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INTRODUCTION

Volume XXXII of this Journal was devoted to lutes in the era of Silvius Leopold Weiss, upon some of which the master himself may have played. We continue this theme in the present issue with articles by several distinguished British and European experts on instruments, lutes, and/or lute music of Weiss's time.

Like Vol. XXXII, this issue features an eight-page color insert, which substantially increased the printing cost. The editors are most grateful to LSA President Dick Hoban and Board of Directors member Dr. Michael Peterson for their generous donations, which made the color section possible.

Authors

In the 1980s Tim Crawford appeared as lutenist and theorbo player with most of the UK's leading baroque ensembles. He has been active in the Lute Society's Committee and served as its journal editor. Formerly a researcher at King's College, London, he currently works in the Centre for Cognition, Computation and Culture at Goldsmiths College, London. His ECOLM (Electronic Corpus of Lute Music, http://www.ecolm.org) project has been publicly funded since 1999. He also works in the rapidly-growing field of music information retrieval and has been active in organizing the ISMIR series of conferences since 2000. He is the current editor of the Complete Works of Silvius Leopold Weiss (1687-1750), and since Volume XXXI has been a Consulting Editor of this Journal.

Eszter Fontana has been Director of the Museum of Musical Instruments of the University of Leipzig since 1995. She was born in Budapest to a family of musicians and educated as restorer of musical instruments in Leipzig. From 1970 she served as restorer in the Hungarian National Museum, and from 1974-1994 as director of the museum's instrument collection. In 1993 she received her doctorate from the Franz Liszt Music Academy in Budapest. Her publications are primarily devoted to the history of musical instrument construction and construction technology. From 1999 to 2004 she served as chairman of the International Committee of Musical Instrument Museums and Collections (CIMCIM).

Klaus Martius is a restorer of musical instruments at the Germanisches Nationalmuseum in Nuremberg. From 1984 to 1986, following his studies of Latin philology and German literature, he was trained by the well-known restorer and lute specialist Friedemann Hellwig in Nuremberg. He has to his credit numerous publications on the technology of historical instruments, particularly bowed and plucked string instruments — including a book on the Nuremberg luther Leopold Waidt — as well as conservation and documentation techniques. He is an amateur lute player. Since Volume XXXIII (published in 2004) he has served on the editorial board of this Journal.

Wolfgang Wenke was educated as musical instrument restorer at the University of Leipzig and worked at many museums in eastern Germany. Since 1995 he has operated a restoration business in Eisenach. He has researched, evaluated, documented, conserved, or restored instruments of all kinds, including bowed, bellows, percussion, keyboard, and mechanical. Since 1975 he has restored some two dozen plucked instruments, among them a late medieval quintern by Ott and a Renaissance lute by Pryffer (both Wartburg Museum, Eisenach), and angelikas by Tielke and Fleischer (Landesbibliothek Schwerin). Among his publications are a guide to the Bachhaus Eisenach and a catalog of the musical instruments in the castle museum at Sondershausen.

John Cassidy has served JLSA as Copy Editor for the past three issues, and we should have introduced him earlier. By day he is Director of Editorial Services in the Office of Communications at Queens College, City University of New York. He serves there as Managing Editor of the Queens College Press, publisher of the Journal of the Violin Society
of America which he has copy-edited for more than twenty years. His new musical interest is learning to play the lute.

Nota bene: Until its move to a new facility in 2006, the Museum für Musikinstrumente der Universität Leipzig (Museum of Musical Instruments of the University of Leipzig) was known as the Musikinstrumentenmuseum der Universität Leipzig (Musical Instrument Museum of the University of Leipzig). Notification came shortly before the issue went to press, thus we were unable to change all references in text and captions.

—Douglas Alton Smith
The Case of the Missing Lute

BY E SZTER F ONTANA

I nstrument cases\(^1\) are not always lovely to look at. This may be one reason that they are not a major focus of research. However, an exhibition can provide the impulse to examine such objects a bit more closely.

The year 2000 gave the Museum of Musical Instruments of the University of Leipzig several occasions to think about jubilees and to honor these with exhibitions. In the special exhibit "Musical Instruments for Johann Sebastian Bach – Masterworks by Leipzig Instrument Makers," documents, instruments, illustrations, furniture and so forth are drawn upon to give museum visitors an idea of musical life in Bach's time.

One display case is dedicated to the musical life and outstanding musicians at the Dresden court. The very topic suggested that we simultaneously also honor Silvius Leopold Weiss, perhaps the last great representative of lute playing, particularly because the museum owns two beautiful lutes from the collection of Philip Hyacinth, Prince of Lobkowicz.\(^2\) Weiss is documented as having often been a guest at Lobkowicz's palace in Raudnitz.\(^3\)

In addition to the Lobkowicz lutes (one of them even bears his emblem, a "P" with crown), a theorbo case is exhibited. It, too, bears a monogram that points to its former owner. There were no clues to the origin of the case, although in an exhibition and especially in a display with musical instruments that feature the Dresden court coat of arms, one would like to report information about important previous owners. A good measure of

---

1 This article is the revised and shortened version of a paper given in 2000 in Dresden, and of its published version "Rätselraten über einen Theorbenkasten," which appeared in the fall of 2000 in \textit{Die Laute}, the yearbook of the Deutsche Lautengesellschaft, pp. 48-63.
2 The lutes were built by Thomas Edlinger the Younger in Prague, Inv. No. 497 (after 1721) and by the same maker in Prague, Inv. No. 3319 (after 1721). The two very similarly formed instruments obviously constitute a pair. For more information on and illustrations of these lutes, see Robert Lundberg, "Weiss's Lutes: The origin of the 13-course baroque lutes," this \textit{Journal}, vol. 32 (1999):35-66 and Eszter Fontana, "Lutes for the Prince: The Edlinger Lutes in Leipzig and Frankfurt am Main," this \textit{Journal}, vol. 35, 74-105.
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curiosity, and not only professional zeal for finding a better decipherment of the monogram, motivated us to investigate instrument cases, and especially this one, which has the inventory number 2167.

Containers are often mentioned in surviving instrument inventories. Frequently they were part of an arrangement in church galleries. These were wooden containers, often trunks, which served to protect and secure the instruments that belonged to the church. A few examples from Leipzig are the musical instruments of the town pipers “to be used for music in both churches and in the town hall.” In 1673 two cases were acquired for the instruments of the pupils’ gallery of the Thomaskirche, in 1678 a new case for instruments of the Nikolaikirche. Often the musicians used their own instruments: these were transported in wooden containers. Leather-covered, form-fitting cases represented a more valuable execution. In this genre from the 18th century the Museum of Musical Instruments possesses, in addition to the above-mentioned theorbo case, a violin case of walnut with brass fittings (Inv. No. 2180) as well as one for a horn, made of wood covered with leather and studded with gilded brass nails (Inv. No. 4949).

The theorbo case is made of wood and follows the form of its instrument. The bowl is made of nine ribs. Inside it is lined with soft, green woolen fabric, outside it is covered with calf leather bearing a diamond-shaped (rhomboid) pattern. The hinged lid of the case can be raised to allow the instrument to be placed inside. The lid can be locked with two iron bolts that are invisible from the exterior. One of the decorative nails served to open it. Along the rims as well as the joint (hinge) of the lid the case is also lined with blackened nails. The black nail heads stand out from the light brown leather and lend the case an elegant appearance. Containers of this kind were made by specialized craftsmen, the so-called case makers (Etuinacher). The instrument in question was placed at their disposal, because they had to derive the form from the instrument (see Figure 1 and Plate 2).

We wanted nothing more from the exhibition than a better description of the monogrammed theorbo case. Thus we undertook to decipher the monograms. Quietly we hoped that perhaps someday an instrument for the case, or at least clues to it, would be found. Soon it became apparent that these hopes were in vain. We could find no completely satisfactory solution to the case of the missing theorbo. On the contrary: since

---

5 In this article I use the personal pronoun “we” to include my colleagues at the museum, namely Frau Grüß, Herr Hecht and Herr Seumel. For their contributions, ideas and help, I here express my very cordial thanks.
Figure 1 - Theorbo case by a Saxon maker (1732)
we began investigating this case, there are perhaps even more questions than before we commenced. In this paper we present our deliberations in the hope that our hypothesis can be solidified. Possibly readers will be able to give us supplementary information or further clues which we would welcome. (We plan soon to present a longer report in German in a publication on the Leipzig instrument maker Hoffmann.)

First we examined old catalogs, since the case bears an inventory number of the Heyer Collection. It appears that several cases without instrument were purchased by Paul de Wit: he must have recognized the significance of these components. In the de Wit catalog of 1896 the lute case does not yet appear, but it is described briefly in the catalog of 1904 under the number 888. From this reference the acquisition date could be fairly well determined. The first Kurzgefasster Katalog aller im Musikhistorischen Museum von Paul de Wit vorhandenen Musik-Instrumente (Brief Catalog of all Musical Instruments contained in the Music History Museum of Paul de Wit) appeared in 1893 in Leipzig and contains 400 entries. A supplement of new acquisitions from the years 1893/94 ended with the number 543, the second supplement for the years 1895 to May 1896 with number 657.

The two supplements, also written by de Wit, were printed in one volume in Leipzig. In the second supplement on page 28 we find the following entry: “634. Lute case of leather 18th cent. (belonging to No. 577 Hoffmann).”6 Here it must be remarked that de Wit did not retain his listing number. The same case received in the new catalog the listing number 889.7 In the catalog of 1904 we find yet another entry, which describes the theorbo of Johann Christian Hoffmann. Here we also find the addition, “Hereto an original case with leather covering and embedded brass studs.”8 In the so-called Little Catalog of W. Heyer9 (Heyer acquired the second collection of de Wit) are listed a great number of instrument cases,10 among them the numbers “2161-2166: 6 lute cases from the 18th century; No. 2162 belonged to a lute by Joh. Christian Hoffmann, Leipzig.

---

6 This case in the Heyer Collection received the number 2162 and is no longer extant. The instrument was probably simultaneously acquired by de Wit. The entry reads: “577 Lute from the 18th century, later arranged for guitar playing with 6-strings. Very beautifully crafted body, black lacquered resonating belly with triple rosette. Handwritten label: Joh. Christian Hoffmann, Königl. Poln. und Churfürstl. Sächs. Hoff-Instrument und Lautenmacher in Leipzig.” This instrument could not be identified among any in the Heyer Collection. Supplement volume, no year, p. 25.
8 Ibid., p. 170.
9 Köln, 1913, p. 213
No. 2167/2168: 2 theorbo cases; No. 2167 with a monogram and the year 1732." The latter is preserved today, as is a theorbo by Hoffmann (Wit No. 146, Heyer No. 506) from 1720, which unfortunately did not belong to the case. Nonetheless, one should pose the question as to whether there is a connection between the two objects. The other cases did not survive World War II.

The acquisition of the theorbo case with monogram could therefore be fixed at the time after completion of editing of the second supplement (May, 1896) and before the printing of the new catalog in 1904. A further narrowing of the time of acquisition was made possible by the journal *Zeitschrift für Instrumentenbau*, founded and published by de Wit. Here he regularly described the most interesting new acquisitions in his collection. At the end of 1900 he reported that he possessed more than one thousand musical instruments and other objects. For the last one hundred years, no further information about the case has appeared. Thus it is understandable that our attention focussed on the monograms.

Cases of this kind were often provided with a monogram, which referred to the owner. To make the monograms a template was first drawn, and the positions of the nails were marked with its help. The attractively outfitted, formed case suggests that the owner had high social standing, and the monograms and the year hint at a special occasion.

On the case are a larger and a smaller monogram and the year, already mentioned in the catalog. The deciphering of the studded, interwoven monograms proved rather difficult, since the lines cannot be easily traced. A series of drawings and possible versions was made, and several combinations were tested.

Our conclusions are as follows:

1) The case belonged to a person of esteemed social rank. It would be of the greatest interest to determine the names.

2) The two monograms suggest this was a gift, the numbers the year of presentation. The smaller monogram could refer to the presenter, the larger one to the receiver (owner).

3) The case is stylistically difficult to categorize, but Italy can be excluded as country of origin. Comparisons from other arenas (for instance, skilled craft) as well as measurement analyses could yield results.

4) A place of acquisition could not be determined. A legion of dealers and agents worked for de Wit, and he constantly received offers from all over the country. The previous owner could also not be determined.
5) The lute case follows the form of the instrument. It is therefore helpful to determine the measurements of the lute on the basis of the case, particularly since here it has to do with a lute with a so-called swan neck. The chance that the missing lute may be found is rather slim, but the search should continue.

6) Cases protect their instruments, and special circumstances are necessary to separate them. Such a circumstance could be the rebuilding of the instrument, after which it no longer fit in the case. A further circumstance could, however, have been the separate sale of both objects, or an exhibition in which only the instrument was displayed while the case entered the depot. Paul de Wit opened his first exhibition in 1896 in Leipzig. As long as we have no additional evidence, the possibility that the missing instrument still exists must be left open. In the Heyer Collection the case was cataloged without an instrument.

7) The expansion of the number of strings on a lute in connection with a theorbo neck seems to be a Saxon phenomenon. This invention or its dissemination can be associated with the instrument-making family Hoffmann. Johann Christian Hoffmann was one of the best lute makers of his time. The famous lutenist Gottlieb Baron praised his plucked instruments: "This skillful master has earned himself such esteem in the galant world with his fine work that his lutes have primarily been sent to Holland, England, and France. In building his lutes he has not only created great proportionate beauty, but also lent them a good and pure tone."11

8) Astonishingly many instruments by J. C. Hoffmann survive in various musical instrument collections.12

The first results yielded by our experiments were that the smaller monogram could be deciphered as the letters L. W., and the larger J. S. W. These letters correspond to the initials of the famous lutenist brothers Silvius Leopold Weiss (1686-1750) and Johann Sigismund Weiss (after 1690-1737). The theorbo case could be a gift from Leopold Weiss to his brother, court lutenist and theorist in Mannheim, who in 1732 was appointed Court Instrumental Music Director (Hofinstrumenten-Musikdirektor). This appointment could also have been the occasion for the gift. After the

12 Twelve existing lutes and theorbos by J. Ch. Hoffmann are known to exist in various collections. I am indebted to Klaus Martius, Germanisches Nationalmuseum Nuremberg, for this information.
German publication of this article, important support for this hypothesis was provided by André Burguete, who drew my attention to the sign "W" on the manuscripts of S. L. Weiss which is very similar to the one on the theorbo case.\textsuperscript{13}

![Monograms on the theorbo case](image)

**Figure 2 - Monograms on the theorbo case**

Exact measurements were taken of the case. Analysis confirmed our presumption of Saxon origin. Its calibrated proportions can be expressed with whole numbers in the Saxon inch system. The case follows the form of the lute, thus the measurements for the shell and for the neck can be easily calculated. Only enough room was allowed for the unfretted basses, and they just fit. The iron bolt on the right side of the case, which was placed above the tuning peg of the chanterelle, was obviously in the way of the tuning peg, thus someone later removed this bolt. This indicates that the case was tailored for a particular lute.

