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EDITORIAL NOTE

Research into English viol player-composers accounts for both articles in the present volume, as well as three of the editions under review. Harmonic and tonal manifestations of the Age of Exploration in Alfonso Ferrabosco the Younger’s fantasias are the topic of Bruce Bellingham’s article. Stephen Morris shares from his recently completed Ph.D. dissertation new findings on the sources, style, and nomenclature of William Young’s three-part consorts. Viol research and bibliography are once again brought up to date thanks to Ian Woodfield’s painstaking annual survey.

English music continues to be highlighted in a pair of reviews that evaluate two modern editions of lyra duos and chamber ensemble music, as well as a facsimile of the Manchester lyra viol manuscript. Three editions of German and Austrian eighteenth-century chamber music with viol are also reviewed. Finally, Herb Myers reviews the long-awaited volume of essays read at the Italian viol conference in Magnano in 2000.

I owe heartfelt thanks to each of the authors, reviewers, and readers who contributed to this volume. Above all I again thank my colleagues Jean Seiler, David Dreyfuss, and George Houle, without whose careful work this Journal could not be brought together.

Stuart Cheney
WILLIAM YOUNG’S FANTASIAS a3, BY ANOTHER NAME, STILL SOUND AS SWEET...

Stephen Morris

Consort players are acquainted with William Young’s fantasies for three viols, available in a modern edition by Rita Morey.¹ These works are a good introduction to the composer: they are well crafted and engaging, with a pleasing variety of textures and endless melodic invention. With respect to nomenclature, however, they may not be quite what they have seemed. This point will be made clearer in the course of the discussion that follows.

The primary source is London’s Guildhall Library, Gresham Collection, GB-gc MSS G 469-471 (hereafter referred to as the Gresham source). The Gresham Collection catalog describes this manuscript as of late-seventeenth-century origin, suggests that it is copied in “several” hands, and goes on to reveal that it consists of three partbooks in octavo format, containing, alongside works by Jenkins, Locke, and Becker, a series of nine “fantasias” a3 by Young (“fansies” and “fantazies” are spellings also used in the manuscript).² Since the compilation of the catalog, Pamela Willetts has determined that there was a single scribe, one Stephen Bing.³

An additional source, but only for the first four trios, is a manuscript in the King’s Library collection of the British Library, GB-Lbl RM 20.h.9 (hereafter referred to as the King’s Library source). This is a single volume copied in score, containing works

¹ VdGS Supplementary Publications No. 150 (c. 1984) and No. 151 (c. 1986). Hereafter, VdGS edition.

² A Catalogue of the Printed Books and Manuscripts Deposited in Guildhall Library (London: Gresham Music Library, 1965), 78. The portion of the catalog dealing with manuscripts was completed by Margery Anthea Baird.

by Purcell, Blow, Reading, and Rosingrave. The readings differ little from those found in the Gresham source. Worth mentioning is that the King’s Library version, uniquely, includes a sparsely figured continuo part, paralleling the bass viol part although somewhat simpler. Noteworthy also is the use of “sonnatas” rather than “fantasias” as a title in this source. However, since the modern edition follows the Gresham source in using the title “fantasias,” these works have been accepted by modern players as examples of that genre.

Recently a new source for these works has been identified. This is an exciting development for several reasons. Ranging from most practical to most esoteric, these may be framed as follows: first, because it permits correction of a few seemingly erroneous readings in the VdGS edition; second, because it offers tidbits of biographical information on the composer; and third, because the title confirms that Young conceived of these works not as fantasies but as sonatas. In the following discussion, consideration of the biographical information takes pride of place; other points are then considered in the order listed.

The New Source

But first a description is in order together with an account of the circumstances leading up to the identification of the new source. It resides in the private library of the family of Dr. Leopold Goëss.

---

4 It may not be foremost in practical value, but new biographical information is of great interest to historians.

5 The Gresham source is listed as the primary source because it is apparently the only complete source, in having parts for three viols for all nine fantasies. But this may be overly simplistic, and it is certainly deceptive. As noted above, the King’s Library source has three parts plus continuo for the first four pieces, though nothing at all for the last five. The newly discovered source has only one surviving partbook, for treble viol. But this source was almost certainly prepared under the supervision of the composer. If it was the basis of both the Gresham and King’s copies, as seems likely, then the presence of continuo parts in the King’s source can be assumed to represent Young’s intentions for all the pieces. In sum, since Gresham lacks the continuo, King’s lacks five pieces, and the new source lacks all but the treble partbook, it is probably safe to say that none of the surviving sources is complete in all the component parts. But if the print was prepared by Young, and subsequently became the source for the Gresham version, then the title “sonatas” should on this basis be deemed preferable to “fantasias.”
(i.e. Count Goëss: the owner is a member of the Austrian nobility), at his family’s seat of Schloss Ebenthal, Klagenfurt, in the southern Austrian province of Carinthia. Some readers may recognize the Goëss name. Their library was mentioned in articles dealing with manuscripts for lute and lyra viol uncovered by the American lutenist Douglas Alton Smith a quarter century ago and subsequently inventoried by Gordon Dodd, Tim Crawford, and others. During this inventory process the new source was erroneously identified as a copy of the violin partbook to Young’s 1653 publication of *Sonate à 3. 4. e 5*. Austrian musicologist Marc Struemper, visiting Schloss Ebenthal recently in connection with a study of the history of viol music in the region, took a closer look. Aware of my doctoral research on Young, Mr. Struemper wrote asking about Young’s published sonatas from 1659. It was the first I had heard of any such works. In response to questioning, Mr. Struemper sent photocopies of the music, which I was able to identify as the treble viol parts of Young’s erstwhile “fantasias” a3. The title page reads:

Soprano. / Sonate / à 3 Viole. / Dedicata / All’ / Illustrissimo & Reverendissimo Prencipe / Guidobaldo, Arcivescovo, e Prencipe / di Salzburg, legato nato della / sede apostolica. / composta / da Guglielmo Young, aiutante di camera di S.A. Ser. / Ferdinando

---

6 The Goëss collection has a RISM identifier, *A-ETgoëss*, for Austria-Ebenthal, Goëss family library, but the print in question has not been given a RISM number. In this paper it will be referred to as the Goëss source. I should like at this point to acknowledge Dr. Leopold Goëss, by whose kind permission quotes from the new source are included in this article.


8 Tim Crawford, in his “General Preface” to Tree Editions’ *Goëss B – Pieces for Viol* (1993, unpaginated), writes, “…the Goëss library at Schloss Ebenthal also contains an unrecorded copy of the first violin part of his extremely rare printed collection *Sonata a 3, 4, e 5* (Innsbruck, 1653).”
Carlo Arciduca / d’Austria. / Innsprug, Appresso Michel Wagner. 
L’anno M.DC.LIX. 

It is laid out in oblong octavo. On the flyleaf appears a bookplate identifying it as “ex libris Graf von Goëss.” In the upper left-hand corner of the flyleaf, above the bookplate, is an apparent shelf number, 4770 XV, and the indication “f.11” referring presumably to the eleven folios that constitute the volume. These include one for each of the nine sonatas, one title page, and one folio on whose recto side is a dedication to Guidobaldo [von Thun], Prince Archbishop of Salzburg, and on whose verso are two curious letters: one from “the author” addressed “to Professors of music,” and a second from Athanasius Kircher to Young, supporting the latter’s claim to being the inventor of an eight-stringed lyra viol. The dedication and letters, together with a translation, appear in an appendix at the end of this article.

Fresh Insights into Young’s Biography

As anyone who has looked into Young’s life will know, biographical information on the composer is scarce. What is known may be summed up in a few words. He was mentioned in Rousseau’s Traité de la Viole as one of several violists who spread the English style of playing to the Continent. But other than manuscript copies of his music in several British libraries, together with a few pieces in anthologies by Playford, little actual trace of Young has surfaced in Britain. Anthony Wood wrote that he was “bred in Rome”; however, it has been assumed that this refers to his religious sympathies rather than to his birthplace. It has also been assumed that he removed himself to the Continent during the ascent of Cromwell, although circumstances of the emigration have not been uncovered. Young turns up in archival records at the court of Archduke Ferdinand Karl of Innsbruck in 1653. That year
he published his *Sonate* for violins, bass viol, and continuo, and dedicated them to his new employer. Young would die and be buried in Innsbruck in 1662, having made one trip home coincident with the Restoration of Charles II.\(^{10}\)

The dedication to the 1659 collection of *Sonate* is the first evidence to come to light of a patronage relationship between Young and Guidobaldo von Thun, Prince Archbishop of Salzburg from 1654 to 1668. The Archbishop’s family belonged to Austria’s nobility and clearly enjoyed some connections: Guidobaldo’s father was Imperial Governor in Prague, and a stepbrother succeeded Guidobaldo as Prince Archbishop after a brief interval. But despite Young’s flattering language, and despite the fact that he was elevated to the rank of Cardinal before he died, Guidobaldo was apparently a minor light in the Salzburg firmament. What gave rise to Young’s impression that Guidobaldo was suffused with “fame” remains unclear.\(^{11}\) Young’s dedication offers little insight into the nature of his relationship with the cleric. Account books from the administration of Ferdinand Karl are not much help. They do however document several trips the composer made, either with or on behalf of the Archducal court. Included among these is a trip undertaken by Young and Marc Antonio Cesti (another of the Archduke’s house musicians) to Regensburg in April of 1654, during a session of the Imperial Diet.\(^{12}\) The musicians spent a month in

---


\(^{11}\)References to Guidobaldo are found in several sources, including *Hierarchia Catholica Medii et Recentioris Aevi* (Regensburg, 1935), 292, 302, 379, 380. A list of the Archbishops of Salzburg together with the dates of their tenure may be consulted at http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Archbishop+of+Salzburg. An article on the Thun-Hohenstein family in *Enciclopedia Italiana* vol. 33 (Rome, 1937) provides the additional information that the title dates only from 1629, and that it was bestowed for services rendered to the Holy Roman Emperor. The article does not state whether Guidobaldo himself was the individual ennobled or whether he inherited the title from his father.

\(^{12}\)Tiroler Landesarchiv, Kammer Raitbuch 1655, Band 186, f. 788 contains a record of a payment of 64 florins to Anderren Mayr, coachman, for taking Cesti
Regensburg where Young played before the Emperor. This trip may have taken them through Salzburg. In any case Thun would have been in attendance at the Diet since he held a seat on the Ecclesiastical Bench. Thus the acquaintance of the musician and the archbishop may stem from that visit. If not, they would have had other occasions to meet. Innsbruck itself lay within Guidobaldo’s Archiepiscopal See, so Guidobaldo would frequently have been a guest at the Innsbruck court.

Still, why Young chose to dedicate his book of viol sonatas to Guidobaldo remains unclear. It may indicate some dissatisfaction with his situation in Innsbruck. Although Ferdinand Karl was enamored of the arts, he was notoriously poor as an administrator and was chronically short of cash. Salary payments to household staff were often in arrears, sometimes by several years. One surviving financial record from September of 1657 documents a payment made to Young in exchange for a gold medal or chain, which may have been previously given to him by the Archduke, and which he was selling back to the Court. Young was at the top of the pay scale for court musicians, with a salary of 600 florins, but it seems likely that the sale was necessary precisely because he had not received his normal pay. Under such straitened circumstances


See Senn, *Musik und Theater*, 256. Senn mentions documentation of a payment to “the Englishman” for playing before the Emperor.

For Ferdinand Karl’s appreciation of the arts, a comment attributed to his court’s Chancellor at the start of his reign is telling. Chancellor Anton Girardi, apparently convinced that Ferdinand Karl was an intellectual lightweight, saw a future filled with only “Masques, comedies, balls, and nothing else.” Quoted in Jutta Höpfel, *Innsbruck: Residenz der alten Musik* (Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1989), 81. On the finances of the court, Franz Steiner reports that Ferdinand Karl’s administration ran a deficit six times between 1654 and 1662, spending on average about 20% beyond what it took in. Steiner, *Geschichte Tirols zur Zeit Erzherzog Ferdinand Karls (2. Hälfte seiner Regierungszeit: 1655–1662)* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Innsbruck, 1961), 525.

The record is in the Tiroler Landesarchiv Kammer Raitbuch for 1658, volume 190, fol. 159v. The price paid by the court for the medal was 175 florins. In the record, it is described as a “Gulden Kötten” or golden chain, a formulation elsewhere used to describe gifts bestowed by Ferdinand Karl on favored courtiers.
Young may have felt that his prospects would improve if he secured a position with the prelate in Salzburg. A search of surviving financial records from Salzburg Cathedral and the Thun family may turn up other evidence of contacts between Young and Guidobaldo.

The two letters that are among the new source’s prefatory materials offer other shards of biographical information. That Young claimed to have invented an eight-stringed lyra viol is not news. Mention of the invention, and Young’s claim to it, are in the journal of an English merchant and adventurer, Robert Bargrave. New, though, is evidence that Young corresponded with Athanasius Kircher, who had assigned credit for the invention to the wrong man. Clearly Young was intent on setting the record straight. Addressing himself “to the professors of music,” Young states that he invented the instrument while a student in Italy. This opens up new ground in our knowledge of the composer.

---

16 Excerpts from Bargrave’s journal are reproduced in articles by Michael Tilmouth, “Music on the Travels of an English Merchant: Robert Bargrave (1628–61),” in Music & Letters 53 (1972): 143–59, and “Music and British Travelers Abroad, 1600–1730,” in Source Materials and the Interpretation of Music: A Memorial Volume to Thurston Dart, ed. Ian Bent (London: Stainer and Bell, 1981), 357–82. Bargrave speaks of his encounter with Young, who showed him the instrument and promised to send along music for it that he was having printed. Unfortunately, it seems this music has not survived.

17 If Young studied in Italy, the circumstances have not yet been discovered. But the Innsbruck court was intimately bound to Italy, and notably to Florence. Ferdinand Karl’s mother was Claudia, a Medici, sister of Grand Duke Cosimo II. Claudia ran the government in Innsbruck as a regent for Ferdinand Karl for fourteen years during the latter’s minority (his father having died in 1632 when he was four). One of Claudia’s cousins was Maria de Medici, wife of Henry IV of France, herself regent for Louis XIII. It was at Claudia’s parents’ wedding that the famous Florentine “Intermedi” of 1589 were given. And Ferdinand Karl married Anna, his cousin on the Medici side, who was the daughter of his uncle Cosimo II. (See Höpfel, Innsbruck, 81.) Perhaps Young had spent time at the court in Florence before coming to Innsbruck. If so, he presumably wasn’t paid, at least via the regular channels, for he is not mentioned in the most thorough study of the musical situation at the Medici court, Warren Kirkendale’s The Court Musicians in Florence during the Principate of the Medici (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1993). Kirkendale does succeed in clarifying the identity of another musician, Domenico Anglesi, who worked at both the Florence and Innsbruck courts, and is sometimes confused with Young in the records of the Innsbruck administration. (See Kirkendale, Court Musicians, 390–93 for a summary of what is known of Anglesi.)
Other than Wood’s reference to Young as “bred in Rome” this is the first solid indication that the composer spent time in Italy before hiring on at the Innsbruck court.¹⁸

Until now, Young’s advent to Innsbruck was thought to have been by way of points further north. The musicologist Percy Young was perhaps the first to suggest what has since been widely credited, that Young came into the service of Ferdinand Karl when the latter was governor of the Spanish Netherlands.¹⁹ But this is a case of mistaken identity; Ferdinand Karl was never the governor of the Spanish territory. The individual for whom he was mistaken was another Habsburg, a cousin of Ferdinand Karl, also named Ferdinand, who wore many splendid hats identifying him variously as a military leader in the Thirty Years’ War, as Cardinal Infante (brother to Philip IV, King of Spain), and as the “real” Archduke of Austria and governor of the Spanish Netherlands.²⁰ This was the individual whom Percy Young mistook for William Young’s patron. The confusion is probably traceable to Young himself who, in the dedication to his Sonates of 1653, addresses

¹⁸ Though Wood said that Young was “bred” in Rome, one of his superiors at Innsbruck wrote that he was “born in England.” The official was probably Chancellor Anton Girardi, who, writing in a journal kept on one of the court’s peregrinations into northern Italy, wrote of “Camerdiener Wilhem Jung, aus Engelland gebirtig….” The courtiers were on a boat bound for Milan, and to pass the time, Young played for them. The journalist writes that his playing “was to the ship’s company what Orpheus was to the hero Jason on his quest for the golden fleece. He played the fiddle marvelously well, captivating those present, who listened attentively to hear such a master of this art, the likes of which is rarely found under the sun.” Quoted in Senn, Musik und Theater, 262. (See also Senn, 347, where the scribe’s likely identity is given.)


his patron as “Archduke of Austria” instead of “Archduke of Innsbruck.” He was to repeat the error on the title page of the 1659 sonatas (see above). However the confusion came about, clearly it was not in the Spanish Netherlands that Young came to Ferdinand Karl’s attention. Perhaps Young came to Innsbruck directly from Italy.

