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RIGHT HAND POSITION IN RENAISSANCE LUTE TECHNIQUE*

BY PAUL BEIER

“For a man may come to the same place divers ways; and that sweet Harmony of the LUTE (the habit whereof wee doe daily affect, with so great travaile) may strike our eares with an ellegant delight, though the hand may be diversly applied.”
—Besard/Dowland

As the interest in early music and the pursuit of authenticity in its performance have increased in recent years, considerable confusion has arisen over the subject of right-hand position in Renaissance lute technique, not only among musical scholars, but among players who seek immediate and practical answers to this question. In a recent interview in Early Music, Robert Spencer pointed to some of the reasons for this confusion:

But what was original? Both the lute and playing technique were constantly changing. In Dowland’s life-time alone the lute grew from six courses to ten, the right-hand ring finger was used for the first time, and the thumb changed from inside to outside the fingers. Should I go back to just one of these tiny periods and limit myself? And if so, which one?1

The present article intends to provide the modern lute player with a guide to original source material dealing with right-hand position. Such a guide, which certainly can not attempt to give a

---

*1 I wish to thank Peter Danner for his continual help and encouragement throughout the writing of this paper and Paul O’Dette, whose perceptive criticism and generous help account for much of the substance presented here. Bruce MacEvoy, Arthur Ness, Douglas Alton Smith, Catherine Strizich, and Robert Strizich all contributed to and helped with the text in various ways. Any errors or omissions are my own. To Diana Poulton I owe the most deeply felt thanks for her tireless help, encouragement, and guidance over the years.

single answer to the lutenist's quest, might at least provide the necessary information needed to help him arrive at an intelligent solution or compromise, suitable both to the interests of historicity and to his individual needs. It is hoped that it might also supplement and, in some cases, emend recent musicological research on the subject as well. It should be kept in mind that this study only covers right-hand position; it is not a survey of all facets of right-hand technique.

For the purpose of this discussion, "Renaissance lute technique" may be said to have begun in the last quarter of the fifteenth century, when the medieval style of playing the lute with a plectrum gave way to a new style of using the finger-tips alone to pluck the strings. This transition, of course, did not occur suddenly; Pietrobono and other famous players known to have used the plectrum were active well into the late fifteenth century and there is a reference to this old style as late as 1523. The new technique was described as early as 1484 by Johannes Tinctoris.

2 Julia Sutton, "Jean-Baptiste Besard's Novus Partus of 1617" (unpublished dissertation, University of Rochester, 1962), p. 118 et passim does not mention the alternative thumb-under position, so liberally discussed in all four versions of Besard's treatise. Michael Lee Leuchtefeld, "Some Relationships Between Musical Style and the Playing Technique of the Late Renaissance and Baroque Lutes" (unpublished M.A. thesis, Washington University, 1974) mentions two right-hand positions in Renaissance lute technique: closed position (p. 4) and open position (p. 26). Although not described in detail, Leuchtefeld makes it clear that they are not the thumb-under and thumb-over positions discussed in the present article. Charles N. Amos, "Lute Practice and Lutenists in Germany Between 1500 and 1750" (unpublished dissertation, University of Iowa, 1975) pp. 20-22 discusses three different right-hand positions based on very few sources and makes a number of erroneous assumptions (see footnote 16 below). The second position (p. 20) is unwarranted, in my opinion, either by Gerle, from whom he draws this tradition, or by subsequent 16th century sources. An accurate, if not very detailed, discussion is found in Marc Southard, "Sixteenth Century Lute Technique" (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Iowa, 1976). This thesis is recommended for its well thought out presentation of lute technique in general. Kurt Dörfmüller's Studien zur Lautenmusik in der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1967) presents a remarkably accurate account of lute technique up to 1550, but this early cut-off date limits its usefulness for the subject at hand.

3 For a wealth of information on right-hand technique found in English treatises and not dealt with here, the reader is referred to Diana Poulton's article, "Some Changes in the Technique of Lute Playing from Le Roy to Mace," The Lute Society Journal, Vol. I (1959), pp. 7-18.

To understand the right-hand position developed by practitioners of the new style, we must first consider the position and technique used by the fifteenth century plectrum players. Musical iconography depicting lute players from this period indicates that rather small five and six course instruments prevailed. These were held high up, near the player’s chest, with the right arm approaching the lute in a horizontal position from the base directly behind the bridge. Earlier illustrations also show the arm approaching from below the instrument.\(^5\) The plectrum was usually held between the first two fingers, often also in contact with the thumb. The wrist was probably not bent; the hand and arm were held at the same angle. In order to execute the stroke, the fingers would have moved very little by themselves, but rather the entire hand and lower arm rotated on its axis (from the wrist) to produce the back and forth movement of the plectrum across the strings.\(^6\)

When players started using the fingers instead of a plectrum, they adopted the same basic technique. The arm and hand remained straight with no bend at the wrist, parallel to the strings. The rotating movement of the arm was maintained, only now the thumb was used on the downward stroke and a finger, usually the index, was used on the upward stroke; with the added motion of the fingers, the rotation of the wrist became less pronounced. Iconography shows that, when the hand and arm are held in this manner, horizontally and parallel to the strings, the thumb does not extend along the plane as far as the fingers. Thus, when the thumb is used to make its downward stroke, it moves to the inside of the hand towards the palm, and the fingers go around and to the outside of the thumb. This is called “thumb-under” technique and is illustrated by the lute player shown in Plate 1.\(^7\)

The similarities between plectrum and thumb-under techniques can best be appreciated in terms of single-line runs, in which the rapid down-up stroke of the plectrum was replaced by the rapid

---

\(^5\)See, for example, the detail from “The Triumph of the Church over the Synagogue” by a follower of Jan van Eyck reproduced in this *Journal*, Vol. V (1972), Plate F.

\(^6\)This account of plectrum technique is necessarily conjectural; it is based on the plentiful iconographical and meagre written evidence from the period, as well as on experimentation by modern players in keeping with the known evidence. I am indebted to Paul O’Dette for his help with this and the following passage. See also Dorfmüller, pp. 48-55.

\(^7\)Venegas de Henestrosa was the only Renaissance writer to name the various right-hand techniques of his day (see footnote 22 below). It is preferable in the present article to use the English expression “thumb-under” rather than Henestrosa’s bulky *figueta estranjera*. Some modern players refer to the technique simply as “figueta” technique, but this is slightly misleading since Henestrosa uses the word “figueta” to apply to all right hand techniques for playing *redobles*. 
alternation between thumb and index-finger. These techniques reflect a fundamental stylistic tradition appropriate to most instrumental music in the Renaissance: that of articulating notes in groups of two, giving greater emphasis to the first note of each pair. This strong-weak articulation is discussed in Renaissance treatises for recorder, viol, and keyboard in addition to the lute.

In plectrum technique, the downward stroke of the plectrum received the strong beat; in thumb-under, the thumb took the strong beat while the index-finger took the weaker or unaccented beat. Notation of this articulation appears in a majority of Renaissance lute tablatures and continues well into the baroque era; it also appears in two of the three surviving tablatures from the fifteenth century. In observing its extremely consistent notation in sixteenth century tablatures, it can be seen that this articulation is not only important in executing single-line diminutions, but it is operative in polyphonic passages as well as where each voice is notated, wherever possible, in terms of the strong-weak pattern. Its notation in Italian and French tablatures was achieved by placing a dot under every note requiring an unaccented upstroke of the index-finger. In German tablatures, the unaccented notes were notated on the rhythm signs, in some cases by a small hook attached to the flag, in others by a dot beneath the stem, as in the following examples:

```
  a  f f f  b  f f f
```

Almost every early sixteenth century lute book with any written instructions at all includes a discussion of the principle of thumb-index alternation, often in connection with an explanation of the rhythmic signs in the tablature. To my knowledge the first

---

8 There are several other techniques used by Renaissance lute players that seem to relate to or derive from plectrum technique. One is the Spanish dedillo in which the index finger alone moves back and forth across the string in much the same way as the plectrum (see footnote 21 below). Another is the Durchstreichen in which five or six note chords are strummed by the thumb moving across the strings. This technique is described in Hans Judenkönig's *Ain Schone Künstliche Vnderweisung auff der Lauten vnd Geygen*, 1523 (translated by Martha Blackman in *The Lute Society Journal*, Vol. XIV [1972], pp. 29-41). This technique is also found in some of the tablatures of Joanambrosio Dalza (compare the modern edition by Helmut Mönkemeyer, *Die Tabulatur*, Heft 7, Friedrich Hofmeister, 1967, p. 21).


written explanations are found in the prefaces to the lute books printed by Ottaviano Petrucci between 1507 and 1511. We read in Petrucci’s *Regula por quelli che non sanno cantare* (“Rules for those who cannot sing,” that is, are not familiar with written vocal notation):

Note also that all notes without a dot written underneath are to be played downward; and those with a dot written underneath are to be plucked upward. An exception is made when more than one note must be plucked; in such cases, the dot calling for an upward stroke will not be found.\(^\text{11}\)

Descriptions of the thumb-index technique occur in the early German lute tutors by Hans Judenkünig (1515-1519, 1523), in the first lute book by the French publisher Pierre Attaingnant (1529), and in many lute books throughout the sixteenth and into the seventeenth centuries.\(^\text{12}\) The general rule on how to apply the thumb-index alternation to achieve the proper strong-weak articulation is found less frequently. It is sometimes implicitly suggested, as in the instructions given by Gerle and Newsidler (see footnote 12). One of the first explicit discussions of the rule is found in the *Intabulatura di Lauto* (1546) by Melchiorre de Barberis:

... and if you find a book which lacks the dots, note this rule: if the *minute* are an odd number, the first must be played upwards; if the *minute* are even, the first must be played downwards, following the order of one stroke upwards and one stroke downwards, those that go upwards always with the finger, those that go downwards with

\(^{11}\) *Item nota che tutte le botte sonno senza punto de sotto se danno / in giu; e quelle dal punto se danno in su: excepto quando sonno piu de una che le pizzichano non essendo de sotto el punto / che bisogna darle tutte in su / ....* Translated by Abram Loft in Claudio Sartori, “A Little Known Petrucci Publication: The Second Book of Lute Tablatures by Francesco Bossinensis,” *The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. XXXIV (1948), p. 239.

\(^{12}\) Attaingnant’s description can be found in his “*troys breves rigles pour estre tost et facilement introduit en la tabulature du lutz,* reprinted in Johannes Wolf, *Handbuch der Notationskunde*, Teil II (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1919), pp. 72-73: “*Item notez que celles ou il y a vng point dessoubz doyuent estre touchees du doigt / et les autres du pouce*” (Also note that those [notes] where there is a dot under must be touched with the finger and the others with the thumb). Hans Judenkünig, *Ain Schone Kunstliche Vnderweisung auff der Lautten und Geggen* (1523), reprinted in *Die Tabulatur*, Heft 10, ed. by Helmut Mönkemeyer (Friedrich Hofmeister, n.d.), p. 8: “*vnd wann die puechstaben oder ziffer / furhin nacheinander gesatt sein / vnd fusellen daruber steen / so schlach mit dem dawmen die erst vndersich / die ander ybersich mit dem zaiger der rechten handts / merkh ain yedlich fusell hat ain strichlein oben / das bedewt ybersich all zeit*” (And when the letters or ciphers are written one after the other with fusae [two flags] over them, strike the first downwards with the thumb, the next upwards with the index finger of the right hand. Note that each fusa which has a line [hook] above it should always be struck upwards). Further examples can be found in the lute books of Capirola, Gerle, Newsidler, le Roy, Iselin, Jobin, Besard, Vallet, Piccinini, Mersenne, Burwell, and in Munich Ms. 1512.
the thumb in sequence... [so that] the last stroke before the picego [strong beat at the beginning of a bar?] must be played upwards... 13

The principle is stated more concisely later in the century by Matthaeus Waissel (1592) and by Thomas Robinson writing in 1603:

Going 4. and 4. then for ever, the first is down, the second is up; so that if the pricks [dots] were away, this is a general rule. 14

One of the first written indications of right-hand position from the sixteenth century is offered to us by Vitale, the compiler of Vicenzo Capirola’s lute book (1515-1517). Vague as it is, it can be interpreted as describing the right-hand position shown in the Costa painting and other early sixteenth century pictures of lute players:

And the thumb of the right hand should be placed under the second finger so that one finger [i.e., the index] does not meet the other [the thumb does not get in its way] in beating the strokes, one up and one down, etc. 15

An early discussion of right-hand position from Germany, found in Hans Gerle’s Musica Teusch (Nuremberg, 1532), seems to corroborate iconographical evidence as well: with the hand held in the thumb-under position, the little finger would naturally fall close behind the rose, especially on a small lute of the period. Gerle does not clearly specify thumb-under technique in his discussion on thumb-index alternation (this sort of information may well have been taken for granted by his audience), but the emphasis and wording of the passage is suggestive of it:

Take the neck of the lute in the left hand, and set the little and ring fingers of the right hand on the belly, not on the rose, but a little behind it.

13 Item quando trovasti qualche libro falat o nelli ponti. Nota questa regula se le minute son disparo la prima si debbe dare in suso. Et se le minute son paro la prima darai in giu, seruando l’ordine una botta in su, & una botta i giu, & sempre quella che uanno in giu con el dito, & quella che uanno in giu con el ditl di sotto sequente. Translation by Diana Poulton to whom I am indebted for showing me this source.


Stop the o. with the ringfinger [left hand] and strike it [the second course] downwards with the thumb [right hand]. After that, stop the d. with the index finger [left hand], striking it [the second course] upwards with the index finger [right hand]. The 4. you must not stop [with the left hand], strike it downwards with the thumb. Then stop the n. with the ring finger and strike it [the third course] upwards with the index finger. Whenever there is a run, you must begin it with the thumb and [strike] the next [note] with the index finger.

Thus one finger [the index] goes around the other [the thumb], one downwards, the other upwards. You must make sure you can hit [the strings] accurately and can alternate nimbly with the two fingers [i.e., thumb and index].

Hans Newsidler, in his Ein Newgeordn Künstlich Lautenbuch, gives very similar advice:

Here follows the first exercise for the lute. It is a long run, which has been composed and arranged so that every beginning student will learn to strike with the thumb and index finger of the right hand moving around one another. The thumb begins and strikes downwards, and the index finger strikes upwards. But this occurs only in runs, as one will later see and understand. One strikes with the two aforementioned fingers moving around one another, the first [thumb] downwards, the other [index] upwards until the run is finished. Take note of this for it is the greatest art in lute playing.

16 Nim den lauten kragen in die lincken handt / vnd sez an der rechten handt den klein finger / Vnd den golfinger auff die deck / nit auff den stern / ein wenig dar hindther...

Also o d 4 n


17 Hie volget das erst Fundament der Lauten.

Das ist ein einiger langer lauff / der ist darumb gemacht vnd gestelt / das ein yeder anfahender schüler / die zwen finger in der rechten hand / den daume vnd fordern finger lerne vnbeinander schlagen / der daume hebt an vn schlecht abwertz / vnd der forder finger schlecht vbersich / aber es kompt nur in den leuslein / wie man hernach sein sehen vmd
The lute book of Ludwig Iselin (1575) leaves little doubt as to how the hand was to be held. Notice that Iselin uses the same phrase as Gerle to describe thumb-index alternation, that is, "the one finger going around the other," but here it is made absolutely clear that this means thumb-under:

If one wants to learn the lute, it will first be shown how one should hold the right hand, down near the rose. First, set the little finger a little below the rose near the strings, [so that] when you strike, the fingers open up [uffgen] in front of the rose. Hold the little finger firmly on the belly. When many voices are present, the tablature [will show? (not legible in the available copy of the manuscript)] where each finger is to be placed. These notes should be struck together. Whatever is shown one after the other should be played in succession with the thumb and index finger, which is called diminution [Colloraturen]. Also, pay close attention that you accustom the fingers to strike and embellish [collorien (sic!)] by moving the index finger merrily up and back [heran und heraus], and the thumb inwards into the hand. This is not only comfortable, but also makes good sense, and gives the agility needed to play diminutions.

The thumb-under position is finally described in detail at the turn of the seventeenth century in two important sources: Matthäus Waissel’s Lautenbuch (1592) and Thomas Robinson’s The Schoole of Musicke (1603). Waissel instructs:

... The runs or diminutions, \(\begin{align*}
\text{\text{-}} & \text{ and } \\
\text{\text{-}} & \text{ respectively, should be}
\end{align*}\)

done on the lute with the thumb and index finger, one going around the other. Each run must be started so that the last [note] is struck upwards with the index finger. ...

---

18So man uuff der lauten lernen will / so wirrt ertlich angezeigt / wie man sich mit der rechten hand unden beif dem sternen halten solle.

Erstlich setze den kleinen finger ein wenig under den stern / hindersich neben der Seiten / wen du schlecht / das glich die finger vor dem stern uffgen / und halt den kleinen finger sterek / uff und fest uff der lauten [next word illegible] / wie fil der stimmen fur kommen und [next word illegible] in die tabulatur / woruff ein yeder finger stehen muss / und uff ein mall geschlagen werden / was aber ein ander nach geht / soll auch nach ein ander / mitt
The right arm is placed not too high, but almost in the middle behind the bridge, so that the hand is stretched out somewhat lengthwise, resting firmly on the little finger, which is placed on the top of the lute and held motionless. The index finger strikes over the thumb, the thumb [moving] into the hand. This is better and contributes more to speed than when the index finger moves under the thumb into the hand.\(^{19}\)

The Robinson passage reads:

\[
\ldots \text{then with the thumb of your right hand (houlding the rest of the fingers straight forth before your thumb (neither to neere the strings nor too farre off), begin to strik the first string downward with the thumb oneleie, and also striking with your thumb behind your fingers say: Base, Tenor, Contra-tenor, Great Meanes, Small meanes Treble. This done: then begin at the Trebles and so goe vpward viz. backward, striking them string by string with your forefinger before your thumb, that is, houlding downe your thumb behind your fingers... downward and vpward, nameing them and also striking them with the thumb behind the fingers...}^{20}\]

The only other reference to thumb-under technique known to the present writer is found in the Spanish treatise *Libro de Cifra Nueva* (1557) by Venegas de Henestrosa. The vihuela seems to have been played in Spain with a greater variety of right-hand technique than was the lute in the rest of Europe. These techniques were

\[
\ldots \text{die leifflin oder colloraturen also } \underaccent{\text{}} \text{ oder also } \overaccent{\text{}} \text{ miessen gemacht werden / unden uff der lauten mit dem dumen und zeig finger / einer um den andren / und muss ein gleichs leifflin angefangen werden / das der leste allwegen mit dem zeig finger uffgeschlagen werde... Ludwig Iselin, "Liber Ludovici Iselin et aricorum" (1575), Basel, Univ. Ms. F.IX.23, translation by Paul O'Dette. The help of Douglas Alton Smith and Catherine Strizich is gratefully acknowledged in deciphering and translating this passage. his passage.}
\]


\(^{20}\) Quoted from Thomas Robinson, *The Schoole of Musicke* (1603), ed. by David Lumsdien (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1971), plate VI.
discussed by Milán (1536), Mudarra (1546), and Fuenllana (1554), and they were summarized by Henestrosa in a part of his treatise dealing with the various instrumental techniques of his time:

You should also know that there are four ways to make diminutions: one with the index finger of the right hand, which is called redoblar de dedillo [with the finger going back and forth across the string], the second is the Castilian style, in which the thumb crosses over the index finger; the third way is the foreign style [figueta estranjera], which is the opposite, bending the index finger over the thumb; the fourth is [to play] with the index and middle fingers.