On the basis of the interior measurements, and with the aid of the Saxon inch system, the dimensions of the lute that belongs to the case could be determined. The application of the Saxon measurements allows us to propose that the maker of the lute could be J. C. Hoffmann. In this region he was the most famous lute maker, one whose skill was highly regarded by

\textsuperscript{13} I here express my very cordial thanks to André Burguete.
his contemporaries. The theorbo of the Leipzig collection (Inv. No. 506) is fitted with a swan neck by Hoffmann. It has two single and six double fingerboard strings as well as six bass pairs. The pegbox (but only the pegbox!) fits in the theorbo case.

The proportionate beauty of the instrument is immediately apparent in the measurement. The total length of the 13-course instrument (2x1 + 6x2 + 5x2) was five Saxon feet, whereby body length and pegbox each were two feet long. The neck length of one foot is in comparison rather short. The body width is 19 Digitus, body depth 12 Digitus, neck width at the shell 6 Digitus, at the pegbox 5 Digitus. It can be assumed that the instrument's shell also consisted of 9 ribs, particularly because most of Hoffmann's surviving instruments were similarly constructed. The Mensur of the basses of the known instruments of Hoffmann is 72 cm. As this instrument had a short neck, it was about 70.8 cm which corresponds to 2.5 Saxon feet (40 Digitus). The Mensur of the bass strings lay a fifth lower, which results in the measure of 3-3/4 feet (60 Digitus) (see Figure 3).

Many readers will now ask how one can calculate this unit of measurement today. For those who would like to do calculations, a Saxon foot corresponds to 28.32 cm, a Digitus is 1/16 of that, or 1.77 cm.

The above research leads to the following conclusions. This case contained an instrument with a theorboed neck, perhaps by J. C. Hoffmann. The instrument was possibly presented by Silvius Leopold Weiss to his brother as a gift. This hypothesis is supported through known facts about the lives of the two Weiss brothers, by the documented connection between Hoffmann and Weiss, and by instruments by Hoffmann with the German theorbo (swan) neck. The extant case appears to be one of the two earliest known, securely dated pieces of evidence for this kind of instrument. The other is the theorbo in the same museum, Inv. No. 506, built by Hoffmann in 1720 and modified by him in 1732.

Translated by Douglas Alton Smith

14 A letter from Hoffmann dated 1740 refers to Weiss's type of theorbo; another source names S. L. Weiss as inventor of the German theorbo. I owe these references to Dr. Douglas Alton Smith, whom I would like to thank for the encouragement to write down the hypotheses presented in this article and for advice and discussion, as well as for the English translation of my German text. [Editor's note: the Hoffmann letter is printed and discussed in Lundberg, "Weiss's Lutes," op. cit., pp. 47-52. The other source is two lexicon entries by Luise Gottsched. See Frank Legl, "Between Grotttau and Neuburg: New information on the biography of Silvius Leopold Weiss," this Journal vol. 31 (1998), pp. 73-74.]
Figure 3 - Reconstruction of the dimensions of the missing theorbo
S. L. Weiss's Use of the Lower Bass Courses

By Tim Crawford

The articles by Frank Legl and Robert Lundberg in recent issues of this *Journal* show convincingly that Silvius Weiss must have been a prime mover in the development of the 13-course lute from its 11-course antecedent. The principal evidence comes from documentary, biographical and organological discoveries, which confirm—among other important findings—what some researchers have long suspected: that Weiss was not only the first composer to make use of the 13-course lute, but that he was publicly recognized as its progenitor.

In this short contribution I want to appraise the manner in which the extra courses are (or are not) used in the various sources of the sonatas in the London and Dresden manuscripts, the most authoritative sources of Weiss's music, since this can shed significant light on the state in which they have come down to us. It should help make clearer a complex picture, especially for the increasing number of non-lutenist scholars and listeners showing interest in our composer who can have little notion of the music “under the fingers.” For, as should become clear in what follows, it is not simply a matter of noting the occurrences of tablature-symbols 5 and 6 which indicate the twelfth and thirteenth courses. It is also necessary to observe with some care the paleographical, musical and technical context in which they appear. Inevitably this introduces a degree of concomitant subjectivity, and there will be those who cannot accept all my findings, but at least a start has been made on a matter which concerns everyone interested in this music or the instruments on which it was played.

At first sight it is trivially easy to determine the disposition of the instrument for which a certain tablature copy of a piece of music by Weiss is intended. Tablatures that use the symbols 5 and 6 require a 13-course lute; those that do not are intended for the 11-course instrument.

---
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But this is not the whole story. On the one hand, the copy under inspection may have been altered from an earlier state, or have been itself copied from an altered version. Yet, on the other hand, the absence of the extra bass symbols may be due to the fact that those notes were simply not required in this particular movement of a sonata. Thus we must probe a little deeper into the music itself, examining its internal technical aspects in some detail, and, where possible, taking careful account of other copies that have come down to us.

Another telltale sign for the type of lute is the existence in a tablature copy of left-hand stopped bass notes. Once we have decided that a 13-course lute was intended, it is possible to show in a few cases that a piece was conceived for a lute with a single pegbox (with a bass rider carrying the lowest two courses) rather than one with multiple pegboxes on an extended swan neck. Although, as Robert Lundberg has shown, the bass-rider and swan-neck 13-course lute types were almost certainly developed under the direction or guidance of Weiss around 1718 and 1732, respectively, it becomes clear from the use of the bass courses in the tablature that Weiss continued to use the bass-rider lute in some of his later music, suggesting, perhaps, that the swan-neck type was reserved for special types of music.

Of course, one must bear in mind the resources available to the person for whom a tablature copy was made. At the time of writing, with very few exceptions, it has not been possible to identify tablatures that certainly came from Weiss’s own archive. Therefore it must be borne in mind that the person for whom a copy was made (usually, we must presume, a pupil) may not have owned more than one lute on which to play the pieces, and thus the copy may have been tailored to his or her requirements. And again, there is the problem of negative evidence: stopped notes below the eighth course positively suggest the use of a bass-rider type, but their absence proves nothing, as chromatic alterations in the bass may simply not be needed in the music. But future analysis of the pieces that do not require stopped basses might reveal a clear distinction between two styles of solo composition that may be attributed to the two instruments. (I shall not attempt this here.)

In what follows, I hope to show how it is possible in most cases to come to a fairly definite conclusion about the disposition of the lute for which a piece was originally conceived, even where the actual surviving tablature copy is apparently for another type. This is mostly done by giving commented examples rather than by establishing a systematic set of criteria,

---

3 Note, however, that Weiss’s pupil Friedrich Wilhelm Raschke, possibly the compiler of the Dresden manuscript, is known to have owned 13-course instruments of both types. (See T. Crawford, op.cit.)
but I hope that it will be found helpful in confronting pieces from other tablature sources not covered here.

One gross assumption that I make here is that Weiss did not write for the 12-course lute. While it is true that at least one lutenist from the Breslau tradition, Esaias Reusner the Younger (1636-1679), left some pieces for 12-course lute in his autograph additions to a copy of *Neue Lautenfrüchte* (Berlin, 1676),⁴ that instrument was by no means exceptional in Northern Europe in the late 1670s. However, I am aware of no evidence that it continued to be cultivated in Breslau by the time Weiss began to compose soon after 1700. Lutes with 12 courses do not doubt still could be encountered in Germany and Italy in the early 18th century, but probably not in the d minor tuning used exclusively by Weiss. The 11-course French lute (presumably tuned in d minor), as depicted in the hands of Charles Mouton in François de Troy’s famous portrait (1690) and its version engraved by Gérard Edelinck, seems to have been adopted completely by German lutenists by around 1695, the date of publication of the *Cabinet der Lauten* by the Breslau lutenist Philipp Franz LeSage de Richée, a former pupil of Mouton’s. The Italians’ use of the old Renaissance tuning (exemplified in the set of sonatas by Giovanni Zamboni published in 1718) seems to be associated with a 14-course instrument.⁵ It is possible that hearing (and experimenting with) such instruments in Italy between 1710 and 1714 gave Weiss the inspiration to modify the standard German 11-course lute by providing it with a complete octave of open bass courses. A few Weiss sonatas have come down to us in versions that use no more than 12 courses,⁶ but in each case it is possible to eliminate them as evidence that he actually composed for a 12-course instrument.

Another, perhaps less cautious assumption I have made is that while there are many examples of 11-course pieces that were later modified for the 13-course lute, the reverse does not occur. I have not yet found a single case where a 13-course copy of a piece has had alterations made to the tablature so that the lowest notes (5 and 6) are played an octave higher.

---


⁶ For example, the following autograph movements in Sonatas 1 (4, Bourée; 6, Menuet) and 2 (7, Giga) in *London* employ the symbol 5; in both cases, however, these notes were clearly added by another hand afterwards. The versions of the two movements from Sonata 1 in *Dresden* are both for 11-course lute.
Eleven-course music was still being published as late as 1747\(^7\), so there were presumably plenty of players of the earlier type of instrument, but all of it can be played perfectly satisfactorily on the 13-course lute, with the extemporaneous addition of the extra bass notes if a player so desires.

Music by Weiss originally composed for 11-course lute might come down to us in any of the following states:

(a) Tablature only uses 11 courses;
(b) Symbols 5 and 6 have been added to the tablature later;
(c) The piece is copied from an exemplar in state (b).

Surprisingly, out of the 48 solo sonatas copied into London and Dresden, only one (S-C no. 19 in F, dated 1719 in London) exists completely in its original unaltered 11-course state (a). Sonata 44 in A, which survives in more complete and partial copies than any other Weiss sonata\(^8\), is an early work, composed in Rome according to Weiss's explicit annotation formerly visible in the Dresden copy. This dating is supported by the fact that another of its sources, Paris II, carries the date 'Venetis. 7. 7br. 1712.' (i.e. 7 September 1712), although there are stronger associations with Rome for much of its contents. Apart from the last note of its unique prelude in Dresden (probably supplied later than the rest of the sonata) and the unique second of its two gigues in the same copy (again almost certainly an addition to the original sonata), it uses only 11 courses, and can thus also be assigned to state (a).

When we have two copies of an early sonata, it is often the case that the usage of the lower courses differs. Example 1 shows a passage from two versions of the courante from Sonata 12; Dresden (1b) here preserves the original form, whereas the London copy (1a) is in state (c).

---

\(^7\) David Kellner, *XVI Auserlesene Lauten-Stücke* (Hamburg: Brandt, 1747). Versions of several of Kellner's pieces can be found in various manuscripts (probably later than the print), and in some cases these have been modified for 13-course lute. The small collection *Neue Lauten Stücke* (Frankfurt an der Oder: J. G. Conradi, 1724) is for 11-course lute, but in a prefatory note the publisher announces the imminent appearance of music for 13-course lute (now lost), suggesting that there was already a significant demand for music for the larger instrument.

\(^8\) Copies of sonata 44 are found in the following MSS: Dresden (vol 3, pp. 10-15); Paris II (ff. 12v-15), with an extra Trio and a later-added Gavotte (which is ascribed in Haslemere, p. 134, to Weichenerger, possibly in error); Warsaw 2003 (pp. 14v-16); Brno HAM 372 (pp. 45-8); Harrach Rohrau 1 (pp. 54-9), with doubling parts for violin and basso; Chilesotti MS (504.2-505.3, a modern transcription of a lost MS); Haslemere (pp. 127-9, lacks Menuet); Warsaw 2005 (pp. 121-3), lacks Bourée, Sarabande and Menuet); WRu (pp.41-3, lacks Allemande and Courante). Isolated movements from the sonata survive in KNu; Strasbourg; Warsaw 2008; Warsaw 2009.
In Example 2, the opening of the Ouverture from Sonata 4, the situation is reversed, with London giving the 11-course form (2a), modified in the later Dresden copy (2b) in state (c). In these cases (and in many others like them), there is no doubt that the music was conceived for 11-course lute and “updated” for 13-course lute in the later copies. In fact, where we have several manuscripts of the same piece, inconsistent use of 5 and 6 between the sources is a sure sign that they were originally for 11-course lute.

Where more than two sources exist for Weiss pieces, in most cases the music is for 11-course lute. The few 13-course pieces found in several sources, such as Sonata 16 in A, probably represent a stage of experimentation with the 13-course lute, and can usually be played on the 11-course instrument, although with a significant loss of sonority.
By far the greater part of Weiss's music is either genuine 13-course music or is transmitted in single copies in states (b) and (c). State (b) can usually be recognized by examination of the manuscript, and is often clear even from a microfilm copy, but how can we distinguish a unique copy in state (c) from genuine 13-course music? In such cases we cannot rely on physical appearance, but must examine the music itself. One seemingly very reliable test for distinguishing 11-course music to which notes 5 and 6 have been added from "real" 13-course music is simply to transpose the extra bass notes up an octave without altering any neighboring tablature notes. If the music is equally playable in this form, then it is very likely that it was originally for 11-course lute; if it renders a passage awkward or even unplayable, then it is unlikely to be the music's original layout.

The two passages in Example 3, both from the bourrée of Sonata 5, illustrate the test. Transposing the bass notes in measure 7 of Example 3a (following the precedent of measure 5) causes no technical or musical problem; applying precisely the same transposition to the bass notes in measures 33-35 in Example 3b similarly leaves the music intact. This is clearly 11-course music.

Example 3a - Sonata 5, Bourée, mm. 4-8

Example 3b - Sonata 5, Bourée, mm. 32-36

When applying this transposition test, problems rarely arise with the use of the thirteenth course, since the note A is almost always available an octave higher as the open 6th course. With the exception of a single work, the Tombeau sur la Mort de M: Cajetan Baron d’Hartig arrivée le 25 de Mars 1719 (London, ff. 88v-9), in the highly unusual key of E flat minor, Weiss always kept the thirteenth course tuned to A, even in pieces in C minor and E flat major, where the inflection of a diatonic A in the scale should be
flat. This is explicitly mentioned as the normal practice of Weiss, his pupil Johann Kropfgans and Ernst Gottlieb Baron in the preface to J.C. Beyer’s arrangements of Gellert’s Oden und Lieder. Thus, even in keys with an A flat in the diatonic scale, the tablature symbol 6 can often be substituted an octave higher by the open sixth course. The twelfth course can be tuned to B or B flat, and is generally less easy to transpose up an octave. In passages in which the neighboring tablature notes are in low positions on the fingerboard there is the choice of b or c on the sixth course, or d or e on the seventh, according to the key. Thus the usage of the twelfth course is generally the more reliable indicator of the original disposition.