There is another thread in the correspondence with Kircher that, if pursued, may lead to further biographical discoveries. This is the reference to one Somerset, Anglus, to whom Kircher assigned the credit for inventing the eight-stringed lyra viol. In Kircher’s telling, he questioned Somerset, and was misled, perhaps deliberately. Kircher refers to the man as “Comus” and as “Conte” Somerset. In the 1650s this must refer to Edward Somerset, one of England’s foremost peers. Among his many titles were Sixth Earl and Second Marquess of Worcester and Earl of Glamorgan. He was an avowed Catholic, enemy of Cromwell, and supporter of the Royalist cause in England’s Civil War. He was also inordinately wealthy, enjoying numerous ties to and performing many services for the royal family. Somerset was no stranger to intrigue. He apparently fabricated documents supporting his claim to his titles, and misrepresented both his position and authority when negotiating and signing documents on behalf of Charles I while acting as the latter’s emissary to Ireland.

21 English references to Ferdinand Karl call him the “Archduke of Innsbruck.” Perhaps the formulation ought to be “Archduke of the Tirol,” the Austrian province of which Innsbruck is and was the capital. Reference to an “Archduke of Austria” may in some situations have been meant generically, in the sense that any archduke belonging to the Habsburg family belonged to “the house of Austria.”


23 See Cokayne, The Complete Peerage, vol. 12, part 1, 69 for an outline of the forged documents. Also see the same work, vol. 12, part 2, 860, for a synopsis of misrepresentations made by Somerset during his mission to raise troops in Ireland on the King’s behalf. The title “Marquess of Worcester” was bestowed by Charles I on Edward’s father, for military and financial support in the early years of the Civil War. In the normal course of things it would have passed down to the legitimate heir, Edward. But Charles I fled first London and then Oxford, and the
tured, and after Raglan, Somerset’s family seat, was taken by Cromwell’s forces, the peer fled England into exile, first in France (at the French court along with Henrietta Maria and her son the future Charles II), later in the Spanish Netherlands. But this is far from Rome where Somerset supposedly misled Kircher. Moreover, there is a problem of timing. As a younger man, during the 1620s, Somerset had traveled through Italy on the Grand Tour, but I have seen nothing to suggest that he was in Rome in the 1650s. However, a brother, John Somerset, numbered among English Catholics resident in the Holy City at mid-century. This may have been the Somerset who misled Kircher. Perhaps John falsely styled himself “Count” Somerset, borrowing his brother’s title. Or Kircher may have questioned John about Edward’s activities and the title “Count” somehow attached to the wrong man. But in Kircher’s letter to Young, when he speaks of having questioned certain individuals to verify his information, he certainly implies that he questioned the “Count” in person. In any event it is worth noting that Edward, the peer, was something of a tinkerer. After returning from exile and settling into a quieter life in Restoration England he is supposed to have installed a steam engine of his own creation at Vauxhall (fully a century before Isaac Watt’s invention). The device for raising water was viewed and reported on by Cosimo de Medici among others. According to Dirks, Edward Somerset authored *A Century of Inventions*, a book containing descriptions of one hundred of the greatest inventions of the age. There are, alas, no viols among the “instruments” described. But John Somerset would have been proud of his brother’s mechanical aptitude. A plausible scenario is that John knew of the eight-stringed viol and claimed its invention on Ed-

Great Seal was captured by Cromwell’s men, before the Second Marquess could be properly designated. Thus Edward’s ruse (he counterfeited documents naming him Marquess over Charles’s signature) must have been in his own mind a reasonable recourse, made necessary given the circumstances.

24 Dirks thinks Somerset remained in Paris when other members of the English entourage went with Charles II to various towns in the Spanish Netherlands, including Flanders and Bruges, but *The Complete Peerage* account suggests he went into the Low Countries.
ward’s behalf, leading Kircher astray. If John deceived Kircher, we may never know whether it was done deliberately.  

Still, the story doesn’t end there. At Somerset’s seat of Raglan Castle the noble family raised many sons of the local gentry as wards. These individuals were given an education and an introduction into courtly manners in exchange for light service. Many served at table even though some enjoyed private incomes as high as 700 pounds. In charge of the household was a steward, one William Jones. Archival records for the year 1651 reveal that a William Jones received permission that year to go to the Low Countries in the company of his “servant” William Young. A coincidence? Or was this the Steward of Raglan, and his “servant” the Young who would shortly afterwards surface in Innsbruck? It is likely that Young received musical training in a private household such as that of the Somersets. We know the family took in wards, and was clearly of the class that could provide advanced musical education to talented individuals. If Young had been part of their household, John Somerset would have known of it. John might have thought it reasonable to assert that credit for the inven-

25 Kircher, in his letter to Young, seems to exonerate Somerset of blame, even while suggesting that the latter “dissembled” when asked about the eight-stringed viol.


27 Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, Commonwealth 3, 1651, 530, under “Warrants from the Council of State and Admiralty Committee.”

28 Obviously this is a long shot. The names William Jones and William Young could hardly be more common. Records from Oxford and Cambridge show that during the seventeenth century (and extending a decade or two on each end) there were many individuals in attendance by the name of William Young, though seemingly none can be linked to the musician. A William Young was taken into service as a musician at the Restoration court, but this individual was apparently unrelated to the composer. English public records for 1662–63 contain wills or death warrants for at least three William Youngs, though again it seems none of these can be connected with the musician. One such will, made in March of 1662, a few weeks before the death of the Innsbruck-based musician, is tantalizing, but upon closer examination it proves to be a red herring.

29 His name is not among those found in surviving records for institutions where he might otherwise have been trained, including records of the Inns of Court, Universities, Chapel Royal, King’s Music, apprenticeship records for guilds, and inscription rolls for private schools whether run by charitable foundations or teaching orders of the Catholic Church.
tion of an instrument was due to his brother, instead of to his brother’s (or father’s) sometime employee. This seems to be a line worthy of further investigation.

**The Sonatas: New (and Improved) Readings**

The new source will not dramatically change anyone’s impression of Young’s sonatas for three viols. But it does color things a bit differently in some areas. First, meter signs are different from those in the Gresham source, which was the basis of the VdGS edition. Gresham uses an “alla breve” † at the start of every piece, where the Goëss source uses C. This seems only a minor difference, and in truth its significance is not absolutely clear. It was apparently common for English composers to use the two signs, † and C, somewhat arbitrarily. Simpson comments, “… a dash or stroke through the sign of the Mood thus † is properly a sign of Diminution; though many dash it so, without any such Intention.” Simpson describes only one time-beating mechanism for a duple signature, regardless of which of these two signs is used. In either case the tactus (or hand motion of the time beater) governs the whole note, with one half note to the down-stroke and another to the up-stroke. Even so, Simpson suggests counting four beats, two to the down-stroke and two to the up-stroke. These four beats are to proceed at a sober pace:

But you may say, I have told you that a Semibreve is the length of a Time, and a Time the length of a Semibreve, and still you are ignorant what that length is. To which I answer, (in case you have none to guide your Hand at the first measuring of Notes) I would have

---

30 Christopher Simpson, *A Compendium of Practical Musick*, 3rd ed. (London, 1678), 27. Already in the 1630s Charles Butler implies that the sign with the slash is the standard sign where duple time or proportion is operative. Under it, time should be counted by the semibreve or whole note: “The principal time note is the semibreve... and it is measured by the tactus or the stroke of the hand....” “The parts of the tactus are two [Thesis and Arsis]: i – the depression or fall and [ii] – the elevation or rise of the hand.” Duple proportion assumes a semibreve as a measure note, marked with a minim to the descending part of the tactus, and another to the ascending; the sign used is †. See Butler, *The Principles of Musick in Singing and Setting* (London, 1636; facsimile reprint, New York: Da Capo, 1970), 24. Playford also offers the sign † as the normal indicator for duple time. See John Playford, *An Introduction to the Skill of Musick* (London, 1674; facsimile reprint, Ridgewood, N.J.: Gregg Press, 1966); his discussion of mensuration is on 30–34.
William Young’s Fantasias a3

you pronounce these words [One, Two, Three, Four] in an equal length, as you would (leisurely) read them: Then fancy those four words to be four Crochets, which make up the quantity or length of a Semibreve, and consequently of a Time or Measure: In which, let these two words [One, Two] be pronounced with the Hand Down; and [Three, Four] with it Up. In the continuation of this motion you will be able to Measure and compute all your other Notes.31

If Stephen Bing worked from the Goëss print in copying the Gresham source he must have deliberately changed the meter sign, possibly to bring it into accordance with local practice. But Young used the duple sign without the slash in the Goëss source, such that the measure properly consists of four moderate pulses, not two. Simpson’s instructions are clear: even under the mensuration sign † though the hand of the time keeper marks half notes, the pulse is at the level of quarter notes. I draw attention to the unslashed C in the Goëss source, and the discussion in Simpson, because modern players are apt to assume a brisker pace under the † sign than may be warranted in these pieces.

The triple-time sections are another matter. The VdGS edition signals the change to triple time by introducing the sign łat, or in the case of the ninth sonata, .GenerationType. At each meter change, above-the-staff indications are provided editorially, showing a suggested relationship of old-to-new values.32 In several cases these suggestions may be misleading. When shifting to triple time, the Gresham source uses either a simple digit 3 or, in the first two sonatas, the 3 reversed: 3. These usages are the same as in the Goëss source. Reversal of the direction of a meter sign was a signal of diminution, so certainly in the first two sonatas, at a minimum, the triple-time sections should be taken fairly rapidly.

In the later sonatas the triple signs are not reversed. Here the ratios given in the VdGS edition are seemingly more viable, insofar as they accord with discussions by many seventeenth-century the-


32 The VdGS edition shows whole note under duple equating to dotted whole under triple, for sonatas 1–4 and 7. In sonatas 5 and 8 there is no change to triple (notwithstanding a gigue-like effect achieved by means of dotted-eighth-sixteenth groupings in sonata 8). In sonata 9 the VdGS edition indicates the change to triple with a 9 signature, together with a suggestion that the old whole equates to the new dotted whole.
orists. But even though the digit is not reversed, one could still argue that the triple sign calls for an adjustment whereby the old half equals the new dotted whole. The interpretation of mensural changes is fraught with problems. A detour may be worthwhile, to touch on some of the background.

At the start of the seventeenth century, triple division was shown through a hand motion known as *tactus inæqualis*, whereby a longer down-stroke lasts two half notes, and a shorter up-stroke lasts one. But, as instrumental music came increasingly to be dominated by dances, particularly triple time dances, and where these were livelier rather than more measured, complications arose. Simpson mentions “divers Tripla’s of a shorter Measure, which by reason of their quick movement, are usually measured by comting three down, and three up, with the Hand; so that of them it may be said that two Measures make but one time.” 33 It is of interest that “Time” is no longer a concomitant of a single measure, but of two measures taken together. Different interpretations are possible. One is this: if, under a duple sign, the tactus governs a whole note, then under rapid triple mensuration one stroke of the tactus (whether down or up) may govern a dotted whole note (the “measure” on the page), such that a complete tactus will govern two measures. This would imply that the change to triple itself becomes a sign of diminution, so that values under the triple are not in the ratio of 2:3, but 2:6. 34

That this is a reasonable interpretation finds some support in a discussion of mensuration in Praetorius. 35 He notes that problems with timekeeping were encountered when various nations began


34 In fairness, it should be said that where theorists speak of these rapid triplas, they often specify the use of quarter notes or “black minims.” This refers to half notes that have been blackened in, i.e. “colored,” where “coloration” is a sign of triple subdivision. Obviously, black minims are indistinguishable visually from quarter notes. Coloration as a convention of notation was disappearing in the seventeenth century, though it occurs in Young’s 1653 publication of *Sonates*. Some composers may have gone from showing blackened minims to showing normal “white” minims under triple meter, even when the triple was meant to be taken at a fairly brisk clip.

writing rapid triple-time dances, specifically mentioning the French and the English. Several ways of adapting the tactus were tried. The problem was that a \textit{tactus inæqualis} was unsuited to showing the more rapid triple divisions. Where the triple subdivision was applied at the level of the half measure (i.e. with the half note dividing into three quarters), rather than at the level of the measure (with the whole note dividing into three halves), the time-beating convention proved inadequate. This was the case because the normal means of showing a triple division with a \textit{tactus inæqualis} meant that the hand rose, not on the fourth of six subdivisions, where it would coincide with a sense of the rapid triple pulse, but at the fifth of six, corresponding to the third half note, where it grievously disrupted the metric flow. Praetorius suggests that dancing masters tried stamping their foot at the fourth of six subdivisions, as a way to convey the true pulse, even as they continued to show the old \textit{tactus inæqualis}.\footnote{Lully’s unfortunate accident was presumably not attributable to precisely this conflict between compound triple and the \textit{tactus inæqualis}, but might easily have resulted from similar confusion.} But this proved unsatisfactory and other innovations were sought. In Praetorius’s formulation, one of these involved taking “two tactus in the time of one.” This is close to an inversion of Simpson’s wording. But what was involved, apparently, was that upon encountering the triple signature the leader showed \textit{two} tactus, both \textit{inæqualis}, in the time previously occupied by \textit{one} measure and \textit{one} tactus. This results in a tactus that is twice as fast under the sign for triple relative to duple time. But the adaptation had the virtue of showing the strong pulse on the fourth of six subdivisions. An alternate and more elegant adaptation involved the use of a \textit{tactus æqualis} within which both the down-stroke and the up-stroke were subdivisible into three.

The complications attached to triple time are legion, and the arguments will not be put to rest in the confines of this article. It is however worth mentioning Simpson’s suggestion that “in all Tripla’s [under any triple signature] the Notes are sung or play’d much quicker than they are in common Time.”\footnote{Simpson, \textit{Compendium}, 26.} My own sense is that the triple-time sections in sonatas 1–4 and 7 work well if the
ratio is (duple) half = (triple) dotted whole, and this will be most effective if the duple sections are taken at a somewhat staid tempo, with quarters instead of halves as a basic unit of pulse.³⁸

Beyond mensuration signs there are numerous inconsequential discrepancies between the VdGS edition and the Goëss source, but a few more noteworthy corrections suggest themselves. In Sonata 5, at measure 81, the Gresham copyist omitted the fifth note in the treble part, and upon recognizing that a rhythmic anomaly resulted, tried various expediencies without restoring the missing note. The resulting reading is flawed, but the Goëss source permits a solution (Example 1).

