieces: an almain, two sarabands, and an ayre (nos. 44-47). From the contexts, we can see that the thump may be either harmonic or melodic, and it can be done quickly, even directly following or preceding chords or double stops (see Example 8).

![Example 8](image)


Tuning: defhs.

(The straight line in this example is Playford’s sign for a slur.)

---


25A modern edition of this piece can also be found in Bishop, ed., *Tablature for One*, 134.
In the manuscript sources, the most common marks for the thump are one, two, or three dots, but occasionally other marks are used, such as a vertical stroke. In Narcissus Marsh's lyra viol manuscript, an untitled composition by "Mr. Mace" (shown in Plate 1, previous page) also has indications for what are most likely thumps (marked ⅛). Here I believe that the word "finger" following a passage of plucked notes is the equivalent of the modern term *arco*, or a direction to resume bowing as usual.\(^{26}\)

The thump is found most often on open strings, but occurs occasionally for the left hand on stopped notes too, where the first finger is used to hold down a note, or to bar two or more notes on the same fret across the strings, while another finger of the left hand plucks the string. Ford's use of one, two, or three dots beneath the letter in tablature notation is instructive, because it suggests that the fingers of the left hand ought to be used in alternation, presumably to enhance the "ringing" effect. As can be seen in Example 9, Ford usually employs the longer third finger for plucking the low strings, although this does not appear to be a strict rule. A similar use of one, two, or three dots under the letter can be found in the Manchester lyra viol manuscript, and pieces such as Gervise Gerrarde's "Paven" also call for an alternation of left-hand fingers to pluck successive notes (see Example 10).

In Example 10, the thumps in measures 3 to 5 also require holds with the first finger across four strings, first on the d fret and then on the f fret. The hold and thumps in measures 5 and 6 require the player to look ahead: since the first and second fingers will be required for plucking open strings, the double stop on the letters c and d must be taken with the third and fourth fingers and held. Needless to say, the left-hand thump requires extra agility and coordination from the player in some cases.

Although the thump usually implies use of the left hand, some passages appear to require right-hand pizzicato, even though it is not indicated. Example 11 demonstrates the use of the thump in addition to holds and barring of the first finger; in this case, the passage would be much easier to perform using right-hand pizzicato rather than the usual left-hand thump.

A final bowed ornament that was used as a novelty similar to pizzicato was striking the strings with the wood of the bow. There was no specific sign for this unusual technique; instead, composers generally wrote a short direction to the performer, as for example in the well-known concluding passage of chords in "Harke, harke," where Hume directs the player to "drum this with the back of your Bow." There are also a few other examples in manuscript sources.

\(^{26}\)The piece by Thomas Mace can be found in a modern edition by Ian Graham-Jones, *Music for the Lyra-Viol*, Book II (West Sussex, 1983), 9. Graham-Jones omits the indication "finger" from his edition. The vertical stroke, once again suggesting the thump, can also be found in a "Corant" by Mr. law[es] (fol. 65)' in Narcissus Marsh's lyra viol manuscript.

\(^{27}\)A modern edition of the piece can be found in Martha Bishop, ed., *Tablature for Two* (Atlanta, 1982), 42–43.
An anonymous and untitled piece in the William Ballet manuscript (see Example 12) bears the indication “For the Back of ye bow,” and since there are no indications that single notes are to be done col legno, the direction might imply that the entire piece is intended to be performed in that manner.


Example 12. Anonymous, untitled piece from the William Ballet lyra viol manuscript, p. 68. “For the back of ye bow.” Tuning: ef/hf—“Alfonsoe way onelly the treble set one note Low.”

28 A modern edition of the piece can be found in Cyri, Tovys, Thumpes, and Ayres, 32.
Another possibility, however, is that the col legno effect may have been intended only for open strings in this example rather than for the entire piece. The quick alternation of col legno and normal bowing gives the piece a playful character, which seems much in keeping with the technique as a grace, and in any case the frequent double stops seem to argue against the possibility that col legno should be used throughout. Another use of the back of the bow as well as the thump in the same piece is found in "My Lady Connelby's Delight" from Peter Leycester's lyra viol manuscript.²⁹

Various types of slurs, pizzicato, and col legno offered players and composer different timbres and expressive devices with which to experiment, but by far the greatest number of ornament signs represent graces or embellishments that are performed with the left hand. A survey of these, and explanations of how they are performed, will be the subject of Part II of this article.

The tonal realization of this trio has always been a major headache for organists. Rust¹ assumes that the original version was a lost cantata movement, and he suspects an obbligato cello part in the original. Schweitzer speaks of a "strange impression" that this trio makes, and holds that "it is reminiscent of a transcription of a piece from a cantata."² The work exists in three distinct versions: BWV 660, 660a, and 660b.³ Version BWV 660 (marked a due Bassi) is an arrangement from Leipzig of the Weimar version BWV 660a, which bears the designation à 2 claviers et pédales. It is one of the so-called "Seventeen Leipzig Chorales." A third version, BWV 660b, presumably does not originate with Bach.⁴ For our pur-

²⁹See Abbey, "Sir Peter Leycester's Book on Music," 40. The piece is on folio 1 of the manuscript.

²A. Schweitzer, J. S. Bach (Leipzig, 1908), 269.
⁴NBA 4/2, Critical Commentary, 76.
poses, the older (Weimar) version BWV 660a is of particular interest. It differs from the final version BWV 660 in the following points:

1. The ornamental elaboration of the cantus firmus has a more *cantabile* effect, since it generally avoids large melodic leaps.

2. Both of the chords in the left-hand part (measures 15 and 42) are furnished with arpeggio signs in BWV 660a.

3. The final chord in BWV 660a is a G-major chord, while BWV 660 has a G-minor chord.

The piece is exceptional among Bach’s works in the way in which the parts are handled: two animated bass parts, which imitate one another and frequently cross, accompany a decorated cantus firmus in anticipatory imitation. The two bass parts are assigned to the left hand and the pedal. The two four-note chords that occur in the higher bass part can easily sound awkward on the organ, due to the unprepared increase in sonority. There is no parallel example anywhere else in Bach’s organ works of a strictly contrapuntal movement in three parts in which chords suddenly appear in one part. In viola da gamba music, however, this is not unusual. Due to its tuning in fourths and third, the viol is much better suited for playing chords than the instruments of the violin family. If one wishes to regard this chorale setting as an adaptation for organ of a cantata movement, then the viola da gamba is quite possibly the best choice for the execution of the middle part. Both of the chords are impossible to play on the cello because of their close spacing. On the viol, however, both chords of the BWV 660a version lie very comfortably. One might still object that—as his procedure in the Schübler Chorales suggest—surely Bach was by no means obliged to reproduce the entire score without alterations when making his organ transcription. Thus one should not completely rule out the possibility that the original middle voice was somewhat differently constituted and contained chords in open spacing that are playable on cello. On the other hand, the chords as they appear in the organ version do turn out to be particularly idiomatic to the viol (especially the D-major chord).