A clear-cut case of adaptation of an 11-course piece to the 13-course lute is the allemande of Sonata 5. Although we have no later complete source,

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{c} \text{f} & \text{f} & \text{f} & \text{h} & \text{a} & \text{f} & \text{e} & \text{a} \\
a & a & & & & & & \text{a} \\
\end{array}
\]

**Example 4a - Sonata 5, Allemande, opening**

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{f} \text{f} & \text{f} & \text{f} & \text{f} & \text{f} & \text{f} & \text{f} & \text{f} \\
a & & & & & & \text{a} & \text{a} \\
\end{array}
\]

**Example 4b - Breitkopf’s incipit to “Partita 56”**

---

9 Johann Christian Beyer, Herrn Prof. Gellerts Oden, Lieder und Fabeln ... für die Laute übersetzt (Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1760; facs. ed. [no place]: Antiqua Edition, 1993), p. IV, ‘An bey ist zu merken, daß die Lautenstein [sic] des Herrn Weißen, Barons und Kropfgansens, welche aus dem C moll und Dis dur gehen aus eben der B dur Stimmung können gespielt werden, aber bey Herrn Falckenhagens und Herrn Durants Stück aus diesen beyden Thönen muß noch das zes ... gestimmt werden.’ (It should be noted that the tablature of Sonata 55, Johann Sigismund Weiss’s concerto in C minor for lute and strings, although originally written for 11-course lute, was later altered for a 13-course lute tuned with a low A flat.)

10 The single possible exception to this that I have encountered is the late copy of a probably early isolated allemande in F minor (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. 5362, ff. 26v-7), where the sixth course is lowered to A flat, as in the tuning adopted by J.C. Weyrauch for his intabulation of J.S. Bach’s C minor partita, BWV 997 (Leipzig, Musikbibliothek der Stadt, MS. III.11.3). The Weiss allemande does not use the 13th course at all.
its incipit appears as Partita 56 in the Breitkopf thematic catalogue of works by Weiss\textsuperscript{11} offered posthumously for sale in manuscript copies, so it was at least extant in another copy in 1769. The first two measures in London (Example 4a) are playable on 11-course lute, but in the Breitkopf incipit (4b) the last chord of measure 2 is re-disposed (with a somewhat confusing typographical error) and the bass note transposed down an octave onto the open twelfth course:

\begin{example}
\begin{music}
\hspace{1cm} \begin{xy}
0,0,125,125;
\GC{x:50,y:100}{/e}
\GC{x:50,y:70}{/f}
\GC{x:50,y:40}{/e}
\GC{x:50,y:10}{/h}
\GC{x:100,y:40}{/g}
\GC{x:100,y:70}{/f}
\GC{x:100,y:100}{/e}
\end{xy}
\end{music}
\end{example}

Example 5a - Sonata 5, Allemande, mm. 29-31

\begin{example}
\begin{music}
\hspace{1cm} \begin{xy}
0,0,125,125;
\GC{x:50,y:100}{/e}
\GC{x:50,y:70}{/f}
\GC{x:50,y:40}{/e}
\GC{x:50,y:10}{/h}
\GC{x:100,y:40}{/g}
\GC{x:100,y:70}{/f}
\GC{x:100,y:100}{/e}
\end{xy}
\end{music}
\end{example}

Example 5b - Easier (editorial) version for 13-course lute

It is not always necessary in 11-course music for the notes accompanied by a B or B flat in the bass to be in low positions, as Example 5a, measures 29-31 from the same 11-course allemande, shows. Although we do not have a 13-course version, this passage would almost certainly have been found easier for most amateur players to play on the twelfth course of the later instrument, as in Example 5b.

In some cases, the efforts of the later 13-course-playing copyists render the music more awkward to play. The bass B in measure 3 of Example 6a (Sonata 5, sarabande, mm. 3-5) requires a tricky leap with the thumb, which would not be present in what must have been the original 11-course version, Example 6b. A more consistent editorial version of the passage for 13-course lute, significantly easier to play, is given as Example 6c.

\begin{example}
\begin{music}
\hspace{1cm} \begin{xy}
0,0,125,125;
\GC{x:50,y:100}{/a}
\GC{x:50,y:70}{/g}
\GC{x:50,y:40}{/a}
\GC{x:50,y:10}{/e}
\GC{x:100,y:40}{/g}
\GC{x:100,y:70}{/f}
\GC{x:100,y:100}{/e}
\end{xy}
\end{music}
\end{example}

Example 5c - Easier (editorial) version for 13-course lute

\begin{example}
\begin{music}
\hspace{1cm} \begin{xy}
0,0,125,125;
\GC{x:50,y:100}{/a}
\GC{x:50,y:70}{/g}
\GC{x:50,y:40}{/a}
\GC{x:50,y:10}{/e}
\GC{x:100,y:40}{/g}
\GC{x:100,y:70}{/f}
\GC{x:100,y:100}{/e}
\end{xy}
\end{music}
\end{example}

Example 6c - Easier (editorial) version for 13-course lute

\begin{example}
\begin{music}
\hspace{1cm} \begin{xy}
0,0,125,125;
\GC{x:50,y:100}{/a}
\GC{x:50,y:70}{/g}
\GC{x:50,y:40}{/a}
\GC{x:50,y:10}{/e}
\GC{x:100,y:40}{/g}
\GC{x:100,y:70}{/f}
\GC{x:100,y:100}{/e}
\end{xy}
\end{music}
\end{example}

Example 6c - Easier (editorial) version for 13-course lute

\footnote{\textsuperscript{11} B. Brook, ed., \textit{The Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue ... 1762-1787} (New York: Dover, 1966), pp. xiii-xv.}
In Weiss's case, as opposed to those of his many contemporaries and followers, we have a considerable body of music apparently spanning much of his career. This allows us the luxury of being able to draw a few general conclusions about changes in his musical style and technical use of the lute. Given that Weiss progressed from the 11-course to the 13-course lute as his favored instrument, and accepting the notion that he was a pioneer in the general changeover of preference, it is likely that we will find three types of music for 13-course lute by him:

(i) "Extended" 11-course music in which Weiss has transposed the lowest notes down to use courses 5 and 6 (by definition, early compositions copied in later sources; corresponds to types (b) or (c) above and all playable on an 11-course lute);

(ii) "Tentative" 13-course music in which courses 5 and 6 are used to extend the bass range for extra sonority and sometimes to provide bass notes which are otherwise hard to finger at the higher octave (early

12 Or another person in the chain of transmission – the cases are likely to be indistinguishable in general except in the case of autographs.
experiments in the use of the 13-course lute; often easily adaptable to the 11-course lute, but only with some compromise to the music); the 11-course lute, but only with some compromise to the music);

(iii) "Full-fledged" 13-course music whose texture and effect depends on the full unbroken octave of open basses, and which often paradoxically shows an extension in upward melodic tessitura (the mature works for 13-course lute; generally unplayable on 11 courses).

The fully mature style is illustrated in Example 7, a brief extract from the courante of Sonata 35 mm. 74-77, possibly among Weiss's last works; it is hard to imagine how the extended trill in measure 76 might be performed on an 11-course instrument with the bass line an octave higher than written—this music positively demands the 13-course lute for its realization.

Example 7 - Sonata 35, Courante, mm. 74-77

Stopped notes on the bass courses are frequent in all Weiss's music, but are usually restricted to the seventh course (very often stopped at the third fret to provide a B flat) and the eighth course, where a bass F is fairly often inflected to an F sharp by stopping at the first fret. For the rest of the bass courses, Weiss's usage varies somewhat, but it seems likely that he was used to stopping the ninth course from time to time to raise a string tuned to E flat to an E natural, or an E natural to an F; this happens both in 11-course music and in that for 13-course lute. However, on the 13-course lute it is not as common as might be expected. Taking this with the evidence from his use of stopped strings below the ninth, it suggests that a case might be made for separating by this means the music he composed for the swan-neck lute from that for the bass-rider type. On the latter, it is possible to stop down to the 11th course without trouble. In the accompanying table, I do not attempt to make such a distinction, giving the raw evidence without comment.

One point that should be borne in mind is that it seems likely that the lowest course on many 11-course instruments could not be stopped by the left hand, because it lay slightly outside the edge of the fingerboard
(see the instrument in the portrait of Charles Mouton referred to above). Some of the pieces supposed to have been "composées à Rome" in Paris I, a manuscript formerly belonging to Mme Thibault de Chambure (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, ms Rés.Vma.1213), which appear to have been modified for a 13-course lute at the time they were copied by Luise Gottsched (1713-1762) in the 1730s, require stopping of these low courses, an anomaly which has yet to be explained.

Another surprising feature revealed in the accompanying table is an exception to the general pattern in London. Two 13-course pieces (Sonatas 6 and 8) appear in a section that seems likely to have been copied before 1719 (the first piece bearing this date, the Fantasie in C minor, comes in a section following Sonata 14, some 32 pages later). The fact that both are ensemble pieces is surely significant. This may suggest that Weiss's (and his brother's?) first experiments with a 13-course instrument were connected with ensemble performance, but there is simply not enough evidence at present to be certain.

In the table are listed the sonatas in London and Dresden, assigned by the criteria outlined above to columns for 11- or 13-course original states, together with the lowest course that is stopped in the tablature (below the seventh, which is stopped freely by Weiss throughout his music). Where a date is given in the manuscript (or can be deduced from other evidence), this is also given, although no distinction can be made between copying and composition dates.

---

### Summary table of lute types and use of bass courses for *London*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>11 courses Sonata Number:</th>
<th>Lowest stopped course*</th>
<th>13 courses Sonata Number:</th>
<th>Lowest stopped course*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>1 (1717)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-16v</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21v-25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25v-29v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (ensemble)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>7 (1706)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v-36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (by J. S. Weiss; ensemble)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-39</td>
<td>9 (ensemble)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40v-46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51v-56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56v-58v</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61v-65</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 (ensemble)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-74</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 (1719?)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74v-78</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78v-83</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83v-88</td>
<td>18 (1719)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-96</td>
<td>19 (1719)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96v-100</td>
<td>20/2-6</td>
<td>20/1 (1719)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100v-105</td>
<td>(1719)</td>
<td>21 (1719)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105v-112</td>
<td></td>
<td>22/2-7 (1719)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112v-117</td>
<td>22/1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117v-121</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122-125</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125v-129</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129v-133</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133v-138</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138v-141</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141v-145</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147-150</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156-159</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Below the seventh course (which is stopped routinely by Weiss throughout his works).
**Summary table of lute types and use of bass courses for *Dresden***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume (1-6) and pages</th>
<th>Sonata Number: 11 courses</th>
<th>Lowest stopped course*</th>
<th>Sonata Number: 13 courses</th>
<th>Lowest stopped course*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1-5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/25-31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/43-50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/51-57</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1-7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/11-18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20-29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/33-40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/43-49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/51-58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/65-72</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10-15</td>
<td>44/1-7 (1710-14)</td>
<td>44/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26-34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/35-44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/47-54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/57-64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/9-16</td>
<td>49 (c1728)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/27-34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/51-58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/18-27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2-8</td>
<td>53 (1731)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/9-14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15-18</td>
<td>55 (J.S. Weiss)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19-23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/24-31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/32-39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/40-46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/47-52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Below the seventh course (which is stopped routinely by Weiss throughout his works).
Sebastian Schelle and the Swan-Necked Lute

BY KLAUS MARTIUS

In the discussion of the origin of the 13-course Baroque lute, the roles of the luthiers Thomas and Josef Joachim Edlinger as well as Johann Christian Hoffmann have been outlined. Robert Lundberg has established that rebuilt Renaissance lutes were a decisive factor. While the development of the 13-course Baroque lute with bent-back pegbox has been convincingly connected to Thomas Edlinger, shortly before 1720, the “invention” of the German theorboed lute has not been so clearly associated with an instrument maker. In any case, the second date in the 14-course lute of Hoffmann (Leipzig, 1720), with its conversion year of 1732 only recently correctly deciphered, represents a prominent piece of evidence, as does the dating on a lute case in the same museum, whose contents today are unfortunately lost. (See Plate 3a).

In the search for the earliest instruments of this new type of lute, this article will illuminate the role of the third great luthier of this epoch, Sebastian Schelle of Nuremberg. Several German theorboes or theorboed lutes from his workshop survive today. Further, he and his successor Leopold Widhalm also were concerned with rebuilding old lutes.

The surviving lutes

Of the 11 surviving lutes from the hand of Schelle, only two have come down to us with a swan neck. The theorboed lute in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum with its date of 1744 is too late to be a factor in our search for early German theorboed lutes, especially since

2 Musical Instrument Museum of the University of Leipzig, Inv. No. 506.
3 The correct reading was only recently established, thanks to Volker Seumel and Eszter Fontana of the Musical Instrument Museum of the University of Leipzig.
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Figure 1 - Lute by Sebastian Schelle, 1744 (pegbox extension added later by Leopold Widhalm). Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum Inv. No. M1 46
the manipulation on the decade number of the signature gives cause for suspicion that Widhalm may have subsequently back-dated the instrument, perhaps to achieve a better sale price with the name of his famous predecessor.

The other instrument, in the same museum, labeled with the date 1721 (MIR 902), would be the earliest surviving example of this type if the swan neck were original. However, a close look quickly gives the impression that this neck, which is clearly constructed differently than the other swan necks from the Schelle-Widhalm workshop, may not be the original. In contrast to the other theorboed lutes, its inlay ornamentation on the rear of the pegbox does not follow the contours of the pegbox. On the upper end it seems abruptly cut off and continues on the upper pegbox, similarly without a transition. Everything points to both parts having been cut apart and finding here a secondary use. The slight rounding on the lower edge of the ornament, where the pegbox is attached to the neck, may even echo the neck’s cross section, so that it is not inconceivable that the inlay ornament constituted the rear wall of the

Figure 2 - Detail, theorboed lute, Sebastian Schelle. Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum MIR 902
Figure 3 - Theorboed lute, Sebastian Schelle. Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum M1R 902
original bent-back pegbox. The length of $16.3 + 7.3 = 23.6$ cm would just allow this. Unfortunately there is no reference to a repair inside the instrument.

**Sebastian Schelle's Conversions of Lutes**

The rebuilt instruments from the Schelle workshop will be the primary focus of this article, with special emphasis on the swan-necked lute. In 1996, in my documentation of Nuremberg lute and violin making, I dedicated a chapter to rebuilt stringed instruments, especially plucked instruments of the lute family. At that time I was not yet fully conscious of the import of the role of the rebuilt instrument for the development of the German theorbo and theorboed lute, so I did not pursue it much beyond a simple listing of the converted instruments. I offer the chronological list here again, expanded by a few details, as the point of departure for further consideration.

1721
Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum. Inv. No. MIR 905
Lute, Johannes Rehm, Füssen, 1607
Current condition: bent-back neck with rider for four bass courses
Labels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Rehm z. Fuessen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me fecit Anno 160 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias Hummel / Lauten- und Geigenmacher in Nürnberg / Anno 1 701[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Schelle, Lautenend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geigenmacher in Nürnberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummels Erben, An 17 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTIR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 By way of comparison, here are the lengths of some bent-back pegboxes (rear side): Th. Edlinger, Leipzig MUL Nr. 3319: 24.4 cm; Th. Edlinger Leipzig MUL Nr. 497: 23.9 cm; J. Tielke, Nuremberg GNM MI 394: 24.5 cm; Bl. Weigert, Nuremberg GNM MIR 898: 25.9 cm.


7 Roman type indicates printed letters. Italic type indicates handwritten letters.
Figure 4 - Repair labels by Hummel and Schelle in a lute by Johannes Rehm, Füssen, 1607. Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum. Inv. No. MIR 905. Montage of two photos taken through the rosette.