The correct reading sets up a syncopated passage that continues for several measures in the treble. In the VdGS edition the start of the syncopation is delayed, thereby reducing its effectiveness. The effect of syncopation (called “driving” notes in Young’s day) was a favorite device among the English. By delaying the start of the syncopation the errant reading certainly weakens Young’s intended effect.

In Sonata 8, at measure 54, the Gresham scribe made another transcription error, followed in the VdGS edition, for which a correction is now possible. As is evident in Example 2, when the bass changes to B♭ at the latter half of the second quarter, the Gresham source indicates f" in the treble, but this should be g". The corrected version successfully avoids parallel fifths, which are present if slightly masked in the uncorrected version.

A third transcription error affects the rhythm of the Gresham reading (so also the VdGS edition) in Sonata 8 at measure 66, treble, where a rhythmic figure consisting of sixteenth, two thirty-

³⁸There is further support for interpreting the triple-time sections as requiring a fairly brisk tempo in Putnam Aldrich, Rhythm in Seventeenth-Century Italian Monody (New York: Norton, 1966). He suggests that in seventeenth-century Italian instrumental music the use of a digit 3 in a mensuration sign indicated that the tempo should be fast enough that the operative system is felt as compound time—in other words, two large beats, each divisible into three. Aldrich suggests that the triple division should still be shown as a tactus inæqualis, but his argument tends to suggest that the convention described by Simpson and Praetorius, of a quicker-moving tactus taking in two measures, is the norm. See Aldrich, 58. Young was not writing Italian instrumental music, but he apparently wrote these pieces after studying in Italy, so may have been affected by notational practices picked up there.
seconds, and eighth is transcribed as uniform sixteenths (Example 3). The error results in the suppression of close canonic imitation between the upper voices, since the tenor replicates the figure on the subsequent beat.

The scribe of the Gresham source erred twice in Sonata 9, and flawed transcriptions again result in the VdGS edition. In measure 32, treble, at the second quarter-note beat, the VdGS reading gives a'–b' in eighth notes, but these should be a second higher at bb'–c" (Example 4). The Gresham source omits measure 89, treble; the editor of the VdGS edition makes an educated guess at the contents of the missing measure, but the new source reveals the composer’s true intentions (Example 5).

Other corrections are possible, but these examples will give an idea of improved readings to be found in the new source.

Example 1. Sonata 5, mm. 81–83; top: after the Gresham source; bottom: after the Goëss source.
Naming is a predilection of our species: we name things to know them, and to assert control over them. But at the end of the day, is it of any consequence whether these works are called “fantasias” or “sonatas?” The issue of what differentiates one form from another is too complex for a full treatment here, but a few observations are in order.

One consideration interacting with nomenclature is chronology. The Goëss source, in addition to providing us with a new name for the pieces, suggests that their date of composition may be later than we otherwise might have thought. When the only sources were those lodged in British libraries, the tendency was to assume that the works dated from before Young left England. Thus, when Pamela Willetts suggests that Stephen Bing probably
copied the Gresham source during the Commonwealth era, although she doesn’t reveal what prompted her thinking, it may have been predicated in part on an assumption that Young’s contribution predated his departure from England. Similarly, in introducing Young’s works in his *Thematic Index*, Dodd suggests that the composer is “better known” for the sonatas of 1653 than for his “English” works.39 No examples of the latter are named, but again, it is not unreasonable to assume that Dodd had in mind above all the sonatas a3, since they have been the most accessible and are therefore the works by which most consort players have come to know Young.

---

39 Dodd, *Thematic Index*. The pagination is not continuous, but grouped by composer, always beginning with “[composer’s name]-1” when a new composer is taken up. The reference is to page “Young-1”.

---

Example 3. Sonata 8, m. 66; top: after the Gresham source; bottom: after the Goëss source.
Upon close examination, however, Young’s sonatas $a3$ differ in several respects from the “norm” for an English fantasia (a difficult concept, to be sure, for a vehicle said to be governed only by the whim of the composer). It is generally agreed that the Fantasia beloved of viol players derives from the sacred motet of the Renaissance. A hallmark of both vehicles is imitative polyphony. Simpson, in defining the dance air, found it convenient to distinguish it from the strict imitative style of the English fantasy: “In these, and other airy Musicks of Strains, which now pass under the common name of Aires, you will often hear some touches of Points or Fuges; but not insisted upon, or continued, as in

---

Fancy-Musick.” From this it seems clear that “Fancy-Musick” or fantasies were characterized in Simpson’s mind by an insistence upon close imitation. This lent the vehicle its continuity and integrity, regardless of how many points of imitation were introduced in a given work. Young’s sonatas all feature imitative polyphony, but always in clearly delimited sections, beyond which they exhibit a considerable degree of formal variety. This increase in complexity may be due to the impact of the popularity of the fantasy-suite in the second quarter of the century. And yet the outlines of the fantasy-suite are in general more predictable than Young’s sonatas, which are quite flexible with respect to form.

Flexible as they are, however, in many respects they agree with (or rather, anticipate, in a kind of foreshadowing way) Roger North’s abstract description of a sonata. North, writing c. 1715, suggests that the sonata should begin with a grave (a slow section replete with harmony and suspensions), and continue to a fuge.

---


42 As found in works by Hingeston, for example, reviewed elsewhere in the present volume of this Journal.
with “a cast of busiess [sic] or debate, of which the melodious point is made the subject; and accordingly it is wrought over and under till, like waves upon water, it is spent and vanisheth, leaving the musick to proceed smoothly…”

By virtue of its dependence on imitative polyphony, this fuge clearly invokes the fantasia, and presumably shares the latter’s line of descent from the Renaissance motet. In North’s account of the sonata there follow in turn an adagio (emphasizing harmony and suggestive of a state of rest), a dance (conceivably a gavotte, minuet, or corant), possibly a diversion to another slow section (andante or ricercata), before finishing with a lively gigue—“and so good night.” In all, North’s template includes some five or six movements. While Young’s sonatas usually fall short of this by a movement or two, in many other respects they correspond to North’s parameters. Table 1 shows the formal outlines of Young’s 1659 sonatas; these may be compared with the outline of the sonatas of 1653 as shown in Table 2. Representative works from the two collections are similar in style, with these exceptions: in the earlier publication (see Table 2), the fugal movement that is the focal point of the works usually comes in final rather than initial position, and secondly, the works dated 1653 tend to exhibit slightly more in the way of formal variety.

It seems clear that in both collections Young deliberately creates complex pieces, articulated in distinct “movements”; that these are set off from one another with dramatic contrasts of mood (often by tempo and meter shifts); that one segment in each sonata, voiced in prima prattica-style, imitative counterpoint, is a focal point; that this segment is an intentional link with the fantasia; that alongside this segment, slow introductory or linking passages are very often included; and that still other segments (notably those in triple time) suggest links with the nascent tradition of the dance suite.

Another composer (particularly one of Young’s English contemporaries) might have written works in similar style and called them “fantasias” without raising eyebrows. That point is under-
scored by the fact that many of us have played these works as fantasia without a second thought. But in choosing one title over the other, Young may have intended to invoke a particular temporal and aesthetic perspective with regard to conventions, signaling that the works are conceived stylistically as forward-looking, and the player or auditor should experience them in light of then “recent” trends in dramatic instrumental writing.

Lines differentiating the fantasia from the sonata were not clear in Young’s day. It seems clear, however, that in the fantasia of the first half of the century the supremacy of the *prima prattica* style continued relatively unchallenged, while at mid-century the older style was being made to accommodate newer, more dramatic styles, for the sake of an emerging aesthetic ideal. The most rewarding view of these works may be to see them as a deliberate commingling of *prima* and *seconda prattica* styles, towards a hopefully more fecund union.
Table 1. Formal Components of the 1659 *Sonate à 3 Viole*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sonata (key)</th>
<th>Slow Intro?</th>
<th>Mvt. I (or II)</th>
<th>Mvt. II (or III)</th>
<th>Mvt. III (or IV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>prima</em> (g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(duple) canzona</td>
<td>(triple) corant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ freer sub-sect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>seconda</em> (g)</td>
<td>✓ (duple)</td>
<td>(duple) canzona</td>
<td>(triple) fantasia-like</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>highly elaborate!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>terza</em> (g)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(duple) canzona</td>
<td>(triple) corant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ many sub-sects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>quarta</em> (G)</td>
<td>✓ (duple)</td>
<td>(triple) canzona</td>
<td>(duple) lively rhythms, call and response</td>
<td>(triple) saraband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>quinta</em> (c)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(duple) complex, 3 sub-sects., 2 are canzona-like</td>
<td>(duple) dance-like</td>
<td>(duple) fantasia-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sesta</em> (C)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(duple) 3 sub-sects., 1st, 3rd canzona-like</td>
<td>(triple) fantasia-like</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>settima</em> (d)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(duple) 2 sub-sects., both canzona-like</td>
<td>(triple) 7 sub-sects., saraband-like</td>
<td>(duple) 2 sub-sects., 1st imitative, 2nd homophonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ottava</em> (d)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(duple) canzona + 2 imitative sub-sects.</td>
<td>(duple) gigue-like</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nona</em> (C)</td>
<td>✓ (duple)</td>
<td>(duple) canzona + binary dance</td>
<td>(triple) corant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Formal Components of the 1653 *Sonate* for Violins, Bass Viol and Continuo.

Comments: Points of interest are the location of the “canzona” (main imitative movement, usually designated by this name at the appropriate place in each partbook), contrast of metric scheme from duple to triple (assumed duple unless otherwise specified), and contrasts of speed. If tempo is not given in the source, it is here specified *fast* or *slow* based on predominance of smaller or larger sub-divisions. Triple movements are assumed to be fast. Tempi in indications that do appear in the source are reproduced here as “*Allegro*” and “*Adagio*.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prima</td>
<td>canzona 3/2</td>
<td>fast</td>
<td>da capo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seconda</td>
<td>fast 3/2</td>
<td>canzona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terza</td>
<td>slow fast</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/2 canzona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarta</td>
<td>complex: slow, fast</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>fast canzona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quinta</td>
<td>slow 6/4 slow</td>
<td></td>
<td>canzona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sesta</td>
<td>slow “Allegro”</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>canzona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settima</td>
<td>“Adagio” “Allegro”</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>canzona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ottava</td>
<td>slow “Allegro”</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>“Allegro” canzona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nona</td>
<td>slow 3/2 canzona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decima</td>
<td>3/2 fast canzona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecima</td>
<td>slow “Allegro” fast “Resposte” canzona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fast canzona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix

Dedication and Letters from Young’s 1659 Sonate à 3 Viole

[English translation on facing pages]


Al Merito dell Illustrissimo & Reverendissimo Prencipe, le cui Glorie incaminandosi à trionfare del tempo e della sorte obligano lo stupore universale ad inalzarl gli Archi de cigli, vengo ancor’ io devoto ammiratore ad offerirli l’Arco ossequioso della mia Viola, e se ben questa non e valeuole cóme la cetra d’Anfion ad inalzare fabrice eccelse al nome dell’Illustr.mo & Rev.mo Prencipe servirà a meno per formar un Ecco sonoro à quelli Applausi, onde l’ist esso vien riuerito dal Mondo si compiaècia la sua benignita di gradir quest’humile espressione della mia osservanza Mentre mi dedico.

Dell’Illustr.mo & Rev.mo Prencipe. Devotissimo & obligatissimo servitore

Guglielmo Young.

L’Autore ai Professori della Musica.

Hauendo io risoluto di stampare alcune sonate di viola ordinaria & alcune altrè di viola à otto cordè, instrumento ritrovato da mè molti anni sono, nel tempo, che andauo studiando per l’Italia, fui auuertito da amico letterato, che in un libro del Padre Athanasio Kircher, intitolato “Musurgia universalis”, al foglio 486, del primo Tomo, erano stampate le seguenti parole: “Excogitavit et Novum Chelis genus octochordon Excellentissimus Dominus Comes à Somerset Anglus, quod omnia Musicæ arcana in eminentissimo gradu continet, Instrumentum auditu dignissimum & quod in admirationem rapiat omnes auditores.”
To the Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Prince Guidobaldo [von Thun], Archbishop of Salzburg and Prince of the Holy Roman Empire, Legate of the Sacred Apostolic Seat. My Most Merciful Patron.

In recognition of the worthiness of the most illustrious and most reverend Prince, whose fame on the path to triumph over time and destiny compels universal wonderment to raise its brows, I, a devoted admirer, come also to present the respectful bow of my viol, and if it be not so apt as the lyre of Amphion in raising lofty monuments in the name of my Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Prince, it will at least serve to make a resonant echo to that applause with which the world acclaims [your worthiness] if it pleases your Grace to receive this humble expression of my reverence, while I dedicate myself as the most devoted and obliged servant of my Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Prince,

William Young.

The Author to the Professors of Music.

Having resolved to print some sonatas for the ordinary viol and for the viol of eight strings, an instrument discovered by me many years ago at the time that I traveled throughout Italy studying, I was informed by a learned friend that in a book by Father Athanasius Kircher entitled “Musurgia universalis,” on page 486 of the first volume, are printed these words: “The Most Excellent Lord, The English Earl of Somerset invented a new and ingenuous viol with eight strings, which contained all the secrets of music in the highest degree, an instrument most worthy of being heard, that seized all of its listeners with admiration.”
Io, che del certo sapeuo non hauer la viola à 8. corde altra origine, che dal mio pouero ingegno, e che in Italia, come anco in Germania, & in particolare nella corte, in cui attualmente io servo, haueuo propalata per mia l’inuenzione di quella viola, e la maniera di sonarla, dubitai à prima vista, che il mondo non mi stimasse copiatore, ò vero falzo usurpatore de gl’altrui ritrouamenti. Mosso dunque dallo stimolo della propria riputazione, ch’è il primo elemento di un huomo da bene, scrißi al sudetto Padre libero mà discretamente i miei sensi, & egli con quell ingenuità, ch’è propria de virtuosi grandi, mi favori della suguente risposta. Non per altro fine, che per sincerarmi appresso al mondo, hò voluto di consenso del Padre Kircher dar in luce questa lettera. Compiaceteui fratanto ò virtuosi professori di sentir le debolezze di queste mie poche Sonate, che se vedrò esser gradite mi daranno ardire di apportarui in breue anco le altre della mia viola à 8. corde, qual di presente vò correggendo. Compatitemi, e viuete felici.

[Kircher’s letter to Young.]