It is striking that the final chord of BWV 660a is a G-major chord. Granted that Bach’s minor movements frequently end with a major chord, nevertheless in this piece the major chord has a somewhat unexpected effect. Bach must also have sensed this, as otherwise he likely would not have replaced the major chord with a minor chord in the final version BWV 660. The minor chord, however, is playable on the viol only with great effort. (In the first movement of the G-minor viola da gamba sonata Bach omits the third of the final chord in the viol part.)

Equally striking is the difference in range between the two bass parts. The higher bass part, ranging from D to g', corresponds exactly with the range of the first position on the bass viol, while the lower part (C–d') can be played entirely in first position on the cello.

When the higher bass part is played on the viol, the effect produced by the two four-note chords is very much more convincing than on the organ. And if the chords are played arpeggiated, the strings will continue to resonate for a relatively long time after they are struck, since the fret (unlike the finger on the fingerboard of the cello) causes only a slight dampening of the string. The sound produced in this way has an effect that is not nearly so heavy as a solid block chord played on the organ.

We should not fail to notice that the lowest part has been devised throughout in a way that suits the pedal, thus permitting the performance of the sixteenth-note passages with alternating toes. On the one hand, it would be conceivable that Bach carried out some small retouchings to the supposed archetype; on the other hand, it is also possible that the archetype could have happened purely by chance to correspond to the pedal technique. These sorts of figurations are not at all uncommon in Bach’s compositions.

Although vocal execution of a decorated cantus firmus is certainly not a frequent occurrence in Bach’s music, nevertheless some examples do exist. The vocal technical difficulties of the soprano line of BWV 660a are no greater than what is usual in Bach, whereas the vocal execution of the cantus firmus in BWV 660 would be appreciably more difficult. The possibility should

---

5Examples are found, for instance, in Cantatas 137 (second movement), 40 (fourth movement), 180 (third movement), and 80 (second movement).
not be entirely ruled out that this chorale setting might have been performed purely instrumentally (say, with oboe on the cantus firmus)—possibly as a prelude to a cantata—even though there are no other parallel instances of this, either. In the only purely instrumental chorale setting that occurs in Bach’s cantatas, the eighth movement of Cantata 75, the accompaniment is a four-part orchestral texture, and the cantus firmus is played by the trumpet. The thin texture of BWV 660a more likely indicates a chamber scoring with voice.

The foregoing arguments may be taken to suggest that this piece derives from a (now lost) chorale setting for soprano solo, obbligato viola da gamba, and basso continuo.

If a cello is chosen for the continuo instrument, the first bass part will stand out against the continuo part because of the distinctly brighter tone color of the viol. The viol forms, so to speak, a tonal bridge between the cello and the soprano voice. Execution of the middle part on cello would appreciably disturb the tonal balance. (In the aria “Laß mein Herz die Münze sein” from Cantata 163, the only aria of Bach’s with two obbligato cellos, the relationship among the parts is materially different: the solo voice in the bass register is accompanied by two cellos and an independent continuo part, so that in this case we are dealing with four obbligato bass parts.) The continuo instrument (organ) must have followed along with the cello part, even where it lies above the viol part. In such places, Bach’s bass figuring that may once have existed would not have given any information about the actual chord inversions that are present. The figuring would thus have to have referred to the note of the cello part, without taking into account the register of the viol part. It appears doubtful that notes that lay below the cello part would have been included in the figuring. There is no example in Bach’s works of a place where the thoroughbass player would have frequently switched back and forth between two bass parts, following the lower one at any given moment. Dropping the bass line an octave lower through the use of the double bass would greatly disturb the carefully balanced equilibrium between the two bass parts, since the second bass part is of equal importance with the first and does not have the character of a continuo part at all. A further argument against the use of the double bass is offered by two places in the musical text: measure 13, fourth and fifth eighth note, and measure 22, first eighth note. In these places, even with the bass an octave lower in the 16-foot register, the viol part would still lie a fifth or a third respectively below the double-bass part. The resulting sonority would be quite unsatisfactory.

It is no longer possible to determine to which strophe of the chorale text this setting originally belonged. For practical use, therefore, the obvious course is to underlay the first verse. A thoroughbass realization would also have to be reconstructed.

The doubts that Hans Klotz expressed concerning the authenticity of version BWV 660b can only receive further confirmation from the convincing overall effect of version BWV 660a in performance with soprano, viola da gamba, and continuo. It seems puzzling that Rust should single out the BWV 660b version for his conjecture of a prototype with solo cello.

The following conclusions for organists are suggested by the insights that we have gained:

1. Both bass parts should use an 8-foot registration.
2. The first bass part’s registration must be richer in overtones than the second. For both bass parts, restrained tone colors that provide a clear contrast are advisable, and one should refrain from the use of high mutations. [Translator’s Note: The German term *Aliquote* can refer to all organ ranks that reinforce the upper harmonics, including those incorporated in mixture stops and sometimes octaves of 2-foot pitch or higher. It is therefore somewhat broader in scope than the nearest English equivalent, “mutations.”]

3. Both of the four-note chords will possibly sound better, at least in a reverberant space, if they are arpeggiated rather than being played as block chords.

Finally, let it be remarked that the organ version BWV 660 is in no sense an “improved compositional revision” of version BWV 660a, but rather just a recasting of the cantus firmus

---

6See note 4.
7See note 1.
8Keller, *Orgelwerke*, 188.
according to the technical possibilities of the organ as opposed to the more restricted agility of the voice.

If we must live with the knowledge that Bach's solo movements for viola da gamba are not exactly numerous, at least we can take consolation from the fact that an appreciable enlargement of the original viol literature by Bach may now result from the addition of this piece.

The author extends cordial thanks to Dr. Alfred Dürr (Boven den) for his kind suggestions.


a. *Nun komm' der Himmelich.*

a 2 Clav. o Pedale

(*Nach dem Autograph*)
RECENT RESEARCH ON THE VIOL

Ian Woodfield

This bibliography is intended as a concise guide to recent research related to the viol. It lists books, articles, dissertations, selected reviews, published papers, and major scholarly editions of music. Research on any aspect of the viol (and related instruments such as the baryton) will qualify for inclusion. Suggestions for additional entries in any language would be most welcome. They should be sent to Ian Woodfield, School of Music, Queen's University of Belfast, Belfast BT7 1NN, Northern Ireland.


**REVIEWS**


A colleague once said about directing a collegium: “We have a band director who takes care of wind music after 1800, an orchestra director who handles string music after 1750, and a choral director who does vocal music after 1700. I do the rest.” This presents an enormous challenge, and the breadth of knowledge needed for directing an early music ensemble goes beyond chronology and repertory. Often a director finds herself coaching an advanced student through nuances of ornamentation and shading while at the same time helping a frustrated student who can’t get his crumhorn to sound.

Resources to meet such wide needs must perform be either comprehensive, or multitudinous and diverse. While there is no lack of the latter in specialized journals and monographs, comprehensive resources for those just starting—or even for those with established early music programs—have been rare. *A Performer’s Guide to Renaissance Music* (along with the rest of the proposed series, which will treat music from the Middle Ages to the Early Romantic period) aims to fill that gap by providing an introduction to the most important issues facing the director or performer in an early music ensemble.