Henestrosa’s third manner of playing redobles (diminutions), is the thumb-under technique we have been discussing; it is significant that it is termed figueta estranjera, “foreign style,” referring to the manner of playing the lute outside Spain.

Toward the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries, European musical culture underwent the extraordinary changes in style and taste known as the transition from the Renaissance to the baroque era. We find at this time major changes in most aspects of lute playing, including the technique and position of the right hand. The lutenist in Plate II illustrates these changes: the arm now approaches the lute, not from behind the bridge as before, but from above it on the bass side of the instrument; the right hand is held diagonally or nearly parallel to the strings and the little finger is held closer to the bridge, sometimes even behind it as in the illustration. The thumb is now stretched out and held closer to the rose than the fingers and, when thumb-index alternation is used, the thumb moves to the outside of the fingers; the fingers move into the palm. This is called “thumb-out” or “thumb-over” technique (cf. Henestrosa’s figueta castellana).

21 Luis Milán, El Maestro (Valencia, 1536), fol. AvI et passim and Alonso Mudarra Tres Libros de Musica (Sevilla, 1546) both mention two different techniques for playing redobles (single-line diminutions): dedillo and dos dedos. Miguel de Fuenllana, Orphónica Lyra (Valladolid, 1554), fol. Tvi explains that dedillo is playing with the index finger alone going back and forth across the string and dos dedos is playing with the thumb and index finger; Fuenllana mentions a third technique, con los dos dedos primeros de los quatro, that is, using the first two fingers “of the four,” the index and middle fingers. See John M. Ward, “The Vihuela de Mano and its Music (1536-1575),” (unpublished dissertation, New York University, 1953).

22 También se ha de saber, que ay quatro maneras de redoblar: una con el dedo segundo de la mano derecha, que llaman redoblar de dedillo, la segunda es de figueta castellana, que es cruzando el primer dedo sobre el segundo: la tercera manera es de figueta estranjera, que es al contrario, doblando el segundo dedo sobre el primero: la quarta, es con el segundo y tercero dedos:.... Quoted from Monumentos de la Música Española, Vol. II, pp. 159-160, edited by H. Anglés; translation by Peter Danner. I thank Diana Poulton for bringing this passage to my attention.
PLATE II. The Lute Player by Hendrick ter Bruggen (1588-1629). Reproduced by courtesy of the Trustees, The National Gallery, London.
The many reasons for this change in technique can be grouped in three overlapping categories: changes in compositional style, changes in lute design, and changes in musical taste; these things combined to change the role and function of the right hand and resulted in the new position. In the following discussion, attention first be paid to some of the technical reasons for the change-over: lute design and musical textures. Then, after an examination of the contemporary discussions on lute technique, the change-over will be viewed from the subjective standpoint of changing musical taste.

Pictorial evidence showing a changing hand position can be found as early as the mid-sixteenth century in the wood-cut frontispieces to Valentin Bakfark’s *Intabulatura* (Lyons, 1553) and Sebastian Ochsenkun’s *Tabulaturbuch* (Heidelberg, 1558). In both of these woodcuts, unusually large, round-bodied lutes are being played. The mere logistics of holding such an instrument forces the arm to approach the lute from above and forces the hand into a diagonal position relative to the strings; it is hardly possible, as with smaller instruments, to keep the arm and hand parallel to the strings. Throughout most of the sixteenth century, the most popular variety of lute seems to have been small, six-course instruments with the "pearl-mould" shape—for example, the lutes of Laux Maler and Hans Frei—the back being long and somewhat flat with narrow shoulders. Toward the beginning of the seventeenth century, larger and rounder bodied lutes became increasingly prevalent. Added to this was the fashion of added bass courses; eight and nine course lutes were in use by 1600, ten course instruments became popular shortly thereafter, and archlutes and chitarrones were being built with up to fourteen single and double courses. Again, the mere logistics of stretching the thumb far enough back to reach a ninth or tenth course forces the hand into a somewhat diagonal position.

The general texture of lute music in the early sixteenth century was fairly simple; single-line diminutions were predominant, polyphony of more than two or three voices was often more implicit than actual, and bass lines were slow moving and fairly inactive. Lute technique was still very much under the influence of the plectrum style of the previous century, with the thumb and index finger being,

---


for the most part, equally at home from the first through the sixth course. As the century progressed, musical textures became thicker and more complex, with more frequent harmonic changes and with a more active and independent bass line. As a result, there began to be a separation in function between the thumb and the fingers of the right hand; the thumb began to stay among the bass courses while the fingers became associated with the treble strings.

This separation in function between fingers and thumb began as early as the late 1520’s when, in an anonymous German manuscript (Munich 1512), we are told that a bass line moving in minims (stems with one flag) should be played with the thumb only.25 Later, in the 1580’s and 1590’s, manuscripts such as the Cavalcanti lute book began to notate the use of a middle-index alternation instead of the more familiar thumb-index alternation in those running diminutions accompanied by a slower moving bass line.26 This was done in order to avoid the constant leaping of the thumb between the treble and bass strings and allowed for an active bass line even during fast treble diminutions. In Richard Allison’s The Psalms of David in Meter (1599), the second and ring fingers are given extraordinarily active roles; the middle finger is often used instead of the thumb on the treble strings, not necessarily only in diminutions, and the ring finger is used in a variety of contexts which, earlier in the century, invariably would have been notated for either thumb or for index finger.27 Thomas Robinson also notates this more active role of the middle and ring fingers among the treble strings in Schoole of Musicke. He notes that the thumb has a greater role in the basses:

You haue heard, that euerystrokismore naturally to be striken downward thenvward, which is very true, but above all, the Bases are to be striken downward, and for the same purpose, you see how aptly the thumb fitteth that office....[fol. Cii²]

25...die Minima thuen 4 ain lange noten, und man schlecht sy all unndersich mit dem Daumen, ausgenommen sy khumen zwischen zwaten Concordantzten, also wie hie stet: [\[\hat{\circ} \hat{\circ} \hat{\circ} \hat{\circ}\]]

O o So get die erst unndersich die ander ubeisch. (...all long notes go downwards with c g i 2

the thumb, the same for breves...four minums equal a long note and they are all struck downwards with the thumb, except when they fall between two consonances, as shown here: [see German text above]. The first goes downwards with the thumb, the next upwards.) Translation by Paul O’Dette. Quoted in Dorfmüller, p. 46.


27 I am indebted to Diana Poulton for this information.
In pointing out the new roles of the thumb and fingers, Robinson provides perhaps the clearest example of the fact that, at least until the early seventeenth century, thumb-under technique was still considered suitable for meeting the demands imposed by thicker musical textures and larger lutes.

The passage quoted above by Mattheaus Waissel, in which the reader is warned against using a thumb-over position, reminds us, however, that the new position was gaining in popularity well before the turn of the century. Johann Stobäus, in an important passage (quoted below), lists a number of famous lutenists active around 1600 who used the thumb-over position. The first writer to specifically recommend the thumb-over position was Jean Baptiste Besard, whose treatise on lute technique first appeared in Latin in his anthology *Thesaurus Harmonicus* (Cologne, 1603) and later was translated into English by John Dowland for his son Robert’s *Varietie of Lute Lessons* (London, 1610):

For the vse of the right hand. First, set your little finger on the belly of the LVTE, not towards the Rose, but a little lower, Stretch out your Thombe with all the force you can, especially if thy Thombe be short, so that the other fingers may be carried in a manner of a fist, and let the Thombe be held higher then them, this in the beginning will be hard [*Varietie*, fol. Ci].

Besard’s treatise was subsequently revised in Latin and German for two publications in Augsburg, 1617;28 indeed, this treatise seems to have enjoyed a long-lived popularity. It is significant that in the earliest versions (1603 and 1610), Besard mentions that the older technique of thumb-under is suitable for some people with short thumbs, without suggesting that it is an outdated and hence condemnable practice. Later, in the German revision (quoted here), he treats the subject with slightly more condescension:

But those who have a short thumb, may do as those who pluck pulling the thumb inwards, as if they wanted to hide the thumb beneath the fingers. Though this is not becoming, it is nevertheless easy.29


29 *Diejenigen aber, deren Daumen zu kurz geraten ist, mögen es denen gleich tun, die beim Anschlag den Daumen einwärts ziehen, so, als wenn sie den Daumen unter den Fingern verbergen wollten. Ist dieses zwar nicht schön, so ist es doch leicht. Instituto pro arte testudinis*, p. 18. Translation by Paul O’Dette.
Besard instructs the use of thumb-index alternation as a general rule, but notes that the technique is not always suitable for diminutions on the treble strings when they are accompanied by a slower moving bass line. While thumb-index should be used on the bass courses, slow moving bass lines can be played with the thumb alone:

Of playing with the two fingers. These things [rules for fingering] being well observed, know that the two first fingers may be used in Diminutions very well instead of the Thombe and the fore-finger, if they be placed with some Bases, so that the middle finger be in place of the Thombe, which Thombe whilst it is occupied in striking at least the Bases, both the hands will be graced, and that vnmanly motion of Arme (which many cannot so well auoide) shall be shunned. But if with the said Diminutions there be not set Bases which are to be stopped, I will not counsell you to vse the two first fingers, but rather the Thombe and the fore-finger; neither will I wish you to vse the two first fingers, if you be to proceede (that is to runne) into the fourth, fift or sixt string with Diminutions set also with some parts. Besides you shall know that low letters placed in the Bases, from the fourth Chorus to the ninth, if they be noted with this time ≡ may more fitly, nay must all be stroke with the Thombe... [Varietie, vol. C2].

In the revised Latin version (1617) Besard allows for more frequent use of the middle-index alternation:

Many follow this procedure [using the middle finger instead of the thumb] even outside of diminutions, so that while the thumb is busy plucking single line bass notes, a greater faculty is given to the hand, and that unseemly motion of the whole arm, which we cannot guard against too carefully, will be most easily avoided.

Here, as well as in the advice about thumb-under (above), elegance and economy of motion seem to be the key factors governing the choice of fingering and hand position. In a similar vein, Nicolas

30 These recommendations evoke similar considerations by the Spanish vihuelist Fuenllana (1554) cited in Ward: "...de dos dedos, with the thumb and index..."contains perfection in itself" but should be restricted to the lowest courses, which are closest to the thumb; since these strings are thicker they require strong fingers for complete and firm redobles. The third fingering alone [with index and middle fingers] has 'all the perfection of which the redoble is capable, as much in speed as in clarity... ’ (Ward, p. 90; quoted in Amos, p. 38).

31...ut secondus dignus (quod multi etiam extra diminutiones observant) tibi loco pollicis inseruit: quidquid pollex, dum in solis basis attingendis occupatur, & magna manui facilites praestabatur, & indecens ille totius brachii motus, qui a multis non ita bene caueri potest, commodissime euitabitur. Besard. Ad artem Testudinis breui (Instituto pro arte testudinis edition, p. 39); translation from Sutton, p. 248.
Vallet condemns thumb-under in his *Paradisius Musicus Testudinis* (1618):

You must also avoid using the thumb all the time touching the courses, and especially bending it towards the inside of the hand, as many inept players are still doing today, which is a clumsy and ridiculous mistake. For the thumb must always bend outwards and not bend into the hand; here is what causes the motion of the entire body and many violent grimaces.\(^{32}\)

The lute book of Johann Stobäus contains an even more forceful condemnation of the old technique. There is some confusion about the date of this book, but the following passage appears to have been written before 1619.

Of the right hand.
The right hand should be held a little in front of the bridge, and the little finger should be placed firmly [on the soundboard] and held [there]. The thumb should be stretched out sharply so that almost all of it is in front of the other fingers.\(^{33}\) The fingers should be pulled inwards under the thumb [i.e. into the palm of the hand], so that the sound is strong and resonant. The thumb should strike outwards, not inwards as the older generation [Alten] does, and commonly the Netherlanders and elder Germans. For it has been demonstrated to be much better to strike with the thumb outwards. This sounds clearer, crisper and brighter. The other [method] sounds very dull [faull] and muffled. These famous lutenists play with the thumb out: In Germany, Gregory Huwet, the English Dowland [Dulandus Anglus], who nonetheless began playing with the thumb inwards. In Italy, Laurencini in Rome, Hortensius in Padua. In France, Bocquet, the Polish Mercure [Mercurius Polandus] and others. For full chords, one uses all four fingers [i.e. the thumb and first three fingers]; for runs, sometimes the thumb and index finger, sometimes the index and middle fingers, as is intended in the runs below.\(^{34}\)

\(^{32}\) *Il se faut aussi garder de se servir a tous coups du poulce touchant les freddons, et principalement le recourbant au dedans de la main, comme plusieurs in experts font encore pour le Jourdhui, qui est ve lourde et ridicule faulte. Car le poulce doit toujours remuer en dehors et non pas courber au dedans de la main, voila ce qui Cause le mouvement de tout le corps, et souvent force force grimaces. Vallet, Paradisius Musicus Testudinis, "Petit Discours" (CRNS edition, Plate II). Translation by Peter Danner.*

\(^{33}\) *Stobäus actually says here "so that it has almost one joint in front of the fingers.. [dass er fast ein g lied den andern fingern vorgehe]. He must have considered the entire thumb as one joint, since stretching out only the first joint in front of the fingers is not a very "sharp" extension and would cause constant collisions between the thumb and index finger. Furthermore, most paintings from this period show a large portion of the thumb protruding.*

\(^{34}\) *1. Von der Rechten Handt.
Die Rechte Hand soll kurz für dem Stege gehalten u. der Kleine finger steif aufgesetzt u.*
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Here, Stobäus provides another clue as to why the change-over in technique occurred: tone quality. With thumb-under, the fingers were placed quite near the rose and both fingers and thumb had a great deal of contact with the strings; they struck the strings using a relatively large surface area of flesh and string. The effect of this is to produce a rather warm and luscious tone. With thumb-over, the opposite is true. The fingers strike the strings at a sharper angle with little surface area. Furthermore, seventeenth century lute treatises generally recommend holding the hand fairly close to the bridge, where there is more resistance in the strings. These factors all tend to produce a bright sound, just as Stobäus describes.

The changing styles in lute construction also had a considerable effect on tone. The small, high-pitched, narrow-bodied lutes of the early period were generally made with very hard woods for the ribs and have an inherently bright and piercing tone. The warm sound of

---

35Baroque lute treatises usually recommend holding the right hand half way between the rose and the bridge or close to the bridge. For example, compare: Piccinini, Intavolatura di Liuto e di Chitarrone (1623), Cap. III, “Rende il Liuto, e cosi ancor il Chitarrone miglior’armonía in mezo fra la Rosa, e lo scanello; e pero quel luoco si deue tenere la mano destra”; Burwell (c. 1660-1670), “The little finger ought alwayes to be fixt upon the belly of the Lute betweene the Bridge and the Rose...”; and Thomas Mace, Musick’s Monument (London, 1676), p. 71, “...set your Little Finger down upon the Belly of the Lute, just under the Bridge, against the Treble or Second String...."
thumb-under is ideally suited to compensate for this. Larger, round-bodied lutes were often made with soft woods for the ribs, such as yew, and have a naturally softer, darker tone for which some compensation, such as playing nearer the bridge, is necessary. The evidence suggests that seventeenth century lutenists preferred as bright and loud a sound as possible. Besard, for instance, talks of striking the strings with great force.

In striking the strings, learn to draw the strings quite vigorously and, as one says, to grasp boldly into the mouth of the lute. Also, with longer string lengths, more volume and a greater dynamic range is possible. Certainly, playing near the bridge with the new thumb-over technique must have gone a long way toward helping lutenists achieve the ideal of a bright, loud tone.

It has been suggested that many of the factors discussed here—including thicker musical textures, greater equality among the fingers, and a less pronounced strong-weak articulation achieved through middle-index alternation—helped give the lute a more harpsichord-like tone quality. Perhaps lutenists of the early baroque were as much influenced by the growing ranks of harpsichordists as the keyboard players seem to have been influenced by lutenists.

Writers on right-hand position after Besard (and throughout the baroque) unanimously agree on the thumb-over position and, after Stobäus and Vallet, there is no further mention of thumb-under; but because these two writers saw fit to stress their disapproval of the old technique, and because of late pictorial examples depicting thumb-under, we may assume that there were a lingering number of

---

36 For evidence concerning the woods used for lute bodies during the first half of the 16th century see the instrument inventory of Raymond Fugger (1566) published in Archiv für Musikwissenschaft, 1964; an English translation by Douglas Alton Smith will appear in the 1980 Galpin Society Journal. This information was given to me by D.A. Smith, who in private correspondence dated 10/13/1979 remarks further: “It is characteristic that lute bodies of the first half of the 16th century were very often, if not primarily, made of very hard woods such as ash or maple, or even ebony or snakewood, and of ivory and whalebone. Hard woods and other hard substances respond very fast and favor high overtones, hence the bright sound, which is enhanced by the relatively narrow Maler-model belly....Probably in the 1560’s or 70’s the Venetian and Paduan luthiers began to build lutes that were wider in the shoulders, making a considerably larger resonating surface on the soundboard, and often shallower in the body. Yew wood, a coniferous wood that is much softer than maple or ivory, became the preferred lute-body material. The resulting tone is less bright....” These ideas have their origin in conversations between Smith and Robert Lundberg in Erlangen, Germany in 1979.

37 So gewehne dich / das du im schlagen die seiten fein starck anziehest / und wie ma zu sage pflegt / der Laute etwas dapffer ins maul greiffest / .... Besard, Isagoge in artem testudinarium (1617). Quoted from the Instituto pro parte testudinis edition, p. 18. Translation by Paul O’Dette.
adherents to the no longer popular method well into the second or third decade of the seventeenth century.

The lute books of Alessandro Piccinini (1623), Mary Burwell (c. 1660-1670), and Thomas Mace (1676), as well as Marin Mercenner’s book on string instruments in *Harmonie Universelle* (1636) are among the lute books from the baroque that discuss thumb-over. It should suffice here to quote but one of these writers, Piccinini:

To learn to hold the right hand well, make a fist and then open it a little until the fingers are touching the strings, the thumb should be stretched out. . . . To do *groppi* and *tirate* [single-string runs] in the ordinary way, you must stretch out the thumb holding the index finger under it at right-angles.  

Thumb-index alternation for running passages was still recommended as late as Burwell’s tutor, but here it is only advocated for passages of a particular kind: single notes in the bass and a run of single notes across all the strings “where such passage must be done swiftly.” This technique seems to have gone out of style by the time of Thomas Mace and the later German baroque lutenists.

The main points discussed in this article can be summarized in the following way. After the plectrum was discarded in favor of playing with the fingers in the late fifteenth century, lutenists developed a technique for the right hand that was essentially similar to the plectrum technique: the hand and arm were held nearly parallel to the strings and the hand was held flat with the fingers stretching beyond the thumb towards the rose, so that when striking the strings, the thumb moved inward towards the palm. This technique was in use throughout the sixteenth century and probably up until the third decade of the seventeenth, although writers of lute treatises after the first decade of the seventeenth century no longer recommend it. A convenient general rule for the use of thumb-under is that it can be used for music composed for lutes with from six to ten courses in *vieil ton* (Renaissance-tuning).