_Molt’Illustr. Signor e Patrono Osservandissimo._

Il disgusto riceuuto da VS è stato Commune anch’ à me, mentre vedo che nell’ opra della musurgia sono defraudato dal fine da me preteso, che era di ricreare ogn’ uno, e non già à veruno dar disgusto, e molto meno d’ essere pregiuditiale in cosa alcuna, VS. dunque scuserà il caso auuenuto in questa maniera. Douendo io per mia sodisfattione nell’opra predetta far menzione della viola d’ ottochorde, per non discorrerne senza saperne l’auttore, m’informai per Roma da varij, da quali (ò perché cosi pensauano, ò d’altronde con fondamento sofficiente il sapessero) non mai hò inteso altro, se non essere tal viola stata pensiero del Signeor Conte Sommerset, il quale ancora insieme con esso me è fuori de Colpa, e merita scusa, perché da lui in persona non hò sentito simile cosa, e quando io gli presentai l’opra, facendo pure menzione della sopradetta viola, egli dissimolò tutto. Se per ciò VS. teme alcuno scapito di riputatione d’honore presso cotesti Serenissimi Signori à me dispiacerebbe l’auuenimento onde per rimedarui, in quanto à
Knowing with certainty that the eight-stringed viol had no other origin than my own poor genius, having maintained, in Italy, in Germany, and particularly at the Court where I presently serve, that I invented both the viol and a way of playing it, when I first saw the citation from Kircher, I feared for my reputation, that others would think I falsely usurp the credit for the invention. Moved therefore to defend my reputation, which is of the prime importance to a man of quality, I wrote to the above-named Father, freely but discreetly expressing my thinking, and he, with the openness characteristic of all great men, favored me with the following reply. With no other aim than to acquit myself in the eyes of the world, I sought Father Kircher’s permission to publish this letter. It may in the meantime please you, worthy professors, to hear these my few frail sonatas, which if I see that they are found pleasing, will soon be followed by others for the eight-string viol, which at present I am correcting. Indulge me, and live happily.

Most Illustrious Sir and Esteemed Patron:

The displeasure experienced by our lordship was shared by me when I saw that in my work, Musurgia, I was cheated of my intent to edify everyone and to give offense to no one, much less be harmful in any way; your lordship will therefore excuse this incident, which came about in this manner. For my own satisfaction I needed to mention in the above-named work the eight-stringed viol, and to avoid discussing it without knowing its author, I asked various people around Rome, but these (either because they knew with certainty, or had sufficient evidence to speculate), only confirmed that the viol was the idea of the Earl of Somerset. He, together with myself, is not deserving of blame, and merits an apology, because from him personally I heard nothing false, and when I presented him with the work, and drew his attention to the above-named viol, he dissembled. Nevertheless, I would be displeased if on account of this business your lordship’s reputation has suffered among those most serene Lords. Therefore, to make amends, I readily give my assent for
me, volontieri vedrò, che VS. da se stessa nelle stampe ch’ella scriue hauer per le mani, notifichi al mondo, adoperando il suo solito termine di dicretione, l’auuenimento occorso senza colpa alcuna dell’ auttore, e senza cooperatore. Di Monsignore Sommerset: tanto più che per hora io non mi ritrouo in occasione di poter far ciò, che VS. da se stessa e con maggior sua sodisfattione saprà esseguire. Certo è che, chi maneggia simili negotij, e palesa al mondo le cose da lui non vedute con proprij occhi, bisogno è che si stij, alle relationi d’huomini degni di fede par altro; altrimenti cose simili accadderebbero giornalmente & s’ascriuerebbe il delitto all’ innocente; scusimi VS. di nuovo e veggia se in altro la possi seruire mentre le prego dal Cielo ogni contentezza.


your lordship to cause to be printed what you wrote to me, serving notice to the world, in the usual discreet language, that what has occurred was through neither fault nor complicity of the author.

With respect to my Lord Somerset, it may be that I will never be in a better position [to rectify matters], though I certainly hope through this to provide some satisfaction to your lordship. It is certain that whoever engages in similar affairs, presenting to the world what he has not been able to verify with his own eyes, must be able to rely on others. All human relationships must be based on faith in one another, else such things will take place commonly, and the innocent will be blamed.

Again I apologize to your lordship, and will seek always to be of service. May Heaven grant you every happiness.

From Rome, 25 March, 1656.

From your most illustrious lordship’s affectionate servant in Christ, Atanasio Kircher, Society of Jesus.
In the gradual emancipation of instrumental music from its vocal precedents in the late Renaissance, the English fantasia for viols proved to be a fertile ground for expansion of expressive devices independent of words. Madrigal composers in both Italy and England frequently set their texts with particularly remarkable chromatic passages for purposes of bringing out the meanings and implications of individual words or phrases. Ian Woodfield, in his valuable study of music and geographical exploration, declares John Wilbye to have been “the first English composer to set a text based on the imagery of far-flung places and their treasures,” and suggests that Thomas Weelkes’s madrigal pair “Thule: The Period of Cosmography” and “The Andalusian Merchant” published in 1600 were intended to be a response to the earlier Wilbye madrigals, constituting “a brilliantly successful attempt to convey the sense of excitement in the expanding world of Elizabethan exploration in a musical miniature.”

The sixteenth-century belief that Thule (Iceland) was an island at the farthest reaches of the known world prompted voyages that might discover lands even farther beyond. Christopher Field summarizes his discussion of the Weelkes madrigal with this comparison: “It is tempting to see an analogy between man’s growing

familiarity with the earth and his rolling back of musical horizons,” and he makes reference to the 1941 study by Edward Lowinsky, “The Concept of Physical and Music Space in the Renaissance,” where it is suggested that composers were beginning to “discover new lands in harmonic music by approaching new and unused keys through modulation.”

As a preface to the central portion of this article, a brief discussion of the particular passage from the Weelkes madrigal will be necessary. (See Appendix 1.) The text of the second madrigal reads: “The Andalusian merchant, laden with Cochineal and China dishes, reports in Spain how strangely Fogo burns.”

The passage about the volcano generates the only excursion away from the tonal center of F (with B♭ signature) and can only be understood as exhibiting unusual or strange chromatic melodic lines and harmonic shifts in order to illustrate the text. Melodic passages move in successive semitone intervals, not derived from conventional musica ficta or hexachord scales. The horizontal melodic chromaticisms produce vertical harmonic shifts that rapidly transfer from D major to D minor, C major to C minor, using accidentals of F♯/F, B♭/B, E♭/E—without progressing any significant distance from the F Lydian modal basis of the piece. Most of the chromaticism present is descending, with the first raised semitone suggesting a motion upwards (mi–fa), followed by a lowered semitone usually moving downwards (fa–mi). Traditional expectations are overturned, although over the entire passage the chromaticisms are local, generated almost entirely by the word “strangely.” In fact, however, the harmonic range exhibits a rather

---


3 Woodfield, English Musicians, 257, identifies the fiery island of Fogo to be located in the Cape Verde group, off the tip of West Africa.
modest shift from the tonic F Lydian to tonal areas only two flats or two sharps farther away.\textsuperscript{4}

Joseph Kerman points out that English composers were much less interested in chromatic passages than their Italian influences, and preferred more the style of canzonetta and balletto, where any harmonic motions away from tonic/dominant relations were rare. In his discussion of “Chromaticism in the English Madrigal,” he defines a chromatic step as “one in which a note is followed by its altered version: C – C-sharp, D – D-flat” and further defines a chromatic chord progression as involving a chromatic step in one or more of the voices.\textsuperscript{5}

**Established Music Theory**

As a basis for the main portion of this article, we must first establish what was the “known world” in music by the early sixteenth century. Gaston Allaire amassed a broad range of materials in order to define some general principles about Renaissance perceptions of music theory.\textsuperscript{6} Since Guido d’Arezzo, the diatonic gamut was organized around three basic hexachords, each having the same six solmization syllables, \textit{ut re mi fa sol la}:

- the central Hexachord \textit{naturale} C D E F G A
- flanked by the Hexachord \textit{molle} F G A B\textsubscript{b} C D a fifth below or a fourth above
- and the Hexachord \textit{durum} G A B C D E a fifth above or a fourth below.

\textsuperscript{4} The harmonic language of this madrigal remains generally limited to the diatonic realms of the F Lydian mode, with B-flat signature—except for the refrain that appears in both sections: “These things seem wondrous, yet more wondrous I, whose heart with fear doth freeze,” where the mysteries of the geographical world have less power over the emotions than the wonder of love (Woodfield, \textit{English Musicians}, 261: “The images of fire and ice fade before the yet greater wonders of the human heart”).

\textsuperscript{5} Joseph Kerman, \textit{The Elizabethan Madrigal: A Comparative Study} (New York: American Musicological Society, 1962), 213. As an illustration of the distinction between Italian and English practices, he defines four different kinds of Italian madrigal chromaticisms, characteristically moving in successive semitones.

The essential character of each hexachord is distinguished by the semitone interval *mi-fa* between the third and fourth notes (marked ▲). As Allaire explains, “since each hexachord contains only six notes and each has one note which the other lacks, it is only by interlocking them that it is possible to cover the interval of an octave.”⁷ He further explains that “since a hexachord contains only six notes and a modal octave eight, the hexachords naturale and durum must be interlocked … if they are to illustrate the modes in their regular position. In contradistinction, when the same modes use either B-flat or F-sharp, they are said to be in *irregular* position. It should be stressed that the irregular modal positions do not produce chromaticism, and are therefore not to be associated or identified with chromatic practice.”⁸ Figure 1 presents Allaire’s three Tables IX, X, and XI to illustrate how the modes in a diatonic gamut are incorporated into the hexachord order.

We may observe that the modes stand within the hexachord order, and that interlocking of the hexachords could occur on the structural octave divisions of the fifth and fourth. Therefore, the Dorian mode on D beginning on the second step of the hexachord *naturale* could take two configurations:

1) when the hexachord *naturale* is linked with the hexachord *durum*, the D Dorian mode could be read with the solmization syllables:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{D} & \quad \text{E} & \quad \text{F} & \quad \text{G} & \quad \text{A} & \quad \text{B} & \quad \text{C} & \quad \text{D} \\
re & \quad mi & \quad ▲ & \quad fa & \quad sol/ut & \quad re & \quad mi & \quad ▲ & \quad fa & \quad sol
\end{align*}
\]

Here, a hexachord formed on the fifth degree of another hexachord causes the harmony to move one step nearer to the realm of sharp pitches. The *naturale* joins with the *durum* on the fifth degree, G *sol/ut*, which must be understood also as the fourth step of the D Dorian mode.

---

2) when the hexachord *naturale* is linked with the hexachord *molle*, the D Dorian mode could be read with the solmization syllables:

On this scale, a hexachord formed on the fourth degree of another hexachord causes the harmony to move one step nearer to the realm of flat pitches. The *naturale* joins with the *molle* on the fourth degree, F *fa/ut* (the third step of the D Dorian mode), so that the pitch B₇ is available. On the far end of the second example, a step higher than the D *la* would usually be read as a semitone above, following the rule “una nota super ‘la’ semper est canendum ‘fa’.”

Following the patterns established above for the *molle / naturale / durum* hexachords, further hexachords could be constructed at further intervals of fifths on each side of the original “*musica vera*” (or “true music”) of the regular gamut. Any accidentals beyond the original B₇ or B♯ were considered to be “*musica ficta,*” and were obtained through progressing by fifths higher to produce sharps or by fifths lower to produce flats. A new hexachord beginning at each position would thus cause the *mi-fa* semitone between the third and fourth degrees, and thus every pitch of a chromatic scale could be capable of standing as the basic foundation of a hexachord, and every pitch could stand as a *mi* (leading upwards) or as a *fa* (leading downwards):

```
D♭  A♭  E♭  B♭  F  C  G
f#g♭  c♯d♭  g♭a♭  d♭c♭  a♭b♭  e♭f  b♭c  f♯g  c♯d  g♯a  d♯e  a♯b
```

Because a mode such as D Dorian could include either a B♭ or a B♯, Allaire observes that a kind of oscillation between hexachords could occur, in this case between *durum* and *molle*, because polyphonic music will usually have individual parts that belong to “two different modulatory positions of the same mode. They occur because a mode can oscillate between two opposite areas, this oscillation being made possible by a neuter hexachord flanked on both sides by hexachords tending in contrary positions.”

---

*naturale* hexachord provides a neutral position between those a fifth away on each side, in order to avoid the harmonic clash of “*fa contra mi*”—that is, B♭ and B♯ occurring simultaneously.

Moving from one hexachord to another required a use of “mutation,” so that a change of solmization syllable could signal an alteration in the relations of the *mi-fa* positions. *Conjunctae*—sharps (with the natural always signifying *mi*) or flats (signifying *fa*)—would allow for rapid transition to more distant relationships. For example, the appearance of a C♯ in D Dorian would indicate a mutation from the *naturale* hexachord (whose second step is D/re) to the A hexachord, and could serve to establish a harmonic arrival on the fifth degree of the D Dorian composition.

Especially pertinent to our study here is the distinction made by a number of modern writers about the role of the modal and hexachordal system in the later sixteenth century. Allaire suggests that “singers did not need to know the conjunctae…. However, knowledge of the conjunctae was absolutely indispensable to the composer as well as to the instrumentalist who applied musica ficta, improvised, and transposed freely.”¹⁰ His further observation that “in the composer’s solmization all the standard hexachords with their flats or sharps were used”¹¹ agrees in principle with Karol Berger’s long-range view of the changing perceptions of the gamut:

So long as the controlling image in terms of which the gamut was conceived was that of the [Guidonian] hand, so long, that is, as a musician thought about accidentals primarily in terms of syllables (♭=*fa*, ♯/#=*mi*), he was likely to assume that the flat (or sharp) could not additionally inflect a step which was already *fa* (or *mi*).¹²

Berger continues his observation that by the fifteenth century the introduction of the pitch A♯ broke the barriers of the gamut, and implied that the primary function of an accidental was to inflect and not merely to indicate a solmization syllable; and he suggests that music was being considered in terms of the monochord

---


or keyboard. Further expansive tonal conquests in the sixteenth century led to the conception of the gamut in terms of staff notation rather than the keyboard. Finally, we must be cognizant that one of the principal issues of musica ficta distinguished by Gaston Allaire is the distinction between singer and composer; Berger’s main purpose is “to offer assistance by clarifying the meaning and use of the conventions governing the practice of implied accidentals….” Allaire concludes that “after 1550 … the increased use of sudden and remote hexachordal transpositions, as well as the appearance of chromatic alterations that defied traditional analysis, rendered mandatory the notation of individual sharps and flats.”

For our purposes, therefore, we may observe that a late Renaissance composer would have been quite meticulous in notating his works, no longer leaving decisions about implied accidentals to the performer. However, much of the terminology of mode that was still in use belies the continued utilization of the conventions of practical composition: the octave was the basis of a hierarchy in which the lower fifth has as its lowest note the final of the mode, and within the fifth stand two thirds, major or minor. Inversions of the fifth and the thirds into fourth and sixths thus provide choices of how to treat the mi-fa semitone interval. Comments by the theorist Nicola Vicentino are summarized by Berger in his earlier monograph as defining some pertinent ideas about musical composition:

The musical structure is to be based on the fundamental mode, the choice of which will be governed by the words, and the two steps which limit the juxtaposed fifths and fourths of the mode (that is

---

16 See Karol Berger, *Theories of Chromatic and Enharmonic Music in Late Sixteenth-Century Italy*, Studies in Musicology 10 (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press, 1980), 102, summarizing the modal hierarchy of Zarlino: “If Zarlino’s observation is correct—and I think it is—one might say that a mode is primarily a division of an octave species into species of fifth and fourth and secondarily a division of the species of fifth into two thirds.”
the final and the step a fifth above the final) will serve as the columns supporting the whole structure. Secondary modes may be introduced in the course of the composition, always following the words. These interjected modes should not be confused with the fundamental framework of the structure but are to be treated as ornaments introduced for the sake of variety and expressive flexibility. It is interesting that the art of the composer organizing the form of his work is compared with that of a painter organizing forms in space by means of perspective, creating the illusion of depth on a two-dimensional surface through lines converging in a single point…. There is further comparison with an architect who is able to unite diverse orders in one structure. The art of the composer, as that of a painter or an architect, enables him to organize diverse elements into a structure based on a single, unifying, fundamental principle, be it perspective or the basic mode.\textsuperscript{17}

From the above summary, we may observe that during the sixteenth century the geography of music was extended by means of modulation of hexachords to embrace the distant tonal areas of $F\# / G_b$—the furthest point from C possible. Field presents a valuable illustration of the entire range of Renaissance harmony by adapting a modern cycle-of-fifths diagram to clearly distinguish areas of “\textit{musica vera}” and “\textit{musica ficta}” (Figure 2).\textsuperscript{18}

With this expanding range of hexachords employed to deal with broader harmonic possibilities, sixteenth-century Italian writers made it clear that transposed hexachords were still involved with diatonic scale-patterns:

The transposed diatonic using many accidentals in notation should not be confused with the true chromatic. A step that belongs to a diatonic intervalllic structure is diatonic regardless of how it is

\textsuperscript{17}Nicola Vicentino, \textit{L’Antico musica ridotta alla moderna prattica} (1555), translated and cited in Berger, \textit{Theories of Chromatic}, 33.