The present volume is an expanded version of a typescript manual produced and distributed by Early Music America. The original had served a small readership well, and this improved version and its companions promise to be a vital source for directors and performers alike. The authors of the *Performer’s Guide* represent a rich mix of scholars, performers, and collegium directors (often combined in a single person). This provides an excellent balance of idealistic and pragmatic viewpoints that both challenges readers and reassures them as they try to solve the problems they face.

The *Performer’s Guide* is divided into ten main sections that fall neatly under four large headings. The first part of the book...
deals with instruments and technique and includes sections on vocal and choral issues along with discussions of wind, string, percussion, and keyboard instruments. The second part of the book addresses ensemble issues and includes discussions of "proto-continuo" practice and instrumentation. These are followed by a set of seemingly disparate contributions: "Performance Practice" (tuning and temperament, pitch and transposition, and pronunciation), "Practical Considerations" (editions, copyright, publicity, and program notes), "Aspects of Renaissance Theory," "Renaissance Dance," and "For the Early-Music Director." The organization of these final sections is unfortunate, for it tends to reduce many of them to the status of appendices (as indeed some were in the original). The chapters on dance and theory, for example, could easily have fit under the rubric of "Performance Practice," while "For The Early-Music Director" would better have been placed under "Practical Considerations." Thus all these chapters could fit into two larger, more coherent sections to balance the first two. I will use this four-fold division in my discussion of the book.

Instruments and Techniques

The first part of the book presents an extremely valuable series of chapters on voices and instruments by noted practitioners or ensemble directors. These include Ellen Hargis (the solo voice), Alexander Blachly and Alejandro Planchar (vocal ensembles), Herbert Myers (recorder, flute, and harp), Jeffery Kite-Powell (crumhorn and racket), Ross Duffin (shawm and curtal), Douglas Kirk (cornett), Stewart Carter (sackbut), Wendy Gillespie (early bowed strings), David Douglass (violin), Paul O'Dette (plucked instruments), Ben Harms (percussion), Jack Ashworth (keyboard instruments), and Mark Lindley (keyboard fingering).

It is perhaps to this section that the reader will most often turn, since many of us faced with the frustrated crumhorn player have precious little experience on the instrument ourselves. The different chapters vary in depth and breadth, most often in inverse proportion to the familiarity of the instruments. For this reason, readers of this Journal might well be disappointed by Gillespie's chapter on bowed strings. Here the viola da gamba is merely a part of the general discussion (including a rather lavish three paragraphs on the tromba marina). The purpose of many of these chapters, however, is not to "preach to the choir," but to aid in those areas that have either been considered the province of specialists (for example, the cornett, which receives an extensive and masterful introduction by Kirk) or have only recently been embraced by the early music director (the violin, for instance, covered with real passion by Douglass).

In addition to providing excellent basic information about an instrument and its technique, many chapters include material of general interest. Again, Kirk's article can be singled out, this time for its excellent treatment of intonation and ornamentation. In all cases, historical information is brought to the aid of practical concerns. Many authors take pains to discuss who played these instruments (professional or amateur) and in what context. This imparts a deeper insight into matters of repertory and style. For example, Duffin's article on shawms and curtals and Myers's on recorders give detailed and helpful examples of ensemble possibilities and repertoire. Kite-Powell's on the crumhorn goes so far as to list particular published collections most suitable for the instrument. Another important element covered is the selection of instruments for a growing program. One chapter worthy of special note is Lindley's on Renaissance keyboard fingering. The discussion is an enlightening one and, as he notes, even if these techniques are not employed (and they are certainly counterintuitive for the modern pianist), they provide a great deal of insight into phrasing, rhythm, and ornamentation.

The three chapters on voice and vocal ensemble are equally helpful. These are vital topics for an instrumentalist working with singers, and handled expertly. Hargis provides good information on vocal production along with excellent advice for repertoire. Perhaps more important, she discusses problems the ensemble director faces in dealing with young vocal students and their teachers. Fortunately, most voice teachers are very willing to have their students participate in an early music program when they are confident that the director has a good understanding of the voice as a developing instrument. And while Hargis does not (and cannot) provide a full tutorial, she does give the reader enough
information to discuss matters intelligently with the voice teacher. Likewise, the two chapters by Planchart and Blachly provide information as well as reassurance to directors who do not have a strong choral background, and practical tips for those who do. Each covers the same material (vocal production, phrasing, text, pitch, tempo, and tuning) in complementary fashions. Where there is disagreement it is primarily in nuance, providing the reader a wider palette of techniques and approaches.

**Ensemble Issues**

The second large section delves into ensemble issues. These contributions encourage us to refine our ideas of instrumentation and orchestration, an area more often prone to convention than to innovation. Ashworth and O'Dette discuss the various "proto-continuo" techniques of the period. These include creating melody and accompaniment settings of lighter genres, the early continuo group of the *Intermedii*, the English consort, organ scores, and the integration of chordal instruments into vocal polyphony. The information offered is basic, but eminently useful (especially in conjunction with O'Dette’s earlier chapter on plucked strings). Especially profitable is the final section, based on the contemporary writings of Agostino Agazzari. However, a marked deficiency in this section is in its subheadings and organization, in which each section has a bibliography inserted between the main discussion and "Suggested Performance," causing some confusion for the reader.

The next two chapters make some of the most interesting reading in the collection. James Tyler and Kite-Powell, while dealing with two ostensibly separate issues (Mixed [smaller] Ensembles and Large Ensembles), manage to stake out two extremes of attitude toward orchestration. Happily, we have left behind the most intractable positions, which contrasted the hyperhistorical view (that unless we could prove that a piece was performed in a certain way, it was illegitimate to attempt it), and the other—overly enterprising—view that "at some time, at some place, they might have played it this way, so let’s go ahead and do it." Tyler and Kite-Powell present the rational remnants of this dichotomy. They contrast the idealism of historical study with the desire for effect and, quite frankly, enjoyment and excitement (not to say that the two are mutually exclusive). For example, Tyler asks these questions before assigning instrumentation:

- What is its country or region of origin?
- What is its date?
- Who is likely to have performed it (amateurs or professionals), and under what circumstances?
- Under what genre does it fall?
- What are the ranges of each part?

He then provides four cogent examples of this procedure for planning orchestration. Compare this with Kite-Powell’s view of forming large ensembles:

... The only limitations in orchestrating [polyphonic pieces] are those of imagination and instrumentarium. There was generally more money allocated [for high feast days] . . . , and it may be that your performance is supposed to reflect just such a festive occasion. (p. 230)

It is, of course, the mixture of history and immediacy represented by these two views that is the heart and soul of early music, and it is a useful tonic to see both approaches side by side.

**Performance Practice**

Under the heading of “Performance Practice,” Frederick Gable provides a short bibliographic essay on performance practice sources, Duffin explains some of the intricacies of tuning and temperament (a difficult subject handled gracefully), and Myers continues the debate on pitch standard (and thankfully, in the end, notes that we are mostly limited by instruments, budget, and student abilities to non-transposing instruments, usually at a’=440). The final chapter in this group is Duffin’s introduction to historical pronunciation. It is, as he notes, largely superseded by the publication of editor Timothy McGee’s *Singing Early Music: An Introductory Guide to the Pronunciation of European Languages in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* (Indiana University Press, 1996). At the same time, the general hints he provides are a useful point of departure for the director or student wishing to pursue this aspect of performance.