---


39Burwell, pp. 32 and 38*. I would like to thank Diana Poulton for help with this passage.
Toward the end of the sixteenth century, three main factors contributed to a change in the position and technique of the right hand: thicker musical textures, larger lutes with more bass courses, and a change in taste towards a brighter, louder, and more equal (harpischord-like) tone. With the new technique, the hand is held diagonally or nearly perpendicular to the strings and the thumb is stretched out toward the rose and moves to the outside of the fingers. Thumb-over probably became popular first with the late sixteenth century Italian lutenists, although it may, in fact, have been pioneered by such mid-sixteenth century Central-European players as Bakfark and Ochsenkun. It became the favored technique throughout the baroque period. The general rule for thumb-over is that it can be used for music composed for lutes with from eight to fourteen courses in either vieil ton or accords nouveaux.

Put into practice, the techniques of thumb-under and thumb-over appear to be quite different from one another in terms of the musical result. Thumb-under is especially suitable for the type of single-line diminutions found in sixteenth century music. With the added help of wrist movement and with slightly less finger movement, speed of execution can be cultivated with relative ease. In thumb-over, the wrist is not used and the fingers are responsible for all the movement. This makes for greater equality of tone among the fingers and for a brighter sound, but less agility in single-line diminutions and less of the natural strong-weak articulation achieved by using thumb-under.

The historically conscientious lutenist eventually will have to decide for himself which of the two methods to use; few players will be able to master and do justice to both. This writer advises his own students to base their choice on the peripheral repertoire they feel most strongly drawn to: baroque or early-to-mid-sixteenth century. Fortunately, the central core of the lute’s repertoire, from the late Italian Renaissance and English Elizabethan composers through the Jacobean and early French baroque composers, can be played either way and still remain faithful to historical evidence. It is probably safe to say that thumb-over is just as inappropriate for the music of Francesco da Milano and his contemporaries as is thumb-under for the music of Mouton and Weiss. The player wishing to play music from the entire repertoire will simply have to resign himself to a certain amount of anachronism for at least part of his performance.
THE MODENA TIORBA CONTINUO MANUSCRIPT

BY MIRKO CAFFAGNI

The *tierba* occupies a prominent position in the earliest history of basso continuo, even accompanying its birth towards the end of the sixteenth century. Giulio Caccini is generally regarded as the first *virtuoso di canto* to put into practice the theories of the Camerata of Bardi, which sought to "move the affections" in a new *stile rappresentativo*, and it is here with Caccini that the ""Tiorba, overo Chitarrone"" suddenly appears as the preferred instrument for accompanying the human voice, "and particularly the tenor voice."\(^1\)

It will not be necessary to linger here on the questions of origin and tuning or on the shades of meaning the word *tiorba* assumed outside Italy as the term spread beyond the Alps. These topics threaten to overwhelm the scope of this article and have been discussed recently in essays by Robert Spencer and Douglas Alton Smith.\(^3\) The Italian "tiorba" (and below, for the sake of clarity, we shall adopt the term in Italian without translating it) systematically adopted from the lute a tuning in A with the first two strings tuned an octave lower than the corresponding ones on the lute (or "arciliuto"). The sole exception that we know of to this uniform

---

1The words "tiorba" and "chitarrone" are often treated as synonyms in many sources dating from the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth. For instance, we find the expression "un chitarrone o tiorba che si dica" (a chitarrone, or tiorba, as it is called) in the preface by A. Guidotti to the *Rappresentazione di Anima et Corpo* of Emilio de' Cavalieri (Rome, 1600). The expression "Tiorba, o vero Chitarrone" (tiorba or chitarrone) is by Piccinini, *Intavolatura di liuto, et di chitarrone* (Bologna, 1623), Chapter XXVIII, page 5.

2Giulio Caccini, *Le nuove musiche* (Florence, 1601), preface.

adoption of the tuning in A is the chitarrone described by Adriano Banchieri in his *Conclusioni nel souno dell'organo*, which is tuned in G and with only the first string down an octave, identical to the "theorboe" of Thomas Mace.

If the sources of solo music for tiorba are very scarce (at least compared to the great quantity of surviving music for lute), the intabulated sources of music relating specifically to the tiorba as an instrument for the realization of basso continuo are much rarer still. The reason for this scarcity is quite evident: the performer of an accompaniment on the tiorba improvised his own part reading directly from a figured bass (and frequently from an unfigured one). Tablature was not used; indeed, its preparation would have entailed a boring and wearisome labor completely useless in the face of the widely-noted improvisatory capacity of the performer. One of the causes of the diffusion of basso continuo practice was just this avoidance of the effort of prearranging the tablature. As we read in the well-known treatise by Agostino Agazzari:

This method [of playing upon a bass] has been introduced for three reasons: first owing to the modern style of composing and singing recitative, second owing to its convenience and third owing to the number and variety of works necessary for concerted music.

Speaking of the first reason, I should say that, since the recent discovery of the true style of expressing the text, that is, imitating speech itself in the finest possible manner and which is most successful using a single voice or few voices (as is done in the modern airs of certain able men and now widely practiced in Rome in concerted music), it is no longer necessary to devise a score or a tablature; as we mentioned before, a bass with its signs is sufficient.

A bit further Agazzari comments:

The third and final reason (that is, the number of works required for concerted music) is by itself ample reason, it seems to me, for introducing this particularly convenient method of playing, for if he put into tablature or score all the works which are sung in a single Roman church wherein concert music is professed, that organist would have need of a larger library than a Doctor of Laws.

Reading Agazzari is also interesting because from it we can obtain a lively picture of how the bass should be realized, entrusted

---

4 Bologna, 1609, p. 46ff.
5 Agostino Agazzari, *Del sonare sopra il basso con tutti li stromenti, e dell'uso loro nel conserto* (Siena, 1607). An English translation appears in Oliver Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History* (New York: Norton, 1950), pp. 424-431. This treatise was translated almost entirely by Praetorius and published in the third volume of his *Syntagma Musicum*. 
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as it was, to instrumentalists among whom the pleasures of improvisation could also degenerate into intolerable musical excesses:

Because the instruments are divided into two classes, it follows that they have differing functions and are differently used. An instrument that functions as a foundation instrument must be played with great care and with due regard for the size of the chorus. If there are numerous voices, one should play with full chords and increase the registers; while if there are few, one should use few consonances, decrease the registers and play the work as purely and exactly as possible, use few passages and divisions, occasionally supporting the voices with low notes and frequently avoiding high ones which would cover up the voices, especially the sopranos or falsettos. Because of this, one should take the greatest possible care to avoid playing or diminishing with a division the note being sung by the soprano, so as not to duplicate it or diminish the excellence of the note itself or of the passage which the good singer executes upon it. For the same reason, one would do well to play within a rather small range and in a lower register.

I would say the same for the lute, harp, tiorba, cembalo, etc., when they serve as foundation with one or more voices singing above them, because in this case, in order to support the voice, they must maintain a solid, sonorous and sustained harmony, playing now softly, now loudly, according to the nature and quantity of the voices, the location and the composition, while, in order to avoid interfering with the singer, they must not restrick the strings too often when he is executing a passage or expressing a passion.

But, Agazzari tells us, the instruments can serve as “ornaments” as well as “Fondamento”:

For this reason, one who plays the lute (which is the noblest instrument of all) must play it in a noble manner, with great invention and variety, not as is done by those who, because they have a skillful hand, do nothing but play runs and make divisions from beginning to end, especially when playing with other instruments doing the same thing, in all of which nothing is heard but babel and confusion, displeasing and unagreeable to the listener. Therefore, he must sometimes use gentle strokes and repercussions, sometimes slow passages, sometimes rapid and repeated ones, sometimes play something on the bass strings, sometimes beautiful bandyings and conceits, repeating and bringing out these figures at different pitches and in differing places. He must, in short, so weave the voices together with long groups, trills and accents, each in its turn, that he provides grace to the consort and enjoyment and delight to the listeners.

About the tiorba in particular, Agazzari remarks:
The tiorba, with its full and gentle harmonies, greatly reinforces the melody, repeating and lightly passing over the bass strings, its special virtue, with trills and mute accents played by the left hand.

A document such as Agazzari’s is obviously of particular interest to the topic we are examining. Agazzari tells us a great deal about the reasons why the tiorba was especially appreciated for accompanying the voice. The special tuning of the instrument rendered it impossible, even if so desired, to occupy the range of high voices. To this same peculiarity of tuning we also would have to attribute that character of sweetness of the chords, rich in notes doubled at the unison and normally increased in closed position. It is certain that Agazzari’s text would be much more meaningful to us if it was accompanied by a broad spectrum of musical examples. Unfortunately, as we have said, musical sources of this sort, particularly with respect to the tiorba are a sad rarity and Agazzari is no exception.

The earliest known example of an intabulated realization of a bass for tiorba is found in some madrigals by Salomone Rossi published in Venice in 1600. This is not a particularly eloquent source, even less as an example of the practice of improvised accompaniment. The tuning of the chitarrone here has not yet been stabilized in A (the tuning in D appears twice) and is analogous to what occurs in many collections of accompaniment for lute during the same period. But above all, the possible presence of the first two strings at the lower octave is never consciously used in the profile of the instrumental technique. Thus the tablature has the appearance of having been conceived for a lute of eleven courses rather than for a chitarrone. This fact could raise some doubts about the precise significance of the term “chitarrone” as it is used in the earliest documents where the word is mentioned.

In the Libro primo d’arie passegiate of Hieronymus Kapsberger, on the other hand, we have without doubt a bass part intabulated for tiorba: the tuning is in A and the presence of the two first courses tuned down an octave is consciously utilized. It would not make sense in this case, in contrast to the preceding one, to execute the part on a lute. Furthermore, it contains some distinctive signs found in almost all known tiorba tablatures: the sign \( \uparrow \) used to indicate the arpeggiation of chords and the sign \( \uparrow \) used to indicate “legato” playing.

6 Salomone Rossi, Il primo libro de madrigali a cinque voci di Salamon Rossi Hebreo con alcuni di detti madrigali per cantar nel chittarrone, con la sua intavolatura posta nel soprano (Venice, 1600).
7 Giovanni Girolamo Kapsberger, Libro primo di arie passegiate a una voce con l’intavolatura del chitarone (Rome, 1612).
The Kapsberger is an example of bass realization where the tiorba comports itself primarily as an instrument “that serves as a foundation,” obeying that way of proceeding “very strictly and seriously” as recommended by Agazzari in the passage cited above. A second publication containing intabulated accompaniments of vocal pieces for tiorba that behave in the same manner is the *Capricci a due stromenti* of Bellerofonte Castaldi.8

Sources illustrating the use of the tiorba as an “ornamenting” instrument, capable of realizing a bass with a wealth of passaggi, tirate, sbordonate and similar excesses, remain unknown, with the sole exception of a manuscript in the Biblioteca Estense of Modena, of which we will now speak.

This manuscript is an oblong fascicle of approximately 155 x 212 mm in a parchment cover, designated Mus. G. 239, with the title “Cantate, canzonette per Soprano e Basso continuo e Cadenze finali per Liuto.”9 It contains twenty-seven compositions for soprano and continuo. Apart from the first (the “Lamento di Arianna” of Monteverdi) all the pieces lack ascription to a composer, except thirteen pieces for which the composer is indicated by the initials “b.c.” Between the penultimate and the final piece is inserted, under the title “Cadenze finali,” a section consisting of numerous movements of a bass in bass clef, having beneath it an intabulation for tiorba which constitutes the realization. The bass progressions are not solely cadential (skips of a descending fifth or ascending fourth), but comprise a more varied repertory of alternatives: progression by step in both directions, by skips, and so forth.

Before looking at the manuscript in more detail, let us first list the contents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Incipit of the poetic text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arianna</td>
<td>Monteverdi</td>
<td>Lasciatemi morire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Echo</td>
<td>b.c.</td>
<td>Ahi che fia che consoli il dolor mio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>b.c.</td>
<td>Occhi belli ma rubelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Giovinetta ritrosetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>b.c.</td>
<td>Più non vi miro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Se d’amor la dolce piaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>b.c.</td>
<td>Unitevi tormenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>b.c.</td>
<td>Porterà l’sol dell’occidente il giorno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Dolci miei martiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>b.c.</td>
<td>Lo sdegno ch’hora sorgemi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Bellerofonte Castaldi, *Capricci a due stromenti cioè tiorba e tiorbino* (Modena, 1622).

9 The title of the collection was added in 19th-century script on the first folio of the fascicle together with the index of compositions. The intabulated part of the manuscript carries the original indication “Cadenze finali” without the clarification “per liuto.”
A few details might be noted. The titles attached to pieces 22 and 23 are in a different hand from the one that wrote out the textual incipits. Pieces 24 and 26 are different musical versions of the same poetic text. Piece number 11 lacks a bass part. The initial letter to the text of each composition is decorated with ornate calligraphy, with the exception of pieces 23, 24, 25, and 26.

Several elements contribute to allow us an approximate dating to the collection. The famous Lamento di Arianna, the sole surviving piece from Monteverdi’s second opera Arianna performed in Mantua in 1608, was published in a monodic version in 1623. The title of piece 22 furnishes another precise temporal reference: this cantata obviously cannot have been composed before 1632, the year in which King Gustavus Adolphus fell in battle. On the other hand, it is difficult to imagine that there would have been such a long interval between the copying of the Lamento and the Cantata di Gustavo Adolfo, as the entire manuscript appears to have been calligraphed in the same hand from start to finish.

More interesting than the dating would be to uncover the name of the musician concealed behind the initials “b.c.” Owing to our
musicologist friend A. Cavicchi, we have the solution to this puzzle: it is none other than Bellerofonte Castaldi, a figure of primary importance in the history of music for tiorba in the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{10} In the \textit{Primo Mazzetto di Fiori Musicalmente colti dal giardino Bellerofonte}\textsuperscript{11} printed in Venice in 1623 are found six of the thirteen pieces indicated with the initials b.c. in the Estense library manuscript. These are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estense Ms., number and incipit</th>
<th>Primo Mazzetto, page and title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no. 8: Portera 'l sol</td>
<td>p. 15: Aria d'ottava rima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 10: Lo sdegno</td>
<td>p. 27: Lo sdegno, passeggio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 13: Or meno lieti</td>
<td>p. 24: Stato amoroso felice, Passeggio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 14: Augelletti lascivetti</td>
<td>p. 18: Gioia di ritorno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 15: O Clorida</td>
<td>p. 28: Gagliarda persuasiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 18: Saetta pur</td>
<td>p. 19: Ostinatione amorosa, Corrente</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is only one difference between the versions of the pieces in the Estense Library manuscript and those in the 1623 print: the printed versions are for tenor voice, not soprano. As to the question of why the arias in the \textit{Mazzetto} are written for tenor, we know that Castaldi himself wittily wrote on the final page of the section “To the Reader”: “... and because [these arias] treat love, or the disdain in which thelover holds his loved one, they are represented in the tenor clef, whose intervals are suitable and natural for masculine speech, appearing to the above-mentioned author ridiculous that a man with a feminine voice might make his reasons and pleas for mercy speak in falsetto to his beloved.”

One may, then, conclude with safety that all the pieces denoted “b.c.” in the Estense manuscript are by Bellerofonte Castaldi. It seems implausible, however, to deduce that the entire manuscript can be attributed to the hand of Castaldi himself, as Cavicchi supposes. From a passage on him in a book by Luigi Valdrighi, we know for certain that Castaldi loved to sing accompanying himself on the tiorba.\textsuperscript{12} That he may have also possibly sung privately in falsetto would appear to repudiate his fine sense of the ridiculous. Furthermore, it is sufficient to compare the handwriting in the manuscript with that of Castaldi’s own as we know from several

\textsuperscript{10} Rivista italiana di musicologia, IX (1974), page 309.

\textsuperscript{11} Bellerofonte Castaldi, \textit{Primo mazzetto di fiori musicalmente colti dal giardino Bellerofonte} (Venice, 1623). See also Emil Vogel, \textit{Bibliothek der gedruckten weltlichen Vokalmusik Italiens aus den Jahren 1500-1700} (Berlin, 1892), Volume I, pp. 143-144.

\textsuperscript{12} Luigi F. Valdrighi, “Annotazioni bibliografiche intorno Bellerofonte Castaldi” (Modena, 1880); reprinted in Valdrighi, \textit{Musurgiana} (Modena, 1886; reprint Bologna, 1970).
documents in his hand conserved in the Estense Library\textsuperscript{13} and in the Archivio di Stato in Modena\textsuperscript{14} to arrive at the same conclusion.

\textsuperscript{13} The following manuscripts of Bellerofonte Castaldi are conserved in the Biblioteca Estense in Modena:
- “Rimasuglio di rime berneschte raccolte da Bellerofonte Castaldi, con licentia tolta del 1645, in Venetia” (signature S..3.1)
- letter in poetic form (terza rima) to Signor Don Scapinelli (no date), (Autografoteca Campori)
- letter, also in terza rima, to Signor Francesco Marescotti (Autografoteca Campori)
- another letter, this one in prose, to the same Marescotti, dated Naples, October 18, 1633 (Autografoteca Campori)
- letter in prose to his sister Areta, dated Venice, May 17, 1643 (Autografoteca Campori)

The study by Valdrighi cited in the preceding footnote is based principally upon the “Rimasuglio di rime berneschte.”

\textsuperscript{14} In the Archivio di Stato, Modena, busta 1/A are conserved:
- a letter to Cardinal Alessandro d’Este (Modena, October 22, 1621), which he accompanied with a copy of his “galanterie tiorbesc” (presumably the Capricci per due strumenti).
- another letter to the same recipient (Venice, December 3, 1623), accompanied by four copies of his Mazetto di fiori musicalmente colti.
- the rough draft of a letter (May, 1623) to an unknown recipient, which documents the vivid interest of Castaldi for the musical production of Claudio Monteverdi: “Ho havuto le composicion del Monteverdi da voi mandatemi, e desiderando molto di sentirle fece cantar hier sera con molta mia ricreat(ione) perché mi piacquero assaiissimo come mi sapeva che non potrebbero essere di manco per l’eccellenza dell’autore [undecipherable word] la qual appresso di me è in quella stima maggiore che però havrei caro l’istessa relatione facciate a lui di questo et appunto mi piacerà molto se delle cose sue che vi daranno alle mani mi faretz haver [copia?]”. (I have received the compositions of Monteverdi that you sent me, and wishing greatly to hear them I had them sung yesterday evening to my great pleasure because they pleased me very much, for it appeared to me that it could not have been otherwise, because of the excellence of the composer . . . , which [excellence] has increased in my esteem. Thus I would like for you to relate this to him and I would be very happy if you would make copies for me of those pieces of his that you get.”) It may be that the letter was directed to the publisher Alessandro Vincenti, who in the same year (1623) had published Castaldi’s Mazetto di fiori. Castaldi also expresses himself in elegiac terms about Monteverdi in a rhymed letter to the same Vincenti, contained in the “Rimasuglio” (Capitolessa al Signor Alessandro), of which we cite here a few verses:

\begin{verbatim}
E discendiamo al vostro Botteghino
Dove ogni giorno, ridere, e giore
Voglio con voi, e star allegramente
Ch’in ogni modo al fin s’ha da morire.
Hora a gli amici che vi stanno arente,
Ma più d’altri al Signor Bartolomeo,
Me gli raccomandate caldamente.
Quando vedrò, vò cantare il Tedeo,
Ma sopra ogni’altro il Signor Monteverde,
Novello Apollo, e Musicale Orfeo,
Il cui ’negno, vie più florido, e verde
Quanto più con l’età si va avanzando,
Più nel compor leggiadro si rinverde;
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Descending to your little shop
Where I wish every day to laugh and
Be happy with you; and stay cheerful,
For anyway one dies in the end.
Now to the friends who are near you,
But more to Signor Bartolomeo,
Remember me warmly.
When I see him I’ll sing the Te Deum,
But above all Signor Monteverdi,
The new Apollo and Musical Orpheus,
Whose genius ever more florid and green
The more he advances in years,
The more his lovely compositions become green.
\end{verbatim}
Therefore, excluding the possibility that Castaldi compiled the manuscript, or that he had it copied for his own use (all the pieces are in soprano clef), we must follow a different course of research and advance a more promising hypothesis. We proceed with the following consideration: the anonymous compiler of our manuscript was clearly familiar with the name behind the initials b.c. Otherwise he would have written “of uncertain authorship” or nothing at all, as with the other pieces. Having, after all, presumably compiled the manuscript for his own use, it was not necessary to write out in full the name Bellerofonte Castaldi, if he knew him well. On the other hand, Castaldi was not a well-known figure outside the area of the city of Modena and its environs. Within this restricted sphere, however, he was well known as a musician and satirical poet, and as a bizarre figure compared to other Modenese poets of greater prominence such as Fulvio Testi.\(^{15}\) Castaldi was also known to have been occasionally a Modenese dialect poet. In other words, the compiler of the Estense manuscript may be sought in the area of Modena or nearby. He must also be a theorist and perhaps a singer. If this hypothesis appears tenable, the name of a possible candidate that immediately comes to mind is Pietro Bertacchini. Valdrighi wrote of him too, as a singer, *tiorbista*, guitarist, “collector of musical manuscripts all diligently copied by his own hand,” and finally, expert in the art of dying cloth! The source upon which Valdrighi based his article\(^{16}\) is the autobiography of Bertaccini now in the Archivio Guaitoli in Carpi\(^{17}\) and published in its entirety some years after Valdrighi’s article.\(^{18}\)

Bertacchini was born in 1641 in Carpi, the old residence of a small principality located a few kilometers north of Modena. His father, who played “arcilauto, chitarra, e mandola,” began, when Pietro was nine years old, to give him lessons on archlute and to have him taught embellished singing by the *maestro di capella* of the cathedral of Carpi. But let us refer to Bertacchini’s own words:\(^{19}\)

---

\(^{15}\) See *Frammenti di una corrispondenza poetica del Sec. XVII, raccolti da Giuseppe Cavazzuti* (Modena, 1910).