\textsuperscript{18}Professor Field kindly permitted me to borrow diagrams from his comprehensive and elegant article. In the tradition of Renaissance “imitatio,” I intend to embellish upon his analytical schemes. For example, in this figure, the addition of the basic hexachordal note-letter would illustrate the derivations of the $\text{mi}$-$\text{fa}$ steps, so that the “\textit{musica vera}” position of C (with $\text{mi}$-$\text{fa}$ E-F) would stand at the top, with G to the right and F to the left. Further hexachords radiating at the fifth outwards would thus progress to D, A, E, etc. on the sharp side, and $B_b$, $E_b$, $A_b$, etc. on the flat side. Field explains (p. 7) the term used by Pietro Aaron in 1545—that “feigned” hexachords could be constructed on the sharp side with $C\#$, $G\#$, $D\#$, or $A\#$ as $\text{mi}$, and on the flat side with $E_b$, $A_b$, $D_b$, or $G_b$ as $\text{fa}$.
notated; other steps are purely chromatic. All theorists who describe the relationship between the genera assert that it creates a definite hierarchy of importance between steps: the truly chromatic steps are somehow less important, less fundamental, less stable than the diatonic ones.¹⁹

Such considerations raised among sixteenth-century theorists the issue of temperament, because they realised that only equal temperament would allow for equal semitones and the proper tuning of fretted instruments. In 1588, a friend of Gioseffo Zarlino advocated to him that dividing the octave into 12 equal semitones would permit singers, instrumentalists, and composers to sing or to play on whatever of the twelve steps they wish, according to the usage of practicing musicians, ut-re-mi-fa-sol-la, circling through all the notes, making (as he says) spherical music. They will be able to finish any composition comfortably where they started, as if in perpetual motion.

Music Theory in England

Late Renaissance Italian musical practices appear to have been corroborated, adapted, or even ignored by English composers and theorists. In her recent book, Rebecca Herrisone presents a survey of sources that show a national tendency toward practicality, avoidance of speculative theory, and a simplification of complex systems. Although understanding of the hexachordal system appears to have been confused among late-sixteenth-century English theorists, terminology was inconsistent, and the manner “of reducing the six solmization syllables to four seems to have been almost entirely confined to England, where it came into common use by the early seventeenth century”; nevertheless solmization was generally considered fundamental for learning intervals. One principle held fast, as well: the mi-fa semitone. “Once ficta hexachords

20 Gioseffo Zarlino, Sopplimenti musicali (Venice, 1588), cited in Berger, Theories of Chromatic, 71. Field, “Cosmography,” 9, gives a slightly different translation, but relates the observations about spherical music to his discussion of circumnavigating the globe. Kerman, Elizabethan Madrigal, 215, discusses “harmonic chromaticism” with the observation that “composers modulate by adding remote accidentals diatonically; they can treat any triad within the mode as a tonic center established by musica ficta, and can lower various scale degrees by the introduction of flats. Very effective modulations can be arranged in this way.”


22 Herrisone, Music Theory, 86f.
became possible, they were used to indicate the respective locations of fa and mi in whatever hexachord was operating at the time, and they were no longer restricted to the note B.”

A leader in these changes was the poet / composer / physician Thomas Campion, whose treatise *A New Way of making Fowre Parts in Counterpoint* (c. 1613) stands as a “landmark in English music theory.” Of primary significance is Campion’s advocacy for the bass part as the foundation of composition, rather than the tenor, which had governed previous Renaissance counterpoint:

The names of those foure parts are these. The *Base* which is the lowest part and foundation of the whole song: The *Tenor*, placed next above the *Base*; next above the *Tenor* the *Meane* or *Counter-Tenor*, and in the highest place the *Treble*. These foure parts by the learned are said to resemble the foure Elements: the Base expresseth the true nature of the earth, who being the gravest and lowest of all the Elements, is as a foundation to the rest….

Having now demonstrated that there are in all but foure parts, and that the Base is the foundation of the other three, I assume that the true sight and judgement of the upper three must proceed from the lowest, which is the Base, and I also conclude that every part in nature doth affect his proper and naturall place as the elements doe.

True it is that the auncient Musitions, who entended their Musicke onely for the Church, tooke their sight from the Tenor, which was rather done out of necessity then any respect to the true nature of Musicke: for it was usuall with them to have a Tenor as a Theame, to which they were compelled to adapt their other parts. But I will plainely convince by demonstration that contrary to some opinions the Base containes in it both the Aire and true judgement of the Key, expressing how any man at the first sight may view in at all the other parts in their original essence.  

---


25 Thomas Campion, *A New Way of making Fowre Parts in Counterpoint, by a most familiar, and infallible Rule* (printed c. 1613); modern edition in *The Works of Thomas Campion*, ed. Walter R. Davis (Garden City: Doubleday, 1967), 327. Campion borrowed his comparison of the four voices to the four elements from Zarlino, *Istitutioni harmoniche* (1558), book 3, chapter 58; see Lowinsky, “Concept of Physical and Musical Space” (1989), 10: “In exact parallel to the development of physical space, the tonal space not only was being expanded but also found a new form of organization.”
Even before making this fundamental statement, however, Campion also advocated reducing the traditional number of six solmization syllables to four, leaving out *ut* and *re*, because, as he explained:

> The substance of all Musicke, and the true knowledge of the scale, consists in the observations of the halfe note, which is expressed either by *Mi Fa*, or *La Fa*, and they being knowne in their right places, the other Notes are easily applied unto them.  

Herrisone places Campion’s treatise into the English context especially within her division on “The Development of Harmonic Tonality.” Her comments may therefore serve as a conclusion to this section of our study:

> The muddled state of modal theory in England even in the late sixteenth century, when most Continental treatises still presented it as a relevant system, can only suggest that modality was not being used to organize English music at the time—not least because relatively high-profile composers such as [Thomas] Morley seem to have had little idea how it was supposed to work. It is not surprising, then, that England produced some of the earliest references to a new method of organization based on harmony. Once again, Campion stands out as the most significant figure in this development.”

As she views Campion’s theories, Herrisone observes that he maintained the traditional division of the octave into fifth and fourth, and stressed the importance of establishing the “Key, or Moode, or Tone” of a piece, but did so with the intention of using the octave, fifth, and triads as the measure of a key. He was aware that the dominant had the closest relationship to the tonic, and that, in a minor key, the relative major was next in the hierarchy. “Cam-

---

26 Campion, *A New Way*, ed. Davis, 325. The *La Fa* passage refers to “una nota super ‘la’ semper est canendum ‘fa’”—the seventh step on a hexachordal scale. It cannot be our purpose here to deal with Campion’s advocacy of the four-syllable solmization scale with the solmization syllables sol la mi fa sol la fa sol—this being the outline of the Mixolydian scale. See Herrisone, *Music Theory*, especially p. 87. Campion goes on to explain the semitones by using the lute or the viol, fingering either two frets for a whole tone or one for a semitone; Field, “Cosmography,” 14–15, relates the frets to tablature that would clearly indicate semitones that could be spelled enharmonically.

pion’s understanding of key identity was harmonic,” she states, and concludes that his treatise “is of supreme significance because he was, to my knowledge, the first theorist who made virtually no reference at all to modal theories and was able, instead, to outline an entirely independent conception of key based on the major and minor triads and underscored by departure to related tonal areas.”

Ferrabosco’s Fantasias

Thomas Campion, a disciple of Sir Philip Sidney, dedicated his treatise “To the Flowre of Princes, Charles, Prince of Great Britaine,” and was the principal poet for the masques presented to the court of James I between 1607 and 1613. Scenery was designed by Inigo Jones, and music composed by Alfonso Ferrabosco the Younger among others.

Ferrabosco’s position in the Stuart court stood especially in close association with Henry, Prince of Wales, for whom he may have composed the twenty-three four-part fantasias attributed to him. The sheer number of positions in court as composer and music master to the Prince of Wales “shows Alfonso at the top of the English musical profession. The elusiveness of his person is in stark contrast with the almost mythical reverence in which his

---


29 On the death of Charles’s elder brother Henry, Prince of Wales, Campion wrote the “Songs of Mourning” set to music by Giovanni Coprario. The issue of borrowing and priority of either Campion’s *A New Way* or Coprario’s *Rules how to Compose*, apparently written at the same time, is discussed by Manfred F. Bukofzer in his facsimile edition of *Rules* (Los Angeles: E.E. Gottlieb, 1952), 17–20. Herrisone, *Music Theory*, 20, seems to incline toward Davis’s argument that Campion’s dedicating his treatise to Prince Charles would give it the precedence.

name was held in England.” His compositions were highly regarded and continued to be copied in many practical playing manuscripts through the later part of the seventeenth century. His fantasias are composed in a polished contrapuntal style that exploits many Renaissance conventions of canzona, ricercar, madrigal, canzonetta, and villanella through supple transformations of melodic and rhythmic figures and strong harmonic progressions. Above all, they are self-sufficient instrumental compositions, fully emancipated from word-oriented vocal music. Although he eschewed in his fantasias any chromatic passages of the sort observed in Weelkes, an influence from the Italian madrigal may be traced in Ferrabosco’s use of harmonic excursions. However, his purpose was not to produce wordless madrigals; rather, he created an instrumental idiom of motivic interaction among the parts with fluid treatment of harmonic motion into sometimes remote tonal areas.

It is the remarkable harmonic excursions that appear in certain Ferrabosco fantasias that will be the object of analytical focus in this study. Borrowing and adapting techniques developed by Gaston Allaire and Christopher Field, the following discussion of a single fantasia is an attempt to place the composer into the context of a historic crossroads in English musical style, during a transition from Renaissance traditions to new worlds of harmonic understanding. We do so while following the encouragement of Berger:

I do not think that we have to imitate sixteenth-century theoretical concepts and to refrain from introducing our own when trying to explain sixteenth-century music…. It does not follow, however,


that we may disregard old theorists completely and create totally arbitrary and anachronistic theories of our own.  

Already some important strides in analyzing Ferrabosco works have been made by Christopher Field, in his study of the Ferrabosco fantasia VdGS No. 21 (Musica Britannica vol. 62, no. 11) and the four-part fantasia “On the Hexachord”—as may be observed in his “Modulatory Scheme” (Figure 3).  

Field has been able to demonstrate, by means of this modulatory scheme and graphs that show the distribution of mi-fa steps, that “the most heroic of all the voyages of harmonic discovery recorded in English sources is the younger Ferrabosco’s ‘On the Hexachord’,” and he continues the analogy with geographical discovery by noting seven “eastward” and “westward” circumnavigations around the circle, each representing an enharmonic modulation.  

A score of the complete Fantasia No. 20 is presented as Appendix 2. Table 1 illustrates the range of hexachords that appear in the fantasia, showing the mi-fa semitones that determine which hexachord is in use. The headings mark the basic twelve classes of fundamentals and their diatonic mi-fa semitones, each a fifth away

---


34 The Ferrabosco fantasias “On the Hexachord,” in both four and five parts, are available in an edition by David Pinto, Corda Music Publications CMP 426 (1992), and have recently appeared in a comparative score within Christopher Field’s and Pinto’s Musica Britannica vol. 81 edition of the five- and six-part music of Ferrabosco. I agree with Christopher Field that Lowinsky was mistaken in attributing the Ferrabosco Hexachord fantasies for four and five viols to Alphonso della Viola during the mid-sixteenth century—see Field, “Cosmography,” p. 5, n. 5.


36 A complete recording of all twenty-three Ferrabosco four-part fantasias was prepared by members of the New England Regional Chapter of the Viola da Gamba Society of America to celebrate the chapter’s twenty-fifth anniversary in 2002.
Figure 3. “Modulatory scheme of Alfonso Ferrabosco the younger’s *Ut re mi fa sol la* and *La sol fa mi re ut* (On the Hexachord, parts 1 and 2). Numbers 1.1–1.8 refer to the eight ascending hexachords which form the cantus firmus of Part 1; 2.1–2.8 refer to the eight ascending hexachords which form the cantus firmus of Part 2. As in Figure I.1 [reproduced as Figure 2 above], hexachords are identified by their *mi—fa* steps. Clockwise arrows indicate mutation sharpwards, anticlockwise flatwards.” Fig. I.2 from Field: “Jenkins and the Cosmography of Harmony,” *John Jenkins and His Time: Studies in English Consort Music*, ed. Ashbee and Holman, 25. By permission of Oxford University Press.

ranging from D♭ to F♯. Above them are marked the modal relations that are incorporated along with the hexachords into the governing “key” of this fantasia: for example, the key signature of one flat signifies along with the G final that a system of mode and hexachords will determine the G Dorian mode. A box is marked around the three hexachords that are central to G Dorian. That central determining tone begins on *re* of the F *molle* hexachord and its
scale can be interlocked with the C naturale hexachord to reach the octave above. The fifth step of G may have a triad built above the D that incorporates the mi-fa e/f of the C naturale hexachord or the mi-fa f#/g of the D hexachord that can act as a dominant above the modal center of G. However, already in the first measure, Ferrabosco moves away from the G Dorian modality by providing a B♭, thus signaling a change of mi-fa to B/C, and thus a shift to the G durum hexachord that inclines harmonically toward C. However, the durum hexachord, combined with the mi-fa F#/G of the D hexachord, produces a scalar passage whose “major-scale” character features raised third and seventh degrees. In turn, this too is diverted immediately in the next measure with the G Dorian alto part in the F molle hexachord as well as the same hexachord operating in the tenor for both the fa-mi B♭/A and the E♭ “una nota super ‘la’ semper est canendum ‘fa’” (marked throughout the analysis by parenthesis brackets).

**Table 1.** Ferrabosco II: Fantasia a4 No. 20, Musica Britannica vol. 62 (VdGS No. 22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>“major” V</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAR</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>B♭ F C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>f/g♭</td>
<td>c/d♭</td>
<td>g/a♭</td>
<td>d/e♭</td>
<td>a/b♭</td>
<td>e/f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>( commonplace )</td>
<td>(g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>( commonplace )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>( commonplace )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 1.** Ferrabosco II: Fantasia a4 No. 20, Musica Britannica vol. 62 (VdGS No. 22).