Logically connected with these chapters are the later contributions on Renaissance theory (Sarah Mead) and Renaissance
dance (Ingrid Brainard). Mead’s discussion of theory focuses on the most important subjects for the performer: solmization, modes, ficta, and notation. Hers is a cautious approach, and (perhaps purposefully) it sidesteps the current debates over the nature of Renaissance tonality (beginning with Harold Powers’s article in the 1981 issue of the Journal of the American Musicological Society). The strength in this decision is that the model presented (based mainly on Bernhard Meier’s) is a more efficacious one for the performer just beginning her or his study. Still, one would have liked a more up-to-date bibliography in this area. All the other basics are presented lucidly and will be of great help, especially to the student.

Brainard’s impassioned contribution on Renaissance dance is as much a challenge as a practical guide. The use of dance in concert programs is extremely difficult, and when done badly can be little more than a visual distraction. Brainard challenges us to consider investing the time and energy to do it right. To that end she offers information, encouragement, and lists of resources (printed and human) to guide the director in such an endeavor.

Practical Considerations

The remaining chapters all relate to what the editors term “Practical Considerations.” Included are another bibliographic essay by Gable (this on performance editions), a short guide to copyright issues (Phillip Crabtree), publicity (Beverly Simmons), and program notes (Dean Nuemberger). To this group should be added Kite-Powell’s “For the Early-Music Director—Starting from Scratch.” It is easy to neglect these somewhat mundane areas (especially in the last-minute crunch leading to a concert), but they are often make-or-break issues for the ensemble director. Gable’s brief chapter is a cogent guide for the performer looking for trustworthy editions. For those who have taken a basic bibliography course it is not of great use, but for the amateur and younger performer it is an excellent starting point. Crabtree’s discussion of copyright is telling for what it cannot tell us. “Fair use” is such a problematic issue that one would be well advised to read this more as a background for an intelligent conversation with lawyers (which Crabtree is not) and school administrators.

Perhaps someday all these issues will be worked out, but until then, the basics offered here are best considered carefully. Kite-Powell’s and Simmons’s contributions, on the other hand, need no such mulling and soul-searching. Instead, they provide eminently usable material to help the director in first starting an organization (how to justify it within the curriculum, how to recruit and build an instrument collection, etc.) and then keeping it alive through publicity. Both include helpful examples such as press releases, posters, syllabi, and the like. Nuernberger provides an enjoyable discussion of the pros and cons of program notes and their alternatives.

Overall, the book is very well produced. Kite-Powell exhibits a light hand in the editing of the volume. No attempt is made to smooth over disagreement, as for example Harms’s chapter on drum patterns for ensemble dance music and Tyler’s belief that such usage is suspect at best. As readers we have the feeling of overhearing an extended conversation among the authors. At the same time, the editing is consistent (a notable exception being Nuernberger’s exclusive use of masculine pronouns in contrast to the inclusive language of all other authors). There are a few problems, such as an illustration of a “split” key that is not (p. 176), and some missing numbers in fingering patterns (p. 196), but on the whole the editing and presentation deserve praise. Also worthy of praise is a generous bibliography at the end (cited in short form in the body of chapters and in chapter bibliographies), an accurate index, and the many citations of exemplary recordings.

No comprehensive book can satisfy everyone, but this volume should not disappoint anyone. A Performer’s Guide to Renaissance Music belongs on the shelves of all early music enthusiasts, and in the library of any music department with an early music program. It is useful for the director and the performer, as well as for the student just beginning his or her explorations of Renaissance music. In addition, it could serve as a valuable resource for other classes ranging from performance practice to organology. The editors, contributors, and Early Music America deserve a great deal of credit for initiating this

This book is an unusual treatment of an unusual instrument. Central to Italian Renaissance musical and poetic expression and standing as a symbol of humanist learning, the lira da braccio has nevertheless been virtually ignored by modern performers attempting to recapture the sounds of the past. There are various reasons for this oversight. Few original examples are extant, and even fewer are in an unaltered state; much of what else is known or knowable about the instrument is to be gleaned only from artworks and a few tuning diagrams. Its repertory was an improvised one, only scraps of which were written down; its technique, so far as it can be reconstructed, was difficult, involving multiple stops on a fretless fingerboard. Its role, moreover, was generally a lonely one, as a soloist or provider of self-accompaniment to a solo singer. It thus has little to offer for the sort of convivial music-making that fuels much of the modern interest in Renaissance music. Sterling Jones, who is familiar to aficionados of early music through his years of service with the Studio der frühen Musik of Munich, has turned his attention as both scholar and performer to the problems of this neglected instrument, producing a monograph that greatly increases our knowledge of it as a physical object and as a performance medium.

To call his approach “thorough” would (if we may borrow a simile from the columnist Dave Barry) be like calling the Pacific Ocean “damp.” After providing a short historical overview, Jones begins his investigation of the physical nature of the lira da braccio as evidenced by both extant examples and iconography. Jones has identified at least twenty different body outlines, which can be grouped into three basic types: with four corners, like the violin; with two corners; and with no corners but a smoothly indented waist, like the guitar. (A fourth type—oval—has but one pictorial representative, according to Jones.) Surviving examples all fall into the first two categories, four-cornered and two-cornered. There are some ten specimens with some claim to authenticity; Jones provides descriptions, including basic measurements, line drawings (front view), and citations of published photographs. Only three of the ten appear to have their original necks, pegboxes, and fingerboards; a few of the rest have been restored as liras, while others remain in their remodeled state as violas. (These are recognizable as having started life as liras from the characteristic indentation of the lower bouts where the tailpiece is attached—a feature apparently unique to the lira and one found in many, but by no means all, depictions from the period.)

Nearly one hundred items form the basis of the iconographic study that follows. Categorized according to body outline, these are first described verbally; information includes artistic medium, title of work, artist, place and time of origin, present location, and publication data for reproductions, followed by a short account of the instrument depicted and its bow; in many cases the verbal description is accompanied by a small but clear line drawing. Not content to leave the matter here, however, Jones then commits his information to tabular form; the resultant charts occupy no fewer than twenty-six pages. They not only present some information more efficiently than would be possible in prose, but also allow the reader quickly to assess this mountain of detail: Which sources show the “standard” setup of five strings on the fingerboard and two off? Which show an indentation of the lower bouts? Is there any correlation between bridge placement and body shape? Number of strings and artistic medium? Jones has assembled his charts to answer several such questions, particularly those concerning number of strings and pegs, grouping of strings into courses, placement of soundholes, subject matter of artwork, type of player, and characteristics of the bow (including its position and grip). The information from each chart is summarized below it.