Figure 5 - Repair labels by Matthias Hummel and Sebastian Schelle in the guitarised lute of Georg Kayser, Venice 1595. The sequence of labels renders "zugerricht" ("repaired" or "modified") superfluous. Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Inv. No. MI 620
1726
Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Inv. No. MI 620
Lute, Georgius Kayser, Venice 1595
Current condition: *Wandervogel* lute with carved philosopher head
Labels

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Geörgius Kaysser Inparatto} \\
\text{da Wendelino Dieffenbruger} \\
15.95
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Matthias Hummel / Lauten- und Geigenmacher in Nürnberg / Anno 1715} \\
zugericht
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Sebastian Schelle, Lauten- und Geigenmacher in Nürnberg, 1726}
\end{array}
\]

1723/ 1726
Leipzig, Musical Instrument Museum of the University of Leipzig, Inv.
No. 3357
Lute, Vendelio Venere, Padua 1613
Current condition: theorbo with triple pegbox
String disposition: 4x1/ 4x1/ 6x2
String lengths: 1203/ 1076/ 865 mm
Labels

\[
\begin{array}{l}
1613 \\
\text{IN PADOVA Vendelio Venere}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Sebastian Schelle, Lauten und Geigenmacher in Nürnberg,} \\
zugericht A. 1723./726.
\end{array}
\]

1726
Berlin, Sammlung Alter Musikinstrumente der Hochschule für Musik,
Inv. No. 132
“Mandoline” (?), Magno Tieffenbrucker
Current condition: lost during the war
Labels

Mangnus Dieffenbruger
1621

Sebastian Schelle, Lauten und Geigenmacher in Nürnberg
zugericht. A. 1726

1730
Halle, Händelhaus, Inv. No. MS 168
Lute, Vendelio Tieffenbrucker(?)
Current condition: theorboed lute
See Figure 7 and Plate 5a.

Labels

Brand mark:
W. [anchor] T. (Wendelin Tieffenbrucker?)

Sebastian Schelle; Lauten und Geigenmacher,
zugericht A. 1730

Laux Maller
1415

Figure 6 - Brand mark, lute by Wendelin Tieffenbrucker (?). Halle, Händelhaus
Figure 7 back & side - Lute by Wendelin Tieffenbrucker (?). Halle, Händelhaus
1733
Washington, National Museum of American History, Inv. No. 60.1343
Lute, U[ldrich] dieffopruchar, Venedig
Current condition: 10-course lute (8x2 + 2x1)
Labels

U[ldrich] dieffopruchar a Venetia

Ma[thias] Hummel
Lauten= und Gei=
genmacher in Nürnberg
Anno 1 693 zugericht

Sebastian Scheele, Lauten un Gei=
genmacher in Nürnberg
zugericht A. 1733

Raparirt // Georg Tiefenbrunner
in München 1854

1738
Berlin, Sammlung Alter Musikinstrumente der Hochschule für Musik,
Inv. No. 129
Lute (?), Johann Christian Hoffmann, Leipzig 1717
Current condition: lost during the war
Labels

Johann Christian Hoffmann
Königl. Pohl. Und Churfürstl. Sächs
Hoff Instrument und Lautenmacher
Leipzig 1717

Sebastian Schelle, Lauten und
Geigenmacher in Nürnberg,
Hummels Erben zugericht
An. 1738

1741
Budapest, Hungarian National Museum, Inv. No. 1951.43
Lute, Matteo Sellas, Venice, 1641
Current condition: 13-course Baroque lute with bent pegbox (String
lengths: 790/730 mm)
Labels

Brand mark: MS [crown]

Matteo Sellas alla Corona
In Venetia. 1641.

Sebastian Schelle, Lauten und Geigenmacher in Nürnberg,
Hummels Erben An. 1741.
Zugericht.

1742

Cleveland, Cleveland Museum of Art, Inv. No. Jr. 1918.368
Lute, RE (?), Italy (Venice?) after 1639
Current condition: 14-course (8x1 + 6x2) archlute

Maker’s mark: RE (?)

Repair label

Sebastian Schelle, Lauten und Geigenmacher in Nürnberg,
Hummels Erben, An.17 42.
zu gericht

Figure 8 - Repair label by Sebastian Schelle. Cleveland, Cleveland Museum of Art

1745

Berlin, Sammlung Alter Musikinstrumente der Hochschule für Musik,
Inv. No. 711
Lute, Ernst Conrad Henz, Nürnberg 1672
Current condition: lost during the war

I wish to thank Douglas A. Smith for bringing this instrument to my attention
Labels

Ernst-Hans-Conrad Henz
Noribergensis, Anno 1672

Sebastian Schelle, Lauten und Geigenmacher in Nürnberg,
Hummels Erben, An. 1745

No date
Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Inv. No. MI 54
Lute, Laux Maler, Bologna ca. 1520
Current condition: body only, German theorbo extension removed in 1977, but preserved in the museum's depot.
String lengths: 5x2 = 95.9 cm
6x2 + 2x1 = 70.8 cm

Label
Laux Maler

In discussing these conversions by Schelle, it would seem most logical to arrange them in four groups according to current state of preservation.

1) Two of the lutes (Rehm, Uldaricus Tieffenbrucker) are now rebuilt again into lutes in a historicizing sense. The third (Kayser) has been altered into a guitar. In all three cases, the current status of the neck allows no conclusions about the pegbox arrangement of Schelle. Only in the case of the Tieffenbrucker is at least part of the original neck preserved: the remains, however, give us no information about whether this instrument, rebuilt in 1733, could once have had a swan neck. It is noticeable in these three instruments that the combination of the repair labels by Hummel and Schelle (1693/1733, 1701/1721, and 1715/1726) shows how close the rebuilds are—40, 20, and 11 years apart. In all three cases Matthias Hummel may have rebuilt the old lutes to 11-course Baroque lutes. Schelle, who in 1715 took over the workshop and customers of his late teacher and master (who died childless), in all probability rebuilt the lutes again for 13 courses.

2) The instrument by RE (?) preserved at Cleveland seems still to have its unchanged original tiorbino neck and pegbox in the style of the
Venetian archlutes. Schelle’s alterations are, according to Ray Nurse, minimal, only changing the string disposition to 12 courses (4x2/5x2 + 2x1).9 Most interesting to see is an additional saddle, like a bridge crossing the middle of the lower pegbox, which is also made by Schelle. It shortens the vibrating string length of both of the highest bass courses of the upper pegbox.10

3) Three further instruments from our list (M. Tieffenbrucker, J. C. Hoffmann and E. C. Henz) are unfortunately lost today. Here we can only rely on the details given in Curt Sachs’ catalog,11 who characterized their state then as “Mandoline,” “Theorbe,” and “Theorbierte Laute”. Even photos of these instruments seem not to have been preserved. By analogy to other lutes called “Theorbe” by Sachs, it becomes clear that the instrument of Hoffmann from the year 1717 must have been a German theorboed lute with 13 courses after the rebuild by Schelle. Since it is unlikely that Hoffmann would have made a swan-neck lute in 1717, Schelle doubtless gave it that form in 1738, whereby one may wonder why the owner did not have Hoffmann himself undertake this reconstruction. Of course with the date 1738 there is little reason to suspect that this lute was a pioneering reconstruction.

The final group contains the remaining four instruments rebuilt by Schelle that we will consult in the context of this paper, since they retain sufficient traces of their various conversions.

4a) The instrument by Sellas in Budapest has come down to us relatively unchanged after Schelle’s reconstruction. With its bent-back pegbox, extending markedly over the bass side of the neck, and its bass rider bearing two courses, it constitutes a rather late return by Schelle (in 1741) to the lute type created by Edlinger about 1718, which Schelle also used in the instruments bearing his label at Yale (1726) and Paris (1727). Schelle’s string lengths are 790/730 mm (Q. 1.082 - 13:12).

One delightful affinity between this instrument and the one at Yale is the descant or chanterelle rider, carved in the form of a dolphin. The two forms of the 13-course Baroque lute clearly coexisted for quite some time.

---

9 Restoration report by Ray Nurse, 1988, kindly sent to me by Kenneth Bé, Cleveland Museum of Art.
10 The same feature may be noticed on the big theorbo kept in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum (Inv. No. MI 574), where the crossing additional nut is lost but the mortises of it are still there.
4b) Much more important for our current consideration is the large instrument by Vendelio Venere in the Leipzig museum, no doubt originally built as a chitarrone in 1613. With its double second pegbox, *angereicht* ("prepared") by Schelle in 1723/1726,\(^\text{12}\) it could represent a kind of preliminary step towards the swan-neck lute. To be sure, on careful examination it quickly becomes apparent that the current pegbox construction with its three pegbox elements do not form a thoroughgoing unity. The two upper pegboxes appear to have been later shoved over the capped end of the lower pegbox. Results of my examination of the instrument follow.

See Plate 4 - Theorboed lute, Vendelio Venere, rebuilt by Schelle. Musical Instrument Museum of the University of Leipzig.

**Neck**: the glue on the rather oblique neck joint at the upper block appears to be untouched. The neck is positioned typically asymmetrically, relative to the lengthwise axis, with a fairly perpendicular edge on the descant side and an oblique edge on the bass side, so that the bridge (even in its original state as a chitarrone) could be placed in the middle of the instrument.

---

\(^{12}\) The double year indications 1723 and 1726 on Schelle's repair label are not explainable. While they imply two conversions of the lute by him, these two cannot be discerned.
Fingerboard and neck lamination appear quite new, perhaps added by Hans Jordan in 1958, after transfer through the Wartburg museum to the Musical Instrument Museum of the University of Leipzig.

**Pegboxes:** The lower pegbox for six double courses stems from Schelle, without any doubt. Characteristic are his rounded extension (seen from the side), a separate little rider added onto the outside cheek for the chanterelle peg, and the dual-sided thinning of the pegbox walls towards the inside, which are the same as found on the pegbox of the large thoroughbass theorbo by Schelle bearing the date 1728 (GNM MI 574. Plate 3b). The rear of both pegboxes bears an inset clasp for a lute strap. Even their fingerboard string lengths of 86.5 and 88 cm are similar. The surfaces all run perpendicular, the angular outer edges are slightly
beveled. The pegbox is un laminated; in some places the wood shimmers through the black lacquer. The upper end of Schelle’s original extension is lost. The pegbox is now probably held by a screw under an added-on laminated piece on its lower side.

The two upper pegboxes, configured for four strings each, are made of one piece of wood. This piece is carved out in a U-shape at the joint, as seen from the side, and placed above the lower (Schelle’s) pegbox, which was later narrowed at the sides, and glued on. The under side of the joint is additionally secured with a thin ebony plate. In contrast to the lower pegbox, all walls on the upper ones are oblique. The edges are not so sharp and mostly have rounded ends. The nuts jut energetically out of the pegboxes.

The string lengths are 1203/1076/875 mm. The distance between the main (fingerboard) nut and the nut on the first upper pegbox is approximately a major third; between the main nut and the furthest nut is significantly more than the interval of a fourth. These relations thus can be described, with some latitude, as 4:3 and 4:5. The exact string lengths for the nuts on the upper pegboxes with the above ratios would consist of 1153.3 and 1081.25mm.

The bridge and all pegs stem apparently from Schelle’s workshop. The strap knobs (one in the middle of the endclasp and one in the middle rib over the neck block) are missing.

**Interpretation**

In all probability Schelle rebuilt Venere’s lute or chitarrone to be a thoroughbass theorbo. Like the above-mentioned theorbo of 1728, it would have had a second pegbox at the end of a long neck extension and could have been intended for the D-minor tuning without the f’ string, which is mentioned by Baron and Mattheson.\(^\text{14}\)

The current ending with a double pegbox was made by another hand at a later date, but was likely added around the middle of the 18\(^{\text{th}}\) century. Stylistically, it strongly resembles the pegboxes of some

---

\(^{13}\) See Klaus Marius, “Eine Theorbe von Sebastian Schelle, Nürnberg 1728,” *Gitarre und Laute* vol. 3 (1992), pp. 13-16. Some of the statements about this instrument here, especially my then theory that there were sonorous reasons for offsetting the bridge, are no longer tenable. The bridge was offset because excess wear prevented the use of the original bridge position.

Figure 11 front & side - Lute, Laux Maler, Bologna. Undated conversion to a swan-neck lute by the workshop of Sebastian Schelle. Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum. Inv. No. MI 54
Figure 11 back - Lute, Laux Maler, Bologna. Undated conversion to a swan-neck lute by the workshop of Sebastian Schelle. Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum. Inv. No. MI 54
instruments by Johannes Jauck, and the instrument of Martin Brunner (Olmütz, 1764), as well as a few other instruments we will consider at the end of this article.

4c) The German theorboed lute of the Germanisches Nationalmuseum (MI 54) may have represented the absolutely ideal instrument for the lutenistic dilettante of the 18th century, with its much-sought-after body from the workshop of Laux Maler, which was legendary even then. Originally doubtless a tenor lute, it was modernized in the workshop of Schelle or his successor Widhalm and outfitted for 13 courses. Theoretically this instrument could be the one mentioned by the Nuremberg lutenist J. D. Gneisel in a letter of 1723: “And after I had the good fortune to get an admirable Laux Maler lute, I had it adapted à la modern and for 13 courses, which succeeded so well that with it I can assert myself in an ensemble of 4 or 5 persons and not fear that I will be drowned out.” The result of a conversion in 1723, it was probably a lute with bent-back pegbox, but a further conversion is not unlikely. Unfortunately the instrument in the GNM bears no label of any kind that could help us date the conversion. Thus this instrument must currently be disregarded in the discussion of an early swan-neck lute.

4d) With the instrument now in Halle (Plate 5), we have another pure German theorboed lute. The brand mark “W [anchor] T” on the endclasp gives cause to associate the lute’s back with Wendelin Tieffenbrucker, a hypothesis that will not be further pursued here. In form and size the brand corresponds to the one described by Hellwig.

The swan neck, seen from the side, bears the parabolic curve typical of the Schelle/Widhalm workshop. The pegbox joint, however, is rounded in its beginning, in contrast to comparable instruments. Furthermore, on careful examination examination the pegbox differs slightly in terms of style from the necks by Schelle and Widhalm that

---


have survived. Thus the question arises, whether this particular neck stems from Schelle himself but the others more likely from Widhalm. The pegs are not identical to those of the Nuremberg workshop, but the label is genuine. The attribution of this pegbox to Schelle must remain doubtful for now.

The repair date of 1730 is quite remarkable. This is two years earlier than the date of Hoffmann's theorbo. If the pegbox was made by Schelle, this lute may currently be regarded as the earliest known, clearly datable German theorboed lute.

However, we cannot conclude from this that Sebastian Schelle built the first swan-neck lutes. The Franconian metropolis Nuremberg lies too far from the lute scene around Weiss, rooted in Silesia, Bohemia and Saxony. And yet Nuremberg as a center of publication of many famous musical prints lay, as it were, in the center of the world at that time. The Halle lute with a conversion date of 1730 may show how swiftly the discovery of the swan neck was accepted outside Saxony.