\(^{17}\) Archivio Guaitoli, busta 111, fascicolo 2. The autobiography is a copy in Guaitoli’s hand of the original that is now lost.

\(^{18}\) *Memorie storiche e documenti sulla città e sull’antico principato di Carpi*, volume V (Carpi, 1900).

\(^{19}\) *Memorie storiche . . .*, volume V, pp. 9-10.
When I was thirteen my father died, and I continued music under the above-mentioned [Claudio Zucchi, the previously mentioned maestro di capella] and my study of the arcilauto, since my father had brought the carriage of my hands to the utmost perfection. And in my fifteenth year Signor Benedetto Ferrari, maestro di capella of His Serene Highness Duke Francesco of Modena, asked me to come and serve His Highness as the second soprano and promised to give me instructions on the tiorba. And I betook myself to Modena, where I served His Highness as second soprano, and as first soprano in the Cathedral under Signor Don Marco Uccellini, maestro di capella of the Duomo in San Geminiano and maestro di capella in the concerto of His Highness.

And in my eighteenth year I lost my soprano voice, remaining a good contralto for only six months during which time I undertook to return to Carpi, where my voice became a tenor, and continuing always the study of tiorba and arcilauto, singing, as I could accompany myself, until the age of 23 in the year of our Lord 1664.

When Bertacchini arrived in Modena, towards 1656, we do not know if Castaldi was still alive. However, he cannot have been deceased for long if in 1649 he “did not wear spectacles, read, wrote and sung in all his power and still did not spur himself when wearing boots.”20 In any case, even if he died shortly after, the memory of him would still have been sufficiently alive.

We read in the autobiography about the precious collection of musical manuscripts that Bertacchini collected in the course of his life: 21

... no one, not even princes, could have instruments of more beauty and especially quality than mine. And compositions to be sung by the premier virtuosi, like the sonatas collected by me and of my copying with the greatest possible diligence, without errors just as if they were printed. All was adorned in books well-bound with letters figured with much esteem and cost. ... And the reason why I never wished to give copies of these copying efforts of mine, those of the books collected in Genoa and those others in Lucca, to the ladies and cavaliers and nobility who desired them, is that they were thus rendered more rare and valuable and increased in esteem in my hands.

The description of these manuscripts could certainly correspond to our Estense manuscript, particularly the ornate “figured letters” that enhance the same manuscript.

20 Valdrighi (Musurgiana), p. 110. The cited passage is found on folio 170r of the “Rimasuglio di rime berniesche.”

21 Memorie storiche . . . , p. 20.
The first page of Monteverdi’s famous “Lamento d’Arianna” (Modena, Biblioteca Estense Mus. G 239, p. 1) showing one of the ornate “figured letters”
Continuing with our hypothesis, we still need to inquire as to when the manuscript could have been compiled. We could attempt to address this point directly, but here we prefer to cite Valdrighi, who expresses himself on this question with greater clarity than Bertacchini himself. The latter returned to Carpi towards the end of 1669, after long peregrinations that had carried him to Rome, Florence, Mantua and Viadana, in the course of which he had dedicated himself principally to the guitar: "since certain Signori Lazzari of Carpi were holding daily concerts with bowed strings and spinettone in their home, he (Bertacchini) returned in this circumstance to dedicate himself to the tiorba beginning to practice again, since somewhat lacking on it in the flourishes necessary for accompanying these concerts." The intabulated passages could, therefore, be the fruit of this period of his revival of the study of the tiorba, added towards the end of a collection of vocal pieces he had begun to compile before.

Thus the "flourishes" might possibly be dated about 1670, unless Bertacchini returned to his earlier apprenticeship with Benedetto Ferrari between the fifteenth and eighteenth year of his life, when he still had a soprano voice. In this case, the "flourishes" would have been added between 1656 and 1659. Naturally, the above represents merely a suggested hypothesis that can only be confirmed or refuted if we could recover a manuscript that is certainly by Bertacchini, something which has unfortunately not yet occurred.

Let us now consider the collection of intabulated basses that occupies pages 103 to 127 of the manuscript. The pedagogical intent is obvious: it is a regular, complete repertory of the most frequent passages a tiorbista would find and have need to realize in the contemporary practice of accompaniment, a collection of "loci communes" good for every need. There are cadences in the most current keys, movements of the bass by step and by skip, both ascending and descending, varied combinations of motions alternating by step and by skip; in short, a sort of "manual for the perfect accompanist."

It is obvious that the study of such a repertory of passages must be a part of the normal apprenticeship for the tiorba player who wishes to excel in the art of realizing at sight a bass accompaniment. An improvised execution, however, is not completely extemporaneous, totally invented at the moment of execution. It must inevitably make reference (perhaps unconsciously) to models,

---

22 Valdrighi (Musurgiana), pp. 203-204.
procedures, commonplaces, and patterns already known and practiced. Improvisation is, in reality, very often an extemporaneous selection from among possible standard formulas which, within the confines of a certain musical style and execution, can and must be susceptible to classification and systematic collection. Systematic collections of "passaggi" are well known to those well versed in the field of early music, from the Fontegara of Ganassi to the Vero modo di diminuire of Dalla Casa and the Selva de vari passaggi of Rognoni, and it would not be impossible even today (perhaps someone has already done it) to collect and classify in orderly fashion a "selva [forest] di vari passaggi" for use by a soloist who improvises jazz.

The collection of intabulated basses for tiorba in the Estense manuscript Mus. G. 239, compiled with this same clear pedagogical (or perhaps autodidactical) intent represents a valuable document for the player of today who wishes to revive the old practice of accompaniment on the tiorba within the sphere of the more general revival of interest in early music and performance practice. But the document is also of great interest from the more general point of view of musicological research. It represents a testimony of widespread taste for the rich improvised execution of passaggi, tirate, diminutions, the abuse of which must have been frequent, for very often they aroused the wrath of and drew reprimands from theorists and writers of treatises. The first observation that comes to mind upon reading through these intabulated basses is the following: first and foremost, to realize the harmony above the notated bass, the tiorba player prefers to make diminutions on the bass line. The chords are often quite meager; the third above the bass is hardly ever absent, but the fifth is often missing. To the contrary, the bass line is almost always very animated and varied. In other words, the realization of these basses on the tiorba very frequently assumes the appearance of a "basso diminuito" rather than a "basso continuo" of which we are accustomed to think as having been used since the time of Caccini. In short, the bass is still conceived predominantly as a "parte cantabile" and, similarly, "diminuibile" at the same rate as the other voice above it, more than as a simple harmonic support for those accompanied voices.

Those parts added above the bass line are still conceived as "parti cantabili," as horizontally developed lines, more than as chordal successions in the modern sense. It is, in short, a conception of accompaniment which, at the height of the seventeenth century, revives an older style of musical execution that was evidently still not entirely obsolete. In this regard the sort of treatise on accompaniment for tiorba such as this one decisively contradicts the
nearly contemporaneous Table published in France by the Bolognese theorist Bartolomi, which is, on the contrary, a true treatise on the execution of basso continuo as understood in the modern sense of a primarily harmonic support for the upper parts.\textsuperscript{23} This comparison helps to underscore the lingering presence in Italy of a taste for "cantabilità" that remained for a long time a distinctive mark of Italian music compared to that beyond the Alps.

translated from the Italian by
Douglas Alton Smith

\textsuperscript{23} Angelo Michele Bartolomi, \textit{Table pour apprendre à toucher parfaitement le theorbe} (Paris, 1669).
Although John Dowland wrote many aires and pieces for solo lute, there has been so far only one documented lute duet from his pen—"Lord Chamberlaine's Galliard, for two to play upon one Lute." In this article, however, I propose that there is one lute duet that has hitherto gone unnoticed. In one of the Matthew Holmes lute books in the Cambridge University Library (Dd. 2.11, f. 56) lies a short, relatively undistinguished piece entitled "Complaint J.D." In the recently published *Collected Lute Music of John Dowland,* this piece was included by the editors among the solos (No. 63). This "complaint" has the outward appearances of a solo piece for the lute, in that there are continuous basses and full chords throughout the composition. However, a closer inspection reveals it to be an incomplete piece.

"Complaint" is another name for the popular ballad tune, "Fortune my Foe." In fact, in the consort lesson arrangement of "Fortune my Foe" in the Holmes consort books, the cittern part is

---

1. Published in the *First Booke of Songes,* 1597, and subsequent reprints. One other piece, "Lord Willoughby's Welcome Home," is a solo by Dowland over which someone else wrote another part. It would be hard to classify this as a duet by John Dowland.

2. Diana Poulton and Basil Lam, Faber and Faber Limited, 1974.
notated "Complaint al(iud) ffortunde." Comparisons between the consort lesson lute part, the Dd.2.11 part in question, and the original tune provides some interesting variations. Neither the consort version nor the 2.11 version contain the melody in the A section. In A’, both of the lute versions are an ornamentation of the melody, the 2.11 version being the more faithful. In the B section, the consort version follows the melody, but the 2.11 version keeps harmony in thirds. In B’, the 2.11 manuscript again takes the melody, while the consort version does a variation upon it. The 2.11 version borrows from the consort version in several places (notably the A section and the beginning of B’), but they are certainly not the same piece nor do they have the same function. Consort lesson lute parts often work over the entire framework of a composition, sometimes being an alto part and sometimes the melody and sometimes a bit of all. This is certainly true in Dowland’s “Fortune my Foe” consort lesson part. The 2.11 version follows a slightly different pattern:

A – harmonization against the melody
A’ – melody
B – harmonization
B’ – melody

Because of this lack of melody in the A and B sections, it is very doubtful that the 2.11 piece was conceived as a solo. The more likely formula for a solo would have been to have had the melody in the A and B sections and some variation of it for the A’ and B’ sections. This style of variation is what allowed the “Fortune my Foe” consort lesson lute part to also be played as a solo. It is doubtful that the 2.11 part is another variation of the consort lesson part, since to be a successful part, the lute would need more ornamentation to be heard over the ensemble in such a heterophonic texture. It is also in a different key than the consort lesson. The last likely choice is that of a lute duet, and it is here that the formula fits like a glove. It is common for English lute duets to trade the melody back and forth between the two lutes. (Johnson’s “Flatt Pavin” and “Laveche Pavin,” as well as their galliards, are famous examples of this type of duet.) With the Dd.2.11 part, we essentially have one half of a lute duet.


5 See Poulton, John Dowland (Faber and Faber, 1974), pp. 164-65.
Having recognized this, we are still left with some problems, the most obvious of which is—where is the other lute part? I have not been able to find it among the extant English lute manuscripts, but, unfortunate as this is, lute duets of this type, where the melody and bass are known, are relatively easy to reconstruct. Often one can just reverse the order of the A and A’ sections and the B and B’ sections. In “Complaint,” this leads to a few parallel unisons and a very thick texture. Most of these unisons can be eliminated by simple changes, but the thick texture is a bit out of the ordinary. In most English duets where the tune is traded back and forth, the melody is usually presented as a single line without bass. There are no hints of that in “Complaint.” It seems as though both lutes should keep the bass and chords at all times whether or not they have the melody. Thick
texture was not uncommon in earlier continental duets. In England, this thickness is rare, but it can be found in the Dallis Lute Book. In this manuscript, there are two English duets, “Phillips Paven” and Stroger’s “In Nomine galliard,” which would certainly be as thick as the proposed “Complaint” duet.

Example II

Marchant’s “Fancy” is another example of a fairly thick texture, though at times the melody is played alone. It seems, then, that the thick texture is acceptable for our proposed duet.

It remains a mystery as to why Holmes wrote this piece in Dd.2.11, a manuscript which was otherwise given over completely to solo literature. It was probably copied from another book whose scribe left the second part in the book of a friend. It is a lucky happenstance that at least this one part survived. In terms of its style and its placement in the earliest of the Holmes books, it could be placed among the earliest of the English true duets, possibly dating from the 1580’s. One wonders how many other duets masquerading as solos are hidden in the English manuscripts.

6The “Fantasia per sonar con dui Lauti in ottova,” published by Melchiae de Barbariss in his Libro Decimo, 1549, and republished by Phalése in 1552 (at the unison), is the most obvious example of this thick heterophonic texture.

7Dublin, Trinity College Library, Ms.D.3.30, pp. 82-83 and 93-94, respectively.

Example III

Reconstructed by Lyle Nordstrom
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THE LUTES IN THE
MUSEO MUNICIPAL DE MUSICA
IN BARCELONA

By John Griffiths

In recent years both luthiers and lutenists have been discovering that the principles, methods, and materials employed in the construction of lutes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries not only result in instruments that are more responsive to the touch, but also more agreeable to the ear. Although the task of cataloging, measuring, and comparing surviving instruments is far from complete, much rewarding research has already been carried out in this process of rediscovery. Recent publications by Friedemann Hellwig, Robert Lundberg, Michael Lowe, Douglas Alton Smith, and Michael Saffle stand out among the leading examples of such scholarship.¹

One of the important museums housing original instruments, which has not been included in any previously published catalog or research study, is the Museo Municipal de Musica situated in the Conservatorio Superior Municipal de Musica, Calle Bruch 110, Barcelona, Spain. The museum houses a rich collection of antique instruments from Europe and Latin America. In addition to twenty-eight guitars dating from the mid-eighteenth to the early twentieth century, the museum holds three lutes, two archlutes, and one chitarrone:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Catalog number</th>
<th>Maker</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archlute</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>Matteo Sellas</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archlute</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>Magno Duifopruchar</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Late 16th/early 17th cen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Chitarrone</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>Petrus Oliverius</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1521 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lute</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>Hans Hovb Muler</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Early 17th cen.(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lute</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>Marx Vnuerdorben</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Early 16th cen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lute</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>Matteus Bueckenberg</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>1613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author regrets having been unable to supply adequate information regarding materials and internal construction. Both aging and the stains used in finishing timbers make unequivocal identification of woods impossible, but of the suspected materials, nothing was found that would disagree with the results of Robert Lundberg's investigations. It was not possible to examine the internal construction of the instruments, but Friedemann Hellwig's article on lute bellies is an abundant source of information.

2 The museum is soon to be relocated; the future address was unavailable at the time this project was undertaken. I wish to acknowledge the kind cooperation of the museum staff who permitted the instruments to be measured and photographed.

3 Editors' note: Until further research modifies the nomenclature, the word "archlute" as used in this Journal, with reference to Italian instruments of the 17th century, designates a lute with a string scale of 70cm or less (on the fingerboard) and double courses (in octaves) on the straight extension. A theorbo (or tiorba) is an instrument with single contrabasses on the extension; its fingerboard may in some cases be less than 70cm long. Chitarrone is a synonym for theorbo—in 17th century Italian terminology there is no distinction whatsoever between chitarrone and theorbo. In German theorboes of the late 17th and 18th centuries, the contrabasses are usually double in octaves as on the earlier Italian archlute.
The following table summarizes the overall dimensions, body features, and stringing for each instrument. All dimensions are expressed in centimeters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Instrument</th>
<th>Maker</th>
<th>Total length</th>
<th>Belly (length x width)</th>
<th>Ribs</th>
<th>Mensur</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archlute</td>
<td>Sellas</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>44.0 x 32.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64.0/86.8</td>
<td>14 (7x2;7x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tieffenbrucker</td>
<td>124.5</td>
<td>47.8 x 34.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69.5/100.7</td>
<td>17 (10x2;6x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitarrone</td>
<td>Oliverius</td>
<td>176.0</td>
<td>53.0 x 30.5</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>59.5/139.3</td>
<td>12 (5x2;1x1;6x1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muler</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>45.4 x 31.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>10 (1x1;9x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lute</td>
<td>Unverdorben</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>50.3 x 32.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>7 (1x1;6x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buechenberg</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>53.1 x 35.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>10 (1x1;9x2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To permit an economical presentation of the data, the diagrams below show the measurements taken of each instrument. The letters representing these dimensions correspond to those presented in the tables, one for each instrument, found on subsequent pages of this study. Measurement B is the total length expressed in the third column of the table above. In the case of the archlutes and chitarrone, measurement “B” includes the extension shown in measurement “a.” Measurement C is taken from the top of the fingerboard rather than the top of the bowl. Measurements D, H, I, and J are all at the widest point. G is the measurement of the rose cut-out excluding other ornamentation. L gives the width of the fingerboard at the nut, not the nut itself. The measurement was taken below the nut (that is, on the fingerboard) because it allows for more accurate measurement. Measurements U and V were taken on the treble side. String holes were usually higher on the bass side, but often the bridge was not tapered.