37 Herrisone, *Music Theory*, 92, points out that English theorists often allowed mi on D “which accorded with the tendency to elevate B♭ to the status of recta hexachord in some circumstances.”
Table 1 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAR</th>
<th>D♭</th>
<th>A♭</th>
<th>E♭</th>
<th>B♭</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F♯</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>(IV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>of f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B♭/g</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(V)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plotting the harmonic progressions of the fantasia, Table 1 should be read from top downwards, so that the shift of hexachords from the “musica vera” tonal center to the outer “musica ficta” hexachords can be followed from measure to measure (marked as “Bar” in the left column). A vertical stroke indicates the presence of that hexachord within that measure. On the score (Appendix 2), the hexachords are marked, as well as their mi-fa semitones (using the ▲ symbol). Furthermore, solmization names are provided in order to show when a particular pitch must be renamed in order to mutate to a different hexachord. Symbols of boxes and circles are used to mark those notes that form the structure of the interlocked hexachords formed within each measure—and (if preparation of the table has been accurate in such complex shifts) not necessarily the tonal centers. With such an integration of mode and hexachords, the pitch G can be either part of the molle hexachord (on the second step) or part of the G durum hexachord (as the base finalis). Further, the pitch G can be the plagal fourth degree of a scale on D, thus dividing the octaves into fifths and fourths.

On a larger view (since it is not possible to progress throughout the music on a note-by-note level), the basic motivic figure that is developed throughout Section 1 of the fantasia is itself a cadential function, and many passing cadences are diverted by hexachordal shift so as to produce a seamless contrapuntal progressive texture. Some cadences resolve more strongly, and these are marked on both the score and the analytical Table 1. Some of these cadences are prepared with stronger “dominant/tonic” formulas (marked with the symbol V and the letter name of the cadential arrival); until measure 7, these all remain on the fundamental tonal center of G (with either lowered third B♭ fa or raised third B♯ mi). A stronger cadence occurs for the fifth degree D (measure 10), but the larger harmonic drive shifts within the same measure toward B♭, the “rel-
ative major key” on the third degree of G Dorian—and the two strokes on Table 1 reveal an area of relative rest in measure 11 on the F molle and B♭ hexachords. An especially daring exploitation of the “mi contra fa” rule occurs immediately afterwards in measure 12, as the molle and durum hexachords are combined in a climax of cross-relations. On the other hand, two strokes can also indicate a strong harmonic motion, as the areas of G Dorian (in the molle hexachord) tonal center and its “dominant” on D raise tension through measures 14 and 15 to a strong “tonic” arrival in measure 16.

In Section 2 (beginning at measure 16), the descending melodic motive incorporates a fa-mi figure often in sequential repetitions, thus allowing for progress downwards as a counterpoint to the first motive from Section 1. This combination allows here for the G scale to appear in two outlines: as G Mixolydian on the durum hexachord (with lowered seventh step, F in the naturale hexachord) and as what we would call “G melodic minor” on the F molle hexachord (with lowered sixth degree E♭ from the B♭ hexachord), as well.

Undoubtedly the most strikingly imaginative passage of this fantasia begins its movement around measure 21, with a strong leaping harmonic motion in the bass that prepares for a cadence on the “relative major” B♭ but is deflected back toward G and a cadential formula that includes a suspended seventh degree, immediately followed by another sequentially a tone higher. The passage is constructed, in fact, from the rising Section 1 motive in both the outer parts. The treble plays a melodic sequence of three mi-fa shifts that progresses from B♭ through C and D to E♭—without ever employing any true chromatic series of semitones. This passage is constructed over the bass, playing an augmented version of the same Section 1 motive in the durum version. Harmonic motion increases while moving toward the flat hexachords with E♭ in measure 23 to a strong G/C cadence in measure 24) and a combination of six hexachords with numerous cross-relations. The tonal palette expands further to a ficta hexachord on A♭ (with its Db/C fa-mi semitone), a harmonic excursion seemingly far distant from the original tonal center on G confirmed by strong V/I cadences and predominant statements of the rising Section 1 motive on both the E♭ and A♭ hexachords (measure 30).
The high point of the fantasia has been reached with the distant harmonic excursion, and Ferrabosco manipulates the descending sequential nature of the Section 2 motive through subtle rhythmic shifts and transformations to move away toward the tonic key. The hexachord modulations shown in Table 1 through measures 30 to 36 reveal this drift homewards. Ferrabosco appears to exploit cadential conventions in a passage such as measures 34 and 35, where he prepares for arrival on D but diverts the motion through the intrusion of a B♭ and a G; this type of diverted cadential layering occurs in other fantasias as well. A melodic and rhythmic transformation of the first motive (measure 36) sounds as its last outcry before further sequential falls of the second resign themselves to the harmonic return of the “dominant” D. There, in measure 41, two statements of the first motive appear on the D hexachord and the “una nota super ‘la’” E♭ all prepare for the return of G; only two hexachord strokes on Table 1 show the cadential motion. With the inverted pedal G in the last three measures, the harmonic arrival is repeatedly confirmed. The version of the first figure recalls the opening bars, and joins with the second figure on final sighs in parallel sixths. Even at the end, Ferrabosco leaves the sense that perhaps the entire fantasia is cast in the C tone that is suggested in the opening—and he does so by recalling the durum version of the first motive that leads toward the fourth step, C, and ends with a plagal cadence on G.

Fantasia No. 20 stands as the summation of Ferrabosco’s achievements, short of the fantasia “On the Hexachord”—there is no circumnavigation of the entire gamut, but its tonal palette allows for harmonic excursions as far as A♭ in the G Dorian mode. There is no doubt of the harmonic focus, however—we never feel that we have left the tonal center. Ferrabosco deals with his modulations in such a subtle manner that we may even consider that he has come to understand “modulatione” as no longer a Medieval/Renaissance term involving changes from one hexachord to another, but as a more recent concept of tonal or harmonic shift from one key center to another.

Contrapuntal voice-leadings move with subtle fluidity through highly original harmonic resolutions, rapidly traveling through expected areas, then altered by new sequences and unexpected turns
to deceptive and otherwise elided cadences. The heightened cadence formulas at measures 22 and 23 are especially remarkable. Finally, all of the above are combined with motivic mastery, utilizing what amounts to a monothematic texture, with recapitulatory and climactic recalls of initial thematic materials.

The entire harmonic scope of our sample fantasia is traversed by diatonic semitones—we cannot assume that Ferrabosco composed his works by using solmization, and it is clear from our analysis that the hexachordal system is very much exploited and taxed by the use of so many semitone shifts. But the sample presented here demonstrates that Ferrabosco did not use two simultaneous chromatic steps at any time in his composition. No matter what range of harmonic color Ferrabosco employs here, the pillars B♭ – F – C of the G Dorian mode reinforce the overall design, further strengthened by the harmonic drive towards cadential arrivals on the principal focal points of the composition.

In his edition Alfonso Ferrabosco II: The Hexachord Fantasies in 4 and 5 parts, David Pinto quotes the Oxford historian and viol-player Anthony Wood as calling Ferrabosco “the most famous man in all the world for fantasies of 5. or 6. Parts” and discusses the context of such creations in the atmosphere of artistic and intellectual ferment centered around the burgeoning court circles of Henry, Prince of Wales:

The dissolution of the solmisation system they celebrate, and the advent of new tonality, showed the way to successors like John Jenkins…. Ferrabosco was better placed than any other composer at the center of intellectual life as tutor in music to Henry, Prince of Wales, heir to the throne until premature death in 1612. Even after the height of their collaboration Ben Jonson, not one given to fulsome praise, called Alfonso a man “mastring all the spirits of Musique.”

---


39 Pinto, Hexachord Fantasies, 3. I am indebted to Christopher Field, “Cosmography,” p. 27 n. 57, for this reference. See also Roy Strong, Henry
Ferrabosco’s contemporary and fellow composer, Thomas Tomkins, copied almost all of his fantasias into a score with the heading “Alfonso 4 pts: Fancyes to the Vylls: 20” and the annotation:

All of them excellent good, But made only for the Vylls & organ which is the Reason that he takes such liberty of Compass which he would have restrayned; If it had bin made for voyces only.\(^{40}\)

Could this use of “Compass” refer as well to harmonic excursions?

---

\(^{40}\) London, British Library, Add. MS 29996, fol. 72v-3; facsimile in Musica Britannica vol. 62, p. xxxiii.
Appendix 1

how strangely Fogo burns, how strangely Fogo burns,
how strangely Fogo burns, how strangely Fogo burns,
how strangely Fogo burns, how strangely Fogo burns,
how strangely Fogo burns, how strangely Fogo burns,

Amidst an ocean full of flying
Amidst an ocean full of
Amidst an ocean full of
Amidst an ocean full of
Amidst an ocean full of

strangely Fogo burns, how strangely Fogo burns,
strangely Fogo burns, how strangely Fogo burns,
strangely Fogo burns, how strangely Fogo burns,
strangely Fogo burns, how strangely Fogo burns,
strangely Fogo burns, how strangely Fogo burns,
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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 Belfast, Belfast BT7 1NN, Northern Ireland, or e-mailed to <i.woodfield@qub.ac.uk>.


REVIEWS


This volume, containing a baker’s dozen of articles, is the published result of the fourth in a series of symposia under the inspirational guidance of Christophe Coin that have featured a collaboration among experts in viol building, repertoire, and playing technique. The first three, beginning in 1995 and organized by Coin himself, took place in Limoges and concentrated respectively on French, English, and German traditions of viol making and performance; the last, centered on the generally more neglected topic of the Italian viol, was organized by Susan Orlando and took place in the northern Italian village of Magnano. As the “birthplace” of both the viol and violin families, Italy occupies a special place in the history of bowed strings; while other countries (notably Spain, in the case of the viol) made important contributions to their early development, it is in Italy that we find the first clear evidence of them in their full-fledged state as families, or “consorts.” It is to Italian provenance that the majority of purported sixteenth-century viols have been ascribed, although the authenticity of many of these examples has been hotly debated in the last few decades. Then too, Italy has been recognized as the origin of the species of viol known as the viola bastarda, as well as the hub of its art and style of performance. As the cradle of violin making, Italy has sometimes been blamed for an occasional, almost traitorous introduction of violin-like elements into the supposedly “pure,” classic viol design. And finally, Italy has been seen as the first European country to throw over the viol in favor of the violin. Thus these are the primary themes—early history of the viol, nature and authenticity of surviving examples, bastarda performance and influences, morphology and classification of viol types, and continuing use of the viol throughout a period of decline—that run through the articles in this volume.
An excellent review of the papers as presented at the conference has appeared in this *Journal* (see Thomas G. MacCracken, “Research Report: Conferences in Magnano and Edinburgh,” *JVDGSA* 37 [2000], 68–83), and this report may be consulted for a précis of each article. (Of the original fourteen papers read, only one—Paolo Biordi’s study of Italian viol iconography—did not see its way to publication, presumably because it would have depended too heavily upon graphic reproduction of examples. Other changes, as reflected in alterations to some of the titles, seem to have been minor.) As MacCracken mentions, however, he was able to attend only part of Martin Kirnbauer’s presentation on “The Viola da Gamba in Chromatic and Enharmonic Music in Seventeenth-Century Rome,” so that a slightly fuller account of this paper is in order. As part of his experiments with the revival of certain aspects of ancient Greek musical practice, Giovanni Battista Doni made use of viols with special setups in order to achieve the multiplicity of pure intervals theoretically demanded by extreme chromaticism and modulation. (The original necks of these instruments had been replaced with wider ones, pierced with holes to allow for different string lengths and provided with longitudinal slots to allow for differentiated fret placements—staggered frets, in essence.) In order to handle the complexities of these prepared viols, Doni had to invent special alphabets for his system of tablature. As pointed out by Kirnbauer, it would take a much more extensive exposition of Doni’s ideas than possible in a short paper to explain all of their subtleties and ramifications for viols, but the basic concept of achieving purity of intonation in the performance of some of the most harmonically adventurous music of the period is clear. (It may help readers grappling with the information presented to understand that the names of the modes as discussed by Doni—and thus Kirnbauer—follow the definitions as understood by the ancient Greeks, which differ from those of Medieval and Renaissance theory with which we may be more familiar; thus the order of intervals of Doni’s Phrygian is what we might expect for Dorian, and vice versa. Also, readers should be aware that the graphic information—but not the captions—in Plates 7 and 8 of the article have apparently been switched.)

While a number of the articles in this volume—including Kirnbauer’s—address the question of the continuing production
and use of the viol in Italy in the seventeenth century and beyond, demonstrating that it was not quite the “dead issue” some have claimed, they do not begin to overturn the received opinion of scholars that the gamba enjoyed a considerably more robust following in other countries; it seems quite clear that its post-Renaissance use in Italy was primarily as a “special purpose tool”—for experimental music (such as Doni’s), as a “color” instrument, or as a pedagogical aid. Much more controversial, on the other hand, are several questions looming behind the presentations concerned with the earlier period of the viol’s history.

First, and perhaps most important in its implications for the sound of the viol, is the question of the soundpost. It is no accident that the latter is called l’âme—“the soul”—in French (and l’anima in Italian), so essential it is to the sound of a bowed string instrument. It is not merely a question of support for the belly of the instrument, as assumed by many writers (in spite of copious published information as to its true function). Its primary purpose is to support the treble foot of the bridge, forcing the latter to rotate in its motion around a comparatively fixed point. Without it, or something introducing the same sort of asymmetry of bridge motion, one hears very little fundamental in the timbre (for reasons well understood by acousticians—although any player whose post has fallen knows the characteristic sound). Its influence on tone and volume transcends in importance every other design feature—outline, arching, thicknessing, soundhole shape, finish, and even stringing. The latter details are, of course, much more easily seen, measured, and discussed. The problem of the history of the soundpost, in spite of its crucial significance, has remained elusive. While one author or another investigating Renaissance viols will present “evidence of absence,” such evidence is anything but conclusive, as long as the authenticity of the surviving viols themselves is in doubt. (Even the presence or absence of a soundpost plate, as found in most later viols, is not necessarily definitive, since a soundpost can, in fact, survive in place without one if the back is sufficiently stiff.) Perhaps we may never find a certain answer to this problem, but we cannot say we understand Renaissance viols until we do; without an answer, the most sophisticated acoustical experiments and explanations are of limited value.
On the question of vetting the purported surviving viols, however, we do seem to be making some progress. Not long after the first wave of interest in reconstructing Renaissance viols (which began in the late 1970s), instrument historians became aware of the writings and pronouncements of Karel Moens (himself one of the contributors to the volume under review), who had expressed strong doubts as to the genuineness of the purported originals upon which the reconstructions had been based. While researchers seemed to accept at least some of Moens’s findings, there have continued to be heard some *sotto voce* complaints about the “baby:bathwater” ratio in tossing out all of the previously accepted evidence. It is only recently, however, that other investigators have begun to counter effectively the blanket dismissal of that evidence, showing that at least some elements of some of the instruments are unquestionably old, even though there has been considerable reworking and substitution of parts over the centuries. The contributions of Simone Zopf and Marco Tiella to the Magnano symposium are examples of such careful research. It is surprising, however, that one still finds sprinkled about the volume occasional blithe references to one or another of the disputed originals (particularly the “Ebert” viol—one of the subjects of Moens’s contribution) as evidence, as though the validity of that evidence did not need considerable defense in light of Moens’s findings.