In this context it is interesting to mention that Schelle, about whose customers we unfortunately know almost nothing, was not only known to the Prague workshop of Edlinger, but probably had quite a close connection to it through family ties. In 1661 Thomas Edlinger senior married the daughter of Mathias Hummel senior, and thus doubtless became his successor in Augsburg. Edlinger was therefore the brother-in-law of Schelle's teacher Hummel, who after his immigration to Nuremberg turned the workshop over to Schelle upon his death. The close connection lived on in the next generation. Sebastian Rauch, who is reputed to have learned his trade under Edlinger, supposedly worked before 1700 together with Schelle in the shop which at that time was still led by Hummel.

In order to identify the actual earliest swan-neck lute, we must again point out that Johann Christian Hoffmann seems often to have neglected to document the conversions of his own instruments or those of his father by repair labels. And therefore it must remain likely even after this consideration of the conversions of Schelle that he, Hoffmann, was the first builder of the German theorbo or theorboed lute, the lute with the swan-neck extension.

Coda

With this summary we have reached a conclusion, but another look at the rebuilt chitarone by Vendelio Venere in Leipzig and its triple
pegbox may prove rewarding. Though it is relatively uncommon, a few historical examples bearing the triple pegbox are extant:

Musikhistorisk Museum og Carl Claudius Samling, Copenhagen
Inv. No. 104 A
Andreas B. Jauch, 1734
String disposition: 2x2/ 2x2/ 7x2 + 2x1
string length: 1050/ 930/ 780
Ratio: 9:8; 4.3

Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, Inv. No. GdM 61
Johannes Jauck, Graz 1734
String disposition: 2x2/ 3x2/ 6x2 + 2x1
string length: 1080/ 960/ 800
Ratio: 9:8; 4:3

Hungarian National Museum, Budapest, Inv. No. 1951.45
Johannes Jauck, Graz 1738
String disposition: 2x2/ 3x2/ 6x2 + 2x1
string length: 987/ 875/ 715 mm
Ratio: 9:8; 4:3

Musikhistorisk Museum og Carl Claudius’ Samling, Copenhagen Inv.
No. 105
Samuel Berner, Kloster Neustift (near Vienna) 1741
String disposition: 2x2/ 2x2/ 7x2 + 2x1
string length: 930/ 810/ 645
Ratio: 8:7; 5:4

---

18 Ernst Pohlmann, Lute, Theorbe, Chitarrone (Bremen, 1975), p. 329
19 The instrument is listed in the Claudius Catalogue as: Andreas B. Graetz, Breslau (?) 1734. See Skjerne Claudius, Carl Claudius’ Samling af gamle Musikinstrumenter (1931), p. 112. Luthier Ivo Magherini deciphered the fairly illegible handwritten label as Jauch. His opinion is affirmed by Ture Bergström, curator of the Copenhagen Museum.
20 In the number ratios given, the first indicates the ratio between the upper and the middle nut, the second the ratio between the upper nut and the fingerboard nut. Hereby 3:2 stands for the pure fifth, 4:3 the pure fourth, 5:4 for the pure major third and 6:5 for the minor third; 9:8 and 10:9 indicate the major and minor second.
22 Pohlmann, op. cit., p. 329.
23 For the details of this instrument I am grateful to Eszter Fontana, Leipzig and Bohuslav Cizcek, Prague.
Figure 12 back & side - Theorboed lute, Martin Brunner. Prague, Narodni Muzeum. Inv. No. 450 E
Figure 12 front - Theorboed lute, Martin Brunner. Prague, Narodni Muzeum. Inv. No. 450 E
Narodni Museum, Prague, Inv. No. 4506
Martin Brunner, Olmütz (Olomouc) 1764
String disposition: 2x2/ 3x2/ 6x2 + 2x1
string length: 935/ 825/ 680 mm
Ratio: 9:8; 4:3

Musikinstrumentensammlung im Münchner Stadtmuseum, Inv. No. 9-126
Magnus Tieffenbrucker, Venice 1576, rebuild without label.
String disposition: 2x2/ 3x2/ 6x2 + 2x1
string length: 1044/ 944/ 784
Ratio: 6.5; 4:3

Figure 13 front & side - Details, neck extension by anonymous maker, Munich, Deutsches Museum

24 Friedemann Hellwig, "The Morphology of Lutes with Extended Bass Strings Early Music (October 1981): 452. For further details I thank my colleague Sabine Scheibner of Munich.
Figure 13 back - Details, neck extension by anonymous maker, Munich, Deutsches Museum

New Haven, Yale Collection of Musical Instruments, Coll. of Belle Skinner, Inv. No. 28\textsuperscript{25}
Unreadable label (Andreas Jauch, Dresden?), Body 17\textsuperscript{th} century, rebuilt pegbox
String disposition: 2x2/ 3x2/ 6x2 + 2x1
string length: 701/ 870/ 1004
Ratio: (no sufficiently whole-number ratio); 5:4

Deutsches Museum, Munich, Inv. No. 5434\textsuperscript{26}
Anonymous, Germany, 17\textsuperscript{th} - 18\textsuperscript{th} century
String disposition: 2x2/ 3x2/ 6x2 + 2x1
string length: 976/ 849/ 690 mm
Ratio: 9:8; (7:5)

\textsuperscript{25} William Skinner, The Belle Skinner Collection of Old Musical Instruments (Holyoke, Mass., 1933), pp. 83-84. The string measurements were kindly provided by Michael Thames.
\textsuperscript{26} Bettina Wackernagel, Europäische Zupfinstrumente, Laubhölder und Aolsharfen (Frankfurt/Main, 1997), pp. 17-18.
This type of pegbox has attracted little attention in the organological literature. However to my mind it represents, on the basis of almost all clearly determinable datings, a further development of the usual German theorboed extension, in that it divides the upper pegbox into two elements. Its sonorous advantage is obvious, since it minimizes the often quite pronounced transition between petit jeux and grand jeux with an intermediate set of basses. Further, it reduces the required number of string thicknesses, since strings of the same diameter can be strung over the two nuts, as long as the distances between the nuts lie in ratios of whole-number proportions.

Although most of the triple pegboxes for theorboed lute listed here cannot be attributed to a particular lute maker at this moment, the cluster of the name Jauck is noticeable. Unfortunately, biographical research on the names Johannes Balthasar Jauck and Andreas Balthasar Jauck did not yield sufficient evidence to indicate whether and to what extent the swan-necked lute with triple pegbox could be associated with the Silesian-Saxon lute scene. Lütgendorff’s catalog of luthiers names a violin maker in Dresden called Johannes Jauck, who he presumes to be identical to the Graz luthier Jauch. He considers Andreas Balthasar Jauch (Jauck) in Dresden to be a possible relation, a hypothesis perhaps supported by the shared middle name.

At this point one could even opine that the lute in the style of Weiss may not mean the swan neck at all but rather the triple pegbox. If we consider once again the evidentiary sources cited by Frank Legl and Robert Lundberg with this in mind, the statement of Hoffmann in his letter to Uffenbach that “theorboed after the manner of Mr. Weiss” could support this theory, but not the lexicon entry of Luise Gottsched, which says that the lute under Weiss “has taken a completely different form” in

27 Another instrument with triple pegbox will be ignored here: Musik Museet, Stockholm Inv. Nr. 220: Jonas Elg, Stockholm 1729 (string disposition: 3x2/4x2/6x2 + 2x1; string length: 1140/980/740). The pegbox style departs significantly from the others, and Elg’s dating cannot be verified. See Pohimmann, p. 328.
29 There appear to be no surviving lutes with the triple pegbox by the Dresden lute maker, who since 1744 held the office of court instrument maker (Hofinstrumentenmacher).
31 Robert Lundberg, “Weiss’s Lutes” (see footnote 1).
32 Johann Christoph Gottsched, ed., Handlexicon oder Kurzgefasstes Wörterbuch der schönen Wissenschaften und freien Künste (Leipzig, 1760), articles “Laute” and “Weiβ.”
that he increased it "from eleven to thirteen courses" and "also made its neck straight (gerade) or theorboed (theoribireth)." She clearly assumes that not only the expansion of compass but also the theorboing constituted the novelty.

It may speak against this conclusion that the theorboing of a lute was less of an innovation for Luise Gottsched than for the intended readers of her article. But for the instrument it certainly was not an innovation. Since the beginning of the 17th century the lute in the form of arciliuto or liuto attiorbato had had a straight neck. The treatise of Ernst Gottlieb Baron testifies that these lute types were still known in the 18th century. In his passage on the Paduan and Roman theorbo he writes: "The theorbo's tuning was the same as the old lute tuning: g' d' a f c "G F E D C B' (or Bb') A' G' F' E' D'. Today, however, it commonly has the new lute tuning, which our own lute still has, because it was too much trouble for the lutenist to have to suddenly rethink everything when he picked up the old theorbo."

Further: the theorboed lute is found already with the incipient curved neck extension in the famous illustrations of the Harmonie Universelle of Mersenne as well as in Thomas Mace's "Lute Dyphone." Though these examples are quite removed from the viewpoint of the fourth decade of the 18th century, another source — the Musicalische Gemueths-Ergötzung of Jacob Kremberg (Dresden, 1689) — shows on its title engraving, next to a bent-necked lute, an angelique with a slight swan neck for an upper pegbox with six pegs, and it also contains music for this type of lute.

What could thus be more logical than the assumption that lutenists of the 18th century tuned the old instruments, as far as they were still usable, in their own accustomed tuning? In a second step, the conversions of the sought-after old lutes that still survive today were required by the new tuning and changing string technology, new demands on string length and spacing, and the crowning of the fingerboard.

---

35 Thomas Mace, Musicks Monument (London, 1676), p. 32.
36 The instrument depictions on the title engraving are found in Georg Kinsky, Katalog des Musikhistorischen Museums von Wilhelm Heyer in Cöln (Cologne, 1912), vol. 2, p. 200. The Dresden lute researcher André Burguete presumes for the angelique a decisive role in the development of the German theorbo. We anxiously await the results of his research.
Weiss was thus perhaps not the actual "inventor" of the swan-neck lute, the *protos heuretes* of a new type of lute. Yet towards the end of the history of the occidental lute, he returned to the lute types developed for ensemble concertizing and adapted them anew for his purposes. With the German theorboed lute he created an ideal concertizing instrument,¹⁰ which was equally suited to solo and ensemble playing, and simultaneously for use as a continuo instrument.

*Translated by Douglas Alton Smith*
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**Appendix**
Editor's Note: The following instrument's Schelle label became known to the author shortly before this *Journal* was to go to press.

1722
Paris, Cité de la musique, Inv. no. E 980.2.338
Lute, Laux Boß, Schongau 16th Century
Present condition: 8-course mandora with slightly angled pegpox

Signaures:
Laux Boß zu// Schongaw.
Matthias Hummel / Lauten- und Gei-//genmacher in Nürnberg / Anno 1 [ms]700 // zugerricht.
Sebastian Schelle, Lauten und Gei-//genmacher in Nürnberg,// zugerricht,
A. 17[ms]22


---

³⁷ Since the large thoroughbass theorboes all date from the beginning of the 18th century, we must ask whether the German theorboed lute with its new volume, which is emphasized in all sources, replaced the large instrument at least in many areas.
The Conservation, Restoration and Reconstruction of S. L. Weiss’s (?) Theorbo

By Wolfgang Wenke

In 1615 in Ancona, the luthier Giovanni Tesler built a large chitarrone with six pairs of fingerboard strings ca. 930.5 mm long and eight contrabasses. He made the body of 63 scooped and two flat ribs of shaded yew wood, which have a width of 8.5 to 1.8 mm at the rear end. To this he added an endclasp of seven scooped, shaded yew strips. The body is thus a luxurious specimen that was surely treasured by all previous owners of this unique instrument.

The current configuration, made in a reconstruction by Thomas Edlinger II in Prague in 1715, leaves this theorbo in the string configuration of seven fingerboard courses (2 x 1 and 5 x 2) and seven contrabasses (d’ a f d A G F and E D C B1 A1 G1 F1). This string layout, introduced by Silvius Leopold Weiss, was first described—as a novelty—in 1723. Doubtless this is an indication that Weiss is the only possible person who could have commissioned the reconstruction by Edlinger, eight years earlier, and was thus the owner at that time.

We know for certain that Johann Adolf Faustinus Weiss (1741-1814) continued to use his father’s theorbo in the Dresden orchestra until his own death. At that time the instrument was in the possession of the Saxon court. After Faustinus’ death in 1814, Silvius’ three grandsons

---

1 We arrived at this sounding string length (Messur) through our knowledge of the normal construction principles of the time. The disassembly of the instrument made the following analysis possible. The interior length of the body (from the lower edge of the ribs in the middle of the body to the neck block) measures ca. 619 mm, which correspond to 25 inches of the Roman Papal State at 24.81 mm (multiplied = 620.25 mm). The Messur is then calculated by the relation: interior length x 1.5 = 37.5 Roman inches = 930.5 sounding length of the fingerboard strings. The remaining measurements of the instruments are an outer body width of ca. 392 mm and an interior body depth of ca. 155 mm (from the level of the body's edges to the deepest point in the body).

2 See Weiss’s letter to Johann Mattheson, written in 1723 and published four years later, where the lutenist describes the tuning of an accompaniment lute that he had developed. An English translation appears in Douglas Alton Smith, “A Biography of Silvius Leopold Weiss,” this Journal, vol. 31 (1998), p. 45. “Otherwise I have adapted one of my instruments for accompaniment in the orchestra and in church. It has the size, length, power and resonance of the veritable theorbo, and has the same effect, only that the tuning is different.” From Johann Mattheson, Der neue Göttingische...Ephorus...mit angehängtem Lauten-Memorial (Hamburg, 1727), p. 118.

[Editor's note: The Prussian Court Theorist Ernst Gottlieb Baron specifies the Weissian theorbo tuning, derived from the German baroque lute tuning but without the top (f') string, in an article in 1756.]
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appealed to the court for its return to the family so they could sell it to buy firewood.³ The lutenist André Burguete has hypothetically reconstructed the instrument’s history since 1817, first announced in his lecture at the conference Dresdener Lautentage 2000 and recently published.⁴ Burguete learned from a Weiss descendant that according to a family legend, Silvius Weiss’s “bass lute” had ended up in a Berlin collection. He subsequently found the Tesler theorbo depicted in a picture of a room in the home of the Berlin art and instrument collector Fritz Wildhagen (1878-1957). After Wildhagen’s death, the theorbo passed to an anonymous collector, and finally was purchased recently by the Dresden State Art Collections.

This instrument with its coveted old, beautiful, multi-ribbed body was well suited for reconstruction to a theorbo according to Weiss’s concept. Edlinger repaired the body and belly, and either made a new bridge corresponding to the new stringing, or he rebored the old one. He replaced the neck with a new one with crowned fingerboard and convex underside, shortened by one fret, to be able to realize the highest string—d’—with a sounding length of ca. 878 mm. Thus the instrument resulted in a total length of ca. 1990 mm.

Edlinger crowned and laminated the new neck core. He retained the pegbox of the extension, though he no longer required the eighth peg hole. Further, he added new pegs, and probably also the inlaid heart in the belly below the bridge.