The archlutes by Magno Duiffopruchar (or Magnus Tieffenbrucker as he is more commonly known and as he shall be referred to below) and Matteo Sellas in the Barcelona collection both represent fine examples by the most renowned Venetian luthiers. Both instruments appear typical of their makers’ output and may, therefore, serve as good models for modern reproduction.
Tieffenbrucker has no date, but was probably built more than 25 years before the Sellas, which is dated 1641. Ernst Pohlmann cites instruments by Magnus Tieffenbrucker built between 1575 and 1616. Sellas’s archlute appears to be one of his later instruments, since 1612 to 1641 is the period of his working life discernible from dated instruments given in the same source. The most obvious difference between the two archlutes is in the belly outline. Tieffenbrucker and other luthiers of his time characteristically built instruments whose belly outlines are slimmer towards the neck than those built only a few decades later by Sellas and his contemporaries. Other features are more similar. Although the string length of each instrument differs, other proportional relationships accord. Both instruments have two-piece bellies of fine-grained spruce or fir, each stamped at the top with its maker’s mark. The photographs of the instruments reveal their high level of decoration, another characteristic of much of both makers’ work. Ivory was used in both cases to bind the belly and for rib spacers; the ribs themselves being either of a naturally dark hardwood or, as seems more likely, of light-colored wood stained black. This is particularly evident with the Tieffenbrucker. The veneer covering each instrument’s neck and pegbox is also a light-colored wood stained black and decorated with ivory. Both instruments have attractive swan heads that form the upper pegbox. It is interesting to note that the inlaid necks and pegbox decorations of the two instruments are identical and that three large oblong pieces of ivory, chased with fine drawings, are inlaid into the fingerboard of the Tieffenbrucker. These facts suggest that the neck and/or the pegbox of the Tieffenbrucker are not original. Since the ivory oblongs that decorate its neck are features of at least eleven extant instruments by Sellas, it seems likely that the latter luthier either re-necked Tieffenbrucker’s instrument or fitted the theorbo head to it and redecorated the neck. The possibilities that the original Tieffenbrucker neck and pegbox were merely


5 Ernst Pohlmann, *Laute Theorbe Chitarrone*, 4th edition (Bremen, 1975), pp. 374-379. Pohlmann also acknowledges the existence of the Barcelona instrument. The Tieffenbrucker instruments ostensibly built in 1575 and 1584, however, are both at least partially fake. See W.L. Lütgendorff, *Die Greigen und Lautenmacher vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart...* (Frankfurt am Main: Franksurter Verlags-Anstalt, 1922; reprint New York: Broude Bros., 1967) for more reliable information on Tieffenbrucker.

6 Pohlmann, pp. 357-360. It should be pointed out that these dates are not necessarily inclusive of either maker’s entire working life. Pohlmann’s listings are not comprehensive.

7 I gratefully acknowledge Robert Lundberg’s help in bringing this matter to my attention.
redecorated by Sellas, or that both instruments were re-necked or
redecorated by some later craftsman, seem less probable. It is
feasible, then, that the Tieffenbrucker was perhaps originally built as
a normal lute and, therefore, possible that the bridge is not original.
The Sellas archlute is in much better condition than the
Tieffenbrucker, although a few repairs have been undertaken on
several cracked ribs of the former instrument. The dimensions of
each instrument follow. An asterisk denotes an approximate
measurement (plus or minus 0.3cm).

**Archlute: Matteo Sellas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A  64.0</th>
<th>B 112.5</th>
<th>C  44.0</th>
<th>D  32.4</th>
<th>E  8.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>F 19.9</td>
<td>G  10.5</td>
<td>H  13.5</td>
<td>I 13.0*</td>
<td>J 15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>K 28.9</td>
<td>L  8.8</td>
<td>M 11.9</td>
<td>N  2.4</td>
<td>O  3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegbox</td>
<td>P  –</td>
<td>Q  2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>R 18.3</td>
<td>S 23.9</td>
<td>T 17.0</td>
<td>U  0.7</td>
<td>V  0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegbox</td>
<td>a 39.6</td>
<td>b 22.8</td>
<td>c 18.5</td>
<td>d  0</td>
<td>e  7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extension</td>
<td>g 2.0</td>
<td>h 1.7</td>
<td>i 4.6</td>
<td>j  5.8</td>
<td>k  1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mensur: 64.0/86.8

Pegs: 28 (14 plus 14)

String holes in bridge: 28

String spacing at lower nut: 7 double courses graduating evenly from treble to bass. First pair are 2mm apart, seventh pair are 3.5mm.

Ribs: 31

**Archlute: Magno Duiffopruchar [Magnus Tieffenbrucker]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A  69.5</th>
<th>B 124.5</th>
<th>C  47.8</th>
<th>D  34.1</th>
<th>E  9.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body</td>
<td>F 22.6</td>
<td>G  10.2</td>
<td>H  15.0*</td>
<td>I 16.0*</td>
<td>J 15.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>K 31.2</td>
<td>L  9.5</td>
<td>M 11.2</td>
<td>N  2.2</td>
<td>O  3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegbox</td>
<td>P  –</td>
<td>Q  2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>R 19.3</td>
<td>S 24.7</td>
<td>T 17.1</td>
<td>U 0.55</td>
<td>V  0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegbox</td>
<td>a 46.0</td>
<td>b 29.5</td>
<td>c 23.3</td>
<td>d  0</td>
<td>e  8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extension</td>
<td>g 2.1</td>
<td>h 1.6</td>
<td>i 4.5</td>
<td>j  5.9</td>
<td>k  2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mensur: 69.5/100.7

Pegs: 34 (20 plus 14)

54
String holes in bridge: 32
String spacing at lower nut: Ten double courses of approximately equal spacing
Stringing: 10x2; 6x2
Ribs: 37 fluted
Label: Magno Duiffopruchar a Venetia

The false chitarrone in the Barcelona collection is a strange instrument by an otherwise unknown luthier. Since it is apparent that the instrument is not genuine, we need not discuss it in great detail. It is highly decorated in a reasonably skilled fashion, with ivory and pearl adorning nearly every part of it. The belly binding and rosette decoration is unusually broad, and the entire bowl is so heavily encrusted that no external evidence of the number of ribs is to be found. The label inside the instrument attributes it to “Petrus Oliverius, 1521” and external markings provide two additional dates: on the bowl is the inscription “Fecit 1573,” and on the neck directly behind the lower nut is inscribed “Lucensis 1537.” Additional identification is afforded by a maker’s mark on the belly and two heraldic shields incorporated into the decoration on the bowl. The maker’s marks are stamped into the base of the belly about one centimeter above the edge of the binding. The two symbols used for the marks are a fleur-de-lis and the letters XR. Investigation has failed to link any of the shields or marks with any other instrument. Dimensions of the instrument are given below.

**Chitarrone: Petrus Oliverius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body</th>
<th>A 59.5</th>
<th>B 176.0</th>
<th>C 53.0</th>
<th>D 30.5</th>
<th>E 15.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F 27.5</td>
<td>G 9.2</td>
<td>H 19.0</td>
<td>I 21.0</td>
<td>J 15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>K 22.2</td>
<td>L 7.8</td>
<td>M 8.7</td>
<td>N 2.0</td>
<td>O 2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegbox</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Q 2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>R 12.5</td>
<td>S 20.3</td>
<td>T 11.5</td>
<td>U 1.1</td>
<td>V 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegbox extension</td>
<td>a 100.0</td>
<td>b --</td>
<td>c 28.5</td>
<td>d 2.5</td>
<td>e --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g 1.0</td>
<td>h --</td>
<td>i 4.0</td>
<td>j --</td>
<td>k 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mensur</td>
<td>59.2 / 139.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegs</td>
<td>17 (11 plus 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String holes in bridge</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stringing</td>
<td>5x2; 1x1; 6x1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
<td>Petrus Oliverius, 1521 [!]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 1521 dating is highly suspect; the history of musical style leads one to expect that the earliest chitarroni would not have been constructed until the latter part of the century. In addition to historical reasons, the Oliverius chitarrone is probably inauthentic on the following grounds: body shape, bridge design, bridge placement, style of decoration, and the self-contradictory dates on the instrument.

On the other hand, the three lutes in the Barcelona collection are all genuine instruments of high quality. Only one is difficult to identify. This is the one whose label identifies the maker as Hans Hovb Muler, but furnishes no additional information. The only known luthier with whom there may be any etymological connection of name is Laux Maler, though the lute is certainly not by him. The belly of the instrument appears too rounded to date from the early sixteenth century, and it is likely to be of early seventeenth century construction. Whatever its date and origin, it is a finely constructed light-weight instrument of elegant proportions. One minor inconsistency is that the number of string holes in the bridge exceeds the number of tuning pegs, suggesting that the bridge may not be original. The bridge has 22 holes arranged in eleven pairs; the pegbox is reamed to take 19 pegs, and the nut is scored to carry ten double courses. Therefore, the instrument was probably strung with ten courses including a single chanterelle. The bowl is constructed of thirteen ribs of flamed maple joined without spacers, and there is no binding of any kind along the joint of belly and bowl.

### Lute: Hans Hovb Muler

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body:</th>
<th>A 67.0</th>
<th>B 76.5</th>
<th>C 45.4</th>
<th>D 31.0</th>
<th>E 8.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F 23.3</td>
<td>G 7.8</td>
<td>H 13.0</td>
<td>I 17.0*</td>
<td>J 16.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck:</td>
<td>K 30.0</td>
<td>L 8.2</td>
<td>M 11.2</td>
<td>N 1.7</td>
<td>O 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegbox:</td>
<td>P 26.5</td>
<td>Q 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge:</td>
<td>R 14.4</td>
<td>S 19.3</td>
<td>T 13.8</td>
<td>U 0.8</td>
<td>V 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegs:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String holes in bridge:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribs:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 Giulio Caccini (c. 1570-1618) and Alessandro Piccinini (1566-1638) are the figures most readily associable with the early chitarrone. See Douglas Alton Smith, "On the Origin of the Chitarrone," *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. XXXII, no. 3 (Fall, 1979).

9 The bellies of the Laux Maler lutes cited by Pohlmann (pp. 342-343) have lengths exceeding their widths by factors of 1.52, 1.68, 1.69, and 1.72. The Muler lute has a factor of only 1.46.
The lute cataloged by the Barcelona museum as “number 408, anonymous, Venice, seventeenth century,” is in fact the work of the Venetian luthier Marx Unverdorben, thought to have been active between 1535 and 1570. The label is not fully clear and it was not possible to distinguish whether the surname is actually spelled “vnuerdower” or “vnuerdorben.” The instrument is, thus, one of a relatively small number of instruments surviving from the early sixteenth century. Few other lutes by Unverdorben are known to be extant. The Barcelona instrument appears to be in original condition, and the fact that it has only seven courses suggests that its neck and pegbox are also original. It is a lightweight instrument and is remarkably well preserved, with only some slight damage to the most sensitive areas of the belly and to the finely carved rosette. The belly is of spruce or fir and no form of binding is used to protect its edges. No decorative border is inscribed into the belly around the rosette, which is of simple design based on nine small circles of equal diameter. The bowl, made of thirteen ribs, is constructed from bird’s-eye maple. Inlaid strips of ivory edge the rosewood fingerboard, which displays the typical narrowness of those on early instruments. The neck and pegbox are stained black. It is a splendid instrument of great simplicity and beauty. The excellence of its construction recommends it as a historical model very deserving of the attention of contemporary luthiers.

Lute: Marx Unverdorben

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body:</th>
<th>A 68.1</th>
<th>B 77.3</th>
<th>C 50.3</th>
<th>D 32.4</th>
<th>E 8.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F 23.4</td>
<td>G 10.0</td>
<td>H 16.0</td>
<td>I 19.0*</td>
<td>J 16.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck:</td>
<td>K 27.2</td>
<td>L 5.8</td>
<td>M 8.0</td>
<td>N 2.0</td>
<td>O 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegbox:</td>
<td>P 21.0</td>
<td>Q 2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge:</td>
<td>R 11.0</td>
<td>S 19.3</td>
<td>T 9.2</td>
<td>U 0.6</td>
<td>V 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegs:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String holes on bridge:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stringing:</td>
<td>1x1; 6x2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribs:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label:</td>
<td>Marx vnuerdorben in Venetia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lute by Matteo Buechenberg is a beautiful well-constructed example of the work of one of the most excellent luthiers active in

---

Rome during the first decade of the seventeenth century. It is, therefore, a fine historical model. Spruce or fir is used for the belly, the ribs are of shaded yew, and the neck and pegbox are stained. Narrow stripes of ivory and blackened pear are inlaid into the back of the neck, and an overrider is provided on the pegbox for the chanterelle. The one unusual feature of the instrument is its asymmetrical belly shape. The belly is larger on the treble side in the area below the bridge, suggesting that a period of time elapsed between completing the construction of the bowl and fitting of the belly, sufficient to allow a distortion of the bowl shape to occur. Bowls frequently distort after being taken off the mold, and Buechenberg probably used no form of jig to straighten the distortion when he eventually glued the bowl to the belly. Hangers fitted to the middle of the clasp and the back of the pegbox permit the player to use a strap to help support the instrument.

**Lute: Matteo Buechenberg**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body:</th>
<th>A 72.7</th>
<th>B 81.9</th>
<th>C 53.1</th>
<th>D 35.8</th>
<th>E 8.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F 24.9</td>
<td>G 9.0</td>
<td>H 16.0</td>
<td>I 19.5*</td>
<td>J 16.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(plus 1.0 decoration)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck:</td>
<td>K 28.7</td>
<td>L 7.5</td>
<td>M 9.2</td>
<td>N 1.5</td>
<td>O 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegbox:</td>
<td>P 26.3</td>
<td>Q 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge:</td>
<td>R 15.2</td>
<td>S 21.9</td>
<td>T 14.0</td>
<td>U 0.7</td>
<td>V 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegs:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String holes in bridge:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stringing:</td>
<td>1x1; 9x2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nut details:</td>
<td>19 equally spaced grooves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribs:</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label:</td>
<td>Matteus Bueckenberg / Roma 1613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The articles by Robert Lundberg and Friedemann Hellwig mentioned earlier contain a number of generalized statements about various features and proportions of a large sample of instruments. These amount to a set of guiding principles that a historically conscious luthier may embrace as part of his fundamental knowledge. The instruments discussed in this article have been compared to the findings of these writers and accord favorably with their conclusions. The following comparisons serve to furnish
additional information pertaining to the instruments studied.  

 **Belly thickness:** Measurements are in general agreement, although comprehensive detail was not available. Judging from thickness as taken at the rosette, along cracks, and at edges, all bellies were 2mm thick or less.

 **Placement of rosette:** The centers of the roses on the Sellas, Tieffenbrucker, Unverdorben, and Buechenberg instruments were all located precisely 4/7th of the distance from the bottom of the belly to the neck. This relationship is 3/5 on the Oliverius and Muler instruments. These accord exactly with two of the procedures for geometric belly design presented by Hellwig.\(^{11}\)

 **Diameter of rosette:** Hellwig states that diameters of one third (0.33) and one quarter (0.25) of belly width at the widest point are common in many lutes. The following proportions are found in the present sample: Sellas 0.32; Tieffenbrucker 0.30; Oliverius 0.30; Muler 0.25; Unverdorben 0.31; Buechenberg 0.25. None of these proportions is greater or less than the figures given by Hellwig. The rose diameters, excluding decorative borders, range from 7.8 to 10.5 cm. Lundberg specifies a typical range of between 7.5 and 9.1 cm.\(^{12}\)

 **Bridge placement:** Quoting from the treatise of Henri Arnault of Zwolle (1440) and from Mersenne’s *Harmonie Universelle* (1636), Hellwig supports his observation that bridges tend to be located at one sixth (0.166) of the distance between the base of the belly and the neck.\(^{13}\) Lundberg has given 1/5.5 (0.181) as a commonly occurring proportion within an ambit of 1/7 (0.142) and 1/5 (0.200). Of the six Barcelona instruments, the Buechenberg lute has its bridge closest to the base of the belly, being located at 0.161 of the total belly length. The bridge placements on the other instruments are as follows: Unverdorben 0.172; Muler 0.187; Tieffenbrucker 0.188; Sellas 0.193; and the exceptional Oliverius 0.292. In practical terms, however, these differences are minimal. If the ratios of each instrument (except the Oliverius chitarrone) are applied to a standard belly length of, say, 50cm, the distance between the highest and lowest position would be 16mm.

 **Belly binding:** Only the Muler and Unverdorben lutes have no binding. All the other instruments have the type of half bindings described by Lundberg.\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{11}\) Hellwig, “On the Construction...,” p. 139. See the discussion of the chitarroni by Buechenberg and Graill.

\(^{12}\) Lundberg, p. 34.


\(^{14}\) Lundberg, pp. 34-35.
Bowl profile: The depth of the bowls on the three multi-ribbed instruments (Sellas, Tieffenbrucker, and Buechenberg) are all less than half the body width, that is to say, slightly flattened. These two measurements on the other instruments are approximately equal, except for the Muler, the bowl of which is a bit deeper than half-round. Other features specified particularly by Lundberg, including string height at the bridge, string spacing and neck thickness, are all in agreement with the present measurements.
Around the turn of the present century such Italian and German musicologists as Oscar Chilesotti and Oswald Körte began studying historical lute music and published essays on their investigations. This activity, however, created no discernible reaction in Italy and very little in Germany. At the same time a Swedish “lute singer” named Sven Scholander began traveling through Europe performing folkloristic songs. His instrument was actually not a lute, but a type of theorbo-cittern. Scholander attracted a number of followers in Germany, who used lutes (or “lutars”) in guitar tuning with single strings and with, perhaps, some longer bass strings added. These “minstrels” tried their best, but their music had no similarity with historical lute playing and their activities actually created more misunderstanding than progress.

Another event occurred during this same period that was to become a decisive element in the resurrection of the lute. A youth movement, consisting mainly of middle-school students, emerged in Germany just around 1900. Its aim was to live a more “natural” life; its adherents loved the woods and mountains and set forth to discover the countryside around them. This “wandering” was done, not in the interest of sport, but in the spirit of romance. From the beginning, these students took an irresistible joy in singing, and they would walk singing along roads still free of automobile traffic. They made use of whatever musical instruments they had, mainly guitars and lutars. They liked to visit the smaller villages where, in those years, local folklore was still very much alive, and they learned much of it including local songs. Many of these songs dated back to the eighteenth, seventeenth, or even sixteenth century. They began to collect these treasures, each region having its own style and
repertoire. By making contact with these earlier musical styles, they began to learn something about earlier instrumental styles as well. Their interest led them to the editions of the German musicologists. These editions began to be studied now, but the students found them difficult to use because the music was written in “keyboard” notation.

This youth movement was disrupted by World War I, but after the war it began again with renewed vigor. Some of the individual groups became more interested in musical activity and “wandering” became of only secondary importance. These groups began to have ideals different from the pre-war students; an interest in polyphonic music and baroque styles replaced the interest in folklore. Choral music was generally the prevailing interest, but it is significant that one group gave to its journal the name Die Laute. The musical examples published in Die Laute, however, were written by the collaborators themselves and had little of the qualities of actual early music, being clearly influenced by the prevailing guitar style. A second group published a yearly revue named Die Musikergilde that contained instrumental music, together with vocal music, similar to that found in Die Laute. For the first time, however, they published an actual lute piece: a courante by Jacques Gallot. Unfortunately, this had been rewritten for two lutes in guitar tuning and transposed from f-sharp minor to g minor. Furthermore, all the original ornaments were omitted and modern phrasing and dynamic signs were added. Nonetheless, it was a step in the right direction. Die Musikergilde also presented an allemande by Robert de Visée edited by Hans D. Bruger who later was to become known for his “School of Lute Playing.”

Lute playing lost its importance in these musical groups after 1922 when they turned more to public singing in a new musical style; there was no longer a place for the lute. Lute playing continued being taught in the “popular music schools,” but the school leaders had no faith that it was possible to revive the early lute styles or to teach tablature and early tunings. A few individuals retained their interest, but failed either because they chose unworkable means or through lack of persistence.