Also underlying the problems of understanding Renaissance viols is the question of strings, particularly as it concerns the solutions that were in vogue for bass strings before the advent of metal-overspun strings in the mid-seventeenth century. This question affects all Renaissance and early-Baroque gut-strung instruments, of course, and it has thus occupied a number of researchers over a number of decades; it remains a hotly contested area, particularly since there is so little direct evidence to go on. Oliver Webber in his contribution to the symposium (“Real Gut Strings: Some New Experiments in Historical Stringing”) is a strong advocate for heavy stringing and equal tension from treble to bass, as he is also for pure, “unloaded” gut for the bottom strings. (Other experimenters, particularly Mimmo Peruffo of Aquila strings, have advocated the use of gut impregnated or “loaded” with metallic compounds or other heavy substances.) I believe Webber has been
better at presenting the evidence for his own approach than at reporting the evidence of others (such as Peruffo) with whom he disagrees; enthusiasm for one’s own solutions can certainly be forgiven, but the occasional use of tendentious (loaded!) words such as “authentic” and “historical” to describe them in contradistinction with the solutions of others (especially when the evidence is so tenuous) does not inspire confidence in the writer’s objectivity. In any case, the reader should be aware of the existence of other approaches, which are spelled out in detail in sources referenced in Webber’s footnotes. (I should like to add that, from what I have seen of the iconographic evidence cited by Webber as witness to the extreme gradation in diameter from bass to treble in early stringing, the differences as illustrated are rather smaller than those demanded by his theories of equal tension; they are certainly considerable, but to my eye not quite on the order he advocates.)

One other article in the collection needs to be read with some caution, in my view. Luc Breton’s acoustic theories of the behavior of bowed strings (as stated in his article “The System and Proportions of Barring on Viols”) are quite different from the ones found in the standard texts on acoustics. As published, at least, they do not make sense to me—particularly his explanation of the function of the early bridge and its supposed “chiasma.” It is, of course, quite possible that a longer and more expansive treatment of the subject would allow him to make himself clear, but his non-standard explanations do not come through as convincing in the brief space he has been allotted.

Finally, I should like to comment upon one of the iconographic examples cited by Renato Meucci in the article (“Early Evidence of the Viola da Gamba in Italy”) that opens the volume. Meucci, who has recently produced an edition and translation (into Italian) of Ian Woodfield’s groundbreaking book *The Early History of the Viol* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), has taken this opportunity to collect and present a few discoveries of his own—iconographic, theoretical, linguistic, and organological—that support Woodfield’s theories. He cites a pair of paintings by Parmigianino (on the organ doors of Parma’s church of Santa Maria della Steccata) that show two icons of music, King David and St. Cecilia. According to Meucci, David is holding a *vihuela* of the sort played “indifferently as a plucked or bowed instru-
ment,” while St. Cecilia is holding a viol. I have no problem at all with the latter identification, in spite of the fact that the body of the viol is completely hidden from view; the neck is absolutely typical of that of a viol, and the saint clearly holds a bow with her right hand (though not in playing position!). However, I see absolutely no evidence of the bow Meucci claims David is holding in his left hand, along with the instrument; after examining a number of color reproductions of the paintings, I have concluded that the bow is simply not there. As the date of the paintings (1522–23) is in any case rather late for a sighting of a Valencian-style vihuela de arco, it seems to me that we are simply seeing the depiction of a vihuela de mano (sometimes known as a viola da mano in Italy). As a vihuela de mano it would not necessarily have been strummed with “all the strings . . . sounding simultaneously,” but more likely played with a polyphonic technique resembling that of the lute. (See Hiroyuki Minamino, “The Spanish Plucked Viola in Renaissance Italy, 1480–1530,” Early Music 32/2 [May 2004]: 177–92.) Further nigglng cautions regarding this article concern the word “clarinet” (p. 22), which should surely read “clarino,” and “fifteenth” (p. 31, bottom), which—as a translation of sedicesimo—must certainly read “sixteenth.”

As pointed out in the foreword by Christophe Coin, the subject of the Italian viol is one of exceeding complexity, and the evidence is often debatable. My own reservations (as expressed above) about a few of the articles under review only serve to underscore this view. The organizers and participants in the symposium are all to be complimented for taking on the task of advancing our knowledge of this important subject and for producing a handsome collection of essays. Each author’s passion and commitment to his or her subject is evident, and each offering will serve as a springboard for further research and study.

Herbert W. Myers


“The Manchester Gamba Book, a seventeenth-century manuscript residing in the Manchester Public Library, … is perhaps the richest treasure in the entire literature of the Lyra Viol. It is the largest single collection of Lyra Viol music, containing 246 pieces in tablature (plus another twelve pieces in staff notation) in twenty-two different tunings.” (Paul Furnas) A presumably mid-seventeenth-century source, the Manchester manuscript dates from that slightly mysterious era when the glorious English school of viol playing had fled into continental and provincial diaspora, and before the French school had announced itself in print. As such it relates to the solo works of William Young (some of which are contained in the Manchester manuscript) and the earliest French masters (Du Buisson and Nicolas Hotman) that have only recently come to our attention. In this context, the Manchester manuscript’s approach to the instrument is interesting.

The book is presented almost entirely in French lute tablature, a feature that it holds in common with the much more famous prints of Tobias Hume dating from the opening years of the seventeenth century. However, the player who hopes to find Captain Hume’s dramatic harmonic language extended by the possibilities of the variant tunings will be disappointed (Hume’s music is mostly in “normal” tuning). Instead, the physical sense of play and the exploration of color are the main points of interest in the Manchester manuscript’s repertoire. Tablature, a prescriptive notation, does not indicate how the music will sound. It tells us how to tune the instrument and how to move our fingers and arms. The result is in a sense not precisely a composition of notes, but something more like a composition of physical gestures, a choreography really. Many compositions in odd tunings feature musical content that could really be presented in a normal tuning without any loss in compositional integrity. The unique appeal is to the kinesthetic sense as the right arm is incited to athletic leaps across five strings.
and back, the left hand directed alternately to contract, stretch, or run, all for the sheer joy of movement. For the experienced player, surprises and “in-jokes” abound as familiar movements produce unfamiliar voicings and thoroughly unfamiliar movements are demanded to produce the simplest effects. Lacy textures predominate. Where Hume’s imposing pavanes gave us Elizabethan splendor in five- and six-note chords, the Cavalier violists more frequently offer an airy movement, expressing harmony and virtuosity in deft leaps from voice to voice.

In playing through the book, the voice of the instrument gets an interesting sort of workout as the extreme tunings elicit an exciting range of colors and responses. One might re-string the instrument for some of the stranger tunings. When I did not bother I found that I relished the potent sounds and sensations that my instrument produced under various conditions of tension and slackness.

Highlights in the first part of the book include Richard Sumarte’s very beautiful settings of traditional ballads and dances, and his truly remarkable intabulation of Dowland’s *Lachrymae*. Later we find many compositions employing detailed ornaments, often imparting a vaguely Scots feel to the music (as in Gervaise Gerarde’s untitled piece on page 39). On pages 91 to 97 are found the overtly Scots pipe pieces. A very large part of the book is devoted to rather French dance pieces: Allmands, Sarabands, and Corants. Perhaps the most notable of these are the poetic Allmands of John Jenkins and some bizarreries of William Young. Given the stature and beauty of this important source it is strange that the complete contents of this manuscript had not been published in either facsimile or modern edition until last year, when Jeremy Burbidge’s Peacock Press of West Yorkshire offered us this facsimile, making it one notch easier for all of us to delve into this fascinating and pleasurable repertoire.

One may have quibbles with the production values of this issue. The ivory-colored paper is of poor opacity. Without having seen the original myself, I suspect that the quality of the reproduction is very imperfect, with many lines and figures faint or fading to nothing. The introductory material is minimal, offering no information on the many obscure composers represented, no information about concordances, no speculation about authorship of the many anonymous pieces, nor any information about the date of the manuscript. (The manuscript is not dated, but surely internal evidence
could be used to establish *termini post et ante quem.* The wire binding has the functional value of allowing the pages to open flat on a music stand. It does not produce a beautiful or a durable book. The fact that Mr. Burbidge has misspelled the last name of the author of the introduction (Paul Furnas) on the title page does not inspire confidence that he has taken the care with this publication that would merit the $55 price tag. At that cost, persons interested in studying the repertoire of the Manchester manuscript might well consider the options of borrowing the microfilm from the VdGSA lending library and printing it out at the nearest library, or ordering from University Microfilms a microfilm of Furnas’s excellent dissertation (Stanford, 1978), in which he has taken the trouble to transcribe the entire manuscript in a beautifully clear hand that reproduces well.

Joëlle Morton, in an excellent edition for PRB Productions, has taken a different approach to another important seventeenth-century source for English viol music. The Merro manuscripts housed at the Bodleian Library are a precious treasure trove of hundreds of solos and consort pieces for viols composed by our most beloved Jacobean and Caroline composers. From this imposing and tantalizing source Morton has selected ten delectable lyra duos, and offers them in a carefully prepared, easy-to-use modern edition. Lyra players will enjoy the refreshing experience of playing from clearly legible parts with bar numbers to assist study and rehearsal. Another unusual and welcome feature of the edition is a score in staff notation. (I have often wondered whether lyra-viol music remains so relatively little known in part because so little of it has ever been transcribed into staff notation, and hence the repertoire remains almost entirely unavailable for critical inquiry by anyone who does not make the effort to actually play it.) The selections presented here are lovely. My favorites are the imposing Suite of Simon Ives, and a richly dissonant Alman of John Bosley (VdGS No. 2). Morton has also provided an informative introduction placing the source and repertoire in context, and a critical commentary. Many thanks to Joëlle Morton and PRB Productions for this eminently satisfactory edition of valuable and previously unavailable repertoire.

John Mark Rozendaal

This publication will be welcomed into the libraries of viol players who were captivated by the music of William Lawes during his anniversary year and who now wish to discover other composers active during the English Civil War, Commonwealth, and Restoration. Their music remains for many of us a kind of *mare incognito*—a relatively undifferentiated sea between landmark fantasias of John Coprario, Alfonso Ferrabosco, and their contemporaries on one shore, and Henry Purcell on the other. But the period offers rich rewards, for it saw significant developments in the evolution of instrumental music. A watershed was the “fantasia-suite,” conceived by Coprario and cultivated by John Jenkins and Hingeston, among others of their kind, through the middle years of the century.

Editor Richard Charteris provides a useful summary of the career of the composer, who led a rich life from his birth around 1600 to his death in 1683. He was a close contemporary of Jenkins (1592–1678) and nearly as long-lived. But where Jenkins seems to have preferred the easy pace of country homes to the bustle of the court, Hingeston danced a slightly more frenetic jig. His earliest training was at York Minster, where his father was one of the singing men. From there he was taken into service by the family of Francis Clifford, Earl of Cumberland, who sent him to the capital for several years of organ lessons with Orlando Gibbons. Hingeston returned to work for the Cliffords for a lengthy period (c. 1620–45). After the overthrow of Charles I (and the sacking of the Clifford family home), he taught privately for a few years in London. During the Commonwealth Hingeston was engaged as organist and “Master of the Music” to Oliver Cromwell. He would survive the latter to be appointed viol player and curator of instruments at Charles II’s Restoration Court. At his own death, Hingeston was succeeded in the Royal Music by his sometime apprentice, Henry Purcell.

Works by Hingeston survive for various combinations of viols and keyboards. (A number of dances for cornetts and sackbuts
have fared less well.) The present collection includes nine suites, for violin, bass viol, and organ. The suites all consist of a “fantazia” movement, followed by an “almande,” a triple-time “ayre” (galliard or saraband), and a brief concluding strain in duple time. The latter represents an *envoi* or leave-taking, rather than a separate dance. The organ lines are fully written out, contain independent thematic material, and are not simply realizations of a continuo part. While the organist’s left hand occasionally doubles the viol, each instrument partakes of the polyphonic texture; each is indispensable to the ensemble.

The fantasia-suites demonstrate the creeping influence of the “new” style that was then making inroads from Italy. They typically begin in a sober cast, but quickly manifest intense rhythmic vitality, which often takes the form of propulsive leaps or *saultes* (Roger North’s term, from North, *On Music*, ed. John Wilson [London: Novello, 1959], 74). Points of imitation stated at the outset are treated pliably and submit to a metamorphosis that may begin even before the point is expounded by successive voices. But even as the points are transformed it is often the case that most of the thematic material can be traced back to the initial exposition. An example will illustrate, found in the evolution of the first point of imitation in the opening suite.

In that suite, in B♭ major, the organ introduces the theme (Example 1). The salient features create an arch. A leap to the scale fifth is followed by the completion of the octave in a conjunct rise. Root, fifth, and octave are articulated in white notes, the conjunct rise in eighths. The rapid rise is immediately echoed: degrees 6, 7, and 8 are imitated at 3, 4, and 5. Finally the arch closes with a leap down to the keynote. This point of imitation has several features that give it character. Taken together these make it easily recognizable when subsequent voices proclaim it in turn.

![Example 1](image-url)

*Example 1.* Fantazia from Fantasia-suite in B♭, organ, opening.
First stated by the organ treble, the point is imitated by the viol yoked to the organ bass (Example 2). This iteration preserves the essential features. The imitation is exact rather than tonal, starting on degree 4 (rather than 5) before leaping to 8. The conjunct rise is echoed twice rather than once, and the arch closes not to degree 4 (the starting point in this case) but again to 1.

Example 2. Fantazia from Fantasia-suite in B♭, mm. 2–4, bass viol entry.

When the violin sounds the point (another “answer” entry, although tonal rather than exact), a more surprising change is manifest: a rest is introduced, separating the first pitch from the point (Example 3). Here the metamorphosis of the point (even its gradual dissolution) has already set in. Hingeston directs attention to a single component of the arch, the conjunct rise, now clearly an off-beat figure. The conjunct rise straddles the barline, closing in a metrically strong position.¹

Example 3. Fantazia from Fantasia-suite in B♭, mm. 4–5, violin entry.

To understand the implication of this, it may be useful to recall a line of reasoning laid out by North regarding the nature of “air” as an aesthetic component in music of the seventeenth century. North suggests that a line descending through an octave and set over a sustained tonic is lacking in “air” (Roger North, On Music, p. 74.) But if the descending line is offset relative to the bass, the

¹ Whether barlines were in the original is immaterial, since the point of arrival coincides with the tactus downstroke. Against the argument that the tactus has little rhythmic import in fantasias, the answer must be that by the terms of the Baroque aesthetic, as dance inflections color instrumental music more generally, the tactus clearly frames gestures. These gestures represent corporeal movement, whereby the downstroke equates to the foot touching the floor. This concept is effectively explored in Putnam Aldrich, Rhythm in 17th-Century Italian Monody (New York: Norton, 1966).
same figure acquires “air,” apparently for two reasons: because the action is off-beat, and because the figure generates momentum that propels it to completion in a metrically strong position. (See Example 4.)

Hingeston creates a rhythmic sense of “air” in this same way when he employs the brief conjunct rise. First, it is rhythmically off-beat, and second, it propels the line into the subsequent measure. A cursory examination of the point of imitation would seize on the long values that delineate the scale prime, fifth, and octave—because they invoke the tonic triad so clearly—but the composer focuses instead on a seemingly less consequential detail, and weaves the cloth of the composition from the little conjunct rise. This figure usurps the lion’s share of attention, becoming the raw material of the fantasy. The story is one of rhythmic momentum, an “airy” tale. Stripping away elements of the initial point of imitation, Hingeston arrives at a kernel that is more susceptible of manipulation. It consists of just these two elements: melodically, a conjunct rise through a third; rhythmically, a succession of two brief upbeats leading to a longer downbeat. This, in any event, is the effect, regardless of where the figure arises in the measure.