The possibility of other repairs and small changes made during the time that the instrument was actually played (presumably 1715-1814) cannot be ruled out.

In 1928 the instrument’s then owner, the collector Fritz Wildhagen of Berlin, apparently commissioned the luthier Arthur Voss to make the instrument playable. According to the construction principles of that period, Voss reinforced several parts and shortened the neck by two frets, to a sounding length of 782.5 mm, or normal d minor Baroque lute tuning at low pitch. The body’s edge was provided with thick linings, the edge of the soundboard was straightened, made plane, and a double black-white border was glued on. He replaced the bridge.

---

To disguise the damage and traces of repair work, Voss lacquered the body and belly and replaced defective pegs with others of different form and manufacture.

Figure 1 - Theorbo by Giovanni Tesler, modified by Thomas Edlinger, before restoration
After Voss's revisions and its later departure from the Wildhagen collection, the instrument was stored quite improperly. In the meantime the neck extension was removed and later glued back on.

The instrument was recently found in private ownership in Potsdam. The rosettes had been fractured and pressed into the body. The belly showed signs of impacts. The whole instrument was very dirty and was speckled with drops of white wall paint.

In 1999 the Kunsthändgemuseum (Museum of Arts and Crafts) of the Dresden State Art Collections bought the instrument. At the end of 1999 it was given to me for conservation, restoration, and reconstruction.

The concept for this work was developed by a team that included, in addition to three temporary restorers, the lutenist André Burguete from Dresden and the luthier Günter Mark from Elsa/Bad Rodach. The latter was also involved in working on the detail reconstruction of missing parts of the instrument.

The goal of the project was to reconstruct the instrument into the string configuration and tuning of 1715, in which Silvius Leopold Weiss likely used it, and as it was described in 1719.

The construction history of the instrument

There are three labels in the body of the instrument:
1) A printed label with handwritten year, black ink on yellowed gray paper, 107 x 25 mm:

```
GIOVANNI TESLER
IN ANCONA, 1615
```

2) Handwritten label, brown ink, on yellowed paper, 92 x 28 mm:

```
Thomas EDLinger
eue gericht 1715
```

3) Handwritten, pencil on parchment:

```
Repariert 1928 Berlin Charlottenburg
Arthur Voss
```
Findings at the Beginning of the Work

Findings on the outside of the body

The first things visible were a much shrunken, wrinkled, and browned lacquer that covered many deformations and cracks. The neck-body joint was spackled with glue and black-colored filler.

First we cleaned the body—in the relatively stable condition of the complete instrument—with small amounts of distilled water and a cotton pad. With this we removed dust, hand perspiration, and insect droppings as well as spatterings of color.

After testing, we determined that the dull, wrinkled, and dirty lacquer could be removed with ethanol, ca. 94% solution. The lacquer was softened and rubbed off with damp cotton pads. This lacquer was dull and strongly red-pigmented in all stages of removal.

Underneath was a surface which to all appearances had been treated with a mixture of resin and wax and was scarcely damaged. It showed the usual (here only slight) traces of use. See Plate 7a.

The very dark glue encrustations on cracks and other damaged spots were softened with distilled water and removed.

The now clearly visible original surface of the body shell showed many indentations and lengthwise cracks and fractures in the ribs.

However, other slight indentations had occurred horizontally across the body, corresponding to the parchment strips glued inside the body at approximately 8-cm intervals. Moreover, many small, mechanically damaged spots and fine cracks became visible in approximately half of the yew ribs.

Traces of old repairs showed the presence of cracks and damage even before the lacquering. The cracks and damage are probably the reason...
for the lacquering. The papering on the body’s interior was doubtless conceived as a counterweight to the lacquering.

Figure 3 - Rear of the body

Figure 4 - Cleaning step on the body
Findings on the exterior of the belly

The entire belly had been painted with a brown, alcohol-soluble coloring solution.

The rosettes were badly destroyed. It was clear that they had been methodically pressed into the body. At first it was not possible to determine the extent of the loss of design of the rosettes. Individual rosette pieces still hung on their interior paper backings. The majority of pieces lay inside the body.

![Figure 5 - Rosettes during restoration](image-url)

We assembled the loose rosette pieces. In total we identified 39 small pieces from the rosettes and three larch, rosette-reinforcing bars with rosette fragments still attached.

The rim of the belly consisted (since 1928) of four strips, ebony inside and white plastic ("Elfenit") outside. The altered heart inlay consisted of pearwood with a somewhat irregular ebony border.

The bridge of pearwood was of a later date, as were the uncleanly bored string holes. It was canted forward ca. 0.5 mm into the belly, which, as it later turned out, had been gouged out in a wedge shape.

As preparation for the belly removal, we undertook a partial cleaning of coloring from the belly border area with ethanol and cotton pads. The cleaning process revealed a polished and waxed wooden structure, which showed no tendency to fray.

However, the process also revealed damage to the edges that were filled with spackle, missing splinters, cracks, water damage, and
fractured spots that had previously been concealed by the dominant over-lacquering.

Figure 6 - Mostly cleaned belly, bridge removed, with remaining spot of brown coloring

Findings on the neck and upper extension

- The neck border of the extension was made of blackened maple, chamfered, with overlapping veneer surfaces on the front and back sides. The neck was probably shortened further by Voss in 1928, since the tenth fret would in this condition not be found at the usual position in the area of the upper block. This was the result of shortening of the fingerboard region of the neck by a length corresponding to two frets in order to raise the pitch.

- We found damage of all kinds on the pegboxes. These included cracks, damage to the veneer, and loose glue joints.

- Many small changes and damages were noticeable on the neck and extension. These included the attachment and new gluing of the upper pegbox, and missing (or removed) pieces of veneer.

- There was an improperly added piece of rosewood veneer in the fingerboard. Veneer transitions made of different kinds of wood and dowelings underneath, many cracks, and other damage to the veneer were noted.

- Several types of pegs survived in the instrument. Only six of them (from 1715) proved to be retainable.

- The nut on the fingerboard was missing. The original nut for the contrabasses is made of ivory.
Conservation and Restoration Work in the Year 2000

The belly

Removal of the belly from the body proved to be complicated, since the gluing of the edge binding differed in its adherence. Also, wooden inner linings had been glued to the inside edge of the body for support, so that the gluing surface became broader and uneven.

With steam we softened the hide glue used for fastening the belly. Then, with a thin knife, we loosened the glue joint holding the ca.

Figure 7 - Parchment glued underneath the belly
4-mm-wide edge strips, allowing one ebony binding strip to remain on the belly.

In this manner the entire belly-body glue joint was subsequently dissolved. Some cracks and fractures opened up along the edge of the separated belly. We fixed this edge initially with Japanese paper. We removed the inlaid heart (which was not original) that lay between the bridge and end cap.

The belly was then completely freed of its lacquering using the method described above.

Underneath the belly in the region of the bridge was a glued on ledge of maple, signed 1928, to which the bridge was fastened with 10 small iron screws.

The rest of the belly surface was covered with glued on parchment strips between the bars, excepting only the borders of the rosettes, the maple ledge, and the region of the neck block. The parchment strip above the maple piece bears another handwritten label of 1928.5

None of the barring from the period before 1928 remained. All 10 large bars and the two rows of longitudinal bars had upright annual growth rings.

Above the bridge the bars had been glued on in the regions of the positions where we could later see that the old bars had lain. Beneath the bridge, bass and treble bars had been replaced by a transverse bar. All bars projected into the wooden linings, and some had caused bulging dents in the body ribs along the edge.6

Twelve of the 13 thin, little bars of larch wood underneath the rosettes stem from the original lute.

The two large bars under the pair of rosettes could not be removed since pieces of rosette were glued firmly to them. The bar under the upper rosette had to be removed, though pieces of rosette wood still adhered to it.

The 10 iron screws under the bridge were corroded and could thus only be removed with difficulty, after heating them. Two heads broke off, as did one tip, which remained in the wood. The bridge was then easy to take off.

5 This signed strip of parchment was archived, as were all other removed pieces of paper, parchment, textile, and wood, in the Kunstgewerbemuseum in Dresden.
6 These changes all stem from the repair by Arthur Voss in 1928, who signed his work twice (on the maple strip and on parchment). The belly fracture (due to a blow) in the region of the bass side of the bridge had penetrated the parchment underneath, and therefore dates from after 1928.
Plate 1 - Lute by Thomas Edlinger, Prague. Musical Instrument Museum of the University of Leipzig, MML-497.
Plate 2 - Theorbo case by a Saxon maker (1732). Musical Instrument Museum of the University of Leipzig, Inv. No. 2167.
Plate 3a - Theorbo by Johann Christian Hoffmann. Leipzig, Musical Instrument Museum of the University of Leipzig. Inv. No. 506.

Plate 3b - Theorbo by Sebastian Schelle. Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, MI-574.
Plate 4 - Theorboed lute, Vendelio Venere, rebuilt by Schelle. Musical Instrument Museum of the University of Leipzig.
Plate 5 - Lute by Wendelin Tieffenbrucker, theorboed by Sebastian Schelle. Halle, Händelhaus.
Plate 6 - Interior of shell of a theorbo by Giovanni Tesler, during restoration by Wolfgang Wenke. Dresden, Kunstdgewerbemuseum.
Plate 7a - Detail of Tesler theorbo during the cleaning process, showing browned lacquer (from the early 20th-century) covering the original shaded-yew ribs.

Plate 7b - Tesler theorbo, partially restored rosettes.
Plate 8 - Theorbo by Giovanni Tesler, shell and belly following restoration by Wolfgang Wenke.
The Restoration of S. L. Weiss's (?) Theorbo

Figure 8 - Underside of the belly, after removal of parchment and bars

We removed the parchment and the maple piece after partial dampening with distilled water. Underneath them were traces of original barring. After removal of the newer bars, the traces of old bars became obvious. They showed in the lower region the typical distribution of bars, the bridge and bass bar of Renaissance lutes.\(^7\)

---

\(^7\) The distance from the lower edge of the belly to the middle of the rosette has five parts; the four lower bars lie on the partial lines that separate these parts. The belly is further divided into three parts up to the second partial line. The bass bar is found on the first line. The second line is the center of a circle with a radius of ca. 50 mm = two Roman inches (49.6 mm), which extends from the bass bar to the second bar line. The second line has an additional ending point on the
The traces of the two treble bars and the bass bar also now became visible. Two glue traces for the second treble bar, which cross each other, are evidence of the changes made in 1715.8

![Figure 9 - Underside of the belly with traces of the original barring](image)

It is not to be assumed that traces of bars disappeared because of the work in 1928, since the belly shows the thicknesses that would be expected. Only in the region of the transition to the fingerboard was the belly—presumably during redoing the neck joint—thinned to approximately 1 mm thickness.

The exterior of the belly showed traces of use, but also many signs of damage such as pressure points, fractures, cracks, worm damage, water damage, and splintering.

First we glued the numerous cracks in the belly. This was made possible, in a series of several operations (without inserting additional

---

8 Fullinger thus retained the barring of Tesler. Only the angle of the inner diagonal bar (the treble bar closer to the center of the soundboard) was changed, which corresponds to the widening of the bridge for the increased number of strings.
wooden splinters), by using hide glue under light clamp pressure and pieces of wood for flattening. However, the belly has certainly become somewhat narrower through shrinkage.²

We glued the cracks and corrected unevenly glued old fracture and crack repairs. We diminished or eliminated uneven spots stemming from blows or pressure by rinsing with size (diluted glue).

With spruce pieces we filled the screw holes and small missing pieces in the region of the bridge, the sloping, scraped out section under the renewed bridge, and the missing pieces on bridge ends by the tips. The already replaced pieces were left as is.

Smaller missing pieces and worm-damaged spots had to be closed up with a filler of lycopodium and hide glue.

Cleaning of the rosettes with distilled water followed in the course of their reconstruction. The fragile spruce pieces did not permit complete removal of the staining. Partly dark borders remain, especially at the edges. The belly surface was corrected to a uniform shade by lightly retouching bleached out sections with natural, water-soluble coloring solutions.

Subsequently the raised wood fibers were smoothed with a fir block and the surface slightly compressed and rubbed flat. However, age-related browning and the worn-down, soft annual rings remain clearly visible on the belly surface.

A bridge by Edlinger on another instrument served as the model for a new bridge.¹⁰ This piece was made of pear wood with an ebony cap. As guide for the bridge position, we used the scratch lines under the belly, as well as the traces of the original chitarrone bridge on the top surface. The new bridge was made the same length as the chitarrone bridge (not including the tips) and glued in the middle of its position.¹¹

---

² The two-piece belly was examined by dendrochronology. It bears annual rings between 1418 and 1593, and therefore stems from the first construction phase of the instrument. The belly and body length lent themselves well to analysis, and indicate unchanged measurements:
—The belly length from the lower edge to the middle of the pair of rosettes measures ca. 371.5 mm = 15 Roman inches (≈ 372.2 mm).
—The interior length of the instrument measures ca. 619 mm = 25 Roman inches (≈ 620.25 mm). The ratio of these two measurements results in the normal relation of 3 : 5. The interior length is measured inside the body from the inside edge of the ribs at the lower end of the body (not including lining) up to the neck block.
¹⁰ Bridge by Edlinger on a lute originally by Vendelio Venere (Wendelin Tieffenbrucker), converted to Baroque configuration in 1732 by Edlinger. Musical Instrument Museum of the University of Leipzig, Inv.-Nr. 492.
¹¹ The scratch line on the belly for the forward edge of the chitarrone bridge shows a 13 mm bridge width and 156 mm width without the tips. We thus also made the new bridge (not including tips) to this length, and 18 mm wide. The first string then landed exactly at the position of the first string of Voss's bridge: the neck angle therefore is still correct.
The ebony points at the neck joint had to be reconstructed and glued into the belly again.

After research and examination, the previous heart was replaced with one of ivory with an ebony border.

The belly, which has become somewhat narrower through shrinkage and by gluing of the cracks, initially had an unevenly wide and crooked edge binding. To correct these irregularities, we adopted one black and one white strip from the old edge inlay, and filled the missing border section with a somewhat wider ebony strip.

See Plate 8 for a photo of the belly in its final, restored condition.

Figure 10 - Belly with new, replacement bars
On the interior there remained the two large bars under the pair of rosettes, which had to be reglued and then their shape corrected. On the bar to be removed, under the upper rosette, there clung rosette-paper pieces and the original dye that blackened the reinforcing bar. We separated this part from the bar and glued it under the upper rosette as a small reinforcing bar, ca. 1 mm thick.

Where necessary, we reglued and/or aligned the remaining rosette pieces. We arranged the 42 loose rosette pieces one by one and glued them into place. We glued small strips of paper underneath three small

**Figure 11** - Underside of the rosettes, with remaining original pieces attached

**Figure 12** - Rosettes with original pieces attached
rosette pieces for consolidation and support of the joints.

Only five small rosette pieces found in the body could not be used. They probably stemmed from inside two fairly large holes that remained in each rosette. See Figure 12 and Plate 7b.