Jones then moves on to practical matters of performance, supplying chord charts as well as selected repertoire. As a (usually)
fretless instrument, fingered diatonically, the lira is not well suited to the chromatic form of tablature commonly used for the lute and viola da gamba; Jones’s solution has been to adapt the diatonic tablature system employed in the one surviving source of music for lira (the so-called Pesaro manuscript), adding diacritical marks to its fingering numbers to indicate chromatic alterations. Rhythm is indicated by the accompanying staff notation, obviating the need for the rhythmic symbols appearing in early tablature systems. His chord charts give major, minor, seventh, diminished, and augmented chords (along with major and minor four-three progressions) based on all twelve notes of the chromatic scale. Each chord often admits of several possibilities, depending on inversion, spacing, and left-hand position; Jones gives fingerings in first, second, and third positions, although he acknowledges that there is little evidence for use of positions higher than first (and that their inclusion may thus be of more academic than practical interest). His repertory selections represent the various genres known or thought to have been played on the lira da braccio; they include arrangements of frottole and other vocal works, accompaniments for an early recitative, the two brief examples (both based on the chord pattern of the passamezzo moderno) preserved in the Pesaro manuscript, and an arrangement of a Capriccio for violin by Biagio Marini—a piece that according to its title imitates some of the effects of the lira. Of these selections the recitative (composed by Alfonso della Viola in 1554) is of particular interest, for it is one of the few preserved melodies—perhaps the only one—known to have been sung originally to lira accompaniment. Significantly, it is a bass part, as shown by its behavior at cadences (where it rises by a fourth or falls by a fifth). It thus clearly illustrates the “practice of singing basses accompanied by the sound of the lira” (prattica del dire i bassi accompagnado con il suon della Lyra) mentioned by Silvestro Ganassi (Lettione seconda; Venice, 1543, Chapter 16). Researchers have long recognized the symbiosis between singer/player and instrument implied by Ganassi’s brief comment: the lira provided an easily portable “proto-continuo” in treble or alto range, while the voice (in completing its harmonies below) made up for one of its principal defects—its habit of producing chords in six-four inversion. It is gratifying, however, to see this scholarly understanding borne out in an actual musical example.

The book concludes with an appendix containing facsimiles and transcription of the lira portion of the Pesaro manuscript, as well as editions of two of the pieces on which Jones’s lira arrangements were based: the Italian three-part song Aime sospiri and the Marini Capriccio for violin. (Incidentally, one should not be misled by the title of the latter—Capriccio Per Sonare il Violino con tre corde a modo di Lira—into thinking it is for a three-stringed violin; it is for violin with normal tuning on which the bottom three strings are used in the manner of a lira.)

There was a time when the lira da braccio was thought to have been but a stepping stone in the path to the violin; this idea is even put forth teasingly by the anonymous writer of the sales pitch printed on the back cover of the book. Jones himself, however, is quick to point out that the more plausible theory sees both instruments developing at about the same time; indeed, it would seem the characteristics they share reflect parallel innovations in instrument building. It is generally accepted that the lira developed from the medieval fiddle, an instrument often provided with five strings (four running over the fingerboard and one—the so-called “drone”—running alongside). Such an instrument had long been employed throughout Europe to support solo recitations; circumstantial evidence suggests that near the end of the fifteenth century Italian builders added two strings in a naïve attempt to make their current instrument more plausibly emulate the ancient, seven-stringed lyre—an instrument with which it of course shared little physically, but which was known to have been employed in a similar capacity by the poets of Antiquity. Much work still needs to be done to pin down the particulars of this development. However, failure to grapple adequately with this question represents one of the few flaws in Jones’s iconographic study, for it affects both the selection and evaluation of the examples included. For instance, the famous intarsia representation of a five-stringed fiddle in the studio of Federigo da Montefeltro (Urbino, c. 1480) was deemed to show a sufficient number of lira-like characteristics to be included, while the one in Montefeltro’s Gubbio study (now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York) was not.
(Admission of this oval instrument would, incidentally, have doubled the number of examples of this body type!) Then, too, there is a notable difference in significance between a representation showing five strings from c. 1480 (when that configuration was the norm) and one from the following century (when seven strings had become a defining characteristic of the lira); the former is obviously more likely to reflect reality. Jones appears not to take such distinctions into account.

Tuning is another question less than adequately handled by Jones. The tuning usually regarded as “standard” for the lira is d-d'/g-g'-d'-a'-e" (the slash indicating the division between off- and on-board strings). Ignoring octave doublings, we recognize this as the tuning of a violin with the addition of a “bourdon” or “drone” at a fourth below. However, given the huge range in physical size of extant examples, it is generally understood this represents a nominal or “conceptual” tuning, for only the smallest of them could have actually played at such a high pitch; the real pitch must have been considerably lower. Jones states this is the tuning specified by Giovanni Maria Lanfranco (Scintille di musica; Brescia, 1533). But this information is not quite correct, even though it appears in many musical dictionaries (including Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart and The New Grove); Lanfranco in fact presents only the intervals between strings without committing himself to pitch names. The same intervals—again without pitch names—are given by Jerome Cardan (De Musica, c. 1574—a source not mentioned by Jones). Pietro Cerone (El Melopeo y Maestro; Naples, 1613) repeats the intervals as given by Lanfranco but then suggests c-c'/f-f'-c'-g'-d" as a possible realization in terms of actual pitches; this tuning is, of course, a tone lower than that given above. At this point only the Pesaro manuscript appears to specify the latter. Despite their differences, however, these sources are unanimous regarding the intervals between strings. The real “odd man out” among the sources is Michael Praetorius, who in the Syntagma 2 (Wolfenbüttel, 1619) gives a tuning with a fourth rather than a fifth between the top two strings. Jones claims this is related to the tuning of the medieval fiddle, which could include fourths; however, it seems unlikely (given the evidence of the intervening sources) that any such relationship was a direct one. Jones in any case prefers Praetorius’s tuning, employing it for the majority of his musical examples. The reason for his preference is the enlarged number of options for chords offered by the smaller interval between top strings, but his choice would not appear to have the support of the majority of historical evidence.

Jones’s text is generally quite lucid, the one lapse being in his commentary on the Pesaro manuscript (where some of his explanations are somewhat more abbreviated than they perhaps ought to be). His musical examples are a paragon of typesetting elegance and clarity; the only flaw would seem to be a somewhat casual approach towards transmitting details of the original notation—mensuration signs, note values, clefs, and sometimes even pitches—of his models. All in all, however, the faults identified here represent minor blemishes in an otherwise superbly conceived and presented study.

Herbert Myers


Roland Hutchinson’s detailed and thoughtful review of the first two volumes of Grace Feldman’s monumental pedagogical work appeared in 1995 in volume 32 of this Journal. In addition to making the task of the present reviewer much easier, Hutchinson’s review provides the reader of this overview of the third and fourth volumes with a broader context in which to appraise Feldman’s accomplishments. Volume I covered basic matters: maintenance of the instrument, elementary technique, first position, and extensions. Shifting and half position were the subjects of Volume 2. This review will consider Volumes 3 (sightreading) and 4 (alto and tenor clefs). At the outset it is important again to stress the magnitude and scope of The Golden Viol, a project that will eventually comprise seven volumes. This reviewer concurs heartily with Hutchinson’s overall assessment: it is “a true labor
of love,” and the written summation of the wisdom of a long career of “thoughtful and systematic viol pedagogy.”

The foundation of proper viol technique having been developed in volumes 1 and 2, Feldman has concerned herself in the next two volumes with progressive improvement in the student’s facility and musicianship. A wealth of musical material is provided along with excellent and supportive advice. These methods are a good resource for students who don’t have frequent access to professional instruction or who would like to have a good conscience sitting on their shoulders.