This was the state of the lute in Germany at the end of the second decade of the century. But silently going his own way was an outsider: Hans Neemann who had also come from the original “wanderers.” Early in his life, he had developed an outstanding skill as a guitarist. About 1920 he began studying music seriously with the aim of becoming a pianist. These were the worst post-war years in Germany and he was forced to finance his studies by playing the piano in night restaurants and similar places. When Neemann’s studies were finished, he changed from the piano to the lute. His
education had included continuo playing, a skill he came to dominate completely. He pursued his interest in music history and began to gain a better insight into the richness of early lute music as well as continuing his interest in the guitar.

Neemann’s first years with the lute were very difficult, especially with the lack of proper instruments. He began giving lute concerts, at first with other musicians and, later on, alone. He published historical chamber music that included the lute and soon became convinced that all lute music should be printed with and played from tablature. He realized that tablature was essential to proper learning and performance. Neemann’s concert trips took him to most of the countries in western and northern Europe, as well as to Poland and Czechoslovakia. In each town having a good library or museum, he copied lute music and studied related literature; he also studied museum lutes where he found them. In 1930 he played several difficult compositions by Johann Sebastian Bach at the Bach Festival in Kiel, the first time such a thing had been done in modern times.

After 1930 Neemann’s activities began to change. He gave public concerts less frequently and devoted more of his time to the education and training of good lutenists. He also became increasingly involved in publishing lute music and, of special significance, he began a search for better modern lutes. Lute building had been going on, but with very poor results; luthiers copied museum lutes, but without studying any of the interior parts. Some lute makers followed the lead of the modern guitar and built instruments with a very loud sound, but one quite different from the sound of a real lute. Neemann had another idea, although it too was not without fault. He copied the outward form of a good late baroque lute (one similar to a theorbo), but with the interior construction patterned on instruments he was able to investigate in Czech collections. It is likely that Neemann took a theorbo by Martin Schott as a model. The result was an instrument that sounded almost like a genuine theorbo, but could also be heard within a large consort. The error Neemann made was a common one: lute builders of the time could not believe the thinness of the bellies on the museum lutes and could only account for this by assuming that the wood had shrunk by some 2.3mm (or more) from the 1.1 to 1.8mm thickness early lutes actually had. Only after World War II was it finally shown that the wood would have shrunk by only 10% or even less. Another general error was the understanding that wound strings had been available through the entire seventeenth century.

I came to know Hans Neemann personally in 1932 and took part in all of his musical concerts for the next four years. A group of five lutenists was found, which was later expanded to a wider circle
capable of performing a wide variety of music. The circle began producing a regular publication called Der Lautenkreis, and through its pages many isolated lutenists were connected with the lute movement. Renaissance lute music was published regularly, alternating with music for the baroque lute.

The years from 1933 to 1935 brought the decisive steps towards reconquering the place the lute had lost. Professor G. Schünemann, director of the collection of musical instruments in Berlin’s Musikakademie, brought the museum to life through concerts using all the types of early instruments that could still be used. The participants were members of the Akademie, with only the lutenists brought in from outside. The most enthusiastic collaborators were Professor Schünemann himself and Paul Hindemith, at that time professor of viola and viola d’amore at the Akademie. These concerts did much to awaken an interest in early music as played upon original instruments. Here for the first time was heard the real lute sound of an archlute built by Martin Kaiser in 1636. Neemann’s intention was to interest composers in writing for the lute and Paul Hindemith seriously considered the idea, but political intrigues soon caused him to leave Germany and the idea never materialized.

The single most important event for the lute took place in 1935 at a concert given by our wider circle for members of the German Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft within the museum surrounded by many important instruments including a harpsichord used by J.S. Bach (which was played during the concert) and two vitrines from Bach’s house orchestra. The concert was a great success and the critics were clearly impressed; the prejudice against the lute was finally broken. Bach’s 250th birthday was celebrated in Leipzig the same year. Neemann and I took part playing the lute part in the “Trauerode” (on two lutes) and in the “Johannespassion” (playing two lutes in unison). Once again, the lutes obtained high praise from the critics.

It has been said that Hans Neemann was a man who would not listen to the opinions of others and was a person with few social interests. I cannot agree with this and would like to cite something Erich Schütze, his oldest lute partner, wrote to me after the last war: “Neemann was a very reserved man who let nobody pass certain limits. I had, nevertheless, good friendly relations with him....” I might add that the scope of work he undertook was so overwhelming that little time was left for other dispersed relations. It may be that his hardness shocked others on occasion, but without his reserve he would have never achieved his goal of placing the lute where it belongs.
THE D MINOR LUTE IN CENTRAL EUROPE AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

By Josef Klima

In 1906 Wilhelm Tappert wrote in the preface to his edition Sang und Klang aus alter Zeit that it was not possible to reproduce this collection of baroque lute pieces on the guitar without distortion. Nonetheless, lute pieces appeared again and again in "arrangements" for guitar, and Hans Dagobert Bruger even published a "Lautenschule" which contained, as practice material, lute music changed in both key and voice-leading and set for an instrument in guitar tuning. Because of its pseudo-scholarly format it was very successful. Although Alois Koczirz demonstrated in the Zeitschrift für die Gitarre that almost all the ostensible transcriptions from tablature were really plagiarized transcriptions from the piano notation of musicological publications into guitar notation, and although Heinz Bischoff showed in the periodical Der Gitarreffreund Bruger’s errors of counterpoint and voice-leading, the method was reprinted unchanged after the Second World War and was again good business for the publisher. Whoever "really" wanted to play the lute tuned the G string to F-sharp and thus had the correct intervals for the Renaissance lute, for which there was plenty of literature. Bischoff’s challenge to play in D-minor tuning as well was nowhere heeded.

The reawakening of the D-minor lute after a century of silence was exclusively the service of Hans Neemann, who insisted upon the use of tablature. First he showed in a music supplement to the periodical Gitarre how easy and idiomatic playing from tablature is. Since tablature gives the fingering independent of the tuning, the way was opened to baroque music. But Neemann also made the
repertory available. His editions: the method for the lute, the volume of partitas by Reusner and Weiss in the series *Das Erbe deutscher Musik*, the Haydn trio, and so forth as well as his periodical *Der Lautenkreis*, gave the tablature and also guitar notation, so that many a guitarist was stimulated to play lute music. Articles by Neemann in musicological and guitar periodicals pleaded the cause of the lute and its music. He even resolved the last and greatest problem for the beginning lutenist, the acquisition of a proper instrument. Together with the instrument-making firm Meinel in Markneukirchen he designed stylistically correct lutes after old models.

Unfortunately, Neemann felt himself to be the sole leader of the lute movement; everything had to go through him, and there was no contact among his students. His judgments of similar efforts by others were especially unjust. Thus his criticism of the lute convocation of the *Arbeitskreis für Hausmusik* cost him a civil suit, and he damned Hans-Peter Kosack’s book *Geschichte der Laute und Lautenmusik in Preußen* just as Wilhelm Tappert had condemned Oskar Fleischer’s book on Denis Gaultier: “The best thing would be for him to have them destroyed as soon as possible.” When Neemann died in military service in 1942, his students and followers did not know each other.

Even in 1950 Friedrich Laible could write in his article “Laute und Lautenmusik im Jahre 1950” for the *Zeitschrift für Hausmusik* (p. 125): “Today this D-minor tuning is used by no living lutenist... It has been established that of the entire literature of the late period only very little still appeals to our taste... I doubt that any lutenist would today undertake to play an unabridged sonata or suite by him [S.L. Weiss!]. The numerous other composers, among them the two Gaultiers, will hardly reward study. However it is noteworthy that none of the living lutenists plays Bach in the original tuning.” According to Laible (and also by Gerwig on the well-known recordings!), Bach is best played in guitar tuning, only the instrument is tuned a whole tone lower in d'-D with four or five basses.

What Laible could not know is that before 1950 there was already a community of all the players of the baroque lute. When I was released as an invalid in 1946 from Yugoslavian military captivity, I found to my joyful surprise that among other valuables my instruments and tablatures were unscathed; my wife had concealed them so well that our guests from the East could not practice their destructive lust upon them. My first task for the lute was to establish contact with the libraries to determine which tablatures were still preserved and which must be written off as casualties of the war. Not only did I receive precise information on
the library holdings, but the library officials were so forthcoming as to introduce interested parties with the same problems to each other. Thus Pater Altmann Kellner, head of the Regenterei of the Abbey Kremsmünster, gave me the name and address of Johannes Radke, a teacher of French and gymnastics in Arolsen, Hesse. Radke was doubtless the last to have had the now missing tablatures of the Berlin library in his hands and to have copied out pieces for himself. Of his musicological articles, which are primarily concerned with the lute, the most significant is the study “Beiträge zur Erforschung der Lautentabulaturen des 16.-18. Jahrhunderts” (Die Musikforschung, XVI, 34ff). Here, all the most essential discoveries since Johannes Wolf’s Handbuch der Notationskunde are presented in brief yet complete form; the article is an indispensable compendium for everyone who deals with the lute. Just as exact are his articles in musical dictionaries, for example in Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Radke published lute compositions by Weichenberger and Lauffensteiner in tablature and transcription.

Through the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin I was put in touch with the film merchant Erich Schütze, the oldest and most loyal colleague of Neemann. In his tablature archive he preserved many hand copies of works now lost, some of which he had gotten from Neemann, and he was also an excellent authority on Weiss. He generously gave me his copies of works by Rust, Kühnel, Schotte and others.

The musicologist Paul Nettl, who had emigrated to the U.S. in 1938, provided me with the address of the Prague Primarartzt Dr. Emil Vogl. Vogl, a student of the musicologist Gustav Wilhelm Becking, devoted himself principally to the history of the lute in Bohemia and Moravia. His articles appeared in German and Czech periodicals. A collection of Bohemian baroque lute music edited by him appeared shortly after his death in 1977, and a comprehensive study of Count Losy is awaiting publication.

The technician Kurt Rottmann, a student of Neemann, was found through the Zeitschrift für Hausmusik. His main interest is the construction of especially good-sounding lutes; his new findings have appeared in several journals.

Now the search was continued through instrument makers, especially Hermann Hauser in Munich and Hans Jordan in Markneukirchen. The economist Heinrich Nonweiler in Kirn an der Nahe (a student of F.J. Giesbert) produced photographic prints of music for baroque lute. (Giesbert, in Neuwied am Rhein, had published a method for the baroque lute in 1939, but then turned his attention increasingly to the recorder.) The physics professor Dr. A. Mönch of the University of Halle in Saale had among other items a microfilm of the Ms. 1655 of the Darmstadt Library, which had
burned in the War. He provided a copy for the library. The church painter Hans Leweke, also of Halle an der Saale, had copied out the now-missing pieces by Friedrich Wilhelm Rust.

Of those named above only Radke, Rottmann in Chile, and the two East Germans are still alive. They had in common not only their love for the lute, but the fact that none was a professional musician or music historian. There was no egotistical striving for success, only selfless help and pleasure in the success of another. It was a real, ideal "Arbeitsgemeinschaft." The author of this report is grateful to this "working community by correspondence," for notification of new finds, the loan of copies of lost works, and more.

I myself first had a new lute built, by the now-deceased Meister Josef Krenn, who repaired the instruments of the Viennese collection. He chose as a model one of the prettiest instruments in the collection, the lute of Leonhardt Pradter, Prague, 1689, which Krenn himself had repaired. Since neither Neemann nor Bischoff had concertized in Austria, music for baroque lute was now heard for the first time played on the original instrument. The lute was heard on the Austrian Radio, on German television (Zweiter Programm), at the Melk Monastery baroque exhibit, and at programs at music conservatories and local colleges. Articles in journals and in MGG, the German music encyclopedia, made the instrument better known. For the first time since Neemann there appeared an edition of lute music ("Kärntner Lautenbuch") in tablature and guitar notation.

On the basis of the source index in Wolfgang Boetticher's "Studien zur solistischen Lautenpraxis im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert" (Habilitationsschrift, University of Berlin, 1943) and later the outstanding handbook of Ernst Pohllmann Laute Theorbe Chitarrone (his life's work, now in its fourth edition), I increased my collection of music for baroque lute, so that it is now probably the largest special collection of baroque lute music in the world since there are in it a variety of tablature copies of which the original manuscripts were destroyed or lost during the Second World War, or which are difficult to obtain, I began to publish thematic indexes myself; 22 have thus far appeared. My work has achieved recognition in periodicals both at home and abroad, as far away as Japan. Perhaps most noteworthy is that both local papers in my district have printed detailed articles on my work: one can still say "nemo propheta in patria!"

We, the last survivors of the transitional period, can now see with satisfaction that the lute will live on. In Central Europe Eugen Müller-Dombois, for example, has made Basle a center for study of the lute, and in Vienna Professor Brigitte Zaczek of the Hochschule für Musik and Professor Ludmila Beranova, a student of Vogl,
concertize. However the most significant development has come from the United States. There music historians and music amateurs have been united in The Lute Society of America. To record the successes of this union—both in terms of musicological research and of artistic activity—would be the task of an author who now stands in the midst of the living lute world.

Translated from the German by
Douglas Alton Smith
REVIEWs

BOOKS


Scholars have been attempting for the entire 20th century to gain bibliographical control of lute music. The earliest attempt was made by Robert Eitner in several works published in the late 19th century, which incorporated lute and guitar tablatures into catalogs attempting to encompass all music composed before 1800. The first comprehensive special index of music for plucked strings was Johannes Wolf’s Handbuch der Notationskunde, Volume II (1919); though now much outdated, Wolf’s work still contains many useful insights. In the 1930’s the lutenist Hans Neemann of Berlin had begun a continuation of this work, incorporating incipits and presumably also concordances, but his labors came to a premature, permanent end upon his death in World War II.

Independent of Neemann, the young musicologist Wolfgang Boetticher, a student of Wolf, began before the War to examine lute tablature manuscripts, and his efforts to organize them culminated in his Habilitationsschrift at the University of Berlin in 1943: a lengthy study of lute technique and of musical forms in Renaissance and early to mid-baroque solo lute music, to which was appended a list of all the manuscripts the author had identified to that date. Though on the surface a landmark work in the study of lute music, Boetticher’s study proved in reality a shaky foundation upon which to build, partly because it was created in the ideological climate of National Socialism, and partly because the author adopted many false assumptions (for example, that lute-playing technique “improved” as time progressed and that Thomas Mace was a figure of central importance) that invalidate many of his conclusions. In addition, the manner in which he analyzed musical forms ultimately tells us little about lute style. His index was useful, but quite incomplete.
Boetticher subsequently wrote the articles “Gitarre” and “Laute,” among others, for the encyclopedia Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, and in them he combined a historical overview of instrument and literature with bibliographical references. Here, again, appeared numerous flaws due to careless error or misjudgment by oversimplification. Several of the publications by Hans Radke during the 1960’s (see the bibliography in the volume under discussion for a list of Radke’s articles and reviews) are, to a certain degree, devoted to correcting Boetticher’s mistakes.

Nonetheless, since he had done all the preparatory work, Boetticher was the obvious choice when the Lute Colloquium held in Paris in 1957 proposed a new catalog of lute music sources. Two years later he was given the assignment by the central committee of RISM, and the volume was announced as “in preparation.” Now, at last, the long-awaited book has appeared. But, alas, what a disappointment. Disappointing not merely because much work still remains to be done—a bibliographer’s work is rarely ever definitively completed—but because this task could have been done so much better with the same amount of effort. In essence, although he has been studying lute music and manuscripts for his entire scholarly career, Professor Boetticher simply does not understand how to do this sort of research.

I submit that a bibliography of lute and guitar tablature manuscripts ought to attempt to give the following information (listed roughly in order of decreasing importance):
A) Primary information
   1) Location, signature, title
   2) Composers
   3) Date(s)
   4) Number and names of pieces
   5) Concordances of the pieces in other manuscripts or prints
B) Secondary information (other information telling us something about the music or helping establish the date or composer, if unknown)
   1) Tunings
   2) Scribes
   3) Performance indications
C) Tertiary information, primarily of interest to bibliophiles: description of the binding; size; foliation or pagination; color of ink; history of previous possessors (this only interests the musician if the earliest possessor is known, since this provenance can then help illuminate the circumstances of transmission of the music); condition of the manuscript (this aspect can affect item B if some music is illegible or missing).
A bibliography is not something that is beautiful in itself; it is a tool, and its loveliness is measured by its usefulness. In this regard, the most sublime example of an instrumental-music bibliography to appear so far is Howard Mayer Brown’s *Instrumental Music Printed Before 1600* (a book that was conceived and begun by LSA member Professor John M. Ward), for although it confines itself to cataloging only printed sources, and contains none after 1599, it gives with admirable precision all of the primary information listed above and provides a host of indexes that enable a student to quickly locate music for his particular purpose. Measured by the same scale, the new RISM volume is homely indeed, since its author has proceeded backwards. Boetticher devotes the great majority of the 374 pages to presenting tertiary and secondary information and gives only part of the primary. He entirely leaves out any mention of concordances, generally gives only the briefest indication (frequently misleading) of number and type of pieces, and often completely omits composers!

There are several reasons for this odd set of priorities. The author explains the omission of indexes of the pieces as follows: “Due to the uncertain division of the composition sections and of the fragments from one another, it is not possible to account for the compositions in a manuscript with the desired precision. This is true even when the compositions are subdivided into genres, unmarked or anonymous single sections, a method useful for first information on intabulated manuscripts since R. Eitner’s *Musik-Sammelwerke, 1877.*” (The original German version of this convoluted prose is only slightly more comprehensible.) Further, Boetticher intends to publish his lists of pieces and composers in a second, supplementary volume: “The latter is to appear separately in reduced form as an alphabetic (sic) index of the composition designations and composers’ or intabulators’ names which appear in each manuscript. This system will enable the scholar to penetrate beyond a mere description into the musical material while confining each entry to the relatively narrow space consonant with strict lexicographical economy.” A pity that Boetticher has chosen to practice his “strict lexicographical economy” in the important volume rather than in the present one. But fundamentally I have the impression that Boetticher is a bibliophile who likes handling old manuscripts and has written down and published his first impressions of the physical appearance of over 700 volumes without considering the significance of what he writes.

One example of a small manuscript will suffice to illustrate Boetticher’s approach. I quote below the entire description in my English translation:
"(Vienna, Nationalbibliothek) Ms. Suppl. Mus. 1078. French lute tablature, 6 lines, second quarter of the 18th century. 118 folios, also one flyleaf (Vorsatzblatt) (empty). Blank folios: 1v-3r, 12v, 22v, 32v, 48v-117. 16.9x22.8cm. Exclusively tablature for 11-course lute. Uninscribed, designated and undesigned copper engravings: f. 1r, 12r (Ambassadeurs de Siam), 22r (Porten zu Marseille), 32r, 87r (S. Johann, S. Marci, S. Pauli u. der Schulen zu Venedig), 98r, 108r (Lusthaus des Vice Re zu Neapolis), 113r (Messine secourue), 118r (Ein Theil des Pallasts S. Marci zu Venedig). At least 2 scribes, very different shades of ink. Newer half-leather binding, inside original cardboard binding, whose boards have pasted on them multi-colored printed paper; gilt leaf. (Free instrumental movements, dances, aria, French and Italian indications for movements.)" [Finally, Boetticher gives eight references to articles or books in which the manuscript is discussed.]