The reconstruction of the barring followed according to the traces in the instrument, with seven straight transverse bars, as well as two treble bars and the bent bass bar beneath the bridge. For the second treble bar we chose the glue trace that pointed to the first string at the bridge. We made the bars of spruce with growth rings parallel to the belly, dimensioned according to comparable instruments from the first half of the 17th century.

Corpus

We constructed a plaster cast of the body before removing the belly. The cast clearly showed the deformations of the body shape.

After belly removal, we could see an obviously newer inner liner of pear wood, 4 mm thick — at the counter cap 5 mm — into which the 10 bars had been inserted.12

To free the body for restoration work, the neck first had to be removed. Glued on paper pieces were found on the neck block, covering the expected reinforcing nail. Rust spots on the paper indicated several iron parts.

Papers, both printed and music manuscript, that had been added inside in 1928 in addition to the original maker and repair labels, proved to be very firmly attached with hide glue onto a linen/glue underlayment. They were intended as counterweight to the thick lacquer encrustation on the body exterior, to avoid one-sided layer loading.

After complete removal of the outer layer of lacquer, these inner paper and linen layers had to be removed very quickly to avoid further deformations. After a few removal tests, other (original) parchment and paper were found underneath the recent additions. These included paper strips to reinforce rib joints; paper and parchment lateral strips; and older repairs with pieces of wood, paper, and parchment.

Since the paper and linen solution had to be dissolved in water, only a cellulose-paste compress method could be employed, piece by piece,

12 Under these strips was a poplar support strip, originally 1.5 to 2 mm thick and 8 mm high, which joins to the counter cap. The latter is ca. 270 mm long, 6 mm thick and 25 mm high (= ca. 1 Roman inch) and with a total length of ca. 432 mm (= ca. 17.5 Roman inches) it tapers into a height of 22 mm and 1.5 mm thickness. The body ribs terminate under this interior counter cap. Rib thicknesses measured between 1.2 mm to about 0.7 mm (fluted part). The edge ribs are approximately 1.2 to 1.4 mm thick.
Figure 13 - Interior of the body with old paper layer

to prevent further dampening. This was done to preserve the older repairs, at least temporarily and for documentation, as well as the original gluings and the glue joints of the body ribs.

After removal of the paper and linen layers in the body interior, the paper supports of the rib joints and the lateral paper and parchment strips underneath proved to be secure and well preserved. The older repairs with pieces of wood, paper, and parchment as well as parchment paper and newspaper (from 1928) were easily identifiable. Their removal followed according to the method above.
During, and even more clearly after this removal, it became apparent that yet another thick glutinous glue layer (hide glue) remained over the original wooden ribs and paper support strips. Dissolving this further layer, till then not visible, required another careful partial cleansing of the entire body interior with the above-mentioned method, with long soaking times.

At this point all original parts and traces of repairs were visible and could be evaluated. 13

Now the reinforcements of the neck had become exposed and could be removed. These were the original nail, an additional smaller nail

![Figure 14 - Beginning of removal of paper layer. Linen strips underneath become visible.](image1)

![Figure 16 - Detail with repairs and layer of linen on original parts](image2)

13 The original joint paper strips are 3 mm wide; the six paper lateral strips 30-45 mm; the six parchment strips 11 to 13 mm. Under the counter cap there is a glued parchment covering, ca. 25 mm wide and 250 mm long. Next to it is an unprinted paper covering, ca. 65 mm wide, up to the counter cap. In the upper end of the body next to the regular printed paper strips there is a narrow (ca. 12 mm), unprinted strip of paper.
Figure 15 - Paper and linen layer removed. Repairs (Edlinger's?) are visible.

Figure 17 - Exposed original parts, lower end of body
(from 1715), and a screw (from 1928). We did this by heating the metal parts and loosening the glue between neck and body, which had already mostly detached. Since the neck joint was formed differently from the original, due to fitting corrections, in 1928 a layer of filler based on hide glue had been laid around the neck curve.

Now the damage to the body that was visible even from the outside could be repaired. We had first used the plaster cast to store the body during the dismantling work. We then scraped it out in such a way that the dents and deformations were smoothed over, resulting in a form approximating the original. We were able to press out some body

Figure 18 - Body interior, final restored condition
deformations with warmed sand sacks over a matter of weeks. But most deformations had to be corrected with fitted wooden support plates during the gluing of open joints and cracks.

Gluing the cracks and joints proved complicated, since the fluting of the ribs had to be preserved, the cracks were sometimes already glued, albeit rather unevenly, and all original reinforcing paper and parchments in the interior had to be preserved. After removal of all extra supports, which were now unnecessary, the body shell interior shows again the very properly constructed network of paper strips with the parchment strips lying between them.

By gluing paper strips onto the larger cracks or missing areas, we were able to support the holding function of the glued items in the body interior. An especially wide crack in one rib in the approximate middle of the body could only be closed by inserting a splinter of yew wood.

We were able to reduce the deformations in the body by about half. Because of wood shrinkage at open cracks and the warping caused by the parchment strips, which exerted constant tension, the remaining deformations are no longer correctable.

The linings around the body edge added by Voss in 1928 had to be retained since the belly otherwise would only be attached to the body by contact with the transverse bars. See Figure 18 and Plates 6 and 8.

**Neck and final procedures**

The neck was partially dismantled and increased two frets in length by a new piece of maple. This addition was glued into the cutout for the extension and veneered with 1-mm-thick ebony. It was finally covered with a ca. 2-mm-thick ebony fingerboard that covers the cutout for the nut.

A cutout had to be carved out of the new neck piece, fitted exactly to the extension and glued. Some missing pieces in the ebony veneer on the neck were replaced. The neck was glued to the block and secured with the two de-rusted and conserved nails of 1615 and 1715 and the screw of 1928.\(^{14}\)

When gluing the body to the belly, the shell was embedded in the plaster cast to stabilize the outline form of the instrument.

Adjoining the belly was an improperly added piece of the ebony fingerboard, about 30 mm long, which had to be replaced.

---

\(^{14}\) The neck block is unchanged (original). Its maximum height is 70 mm, thickness 35 mm, length 156 mm.
To correct unevenness in the edge region of the belly, we fitted the somewhat broader ebony binding.

All new wooden parts were rubbed with linseed oil and polished with a poplar block.

A fingerboard nut corresponding to the extension saddle had to be made out of ivory. The neck was provided with eight gut frets. Four frets of ebony had to be glued to the belly; thus their number reaches the number that is required to play the d’ in one of the Weiss concerti.

Small missing pieces in the neck were closed with wax mastic filler.

The missing pegs were made of ebony after models in other instruments by Edlinger.

The final stringing of the instrument with gut (without overspinning) corresponds to practice in the time of the instrument’s use.

Translated by Douglas Alton Smith

Figure 19 - Upper pegbox

All photos were taken by the author, Wolfgang Wenke, except for Figs. 20 and 21, kindly furnished by the Kunstgewerbemuseum.
Figure 20 and 21 - Complete, restored instrument
Lutes for the Prince? The Edlinger Lutes in Leipzig and Frankfurt am Main

BY ESZTER FONTANA

The Museum of Musical Instruments of the University of Leipzig possesses two beautiful lutes, very similar in shape, which obviously form a pair. Both instruments bear identical labels and were built most probably in Prague by Thomas Edlinger the Younger (1662-1729) about the year 1721. They were conceived from the outset as 13-course instruments.

Unfortunately, in later years they underwent several comprehensive repairs. These interventions led to irreversible changes in the instruments and contributed to effacing many traces of their original condition and history. However, one of the lutes bears the emblem of the former owner, which may here indicate that at least this one was built for Prince Philip Hyacinth Lobkowicz.

This princely provenance arouses our curiosity about the history of the instruments. A more secure dating would be interesting, not only for the still only partly established dissemination history of the 13-course lutes, but also for the oeuvre of the important violin and lute maker Thomas Edlinger the Younger.

These deliberations will include yet a third instrument, which is now in the Goethe-Museum in Frankfurt am Main.1 Unfortunately, only parts of it survive.

All three instruments are fitted with a sawn-out (so-called à jour) pegbox, and the whole length of the back of their necks is decorated with a triple, wave-formed ivory inlay. To avoid confusion, these lutes will be referred to by the abbreviation MML or GMF for the respective museums, and the pertinent inventory number.

This article aims to correct statements made about these instruments in earlier publications and to present their history, which, as will be seen, belong together. These three instruments were probably commissioned

---

1 Adolf Layer, Die Augäuer Lauten- und Geigenmacher (Augsburg, 1978), p. 121. I wish here to express my thanks for this and numerous other references to Klaus Martius in Nuremberg; for the corrections in the original German version to Frau Riele-Ricaede Grüß; and for the English translation to Dr. Douglas Alton Smith. For drawings and measurements as well as for many references and details I am grateful to Mr. Volker Friedemann Seumel in Leipzig and to Mr. Gerhard Kölach in Frankfurt am Main.
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ca. 1721 by Prince Philip Hyacinth Lobkowicz, and much of their subsequent history can be retraced. They are the earliest known examples of lutes conceived in the 13-course German tuning which were not rebuilt Renaissance instruments.

**Lute, Inventory No. MML-497**

Brief description: 13-course baroque lute. The shell is built of 11 ivory ribs. The bent-back pegbox has special pegs mounted in rider boxes for the highest and two lowest courses. The back of the neck is decorated with three wave-formed ivory stripes.

The label reads: "THOMAS EDLINGER," A repair label reads: "C. Claus Voigt 1981/repariert." The primary measurements can be read from the accompanying drawing made by Volker Friedemann Seumel. See Plate 1 and Figures 1-5.

The instrument MML-497, today property of the Museum of Musical Instruments of the University of Leipzig, has been described several times in earlier decades. However, new insights make it necessary to take issue with these older descriptions and to consider the lute in more detail.

1. **History of the instrument**

The lute was acquired between 1890-1892 from Paul de Wit (1852-1925), the owner of an important musical instrument collection in Leipzig. De Wit had collected historical musical instruments since about 1880. This cellist, collector, and publisher became well known through the *Zeitschrift für Musikinstrumentenbau* ("Journal of Musical Instrument Making"), founded in that year. He received, as his obituary reports, "offers from churches and palaces, monasteries and workshops (...) In dusty storage rooms, in attics and rummage rooms, treasures were scared up, often in highly questionable condition." He undertook extended journeys throughout Germany, went to Italy, the Netherlands, Austria, and France and by 1886 he had opened a museum in Leipzig at Thomaskirchhof (St. Thomas Churchyard) number 16, in which he exhibited his finds. His collection was publicized in three catalogs (1892, 1893, 1903) and in the so-called *Nachträgen* (supplements) as well as in the instrument journal which he published.

---

Figure 1 - Sketch of a lute by Thomas Edlinger, Prague. Leipzig, MML-497
Lute by Thomas Edlinger, Prague. Leipzig, MML-497

Lute MML-497 was pictured and described in 1892 in the luxuriously produced publication *Perlen* ("pearls"): “German lute by ‘Thomas Edlinger, Augsburg’ from the 17th century, the body entirely of ebony. Pegbox bent back and with pierced ivory decorations; a special rider on the pegbox serves to lengthen the two lowest bass courses. The instrument stems from the estate of Makart. Length 89 cm.” We find an almost word-for-word
repetition of the text in the Kurzgefasster Katalog (“Brief Catalog”) by the same author.5

De Wit also exhibited his musical instruments at other places on special occasions, for instance in 1892 in Vienna at the International Exhibition for Music and Theater6 and at “Paul de Wit’s Historical

Exhibition” during the VI. International Guitarist Days in Munich, where “a highly interesting collection, consisting of 48 rare and splendidly made instruments of the guitar and lute family (...), all in pristine, playable condition” was shown.\(^7\) The Edlinger lute MML-497 was surely seen in Vienna and most probably also in Munich. We assume that the instrument at that time was in a good state of preservation.

In 1905 de Wit sold the instruments he had collected since 1890 to the Music History Museum of Wilhelm Heyer in Cologne, where the Edlinger lute acquired the inventory number 497 that it still bears today. In Cologne it was soon described in an extensive catalog,\(^8\) but with no change of the attribution and provenance.\(^9\) Even the illustration of the label for this catalog was taken from a publication of de Wit’s.\(^10\)

![THOMASEDLINGER](image)

**Figure 5 - Lute label by Thomas Edlinger, Prague. Leipzig, MML-497.**

The literal text of the Heyer catalog reads:

No. 497. Lute with printed label: ‘Thomas Edlinger’ (the elder in Augsburg), from the second half of the 17th century. The beautiful instrument is, with the exception of the belly, entirely of ebony. The body is built of 11 wide ribs, between which ivory spacers are placed. The attractive rosette is cut out of the belly wood. The rear of the neck shows three inlaid, wave-form ivory stripes. The rear of the pegbox is decorated with a pierced ivory carving in Renaissance style. The string configuration is 13 courses and corresponds exactly in arrangement and tuning to the lute 492.\(^11\)

Total length 1.16 m, body length 56 ½ cm, width 34 ½ cm.

This beautiful lute stems from the estate of the painter Hans Makart (d. 1884 in Vienna).\(^12\)

---

\(^7\) “eine höchst interessante Kollektion, bestehend aus 48 seltenen und prächtig gearbeiteten Instrumenten der Gitarren- und Lautenfamilie (...) sämtlich in tadellosem spielbarem Zustande” Zeitschrift für Instrumentenbau, vol. 34 (Sept. 1, 1904). In this article, however, the Edlinger instrument is not described in any detail.

\(^8\) Georg Kinsky, *Katalog des Musikhistorischen Museums von Wilhelm Heyer in Köln*, vol. 2, (Cologne, 1912), p. 94. The pasted-in label of the lute was illustrated on p. 243. The model for it was taken from the publication of Paul de Wit.

\(^9\) I myself adopted this false ascription for a publication. See my article, “Rätselrätsel über einen Theorbenkasten in Leipzig.” *Die Lauten-Jahrbuch der Deutschen Lautengesellschaft IV* (Frankfurt a/M, 2002), p. 61, footnote 3. A closer examination of the instrument was only possible later, in 2002. See footnote 19.

\(^10\) See footnote 19.

The lute did not remain long in Cologne. In 1926 Heyer's collection was sold to Leipzig, and since then the instrument has been in the possession of the university. It was seen in the exhibition from the opening of the museum in 1929 until the war.\textsuperscript{13} During World War II the collection was stored in nearby palaces. Many of the instruments, among them the lute MML-497, returned with damage.\textsuperscript{14} The most pressing restorative work was undertaken in 1976 by Volker Friedemann Seumel, restorer of the Musical Instrument Museum. He fixed the damage to the belly and the shell, which he deduced had resulted from the application of force.\textsuperscript{15} A new, more extensive repair was contracted in 1980 to Curt Claus Voigt of Markneukirchen. In order to carry out the necessary restoration, he removed the belly and thereby determined that "the belly had already been removed several times and reattached improperly (that is, nailed to the edges of the body)."\textsuperscript{16} This instrument maker also pasted a label into the lute: "C. Claus Voigt 1981 // repariert."