Volume 3 sets out to improve the student’s sight-reading skills. To this end, Feldman rightly focuses the student’s attention on recognizing and practicing melodic and rhythmic patterns. She also teaches how to observe pieces for form and content; a good example is her set of instructions for analyzing a bit of a Purcell fantasia on page 82. Given this emphasis, this volume could be subtitled *How to Play with Musical Sense.* In it Feldman teaches not only sightreading, but how to prepare a piece efficiently, without aimless slogging. As the complexity and difficulty of pieces increase, Feldman gives productive advice on subjects that every student needs to learn and every musician needs to remember, making the work useful for players of any level. Her pointers are stated in a supportive manner, using questions such as “without fingering the instrument, can you envision the shift?” (p. 68), and often including reminders urging the student to “try to play with a consistently beautiful sound,” and “shape the contours of the line.” The tone is practical, yet always positive, with the author’s own personal passions (“this lovely song . . .”, p. 64, no. 2) peeking through.

Feldman’s directions and cautions are born of an observant teacher’s long experience. She gives good reminders for bowing direction and provides fingerings that help to set up sequential patterns, although I personally have a preference in many cases for hiding the shifts in half steps, contractions and use of open strings as transitions. Overall, there are actually not many places where fingerings are given, leaving that process open to personal experimentation and taste.

The pieces and exercises, chosen by Feldman from a variety of sources, or in some cases actually composed by her, provide a valuable collection for practicing patterns, especially those I recognized from Schroeder’s cello studies. She also was inventive in arranging and adapting pieces; for example, she made a composite of the three lowest parts of a Lawes fantasia (p. 85). I agree with Hutchinson, however, that it would be a useful service to both teacher and student to have the specific origins of the adapted pieces given next to each excerpt in the text, and the pieces composed by Feldman likewise credited to her.

Most of the pieces are in treble clef, with the addition near the end of some bass clef. I missed the inclusion of selections in alto clef for an additional challenge in the more advanced pieces, and thought I would find it more useful to gain experience in switching clefs. This aspect of learning, however, was saved by Feldman for inclusion in the fourth volume.

Volume 4, while concentrating primarily on learning the alto and tenor clefs, continues the development of sightreading skills, and includes plenty of material for development of good practice habits and technique. This is accomplished with the inclusion of scales, études and an appropriate choice and variety of pieces ranging from English tunes to French Baroque viol repertoire, and on to arrangements of Renaissance and Baroque pieces, some originally written for other instruments. Volume 4 provides a course of study that is useful not only for intermediate but for advanced players as well. The common-sense reminders (know the name of each note you play; locate “landmark” notes in an unfamiliar clef), her solid advice (on shifting technique, p. 79; “lean-lift” articulation, p. 88; analyzing sixths and deciding the shape of your hand, p. 100) and clear directions (shifting, p. 125), reflect Grace Feldman as a teacher: patient and thorough. She is bent on improving not only physical technique, but also analytical techniques in the service of musicianship.

In her presentation for learning a new clef, there is a nice progression of scales followed by exercises; at first these involve only stepwise motion, and subsequently leaps, while key signatures also progress to three sharps or two flats. This allows the student to work gradually into the clef, and then pieces are
provided on which to gain experience. Many will appreciate the encouragement and opportunity to practice switching clefs from one part to another, and then within a single part. There is also plenty of practice material, and, if repetitive, the pointers provide a good “external conscience” for the student, admonishing one to determine the fingering first, to watch for sequences or other organizing musical features, or to play a scale and an arpeggio first before beginning a piece in a new key.

My only major complaint with Volumes 3 and 4 is that I am bothered by inconsistencies in the presentation. The tables of contents provide a well-organized outline of the material in each volume, but no page numbers are provided, nor are the headings in the text always worded to match the entries in the table of contents. To be sure, if one starts at the front of each volume and then works page by page to the back this poses no problem, but if one is looking specifically for something listed in the table of contents, the only way to do that is by thumbing through the book. The index lists pieces (but not exercises) with page numbers. In Volume 3 this is done in alphabetical order, and in Volume 4, in order of appearance. The source list at the end of Volume 4 partially remedies my complaint about Volume 3, but it doesn’t list all the pieces. In the case of those that are listed, I would like to know where the complete or original versions are published, and for what instrument they were originally written. Volume 4 omitted the list of titles of volumes in the series. It also has a number of errors of omission or misplacement of fingering, clefs, chords, and slurs, including two noticeable instances where one is asked to pay special attention to the (omitted) slurs. I liked the presentation of two Simpson divisions in facsimile and wonder why the Boismortier duets were not also reproduced this way. It would have avoided the greatest concentration of the errors of omission and misplacement.

Some of Roland Hutchinson’s criticisms of the first two volumes are addressed in the fourth. “Lute” fingering is introduced on page 92 with an excellent description of the hand position and the motion used to attain it, although it might have been useful to have introduced it before the double stops on page 81. Feldman makes a distinction in the preface under “pointers on bow direction” in heading number 4 that hooking is commonly used on the pulled bow to adjust direction, answering another of Hutchinson’s concerns. Among other useful information, she has included a very clear description of French ornamentation.

The volumes are attractive and well put together with a sewn binding of good quality. They lie flat quite well and should hold up to repeated use. Finally, in what was a very nice touch in the beauty of presentation, the inclusion of sketches and schematic drawings by the late viol builder Don Warnock now makes this series a fitting memorial to his fine work and memorable artistic personality.

Alice Robbins


I first heard about Andreas Lidl (b.?–d.1789?) from August Wenzinger in 1979 when the Baroque Performance Institute at Oberlin was doing a survey of Austrian music. I enjoyed the faculty performance of a Lidl trio for viol, violin and cello, and even bought the Gasparo LP they recorded that included it, but for some youthful (dumb?) reason I was so eager to focus on Marais and Bach that I actually declined Herr Wenzinger’s generous offer of several Lidl sonatas. That was a mistake that I have regretted many times, but that is finally corrected by the arrival of this new publication from Dovehouse.

Lidl was a viol and baryton virtuoso associated with Haydn at Esterhazy in the early 1770s and later described by Burney following some concerts in London around 1780. Editor Donald Beecher remarks early in his substantial notes that little has been written about Lidl, and indeed this publication devotes easily four times as much space to his biography as the New Grove entry. These biographical notes are elegantly written, reminding me that Beecher is actually a Professor of English at Carleton University in Ottawa. Furthermore, he is more than a casual contributor to
the Dovehouse Series, owned and published in recent years by Loux Music in upstate New York. Beecher was a co-founder of Dovehouse in the late 1970s and brought us many treats in those early days. He is a skilled viol player himself, and one always felt that every piece the series published underwent the scrutiny of not only a scholar but also an enthusiastic performer, searching for significant previously unpublished repertoire clearly presented. Reverend Joseph Loux seems to have maintained much of the original vision of the series, and Beecher states in his notes why we should take notice here:

Lidl, in time, may become, along with Emmanuel Bach, Abel and Schaffrath, one of the more important contributors to the repertoire of the rococo viol, if more such music as the following can be found.