Location, signature, type of tablature, and approximate dating are all essential items and are given here; however, the manuscript was probably compiled before 1720 and Boetticher's date is thus erroneous by one or more decades. 118 folios; fine. But of what possible use to anyone is a list of the blank folios? Surely it would suffice to state simply "blank after f. 48v." (Throughout the book Boetticher faithfully enumerates all the blank folios in every manuscript, in one case [the Thysius Ms. in Leiden] thirteen lines' worth involving 187 numbers, an instance where the possibility of error on the author's or typesetter's part is very high and the significant content absolutely nil.) Dimensions, type of instrument: fine. Then come several lines describing material that has nothing to do with the music—merely pictures. "At least 2 scribes:" but there were really exactly four scribes, as established by Elisabeth Maier in one of the books Boetticher cites as a reference; of course the ink of several scribes is going to look different! Then two more lines of bibliophilia. And parenthetically merely a rough idea of the pieces contained within, suggesting that the pieces are randomly arranged. However, the "free instrumental movements" are not free, they are arranged in nine suites. And would it not be of interest to both the lutenist and scholar to know that most of the music is designated by its composer (Count Bergen, Joseph Porsile, Prince Philipp Hyacinth Lobkowitz, Silvius Leopold Weiss, and Antonio Caldara)? Actually, the most useful part of this entry is the bibliography, for it can lead the curious reader to literature where he will find really pertinent information.

This particular entry is quite typical, but there are numerous other problems of a fundamental nature. For instance, there is no
index at all to this volume, yet the indexes to Brown’s Instrumental Music account for much of its usefulness. Without indexes for at least composers and instruments (guitar, lute, theorbo, cittern, etc.) the user must literally examine the entire volume if he wishes to make cross-references, or alternatively, he must consult another bibliography. Some manuscripts that ought to be listed are missing; Denis Gaultier’s “Rhetorique des Dieux,” probably the most famous lute manuscript of all, does not appear, nor does a baroque lute manuscript formerly owned by Oscar Chilesotti and listed in the bibliography of the article “Weiss” in MGG. Thus, there is reason to suspect that the coverage is less complete than would appear.

There are some good aspects to this volume, of course. As anticipated, Boetticher has turned up a variety of new sources in his travels and through scouring library catalogs. Included in the volume are not only extant manuscripts, but also sources whose existence was proven in the 19th or early 20th century but whose present whereabouts are unknown. Boetticher has brought order out of the confusion surrounding changing signatures in many libraries (Nuremberg, Darmstadt) and has clarified the status of the Berlin manuscripts; it is now clear what is in West Berlin, what is in East Berlin, and what is currently unavailable further east. The author’s lists of secondary literature after each manuscript are extremely useful and appear to be quite up to date, and the 45 pages of bibliography in front (to which the individual entries refer) are a valuable source of reference. The book is very attractively typeset and laid out, and is thus easy to read, if the reader’s command of German is good.

In summary, this bibliography is not nearly definitive. It will not even replace Ernst Pohlmann’s index, which, although it contains many errors, nonetheless devotes itself to primary information. The lutenist and lute scholar is assisted somewhat, but not enough, by this book; there still remains a need for a comprehensive catalog of lute and guitar sources.—Douglas Alton Smith


This book is made up of six different articles on instrument building. Chapter headings and authors consist of the following: “The Viol” by Dietrich Kessler, “The Lute” by Ian Harwood, “The Violin” by Adam Paul, “The Classical Guitar” by Jose Romanillos, “The Harpsichord” by Michael Johnson, and “Restoration and
Conservation of Historical Musical Instruments” by Friedemann Hellwig. The purpose of the book, as stated in the editor’s Preface, is to inform both professional and nonprofessional builders about design and building techniques.

None of the six chapters is really long enough or goes into sufficient detail concerning workshop techniques to allow an inexperienced amateur to build one of these instruments. Each would require an entire book of at least this size to do the process justice. On the other hand, the experienced professional builder will find little of importance here and a few causes for annoyance. In short, Making Musical Instruments rather seems to straddle the fence in its purpose: It gives an interesting account of how six individual makers proceed in their work, but not enough information to be really useful. It is more for those who want to read about instrument building than for those who want to build instruments.

I will assume that readers of this Journal will be most interested in the chapter on lute building and will give it the greatest attention. It is by Ian Harwood, one of the most influential modern lute makers, whose work has inspired many current English and American craftsmen. This chapter, like the others, suffers from excessive brevity and would have been far more useful if it contained about three times as much text and ten times as many illustrations as it does. Those who are concerned with historical accuracy may be disturbed by the specific model offered, which is rather arbitrary and uninspired. It is neither a copy of any one historic prototype nor a compendium of historical parts. Rather, it is a modern design that is approximately like a sixteenth century, seven-course lute. Given the current sophistication of the lute playing and lute building community, the reader would have been better served by the exact specifications of a good historical instrument.

Several points in Harwood’s account require special comment. The suggested mould design (bulkhead type) is, in my experience, one of the least satisfactory. Both the solid mould and the no-mould methods are generally thought superior to the bulkhead type, although neither is mentioned here in detail. The neck-pegbox joint described (a simple butt joint) is contrary to general historical practice and not very adequate in use; the so-called “rebate” joint, pictured as an alternative (but not described in the text), is also not historically correct. The rose pattern offered is overly simplified and not very appealing; it would have been better to illustrate several historical patterns and briefly discuss the carving techniques required. The belly barring is overly heavy and not conducive to a fine tone by today’s standards; compared to the barring of a similar sized historical seven-course instrument, it is about 20% overweight.
The above points are important because they could have been made to conform to historical practice, without causing extra difficulty to the builder, while producing a far superior instrument.

Having said all the above, it is only fair to point out that this chapter is the most detailed and accurate account of the entire lute-building process yet published. The subject, however, deserves a much larger and more serious treatment if it is to satisfy the needs of lute builders, either professional or amateur.

The rest of the book has its ups and downs. The viol chapter is a straightforward description of the processes involved, but is even briefer and less detailed than the lute chapter. It is conversational in tone and does not give much in the way of actual working techniques. The dimensions of the belly and bassbar are somewhat heavier than those of most seventeenth and eighteenth century viois. The chapters on the violin and the guitar are similar to the first two, being too brief and sparsely illustrated to stand alone as instructions. There are several books devoted to the construction of these two instruments that give much greater description of design and working technique.

All five of the chapters on building are more interesting than informative. To build an instrument using them would require having on hand other books, plans, etc., which, in the cases of the violin and guitar, would entirely obviate the necessity for the present volume.

The last chapter, by Friedemann Hellwig on restoration and conservation, seems the most interesting and important of the lot. So far, there has not been much information made available to the general public concerning historical instrument restoration. Although this subject too could fill a large book, Mr. Hellwig’s chapter is fascinating with its coverage of all general aspects of restoration and conservation. Topics discussed include effects of climate, warping and shrinking of wood, cleaning of various materials, repairing wood and metal parts, and a call for the proper documentation of all restoration work—a service too frequently neglected in the past.—Lyn Elder


About two years ago, when the first brochures from the Studio per Edizioni Scelte (SPES) arrived on these shores announcing a new facsimile series, a lot of eyebrows were raised. Facsimiles have
become common these days, but most concentrate on English, French, and Spanish music, while the bulk of the Italian repertoire remains unavailable to the general public. The SPES list of planned editions included the most important Italian prints from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century for lute, chitarrone, baroque guitar, and harpsichord, as well as selected ensemble music. The prices quoted seemed quite reasonable, and it remained only to be seen whether the series would, in fact, get off the ground, and whether the quality would compare favorably to the currently available facsimiles. The suspense has finally been relieved with the arrival of Simone Molinaro’s *Intavolatura di Liuto*, the first edition of the series.

The result was well worth the wait, for Molinaro’s print contains some of the finest music in the whole lute literature. Included are seven saltarelli, one ballo-saltarello suite, eleven passamezzo-gagliarda suites, 15 fantasias, and five intabulations by Molinaro, plus 25 fantasias and three intabulations by Molinaro’s uncle and teacher, Giovanni Battista Dalla Gostena, and one fantasia by Giulio Severino. The pieces are for an eight-course lute with a fairly short string length (57-58cm.), judging by some very awkward stretches. Octave stringing probably started at the fourth course, since middle register runs go up and down the fourth course, rather than crossing over to the third.

Molinaro (c. 1565-1615) was the successor to his uncle Gostena as “maestro di capella” at the cathedral in Genoa. Both were known primarily for their vocal music including masses, motets, and madrigals. The works in the 1599 *Intavolatura* contain the only surviving music for lute by either. For further biographical information, a bibliography has been provided at the front of this edition.

Molinaro’s music exhibits an extraordinary sense of balance and structure. His conservative harmonic style is complemented by a predilection for textural contrast and driving rhythms. Diminutions serve to clarify the structure, rather than to show off technical prowess, as was so often the case at this time. For the performer, this is among the most gratifying music to play on the lute.

Molinaro’s fantasias, a few saltarelli, and the ubiquitous “Ballo detto il Conte Orlando” are already quite well known. Less frequently performed are his sets of variations over passamezzo grounds, a situation this edition should help to remedy. Late sixteenth century tablatures are filled with passamezzi, but none are any finer than those of Molinaro. Many contemporary passamezzi ramble on and on without a sense of contrast or overall concept. Molinaro gives each variation its own personality, enabling him to
hold interest through up to ten variations. These pieces not only make excellent exercises (the variations in thirds and sixths are especially useful), but they can also be very effective played in concerts. They provide valuable insights into the improvisational skills possessed by the great virtuosi.

Gostena’s fantasias are unlike anything else in the lute literature. They are of a very serious nature, maintaining strict three and four part counterpoint throughout, with only occasional use of the diminutions so common in most lute music. Even cadences are surprisingly bare. The result is much like the organ and viol ricercars of Luzzaschi, Wert, and Diruta. This presents quite a challenge to the lutenist, to keep individual polyphonic lines flowing from one large chord to the next without the aid of filigree. Gostena further complicates matters by employing numerous bar chords in very awkward positions. The effort required to learn these fantasias is richly rewarded though, as they contain some exquisite music.

Though not lavish, the SPES edition has been well made and conceived. The 9½” x 13¼” format used is slightly larger than the original, having been expanded in the margins. The images are cleanly reproduced on high quality paper with minimal bleed-through from the other side. The covers are of reinforced, heavy paper decorated with a marbled design, as one often sees on library books from this period. While the colors of some issues in this series are a little garish (Frescobaldi’s Libro Primo is turquoise!), the magenta and black used here is fairly attractive. The bindings have been designed with the player in mind, being the very flexible type which lies flat on a music stand. At the same time, they appear to be strong enough to withstand continued use. Many of the currently available facsimiles have stiff bindings which, while sturdy, are a nuisance to play from, as the pages continually turn by themselves.

My only criticism of this publication has to do with some obscured passages, which could have been cleared up by the editor. While I do not believe that editors of facsimiles should “correct” wrong notes and rhythms, I do feel that if portions of the original are unclear, they should be reconstructed in footnotes or supplementary lists. Since many early prints survive in multiple copies, it is often possible to figure out a passage by comparison with the other copies. Thus, the choice of a source is critical in producing a facsimile.

In the case of Molinaro’s Intavolatura, the situation is still more complex. Copies of this volume are found in Cambridge, Florence, and in the British Library. Of these, the Cambridge copy appears to be the cleanest, the Florence the most interesting. (I have not seen the London copy.) The Florence copy contains numerous manuscript changes, apparently made by one of its first owners, who
had to adapt Molinaro's eight-course music to fit a six-course lute. (It is interesting to note the persistence of the six-course lute as late at 1600!)

Several of the alterations involve melodic notes as well as basses. These inked-in changes frequently obliterate the original tablature, making it difficult to reconstruct Molinaro's intentions. Many editors are inclined to always choose the most legible source. I, for one, am glad that Signor Cristoforetti chose the bastardized Florentine copy for this edition, as it gives us valuable insights into the way players of the time adapted music to fit lutes with fewer courses than required. It would have been helpful, though, to have included a list of the alterations, providing the original printed version from the Cambridge copy. This may sound pedantic, but most modern performances and editions of Molinaro's music have followed the manuscript changes, without, I suspect, knowing the difference! At the same time, it should be noted that the editor did replace several messy pages of the Florence copy with clearer Cambridge prints. Unfortunately, this policy seems to have been discontinued, as the recently released Intavolatura of Matelart contains many illegible passages, which should have been supplied from the Paris copy.

All in all, this promises to be an excellent series, which will hopefully convince other publishers to reconsider their inflated prices and unnecessarily posh designs. Facsimiles should be made affordable for musicians, not just for rich libraries as some editions seem to be intended. Players do not need all of the elegant trappings which push prices up. High quality, good choice of repertoire, and reasonable prices are what make the SPES series so exciting. Perhaps finally, the extraordinary Italian lute literature will begin to receive the recognition it so well deserves. Since each proposed volume will only be printed after enough orders have been received for it, I urge lutenists to order all the lute entries in the SPES brochure immediately. The sooner sufficient orders are received, the sooner the volumes will become available.

Viva la musica italiana!!—Paul-O'Dette

GIOVANNI BATTISTA GRANATA, CAPRICCI ARMONICI SOPRA LA CHITTARRIGLIA SPAGNUOLA (Bologna, 1646). Facsimile reprint (Florence: Studio per Edizioni Scelte, 1978), 72 pages plus introduction (by Paolo Paolini).

The recent upsurge in the publication of facsimile editions has been most encouraging to performers of early music. For a player
who is able to make sense out of original notation, such editions are a great boon, as they enable him or her to confront the music directly, without having to worry about whether it has been properly transcribed by an editor. Several firms have begun publishing facsimiles of music for early plucked instruments, and already a number of significant collections of music for Renaissance lute, baroque lute, and baroque guitar have been put out by Boethius Press, Broude Bros., Minkoff Reprint, Oxford Press, the “Institutio pro arte testudinis,” and Tecla Editions, to mention some of the more prolific publishers. Now a new Italian organization, the “Studio Per Edizioni Scelte” in Florence, under the direction of Paolo Paolini, has joined the fray with a growing line of early music facsimiles, published in their series “Archivum Musicum—Collana di Testi Rari.” A sizeable number of work have been reprinted by SPES–17 to be exact; among these are several that will be of great interest to players of early plucked instruments: the lute collections of S. Molinaro (1599), J. Matelart (1559), G.A. Casteliono (1536), P.P. Melii (1616), and J.H. Kapsberger (1610), as well as music for baroque guitar by D. Pellegrini (1650), L. Roncalli (1692), and G.B. Granata (1646). Furthermore, SPES publishes a long list of additional works, any one of which they are prepared to reprint if request is made. Clearly, here is a reprint company that is destined to be quite important to lute and baroque guitar players, particularly those interested in Italian music. The ever-growing number of serious devotees of the baroque guitar will be especially pleased to note the reprinting of the very first publication of Granata, one of the foremost Italian baroque guitarists.

Giovanni Battista Granata was an Italian guitarist and composer who, according to his own testimony, made his living as a surgeon. Although born in Turin some time during the first half of the 17th century, he apparently lived most of his life in Bologna, where he published seven collections of music for the five-course baroque guitar between 1646 and 1684. He was a pupil of the famous Francesco Corbetta who, according to Gaspar Sanz, was considered “El mejor de todos” and who was largely responsible for the tremendous popularity of the instrument throughout Europe during the latter half of the century. Granata’s relationship with Corbetta apparently became strained after Corbetta’s departure from Italy (circa 1648): pupil publicly accused teacher of plagiarism in 1659, and Corbetta responded with counter-charges in his La guitare royale of 1671. Granata became the most prolific of all the 17th-century guitarists, and was a dominant personality in the “school” of guitarists that flourished in Bologna during mid-century and which included such figures as Domenico Pellegrini and A.M. Bartolotti.
It is perhaps no mystery why the relationship between Granata and Corbetta soured, when one considers the complete divergence of style exhibited in their works after Corbetta departed for northern Europe. Corbetta tended more and more towards the French style, becoming obsessed with exploiting idiomatic, coloristic techniques such as strums and *campanelas*. Granata, on the other hand, stayed more firmly entrenched in the Italian tradition, and in his later works emphasized *pizzicato* textures almost to the exclusion of the *battuto* (strummed) element. Indeed, while Corbetta was influenced by the harpsichord and lute in his works (in spite of his vehement denial of any influence from the lutenists in his 1671 publication), Granata showed perhaps more than any other guitarist of the period the influence of that favorite 17th-century Italian instrument—the violin. That this stylistic divergence had much to do with influence is clear, since Corbetta traveled widely and Granata apparently did not. Yet, it may point to an important difference in temperament between the two musicians: while other Italian guitarists (such as Roncalli) allowed themselves to be strongly influenced by the French style, which was well known amongst players of plucked instruments in Italy, Granata minimized French influence in his works and maintained his interest in the more motivically generated, linearly conceived and violin-oriented Italian style up through his last publication of 1684.

Actually, there is some additional evidence linking Granata with the violin. Granata’s op. 4 of 1659 includes five pieces for a *chitarrista urbana* with seven extra bass courses, and in many of his works Granata manifests a strong predilection for the upper register of the instrument which would necessitate a regular *chitarrista spagnuola* with at least 16 frets. Curiously enough, the Stradivari Museum in Cremona possesses plans by the famous violin-maker for a theorboed guitar similar to that prescribed by Granata, and the well-known Stradivari guitar of 1680 in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford is the only guitar from the 17th century known to me that has a playing scale long enough (74 cm./18 frets) to accommodate Granata’s pieces. Could this admittedly *very* circumstantial evidence point to a possible connection between Stradivari and our Bolognese guitarist?

Whatever the answer to this purely speculative question, Granata’s works themselves—especially the later publications—give ample proof of the influence of the Italian violin style. However, in the *Capricci armonici* of 1646, Granata’s first publication, we find the elements of his later style only in embryonic form; here, more affinities with Corbetta’s early works suggest themselves. The *Capricci* contains a total of 61 pieces, 6 of which are completely in the *battuto* style and are obviously accompaniments to popular songs.
and dances of the period; this is Granata’s bow to the battuto accompanimental tradition extending back to the very beginning of the century. The 55 “art” pieces contained in the work fall texturally into two categories—those which combine the battuto and pizzicate elements together in one and the same piece, and those in which exclusive use is made of the lute-like pizzicato approach. Of the serious pieces, dance-types predominate. By far the most frequent type is the Corrente, of which there are 20 examples; most of these tend towards the French style, showing to what extent that style had penetrated into Italy even at this early date. The Passacaglia (8 examples), Alemanda Francese (6), and Sarabanda (6) are next in frequency of appearance, while a few other dance-types are represented by only one or two examples: Ciaccona (2), Ballo di Mantua (1), Aria de Fiorenza (1), Romanesca (1), Aria Musicale (1). There are also a number of examples of free, improvisatory instrumental forms—Toccata (2), Capriccio Musicale (2), Arpegiate (1), Ricercata (1)—as well as one Sinfonia. Occasionally, several successive movements will be in the same tonality, clearly implying suite-form; some eight such suites seem to be present here.

The Capricci is dedicated to Granata’s patron, Lorenzo of Tuscany, and the book begins with the usual dedication. Then follows a short preface to the “Lettor cortese,” which gives some advice to the reader pertaining to the performance of the pieces. Unfortunately, as is so often the case, Granata’s preface fails to give us 20th-century readers the detailed information we would like to have. Granata advocates memorization of the alfabeto, discloses the meaning of the marks which indicate downward and upward strums, and discusses the notation of transposed alfabeto chords indicated by letters with superscripts. He does describe the execution of the strascini (slurs) and the vibrato, but these are relatively unproblematic. Regarding the botte or strums, about which we are liable to be most curious, he states only that all must be played as full strums (“tutte vanno battute piene”) but goes into no detail about the various subtleties of battuto performance that we are quite certain an experienced player would have cultivated. Also frustrating is his remark that upon seeing the letter “T” beside a note one must play a trill (“st dourà fare il tremolo”), without saying anything specific about the way in which this ornament was performed. At the end of the preface, Granata gives a tuning procedure seemingly indicative of the tuning with low bordons frequently found in Spain and Italy: A, A’, d’, g, g, b, e’. The usual chart giving the fingering in tablature of the alfabeto chords concludes the introduction.