After toying with the smaller gesture a certain amount, he fixes on the rhythmic aspect to come up with a “new” figure, which assumes a degree of rhetorical importance by insisting on one pitch instead of sounding the conjunct rise. Thus, in the violin part at the pickup to measure 15, the two upbeat eighths become three, reiterating the pitch g" (Example 5).²

² Any doubt that the repetition carries rhetorical significance should be dispelled by the fact that this gesture comes on the heels of a perfect authentic cadence to G on the second half-note beat of m. 14.
This figure is soon abandoned; a brief stretch shot with cross-rhythms takes its place. A complex texture results as each part weaves figures having in common a dotted quarter (typically in an off-beat position) followed by an eighth, and then, variably, a succession of one or two quarters (Example 6). Thus the rhythmic elements integral to the conjunct rise, first heard in the initial point of imitation as S(hort) - S(hort) - L(long), here morph into L - S - L - L (as in “AL-bu-QUER-QUE”). If the violin is taken as the standard, the last of these Longs is little more than a mere spacer, while the more important grouping is L - S - L, which sounds three-note arabesques like so many cirrus clouds (mm. 18–20). Soon these smooth out into a sequence that recalls the earlier conjunct rise.

Example 6. Rhythmic and melodic shape of figure transformed; conjunct rise returns. Fantazia from Fantasia-suite in Bb, violin, mm. 18–22.

In a variety of ways the conjunct rise that seemed so inconsequential in the opening point of imitation pervades the texture of the fantasia. Echoes are heard even in the other suite movements. It becomes an element tying together disparate stretches of material. Not everyone will hear it this way. But it is worth recalling that Thomas Mace, later in the century, would stipulate that suite
movements ought to have something “akin,” some element that ties them together. The concept is probably a legacy of the pavan-galliard grouping, employing clear thematic links, that many see as the precursor of the suite. The particular figure in question here, the conjunct rise, arguably becomes just such a factor of kinship across the movements of the suite. This is the more striking given the broad leaps of arpeggiation that are the most evident feature of the initial point of imitation. Indeed, similar arpeggiation is featured in the opening point in every fantasia. It is one of the most distinguishing characteristics of the set.

Consider the opening measures of the third suite, in C major (Example 7).

![Example 7. Fantasia-suite in C. Opening of the fantazia.](image)

Broad arpeggiation is used here and also characterizes the opening of the other movements in the suite, tying them together, or making them “akin” (Examples 8 and 9).

![Example 8. Fantasia-suite in C. Opening of the almande.](image)
The deliberate and repeated use of such broad arpeggiation to delineate points of imitation clearly sets these fantasia-suites apart from the Renaissance fantasia, whose points were typically more conjunct, and also more circumspect in range. In a sense, the arpeggiation that suffuses the fantasia-suites is another manifestation of the aesthetic concept of “air” that North suggested was one of the glories of seventeenth-century English music.

Though not everyone may agree with the observations made here, most will find that the music speaks to them, and in a voice that is captivating. There is both a wealth of detail and a wide variety of affect that one might dwell on across the nine suites. The writing is inventive but, thankfully, avoids the division-style pyrotechnics that are sometimes present in music of the middle decades of the century. The saultes, the rhythmic drive, the occasional harmonic surprise, all are engaging. It may be mentioned that the group we assembled for reading purposes substituted a treble viol for a violin, and a harpsichord stop on a synclavier for an organ. This was quite satisfying.

Richard Charteris and Peter Ballinger are to be commended (cheered heartily, even!) for bringing this music to the broader public. Hingeston clearly worked hard to apply lessons learned at the feet of his beloved master, Gibbons. It remains now for the rest of us to study well. I can assure you, our efforts will be richly rewarded.

Stephen Morris


Carl Friedrich Abel is a very familiar name even to non-viol players because of his association with J.C. Bach and Gainsborough in mid-eighteenth-century London. A few of the Abel pieces for unaccompanied solo viol are quite difficult, a brilliant late flowering of the virtuoso tradition. But many viol players are more familiar with his easy continuo sonatas, good for comfortable amateur playing in his time as well as our own. Somewhere in between these genres lies the ensemble music that Abel played with the famous musicians of his age. Roy Wheldon, a fine viol player who edited this new edition of a quartet with viol, points out that Abel’s duties as a member of Queen Charlotte’s band required him to play viola parts on the gamba, which in turn suggests that Abel’s string quartets might be considered viol music. The gamba part in this particular piece is no “viola part” in the early classical sense, however. It is an idiomatic solo part for viol: a true equal to the flute and violin part in the spirit of Telemann. In fact, the flute is silent in the middle cantabile movement while the viol sings an aria accompanied by the violin and cello. This lovely movement is found only in the Berlin manuscript on which Wheldon based his edition. Edgar Hunt, famous senior recorder pedagogue, also owns a manuscript of the piece from which he produced the Schott edition of 1951, long out of print and lacking the cantabile movement. What a pleasure it is to have PRB’s complete and elegant edition with parts and score. There is a short preface followed by a few critical notes, but I suspect the manuscript is relatively unproblem-
ative. Most of all this is an edition for players. I look forward to performing the piece.

While Abel’s music has been frequently played in recent years, two names of other important contributors to the repertoire of the viol in the late eighteenth century are beginning to emerge. Anton Lidl and Franz Hammer, both cellists as well as viol players, were associated at some point with Haydn at Esterhaza in the 1770s. In 1997, when I reviewed in this Journal an edition of Lidl’s sonatas for viol and cello edited by Don Beecher and published by Dovehouse, I was aware that Hazelle Miloradovitch and PRB were preparing to release their edition of the same pieces but were waiting for permission from Catherine Massip at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, where the manuscripts are housed. I was unable to compare the two editions in my review, but did pose some issues that I hoped Miloradovitch would address in her commentary. I am pleased to report that in the 1998 PRB edition several of my questions were answered. In particular, she notes that these works have been in the possession of the B.N. since the late eighteenth century and suggests that they were originally baryton pieces. The baryton is a type of gamba with sympathetic strings that can be plucked with the left thumb (see the VdGSA website, www.vdgsa.org, for a video demonstration by Roland Hutchinson). Lidl was originally engaged by Haydn’s employer, Prince Esterhazy, an enthusiastic amateur barytonist, to play that instrument in his Kapelle, and later toured Europe as a baryton and gamba virtuoso. The Lidl sonatas do not require the plucked strings for baryton found in Haydn’s trios, but sound good on either viol or baryton. They are challenging pieces, but are very idiomatic. Bowings and string crossings make sense, and Miloradovitch even includes the fingerings that survive in one of the manuscripts. Whether they are Lidl’s own, or Monsieur Dogny’s from late-eighteenth-century Paris, is not clear, but they are helpful. Overall, the PRB edition is beautifully presented and a pleasure to work from.

Don Beecher mentioned in his 1997 Dovehouse notes that the Esterhaza cellist Franz Xavier Hammer also wrote sonatas for viol and cello. Roland Hutchinson told me at the time that one of the Hammer sonatas was similar to a Lidl sonata. I mentioned this in my 1997 review, but it was one of the few small questions that Miloradovitch did not answer in her edition of the Lidl sonatas.
What a treat it is then to receive a copy of the new PRB edition of five Hammer sonatas. Editor David Rhodes shows that Hammer’s Sonata No. 2 is indeed an arrangement of Lidl’s Sonata No. 1. In fact his detailed commentary presents a thorough exegesis of what was changed and even why. When you buy this edition, you will get not only a nice score and set of parts, but also an extensive scholarly preface and critical apparatus produced by a serious musicologist who teaches at a college in Ireland. These are attractive viol pieces with cello or keyboard continuo, challenging in the same way as Lidl or Abel but still idiomatic to the viol. The editor holds himself to very high standards, and yet again the published product is beautiful to behold. These are books to love and respect while developing a library of which to be proud.

Because Rhodes is such a serious scholar, I hope he will forgive me if I take issue not with his printed score or critical commentary, which are almost beyond reproach, but with a few of his statements meant to guide performers. The section titled “Editorial Policy” contains a parenthetical statement about “dashes”—they are actually vertical strokes—which he prints as they look over a note in contrast to dots. (Beethoven’s original publishers were not so conscientious.) So far that is good. His statement that such markings are “frequently on the beat with implied accentuation” is contradicted by Hazelle Miloradovitch’s observation in her Lidl edition: “The vertical stroke common in the eighteenth century, and usually indicating separated or detached bow strokes, but not usually having the modern connotation of martellato….” I think Miloradovitch is closer to the notational meaning here, at least for string playing. I played through all of the Lidl and Hammer sonatas, and while a few of the strokes on strong beats suggested speed bow to perform the one-plus-three groupings, I find Rhodes’s statement misleading. My analysis is that Hammer mostly uses “dots” for subtle “portato” effects under one bow and uses “strokes/dashes” for separate bows of all sorts, accented and unaccented.

Rhodes is also very concerned about stem direction in various chords and double stops, as any editor translating an eighteenth-century manuscript or engraving of viol music into twenty-first-century computer program notations must be. Again, so far so good. But then this statement: “Hammer’s intention is
therefore not always clear, and performers should therefore feel free to either observe or ignore all such unison double-stopped notes.” Well, unless the composer is looking over my shoulder or I am performing a really well-known piece for a knowing audience, there are a few difficult unison double stops in Forqueray as well as Benjamin Britten that I admit to leaving out, but I cannot for the life of me figure out which ones he is referring to in this Hammer edition. They are all unisons with open strings and are easy as well as effective. For most viol players learning this music, the unison double-stops will be the least of their problems, so why devote such a long paragraph to it? It must have cost many hours of editing time, but the so-called “inconsistencies” that Rhodes describes in Hammer’s notation are fairly typical in viol music. The notation in idiomatic music such as this is a player’s shorthand for where to put your hand on the fretboard and what string to bow, only a few steps away from tablature. Hammer was clearly not worried about expressing absolute values in voice leading and such, although he was certainly a trained composer.

More problematic for me were a few double stops and slurs that Rhodes added himself. He is such an exacting scholar and musician that these are clearly shown in parentheses and dotted lines. It is clear that they are not in the manuscripts and therefore not “obligatory” in that sense. However, they reveal that Rhodes is probably not a viol player. The extra notes added in Sonata No. 3, measures 10, 28, and 30, are not in the original because they make the passage very difficult to play on a fretted instrument. Hammer’s original way allows one to play a single pitch with one finger and shift positions following the slur to finger the double-stop. C.P.E. Bach did write things for viol such as Rhodes has added, but that is because he was a keyboard player. Paul O’Dette has coined a word for such thinking: “clavicentric.” Similarly, the slurs added in Sonata No. 4 at measures 13 and 45 are very musical and seem to parallel the phrasing in measure 10, but I believe Hammer left them out to avoid glissandi in shifting the hand from one position to the other above the frets. What Rhodes advises sounds good on the piano and is “logical” in a theoretical sense, but misses the logic of viol technique. (Several years ago, I functioned as a consultant to Lowell Lindgren as he produced an edition of Bononcini cello sonatas for A-R Editions. In doing so, I
advised Professor Lindgren on various issues related to cello technique. My contributions are cited in the introduction to that publication. Professor Rhodes graciously thanks the German librarian who granted permission to publish these sonatas, but might have considered having a gamba player look at his score and try a few of his editorial suggestions.)

Professor Rhodes has published a keyboard realization for the sonatas, observing that only Sonatas 2, 4, and 5 are officially for gamba “con Violoncello.” This is good policy in general and reminds us that then as now, performers must sometimes make adjustments to their ensembles to fit the circumstances. He also has noted some of these adjustments in the surviving manuscript parts. Sonata 1, for example, makes no mention of cello for the accompaniment, which appears to be suitable for any bass instrument. What Rhodes fails to notice is that the written-out chords in that bass part are characteristic cello chords rather than idiomatic gamba chords. He states that the presence of figured bass symbols in a revised passage of Sonata 5 counters any argument in favor of only using viol and cello. But cellists in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries often improvised figured bass realizations, as can be seen in numerous cello tutors of the time, including Johann Baptist Baumgartner’s *Instructions de musique, théorique et pratique, à l’usage du violoncelle* (The Hague, c. 1774). In fact, the cello part in the opening of Sonata 1 looks like an example from one of these tutors. Rhodes’s observations about Sonata 3, for which two bass parts survive, is more convincing. He suggests that one is for cello with keyboard and the other is for cello alone. He then encourages performers to feel free to elaborate the simpler cello parts if playing the pieces as duos. That is good advice. I am not so sure I agree with his earlier sentence stating that keyboard continuo was used in the original performances of the sonatas. This is really “Esterhaza-style” music, and to me the texture of Haydn baryton trios with only cello on the bottom feels much better here than one with keyboard. (Again, I think Rhodes comes from a “clavincentric” tradition.) I wish he knew a bit more about playing the viol and cello while giving us so much performance advice or had at least sought a consultant. He clearly knows a great deal about late-eighteenth-century music and performance in general.
There is one last paragraph that I must address in this regard. The opening of the Performance Notes states: “Until the historical performance practice for the late-eighteenth-century viola da gamba repertory has been fully researched, many modern performers will undoubtedly continue to play this music in a flexible but anachronistic mid-to-late-Baroque style.” I have had to think really hard about this one, and I have been playing gamba and Baroque/Classical cello for over twenty-five years, baryton for nearly ten years, not to mention thirty years of all sorts of string quartets and piano trios, and scholarly research on Beethoven quartets at Harvard and in Europe. I would be more likely to suggest that people who want to learn this music could be inspired by reading Leopold Mozart’s violin treatise and listening to stylish performances of Haydn baryton trios, string quartets, and even cello concertos. Hammer was both a cellist and viol player and his viol music is very “cellistic” in style, although still logical on the gamba. Rhodes might agree with such a suggestion, but his words present the idea in a backhanded way: “Although there is at present time little or no knowledge as to how gamba players of the time such as Hammer performed this music, modern musicians should perhaps make themselves aware of recent developments in the area of Classical-era string performance as a whole and be prepared to adopt or at least experiment with these with regard to maintaining a stricter tempo together with the application of late-eighteenth-century methods of bowing, phrasing, articulation, ornamentation, etc.” He is quite right that we do not know much about how these players played. I suspect they were highly individual, sometimes maverick or eccentric and sometimes very conservative. Why else would they still play viol when it was going out of style? There is a painting of Abel showing that he held the bow with three fingers on the hair, including pinky. Was this an attempt to play loud when surrounded by violins and cellos? Did any of these last gambists play with an overhand grip on the bow? I suspect that a few did, although not as many as the revivalists of the early twentieth century. A better question might be: Did someone like Hammer play the cello with a gamba bowhold? There is a description of another German cellist of the time, Johann Georg Christoph Schetky, who did play cello with an underhand grip well into the 1790s. I like Rhodes’s suggestion of experimentation
alongside research. But is “stricter tempo” really the biggest difference between Classical and late-Baroque playing style? Stravinsky and Paul Henry Lang wanted us to believe that strict tempo was important to eighteenth-century music, but that was a sort of antidote to some early-twentieth-century performances characterized by wild tempo changes. I cannot find any overwhelming evidence that Classical players were that much stricter in their tempos than Baroque players. The invention of the metronome coincides with early Romanticism more than with this repertoire. Furtwängler I am not, but I am much more offended by performances lacking warmth and expression than by a few changes in tempo, whether in the music of Bach, Haydn, or Beethoven.

Despite these criticisms, I consider this edition an important and superbly produced piece of work. Professor Rhodes and Peter Ballinger are to be applauded. I think that viol players looking for interesting new solo repertoire will profit from it as will scholars interested in late-eighteenth-century instrumental music. I thank all of the editors listed above as well as PRB for giving us music to care about.

Brent Wissick
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