Even if no more of such music can be found, I think Lidl’s music will be useful for those preparing to play the more virtuoso music of Abel and the Berliners. These pieces might help bridge the pedagogical gap between Abel’s “Easy Sonatas,” which are truly idiomatic for the viol, and the Sonatas of C. P. E. Bach, which contain many passages more natural to a keyboard. Lidl’s sonatas are not heavily marked with performance indications like Marais’ suites (although there are articulation signs and a handful of fingerings to which I will refer later), but there is a technical logic to most of the passages that makes it clear they were composed by a viol player. In addition several of Lidl’s ornamented slow movements are nicely laid out so that one can observe side by side the original line and decorated version. Here we have a genuine gamba example of similar but better known ornamentation “tutors” for violin (Corelli–Roger or Geminiani) or flute (Telemann Methodical Sonatas). This is useful stuff for “Kenners” as well as “Liebhabers” (to borrow from C. P. E. Bach), and I intend to practice, perform, and teach Lidl sonatas in the future.

Grateful though I am to my friend Don Beecher for helping to bring Lidl back into my life, there are still some problems with this new edition that must be mentioned. Even though two manuscripts at the Bibliotheque Nationale (B.N.) in Paris are cited as the sources, there is no acknowledgment of permission for such use being requested or granted. Coincidentally I have learned that Hazelle Miloradovitch of Palo Alto has been preparing an edition of these very Lidl pieces for years, but that Peter Ballinger of PRB Productions has had to delay their release waiting for this customary permission. Technically, I suppose that Dovehouse is in the clear because there are no facsimile reproductions in the edition.

Beecher refers to the second of the B.N. manuscripts as a keyboard version of the sonatas that he found useful for clarification of unclear passages in the first manuscript. While it is true that the staves in this second copy are bracketed to look like many late-eighteenth-century keyboard pieces, I am quite certain it was not intended as a keyboard arrangement. The upper part is in alto clef, and there are even markings for open strings (o) in Sonata II. This second manuscript is indeed a neater fair copy than the first, and it does clarify a few details of pitches, rhythm, and articulation. The first copy, however, appears to have had a much livelier past, for it contains many more fingerings as well as apparent changes to long slurs. Neither Beecher nor I has examined the original source at the B.N., although he thanks Stuart Cheney for doing so in his stead. I sure wish I knew from the Dovehouse notes whether these fingerings and slur changes were in the hand of the original copyist or added by a later hand (I can’t tell from a microfilm print). If not Lidl’s own markings, who was playing such things in the early nineteenth century when Beecher assumes the copy to have been made?

Were they copied and played by Vincenz Hauscka, a turn-of-the-century court official in Vienna reported by Pohl to have been a skilled barytonist? What about Sebastian Friedl, a cellist/barytonist who worked in Berlin through 1826? Why are the manuscripts in Paris? Did they come through Féris, who studied such things, or did they belong to Félix Battachon, who attempted a revival of the baryton during the 1846–47 Paris concert season? Perhaps Hazelle Miloradovitch will address such questions.

I am also sorry to report that there are several errors early in the musical text of the edition. On page 1 of Sonata I there are significant articulation errors in m. 7 and m. 14 as well as a miss-
ing trill in m. 9. All of these details are clear in both Paris copies and should not have been missed by editor or publisher. In m. 17 of the first manuscript there is a substantial fingering for a difficult passage. This fingering does not appear in the Dovehouse edition, nor is it even mentioned in the critical notes! Alice Robbins recently showed me a photocopy of the Hannelore Müller manuscript of these sonatas (the very one offered me by Wenzinger in 1979), and Müller had included this fingering. In the first Paris manuscript it certainly looks to be in the hand of the original copyist and yet does not appear in the so-called keyboard version. Again, I hope Miloradovitch will address this if she has indeed examined the original.

Beecher does include two problematic fingerings found in Sonata V that he footnotes rather than including in the end report. I agree that they are cryptic. Both consist of a 1 followed by a dash lasting through the following note in the passage. A nineteenth-century German pedagogue might have used this to indicate a finger-hold (similar to Marais’s tenue), but I wonder if it indicates a same-finger slide from fret to fret (similar to Marais’s coulé de doigt.) It might also suggest a simple shift of position.

At the end of Sonata I (second ending), a “4” printed in the Dovehouse edition looks exactly like a “fourth finger” provided by someone to help play the written-out cadenza. Upon closer examination, one realizes that it is really an endnote number missing a circle, an unfortunate proofing error that can happen in computer notation. The endnote that one consequently does not bother to read is actually an accurate report of the crossed-out notes in the source.

I hope Beecher will also forgive me if I nit-pick at two other details. In his essay he refers to the “stroke accents” and “staccatos,” by which I assume he means the “Strichen” (wedges) and “Punkten” (dots), which are carefully notated in the two manuscripts and which the Dovehouse edition is largely successful in showing. I mention this because scholars of late-eighteenth-century music have been debating the meanings of these notations for over one hundred years now, and Beecher’s perhaps casual descriptions place him in a camp where he may not wish to reside. Are we to presume that all notes with a stroke are to be accented?

(It works for many but not all.) How staccato are the dots to be played? Lidl uses dots as most eighteenth-century composers did—under slurs—a combination that can indicate playing portamento or secco, so some guidance would be helpful.

In Sonata I, mvt. 3, m. 27, Beecher has reconstructed some double stops in a cadential passage. His endnote reports what seems to show in the first manuscript, which I agree is not usable. The second manuscript shows only single notes without double stops, but indicates a standard 4–3 cadential formula. I am sorry to observe that Beecher’s solution, while playable and even pretty, suggests that he needed to consult the other manuscript for its clearer expression of an eighteenth-century convention. Hannelore Müller, for instance, selected the simpler 4–3 form for her copy. I look forward to Miloradovitch’s solution.

Beecher also mentions the viol and cello sonatas of the Ester­hazy cellist Hammer, and he encourages a further investigation of these works, although he admits he has not seen them. I have not seen them either, but Roland Hutchinson tells me that one is nearly identical to one of these Lidl works.

Finally, I want to return to the question of whether more such rococo viol music can be found. These Lidl sonatas are definitely idiomatic “viol” music. Even though Lidl was also a baryton virtuoso, these sonatas don’t require any plucking of sympathetic strings, although they might sound lovely played on a baryton with the extra resonance and buzzing timbre so maligned by Burney. I think that these pieces might even have been originally intended for solo baryton, the cello part being an alternative to self-accompaniment with the plucked strings.

On the other hand, many of the early Haydn baryton trios don’t require any plucked notes, especially the ones Haydn wrote while Prince Esterhazy was still figuring the thing out (I thank John Hsu for this bit of information). Haydn composed pedagogically graded pieces for his boss, gradually adding difficulties through the years. I love my baryton, but it is possible to play some of these pieces on a vanilla bass viol. Yes, one misses the unique baryton timbre, and some of Haydn’s plucked passages are moments of genius; but there sure is a lot of good music waiting to be played by people who may not be ready to buy barytons! And
they should all own an edition of Lidl to prepare themselves for it. Perhaps within the next year Beecher and Dovehouse will release the other three sonatas just as the Miloradovitch/PRB edition comes out. Herr Wenzinger would be pleased to see Lidl receiving so much attention.