While Granata’s prefatory material is not as detailed as we might wish, and while the works contained in this book are not up to
the high level that he attained in his later collections, the book is nevertheless important not only as a document of the state of art music for the guitar during the middle years of the century, but also as a valuable representation of the early achievements of a guitarist destined to later become one of the major figures of the Italian guitar school.

Paolo Paolini has chosen the simplest of formats for his presentation of the Capricci Armonici: the original text of Granata is reproduced, and preceded by a short two-page introduction written by Paolini himself, in which he talks briefly about Granata’s importance in the development of the baroque guitar and gives a brief synopsis of the contents of the Capricci as well as a list of Granata’s entire oeuvre. The facsimile reproduction is quite clear and legible, and the printing is on paper that seems of reasonably good quality and very durable. The cover is of heavy paper, and the binding appears to be stronger than, for example, the bindings of the paperback editions published by the “Institutio pro arte testudinis” in Germany, which tend to come apart easily. Clearly, the aim of S.P.E.S. has been to produce a sturdy, legible, but low-cost edition that will give the performer ready access to this music. Indeed, at a cost of 9,000 Lira (roughly $10 at the time of writing of this review), this facsimile edition seems much more reasonably priced than many of the facsimile editions of comparable size that are currently available on the market.

While this sort of “bare bones” facsimile edition has its definite merits, it also has unfortunate drawbacks. One of the reasons for keeping editorial comment to a minimum was undoubtedly to keep down the cost of production. Yet, I feel that a collection of music such as this is desperately in need of more editorial comment if it is to really be of practical use to the average player interested in exploring the early baroque guitar literature. The main problem centers around the countless errors in the original tablature, which was published by the Bolognese printer Giacomo Monti. The printing of lute and guitar tablatures was not always at the highest level of development at this time, which was perhaps one reason why so many composers turned to engraving as a more practical and accurate method of making their music available to the general public. Monti did indeed have experience, as he had already published the first guitar book of Corbetta in 1639. However, the 1646 edition of Granata seems to have fared much worse than Corbetta’s publication: the most frequent problem is that both bar lines and rhythm signs are constantly misplaced, so that one is continually having to reconstruct the rhythmic structure of each piece as one reads through the music. Clearly, some editorial comment on this
major difficulty would be of great help to the player who might not be intimately acquainted with the style of this music. I hasten to add that this could pose a fiendish editorial task, since the errors are so extensive: one would have to either a) publish an extremely long list of errata with suggested corrections, b) write proposed corrections directly in the original text itself, or c) as a last resort reset the entire tablature, leaving the original facsimile as an uncorrected "Urtext." Any one of these possible solutions would be time-consuming and costly, and perhaps not every editor would want to take on such a task. But at least the reader of the book ought to be advised regarding the many rhythmic problems to be encountered.

Such advice was indeed given in an old facsimile edition of the Capricci edited by Mirko Caffagni and published by Berben Editore (1962). In this edition, Caffagni wrote a short four-page preface in which he explained the mechanics of the tablature system employed by Granata, and also brought to the reader's attention the fact that many rhythmic errors were to be found in the original text. He transcribed one piece—the "Corrente al Serenissimo Sig. Principe Leopoldo di Toscana" (from page 13 of the tablature)—into modern notation, correcting the errors in the tablature as an example of how other pieces in the book would have to be approached. This is certainly not as complete a job of correction as one might wish, but it is definitely more helpful than Paolini's efforts, since it at least alerts the player to the difficulties that will be encountered in the tablature.

Further editorial comment could have been made about other topics as well. For example, more biographical information could have been given about Granata himself, and some helpful advice could have been given about the stylistic aspects of the music contained in the volume. Also, the crucial issue of the tuning of the baroque guitar could have been brought up. To be sure, Granata's tuning instructions seem to indicate the presence of low octaves on the fourth and fifth courses, and most of the pieces seem to be devoid of any campanelas textures which would point to a high tuning of those courses and therefore contradict his tuning prescription. Yet, there is at least one piece in the Capricci (the "Capriccio Musicale" on pp. 32-36) which contains very striking usage of the campanelas technique. Thus, the issue of which tuning Granata might have had in mind for his pieces may not be at all clear-cut. My own personal opinion is that the 17th-century guitarist might have made use of a variety of tunings depending on the musical situation. The tuning problem is, at any rate, one that is far from solved at present, and it would be most helpful to users of a facsimile edition such as this if they could at least be made aware of the problem by means of knowledgeable editorial comment.
This, then, touches upon two thorny issues: a) what constitutes the “ideal” facsimile edition and b) what, exactly, should the role of the editor be in the publication of facsimile reprints? Since the similar issue of the “ideal” transcription edition has still not been settled (one is still hearing debate over parallel versus separate tablature, “objective” versus “interpretive” transcription, “ideal” transcription versus transcription oriented towards the capabilities of the instrument), it is unlikely that the problem regarding facsimile editions will be easily laid to rest, at least in the near future. There are many factors to be considered, among these being cost of production and the specific segment of the musical populace at which one is aiming the product in question. Indeed, for the specialist in baroque guitar music who is intimately familiar with many styles and capable of solving problems in a text like the 1646 Granata tablature quite independently, the S.P.E.S. format is ideal, since it provides such a player with a clean, well-reproduced Urtext with which one can do as one wishes. However, the S.P.E.S. approach might not be so ideal for the player who is either unable or unwilling to work so hard or so independently on a text; for such an individual, editorial comment and help (such as seems to be regularly provided in the Boethius Press facsimiles) would be indispensable.

At this point, of course, the reader must decide in which “camp” he or she falls. I myself, as a baroque guitar specialist, not only welcome the new S.P.E.S. editions wholeheartedly, but also find myself an enthusiastic supporter of the recent trend towards low-cost facsimile editions. But at the same time, I do feel that a word of caution must be voiced when an original text with severe accuracy problems (such as the Granata Capricci) is under discussion. Thus, I would certainly recommend this edition to anyone willing to grapple with the abovementioned problems. But those of fainter heart might consider postponing their exploration of early Granata until an annotated edition becomes available. —Robert Strizich

JACQUES DE GALLOT, PIÈCES DE LUTH (Paris, no date [1684?]). Facsimile reprint (Geneva: Minkoff Reprint, 1978), 77 pages plus introduction (by François Lesure) and index.

Like the famous Gautiers, the Gallot family represents an important dynasty in the history of French baroque lute music. At least three lute playing members of this clan have been identified: the two brothers Antoine and Jacques, and Antoine’s son whose given name was also Jacques. There is, furthermore, a Henry François de Gallot who compiled two guitar manuscripts preserved in the
Bodleian Library, Oxford, but whether he was a member of the same family has never been determined. Antoine was known as “le vieux d’Angers.” He was lutenist to the Polish king Vladislas IV and died in Vilna in 1647. Little is known about his brother Jacques who was referred to as “le vieux Gallot de Paris.” According to Wolfgang Boetticher, Jacques died about 1685 and had among his students the famous music lexicographer Sebastien de Brossard.\(^1\) In his short introduction to the present edition, François Lesure tells us that Antoine’s son Jacques “le jeune” was a pupil of Denis Gautier and “seems to have travelled a long time abroad before returning to France to exercise his art and give lessons in Paris.”

Because there are two lutenists named Jacques de Gallot and because the Pièces de Luth is undated, considerable confusion has arisen in the attempt to identify the composer and publication date of this important collection. In her master’s thesis on the Pièces, Clare M. Callahan has concluded that Antoine’s brother “le vieux Gallot de Paris” is the composer of the book “which may be dated around 1672-73.”\(^2\) On the other hand, Lesure here offers the date 1684 and remarks, “This late date also appears to confirm that the Pièces are the work of the young Jacques and not his uncle.”

Much of the evidence for dating the Pièces rests on the dedication to “le Comte d’Estrée, vice-admiral de France.” In his dedication, Gallot makes specific reference to the Count’s recent appointment to this naval post. Callahan identifies him as Jean, Comte d’Estrées [sic] (1624-1707) who became vice-admiral in 1670.\(^3\) Lesure, however, states that the Comte d’Estrée only became vice-admiral in 1684 and offers this as proof of the younger Jacques’ authorship. The disparity between Callahan’s and Lesure’s conclusion is explained by the fact that, just as there were two Jacques Gallots, there were also two different counts d’Estrée. Both became vice-admiral of France: Jean II in 1670 and his son Victor-Marie in 1684. Neither Lesure nor Callahan give further reasons for having identified a particular Comte d’Estrée, so it would appear that the question of both date and authorship remains to be resolved.

A further clue to dating the Pièces is furnished by the piece beginning on page 41, which bears the title “Allemande le bout de l’an de Mr gautier” (Allemande, the end of the year of Monsieur Gautier). This is likely a reference to the death of Denis Gautier in
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1672. Even if this assumption is correct, it would still only tell us that the Pièces could not have been published before this date. However, as the Comte d’Estrée had just received his naval position at the time the dedication was written (and Gallot refers to “le choix qui sa Majesté vient de faire de votre personne”), the composer is much more likely to be referring to the 1684 event (Victor-Marie) than one in 1670 (Jean) which would have been at least two years in the past. Lesure, therefore, is likely correct in his dating of the Pièces.

He is on shakier ground, however, in identifying the composer as Gallot “le jeun.” If the elder Jacques died “around 1685” (as Boetticher contends), it would have been possible for him to publish a book in 1684. The Pièces concludes with the statement “Sy dieu mélasse vivre ie doneroy un second livre que ne d‘splaira pas” (if God permits me to live, I will issue a second book which will be no less pleasing). This could be taken as the statement of an older man and, if Jacques “le vieux” died in 1685, would explain why no second volume appeared. More important still are two concordances which appear in the Manuscript Milleran (Bibliothèque Nationale, Rés. 823). The “Alemande La Luresses” on folio 59v and the “Gavote” on folio 61v are both clearly attributed to “Vieux Gallot de paris.” These two dances also appear in the Pièces, the allemande on page 9 and the gavotte on page 15. Lesure mentions the Milleran Manuscript in his introduction as proof that Jacques “le jeun” was the son of Antoine. He fails, however, to mention the pieces on folios 59v and 61v even though they are important evidence against the younger Jacques’ authorship.

The Pièces contains 31 compositions for eleven course lute in D minor tuning. The first fifteen are in the key of F-sharp minor (the ton de chevre or “goat’s tuning” introduced by Denis Gautier). These are followed by a like number of pieces in A minor. The Pièces concludes with an extended set of variation on “Folies d’Espagne” also in A minor. Most of the pieces have fanciful titles such as “la contre chevre” (the contrary goat), “la cigogne” (the stork), and “la piece de huict heurs” (the piece for eight o’clock). The book also contains a table giving “Exemples des marques dont je me sert dans les pieces de ce livre” and nine rules to be followed “pour jouer preprement du luth.” The former lists all the ornament signs contained in the book, while the “rules” give the student such practical advice as playing through the music at first with the left hand alone, learning the pieces slowly, and learning to keep the left hand fingers close to the strings. The music is of high quality and is noteworthy for its lyricism and harmonic invention.

The recent Minkoff edition of the Pièces is a small (105x150mm) paper bound volume printed on Minkoff’s typical paper and offered
at typical Minkoff prices (at the mid-September exchange rate, about $31.50). Although a facsimile, only the title page and tablature are actually given in facsimile form; all the prefatory material, including the dedication, the nine “rules” and the table of ornaments, is replaced with a version in modern type. Even if the original text is difficult to read, it would have been better to include it as well. After all, the major advantage of a facsimile edition is having the original text at hand. Another drawback to this edition is that some of the tablature is extremely hard to decipher. The over-exposed print on pages 26 and 51, for example, is practically illegible. In some chords the letters are squeezed so closely together that sight reading is impaired. A slightly larger format would have eliminated this difficulty. Finally, although most of the pieces are only two pages long, the book is so set up that every single piece requires at least one page turn. This is also a fault with the original edition so that the blame is not Minkoff’s. Nonetheless, it doesn’t make things any easier for the performer.

In conclusion, this edition is not without fault: the price is high, certain pages are difficult to read, and some of the conclusions reached in the introduction are questionable. The quality of the music, however, still makes this a valuable addition to the rapidly growing library of French lute editions.—Peter Danner

RECORDINGS


Titanic Records is a small, enterprising, Boston-based label that seems to thrive on the sort of repertoire most American recording companies would never consider including in their catalogues. Their lists include an ever expanding variety of interesting Renaissance and baroque items and many of their records are beautifully pressed and packaged. At some point Titanic had the good sense to sign Catherine and Robert Strizich to a series of at least four recordings
of which this is the first to appear. Graced with an attractive cover reproduction of Gentileschi’s demure young lutenist, splendid liner notes by Lyle Nordstrom, and a well balanced program of English and Italian music, this record should be enthusiastically received by anyone who appreciates good lute playing.

The performers never attempt to overwhelm the listener with technical display. Rather, they entice him with their fine sense of timing and by their attention to detail. One feels that the composers would be pleased with the result. The Italian pieces are all played with octave stringing on the 4th, 5th, and 6th courses, while the music of Dowland and Robinson utilizes unison stringing on all six courses. Listening to the Italian duets makes one realize the importance of octave tuning. The music of Dalza, in particular, takes on added clarity and depth with this stringing. On the other hand, the same stringing would make a jumble of Dowland’s more layered counterpoint. It is just this willingness to understand the composer’s intentions that makes this disc a pleasure to hear. Attention to detail is discernible in such things as the subtle shifts of color and accent in the drone of Dalza’s Saltarello and in almost all repeats. These are continually varied with ornamentation and, in the case of “The Queenes Treble,” considerable accelerando.

The entire first side provides a good cross section of music from the Italian Renaissance and includes duets by Joanambrosio Dalza, Francesco da Milano, and the enigmatic “B.M.” whose music appears in Galilei’s Il Fronimo of 1584. Dalza’s music is a delight to hear when it is as well played as it is here. The Striziches play it with humor and the “Piva” sparkles. The Francesco da Milano selections include the “Canon” and the “Spagna” as well as one of the fantasias for which Joanne Matelart published a second lute part in 1559. For this last, the Striziches have selected Francesco’s “Fantasia 67” (to use the Ness numbering) for the obvious reason that it is the one Matelart duet to use instruments tuned to the same pitch. As an added touch, the solo version of the fantasia is also played. This last is perhaps the one weak point on the disc; I found it somewhat lacking in legato.

The side concludes with the two “contrapunti” by “B.M.” and Vincenzo Galilei’s own “Fuga a l’unisono.” This last is a compositional tour de force and well worth playing. the original contains a number of errors, but interested lutenists will find a satisfactory edition by Douglas A. Smith (which varies somewhat from the Strizich version) in the January 1976 LSA Newsletter.

The English repertoire is particularly rich in lute duets and fourteen of them are presented on side two of the Titanic record. These include such favorites as John Daniel’s widely played “A
Fancy” and the equally familiar “Twenty waies upon the bels” by Thomas Robinson. The former is an example of the so-called “equal” duet in which the melodic line moves back and forth from one instrument to the other. Unfortunately, only one part of the “Fancy” has survived (in the Sampson Lute Book) and the piece is usually heard in the version by Robert Spencer, the current owner of the book, who reconstructed the second part. The Strizich version differs slightly from Spencer’s and the piece has been made even more convincing. The little Robinson piece is an example of a “treble-ground” duet with one instrument repeating a short bass figure against which the other lute spins the melodic line. As played here, one first hears the two measure ground by itself before the treble enters—a highly effective detail. At the end, the ground is heard again fading into the distance.

Among the less familiar English items are John Marchant’s “Fancy” and a duet setting of “Fortune My Foe.” The former was published several years ago as a Lute Society of America music edition and was the subject of a short article in this Journal (1973) by Lyle Nordstrom who first identified it as a duet while comparing the parts from two different manuscripts. The liner note on “Fortune My Foe” is a bit misleading. It is here attributed to Dowland, although it is unlikely that Dowland ever intended it as a duet. As Dowland’s solo version never states the melody of the popular ballad tune and as the Ballet Ms. describes it as being “to the consort,” it has often been taken to be the lute part to a consort version, although, as John Ward points out (this Journal, Vol. X (1977), page 131), “no copy of the hypothetical primo part has been discovered nor has any consort part....” Robert Strizich has reworked the piece as a duet. This proves to be a delightful addition to the repertoire. Interested readers might want to compare it with Nordstrom’s reconstruction of Dowland’s “Complaint” in the present issue of this Journal.

This is a delightful debut recording. We will look forward to hearing more of the Striziches on the Titanic label and elsewhere.—Peter Danner
COMMUNICATIONS

Marc Southard and Suzana Cooper are to be congratulated for having finally made Newsidler's instructions available to the English-speaking lute community. Unfortunately, the translation, as it appeared in the 1978 Journal, contains several major errors which confuse Newsidler's description of right hand technique.

The instruction “So geen die stüpflein alle ubersich mit dem fordern finger, aber der daum hebt allweg zum ersten an” has been translated (p. 17). “Each time you see a dot as in the illustration, strike upward with the forefinger, making certain you lift the thumb first.” (Italics mine). The verb “anheben” does not, however, mean “to lift,” but rather “to begin.” Newsidler is simply explaining that in runs, the thumb strikes first, followed by the forefinger. A similar instruction in Gerle's Musica Teusch of 1532 confirms this interpretation: “dann alweg wann sich ein leuflein anhebt/ So mustus mit dem daumen anheben/ und das ander mit dem zaig finger.” or “Whenever a run begins, you must start it with the thumb, and the next (note) with the index finger.” The same reading applies to a nearly identical passage in the last paragraph on page 18 of the Newsidler translation. The footnote on page 17 is thus totally incorrect!

That Newsidler used the “thumb-under” technique is clear from his instruction that the thumb and index finger should move “umbeinander” or “around one another.” (On pages 17 and 18, “umbeinander” has been incorrectly translated “alternately”). This distinction is important because “umbeinander” gives a very specific description of the movements involved in playing “thumb-under.” The word “zwicken” (“to pinch”) used by Newsidler to describe the playing of two notes with the thumb and index together, also clearly refers to a “thumb-under” position.

One final point concerning Newsidler’s instructions deserves special attention. Newsidler writes that the thumb strikes “abwertz” (“downwards”) and the index “ubersich.” “Aufwärts” was the common word for “upwards” even in the 16th century, so it is interesting that it was not used here. “Ubersich” may just mean “upwards” in this case, but perhaps a more specific meaning was intended. It may refer to the index finger moving “over the thumb,” a movement already implied by “umbeinander.” Thus the reader would understand that the index not only moves in the opposite direction from the thumb, but literally goes up and over it.

Other German sources of this period, including Judenkünig (1523), Gerle (1532), Iselin (c. 1575) and Munich Ms. 1512, all describe the thumb as moving “untersich.” If the more specific meaning suggested above were correct, then this could be inferred to
mean "under the index." This is only a possibility, however, and needs to be more carefully considered. I have discussed this point with a few German scholars, thus far without conclusion. All have agreed that further research needs to be done into early dictionaries and literary sources. Any ideas concerning this would be greatly appreciated.

For new translations and further discussion of these passages see Paul Beier's article in the present issue of this Journal.—Paul O'Dette, Rochester, N.Y.
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