Brent Wissick


The completion of George Hunter's editions of Ward's music of five parts will have been eagerly awaited by many players who had obtained the previously issued set from Northwood Music of Ward's Five-Part Consort Music. Ward was one of the more prolific composers of Jacobean viol consort music, leaving us over fifty works for two, three, four, five, and six viols as well as several verse anthems. The absence of extant three-part music could perhaps be attributed to the habit of a later era, described by Roger North, of using consort partbooks to light fires or make kites, a practice now severely deplored by musicologists and players alike.

For some time now, musicologists have debated whether there were two John Wards who were composing around the same time. For example, see the article by Robert Ford, "John Ward of Canterbury" in this Journal 23 (1986), 51–63. However, more recently Dr. Ian Payne has published an important article in Chelys 23 (1994), 1–15, entitled "John Ward (c. 1589–1638): The Case for One Composer of the Madrigals, Sacred Music and Five- and Six-Part Consorts." In the course of preparing all of Ward's five- and six-part works for Musica Britannica, Payne has done considerable research into Ward's biography as well as his music, and he is of the opinion that the music was the work of one composer only.

John Ward the composer was in the service of Sir Henry Fanshawe from c. 1607–1616, primarily because his father was lifelong retainer to Fanshawe's wife Elizabeth. Sir Henry had an excellent musical establishment, was in royal service as King's Remembrancer of the Exchequer in London, and was a friend of Prince Henry, who died in 1613. In his article "Sir Henry Fanshawe and Two Sets of Early Seventeenth-Century Part-Books at Christ Church, Oxford," Music and Letters (1976), 11–24, John Aplin suggests that the two elegies by Ward on the death of Prince Henry were commissioned by Fanshawe.

Of importance here is that Ward would have come into contact with musicians in the service of Prince Henry, who in 1612 included Alfonso Ferrabosco II, Walter Quinn, John Bull, Robert Johnson, Thomas Lupo, Thomas Cutting and Thomas Ford. Other musicians in royal service included Coprario, Gibbons, Campion, and Tomkins. Cross-influences and fertilization from composers of this caliber produced some of the best of the viol consort's repertoire, and the Ward works under review here are no exception.

Payne suggests that at Fanshawe's death in 1616, Ward's circumstances changed considerably for the worse. Sir Thomas Fanshawe inherited Sir Henry's estate but did not maintain the domestic music in his household. Ward took the position of attorney for Fanshawe and probably was involved more in administration in London for the rest of his life. Yet as Payne states, this had the advantage of bringing Ward into a new London circle of musicians, including Thomas Myriell.

It is interesting to note the possible dates of composition of the five- and six-part consorts by Ward. His First Set of Madrigals was published in 1613. All of the five-part works appear in Tregian's large manuscript collection now known as Egerton MS 3665. Tregian died in 1619, so dates between 1612 and 1619 would appear logical.

Ward's works must have been popular; like his contemporaries Coprario, Gibbons, White, Ferrabosco II, and others, his works appear in many English sources, particularly Christ Church Oxford and the British Library.

Like his contemporaries, Ward composed organ parts to many of his consorts, but these have been omitted in the Northwood Music editions. In fact, the organ is not even mentioned in The Italian Madrigal Fantasies, and the organ sources (Och MS 436...
and 67) are not listed in Hunter’s critical commentary at the end. This omission is regrettable even if only for musicologists who may refer to this edition. The omission of an organ part in the music is also a shame, although perhaps it could be argued that most players do not have access to a suitable chamber organ and the music will more likely be played without one. The cost of this edition is certainly very reasonable, and perhaps would have been higher with the addition of an organ part. But PRB Productions, the VdGS-GB Supplementary Publications, and other publishers make such organ parts available, and I think it is preferable to do so.

The five works in this edition are textless madrigal fantasies, with the exception of “Cor mio,” where a text was written under the bass part of the Egerton manuscript. Hunter has added words to the other parts “to show what the original version of the piece might have been and to serve as a guide to the interpretation of this highly emotional work.” This is most helpful, and as with the madrigal fantasies of Coprario (also found in Egerton 3665), one often laments the lack of a text to assist the players. My consort did exactly this when playing through the other four fantasies.

Hunter’s introduction is generally helpful, though relatively brief. He gives a biographical snippet, a paragraph on Italian madrigals and their influence on this genre, then short descriptions of the five pieces: “Cor mio,” “Non fu senze,” “Leggiadra sei,” “Dolce languir,” and “La rondinella.” He ends with a quote from Ward’s dedication of his 1613 madrigal collection. I would have welcomed slightly more discussion of Ward and his sources, but this might have necessitated an extra page and the whole edition as it fits twenty-four pages neatly.

The commentary is at the back of the score. Hunter includes the ranges of each piece in a neat table, followed by a list of the sources of the viol parts only. He creates his own abbreviations for the sources instead of using the better-known library sigla that can be found in the Thematic Index of Music for Viols and other reference works. This is a shame for musicologists who know the other sigla, and who have to keep turning the page from the actual commentary back to the list. His guidelines to the commentary seem clear, and the actual commentary is laid out in tabular form, which is more commonly used now than the “knitting pattern” format in Musica Britannica. The typefaces are easy to read, and presentation is very neat. Another small quibble is that Hunter’s numbering of the pieces does not follow the Meyer numbers used elsewhere; nor does he refer to them, which would have been useful, at least in the commentary.

As to the music: this is computer set, neat and very readable. The score gives brief incipits indicating original clefs, key, and first note, and as expected we can see that the music is untransposed and note values untampered with. Page numbers at the top rather than the bottom corners would have been welcome, but at least they are there. The translation of “Cor mio” on page 5 of the score is also welcome, but it is a shame that it is not given in the partbooks too. There is some space at the end of “La Rondinella” or under “Non fu senze” that would have permitted a compressed translation. At least it is there in the score.

One practice that is not welcome is that of “floating” time signatures above the staff for the odd measure of 6/2 that creeps into many of the pieces. These single bars are never “corrected” by a signature indicating a return to the normal meter, and this can be a real problem in the viol parts, where the change occurs during or followed by rests. I have been trapped by this several times in the treble 1 part of the first fantasia of the companion edition, where one busily counts rests wrongly and disrupts the proceedings accordingly, and a similar trap occurs in the treble 2 and bass parts of “Non fu senze” in this edition, namely at measures 25 and 40. When players have to resort to writing in these corrections, it is time for editors to take note!

The presentation of the viol parts is very good and clear, as is usual in these editions. Occasionally an accidental is slightly cramped, a tie may overlap a staff line, or perhaps a busy section is given a little more space by cramming up a less complicated one, but these are very minor quibbles. The music is good and satisfying, and has a great deal for consorts to work on in interpretation. We enjoyed the cycle of fifths in “Dolce languir” (shades of Ferrabosco’s “Hexachord” fantasies?), surprising though it was, and the section from measure 45 to the end, which brought to mind the end of the sixth fantasia from the companion...
volume which is one of our favorites. We also felt the influence of Coprario in some of the motifs.

I acknowledge the assistance of my consort Ye Vyalls in playing through and commenting on this edition. We had previously discovered the companion volume, so this was a welcome addition.

Patrice Connelly
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