The museum has documentation of the restoration work, which reveals that in 1980 playability of the instrument was set as a goal. In 2002 Volker F. Seumel put together a detailed description of the instrument. In that year a dendrochronological examination was made. It revealed that the two-piece belly was made of spruce (\textit{Fichtenholz}) from the Alpine region, and that the wood would have been available to the instrument maker in 1690 at the earliest. Since this date could also allow us to conclude that the Edlingers kept a large supply of wood, more detailed statements about the origin of the lute cannot be drawn from this evidence.

\textsuperscript{13} Helmut Schulz: \textit{Führer durch das Musikwissenschaftliche Instrumenten-Museum der Universität Leipzig} (Leipzig, 1926), p. 58  
\textsuperscript{14} While this fact was indicated with the abbreviation "B" (\textit{beschädigt} = damaged) by hand in the catalog of the Museum, the damage was not described.  
\textsuperscript{15} Restoration report in the museum. Undated (probably 1976).  
\textsuperscript{16} "... die Decke schon mehrere Male abgenommen und unsachgemäß (z.B. auf die Korpusränder aufgenagelt) wieder aufgesetzt." Repair report by C.C. Voigt, Markneukirchen, 1981. Document in the museum (Restaurierungsberichte)
2. Commentary on ascription and provenance

Lute MML-497 bears the printed paper label "THOMAS EDLINGER," glued inside the body, whereby the second line (Lauten- und Geigenmacher in Prag and handwritten date) that we would expect in Edlinger's label is no longer present. The comma in the first line after the name suggests that the label was trimmed.\(^{17}\)

The label for MML-497 is pictured in de Wit's Geigenzettel alter Meister, vol. II. He ascribed it erroneously to Thomas Edlinger the Elder in Augsburg,\(^{18}\) an error that was not corrected by Kinsky in his well-known catalog. However, stylistic and construction details indicate clearly that this lute was made by Thomas Edlinger the Younger in Prague.

We investigated whether the label with the name Thomas Edlinger originally belonged to the instrument or not. We were made suspicious by the fact that this label shows damage that could only occur when someone tried to remove the glued-on paper. On the one hand it is possible that this was necessary for photographic purposes,\(^{19}\) but on the other it is conceivable that the second line belonging to the label was cut off in order to make the instrument appear older than it actually was. Many other cases are known in which an instrument was provided with a false or other label that did not originate with it. De Wit himself remarks in the preface to Geigenzettel alter Meister that one "all too often is misled by pasted-in falsified labels or deceived by people with dubious consciences." In the same place he reports large private collections of violin labels\(^{20}\) (which therefore had been removed from the instruments), and which also served as the basis of his publication.\(^{21}\) However, evidence against manipulation by de Wit is supported by the fact that only two of the lutes described in this article stem from his collection; the third, which also bore a label without place or date, did not. Thus we can conclude that the label stems from Thomas Edlinger the Younger and belongs to this instrument.

---

\(^{17}\) We can assume that the label of the Frankfurt instrument looked similar, and that it, too, lacked the second line. An instrument with complete label including printed place identification and handwritten year (1718) was published in Karl Jälovec, Encyklopädie des Geigenbaues (Prague, 1965), p. 263.


\(^{19}\) The current condition of the lute indicates that it has been opened several times. Between 1902 and 1910 the lute was opened and photographed in Leipzig for the publication Geigenzettel alter Meister. De Wit writes in his publication (Teil I, Leipzig, 1902, p. 3) that: "A great number of these instruments had to be opened by skilled hands in order to photograph the labels." The label was not yet published in that volume, but it was mentioned (on page 7). Perhaps at this time it received new pegs.

\(^{20}\) Among them two Leipzig violin makers, Gustav Siefert and W.H. Hammig.

\(^{21}\) Paul de Wit: Geigenzettel alter Meister (Leipzig, 1902).
Even the origin in the famous art collection of the Viennese painter Hans Makart must be questioned. This collection was auctioned in 1885 and publicized for that purpose in a catalog. Here there were, to be sure, two lutes, but neither can be ascribed to Edlinger. So we must presume that Paul de Wit confused the name. This assumption is supported by the fact that the lute only came to Cologne with the third collection in 1905. An instrument acquired in 1885 would have been found today (if the collection had not been destroyed by fire in World War II) in Berlin in the Musical Instrument Museum, which acquired two collections from de Wit in 1888 and 1890.

However it is quite probable that de Wit acquired lute MML-497 in Vienna. Can that be proven? We shall return to this question at the end of these deliberations.

*Thirteen-course lute, Inventory no. GMF-234*

*Brief description:* 13-course baroque lute. The shell was constructed of 11 ebony ribs. Only the neck, decorated with wave-formed ivory stripes, the pegbox, and the belly are preserved. In the instrument were once the label of Thomas Edlinger the Younger and a repair label of H. Seyffarth in Leipzig. See also the sketch with measurements by Volker Friedemann Seumel (Figure 6 - page 86).

This lute was sold by de Wit to the Goethe-Haus in Frankfurt am Main. An inventory entry of the museum tells us: “Inv. No. 234, Goethe-Haus, 2nd floor: Music room, lute, body of ebony decorated with ivory stripes, bent-back pegbox. According to the written report23 of Paul de Wit from March 25, 1903 (Document I of the GH C), the valuable lute is a work of Thomas Edlinger in Augsburg, whose name is affixed to the interior of the lute (...).”24 Note: “Rep(aired) by H Seifert, Leipzig Gohls 1896 (...).”25

De Wit probably acquired these two lutes, which by their appearance form a pair, at the same time. This thesis is supported by a reference from

---

23 This written report has not survived. I am grateful to Dr. Kölsch for this information. Gerhard Kölsch, scientific associate at the Goethe-Museum in Frankfurt am Main.
Figure 6 - Sketch of a lute by Thomas Edlinger, Prague. Goethe-Haus, Frankfurt am Main, GMF IV-234. Drawing by Volker Friedemann Seumel, measurements by Gerhard Kölsch.
Figure 7 - Top view of a lute belly by Thomas Edlender, Prague.
Goethe-Haus, Frankfurt am Main, GMF IV-234.
Photo by Gerhard Kölsch.
Figure 8 - Underside view of a lute belly by Thomas Edlinger, Prague. Goethe-Haus, Frankfurt am Main, GMF IV-234. Photo by Gerhard Kölsch.
Lute by Thomas Edlinger, Prague. Goethe-Haus, Frankfurt am Main, GMF IV-234. Photos by Gerhard Kölsch

Figure 9 - Neck

Figure 10 - Pegbox

1926 in the Zeitschrift für Instrumentenbau, where the author recalls the repair workshop founded by de Wit and run by Seyffarth.26 “An ever greater number of peculiar constructions came under successful workshop-treatment, (...) lutes (among them a 24-stringed one by Thomas Edlinger,

Translation: "Length of the instrument up to the pegbox 87 cm, length of the pegbox 25 cm, appended: one silk band. Bought from Paul de Wit’s Music History Institute in Leipzig for 300 Marks, see Prot. D. Goethehaus Commission of May 22, 1903 and [unreadable] in the Act No. 1 of the same Commission, 1934 repaired by violin maker Eugen Sprenger (?), Frankfurt am Main, Hochstrasse 42 for 74.50 Reichsmarks." [later addition, probably from the early part of the 1950s] "broken at the
from the possession of Hans Makart), (….). For all these objects a new soul had to be provided."

We assume that one of them (MML-497) was in good condition — otherwise he could not have exhibited it shortly after its acquisition — while the other (GMF-VI.234) had severe damage. Possibly he did not wish to keep the second instrument and immediately had it repaired for future sale. This could explain why this lute is not mentioned in the printed catalogs of Paul de Wit, although it can be proved that it was in his possession. This hypothesis is borne out by a report of 1903 from the Goethe-Haus in Frankfurt am Main\(^{27}\) that mentions they had long attempted to get instruments that played a role in Goethe’s or his family’s life, in order to set up a music room in the Goethe-Haus: “… a spinet (…) lutes were acquired.”\(^{28}\)

De Wit usually had his newly acquired, damaged instruments repaired immediately. At this time the workshop of Hermann Seyffarth must have been very overbooked, so that the work on the lute GMF-IV.234 could only commence years later.\(^{29}\) The repaired lute (or both lutes, thus also MML-497) remained about one year in the workshop and served as the model\(^{30}\) for the reconstruction of the neck and pegbox of an instrument by Joachim Tielke, which thereby acquired a similar form to the Edlinger lutes.\(^{31}\)

No photographic documentation of the label, lost together with the body, has survived. Most probably it was the same as that in MML-
Thirteen-course lute, inventory no. MML-3319

Brief description: 13-course baroque lute. The shell is built of 11 ebony ribs. Its bent-back pegbox holds a chanterelle rider and a bass rider for the highest and the two lowest courses, respectively. The neck is decorated with three wave-formed ivory stripes. Label: "THOMAS EDLINGER," Repair labels by Daniel Achatius Stadlman (1735) and C. Claus Voigt (1981). For basic measurements see the drawings (Fig. 11).

This lute is very similar in its form to the instruments described above, though its pegbox, decorated with a sawn-out ivory plate, differs somewhat from the two others, and it also makes reference to its prominent former owner.

The pegbox bears symmetrical scrollwork on its underside. In the decoration we find a letter P, and above it a crown: the emblem of Prince Philip Hyacinth Lobkowicz. Members of the Lobkowicz family, especially Ferdinand August (1655-1715) and his son Philip Hyacinth (1680-1734), were known as important representatives of Bohemian lute culture. Their collection contained many lutes and other instruments. An inventory of the musical instruments stems unfortunately only from the year 1872, and by that time it can be shown that this lute had already been in Vienna a very long time and was no longer part of the Lobkowicz collection in Bohemia.

Inside the lute shell three labels are glued, one of which refers to the maker and two repairs. In the label diagrams below, roman type refers to printed text, and italic refers to handwritten.

Claus Voigt 1981
repriert

---

32 The work itself stems probably from one of the apprentices or from a contracted source: not only the motif, but also the manner of workmanship are slightly different.

33 In Ježeti (Eisenberg) Castle nine lutes and four mandores were listed in 1872. I am grateful for this reference to Bohuslav Čížek. The collections from Raudnitz were stored elsewhere several times, because between 1741 and 1777 Raudnitz itself was besieged several times. I am grateful to Laura DeBarbieri, curator of the Roudnice Lobkowicz Library (now at Nelahozeves Palace), for this information.
Figure 11 - Sketch of a lute by Thomas Edlinger, Prague. Leipzig, MML-3319. Drawings and measurements by Volker Friedemann Seumel
Lute by Thomas Edlinger, Prague, Leipzig, MML-3319
Photos by Wieland Hecht

Figure 12 - Front view  Figure 13 - Side view

Daniel Achatius Stadlman
Lauten und Geigenmacher in
Wienn Anno 17/35 reparavit

The last digit is scarcely legible since the handwriting has faded. Beneath the repair labels in found the maker's label:
Lute by Thomas Edlinger, Prague. Leipzig, MML-3319
Photos by Wieland Hecht

Figure 14 - Rear view

Figure 15 - Rear detail of pegbox

The comma after the name clearly indicates a missing line, namely the one referring to place and date [Lauten- und Geignmacher in Prag + year].

Since we know the person who commissioned the lute, Prince Lobkowicz, we can assume that this lute, like the others, was made by
Figure 16 - Lute by Thomas Edlinger, Prague. Leipzig, MMI.-3319. Underside of the belly. Photo by Wieland Hecht.
Thomas Edlinger the Younger. The subsequent fate of the lute can be followed through the repair label—Vienna, 1735. It is a clear indication that one year after the death of Prince Lobkowicz, his instrument was already in the imperial capital. It came there along with the possessions of the prince’s widow, the famous lutenist Anna Maria Wilhelmine von Althann (1703-1754). She moved in 1734 to Vienna, where a year later she married Joseph Grundakker, Count von Althann. Was the marriage the reason to turn over the lute to the famous Viennese instrument maker D. A. Stadlmann for repair?

We know nothing of the later owners after Anna Maria Wilhelmine’s death in 1754 until about 1880. After 1800 hardly anyone played the lute, even in Vienna, where interest endured longer than in many other cities. Thus it was surely unused for decades, and acquired later by a collector, perhaps a painter who used it as a motif for studies in perspective.

Around 1880 lute MML-3319 was in the collection of such an artist in Vienna. The painter Friedrich von Amerling (1803-1887) played guitar, and in his youth even gave lessons to earn pocket money. When and from whom Amerling acquired the instrument is not known, but it must have been in poor condition.

Amerling may have had the first large repair made around 1880. For certain repairs the soundboard must be removed, which can lead to damage to the shell and the belly as well. Perhaps for this reason the belly, which probably had other damage to it, was renovated with much-too-thick material and with an inappropriate rosette. The makeup of this belly, the barring, the thick material, the fine inlay at the edge and around the soundholes are reminiscent of the lute-guitars of the end of the 19th century. The belly was renovated again a hundred years later during repairs in 1981, which means that the lute had to be opened another time. This repeated procedure led to the outer ribs being planed down several times, so that they are now approximately 8 mm narrower than the other ribs in

---

34 Silvius Leopold Weiss was her teacher, and may have dedicated works to her. See Legl and Smith, “Documents of Weiss’s Life,” this Journal, forthcoming.
35 I am grateful to Mr. André Burguete in Dresden for this reference.
36 This soundboard, too, was afterwards repaired at least twice. The lower end of the belly, at the endclasp, was given a new lining, and under the bridge another violin maker glued a strip of wood. The rosette was repaired, new ribs were added, and even the interior of the lute was built up with wood.
37 A dendrochronological examination made by Peter Klein of Hamburg indicated that the three-piece belly was made from the wood of a spruce (Picea) tree felled in the Alpine region about 1668. The unknown instrument maker used old wood.
the shell.\textsuperscript{38} The painter’s estate was administered by a painter’s society, the \textit{Stiftung für die Genossenschaft der bildenden Künstler}, and finally auctioned in 1916 after the death of Amerling’s widow.\textsuperscript{39}

The musical instruments from Amerling’s collection were purchased by Karl August Lingner (1861-1916), collector, Maecenas, and founder of the Hygiene Museum in Dresden, which he directed until his death. He was known to have a good eye for art and possessed a small collection of old musical instruments as well as Saxon musician portraits and memoirs.\textsuperscript{40} Unfortunately he could not enjoy his new acquisitions for long, since he died the same year. His collection passed to a foundation and finally in 1933 to the Musical Instrument Museum of the University of Leipzig. No museum documents survive from this period, but other sources confirm this.\textsuperscript{41}

From 1933, for instance, there survives a contract between the city of Leipzig and the University of Leipzig, in which among other things the work of the repair workshop is regulated.\textsuperscript{42} It mentions the student Collegium musicum, which regularly used the museum’s musical

\textsuperscript{38} The lute was already pictured in an auction catalog in this condition. See the following note.\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Sammlung Amerling, Dorotheum k.k. Versteigerungskatalog, Versteigerungskatalog der 263. Kunstauction Wien, 1916,} place 53, No. 780. Laute, Ebenholzkorpus mit Beineinlagen, reich durchbrochen, Fürstenkrone und P. Arbeit von Thomas Edlinger, Augsburg um 1670, von Daniel Achatus Stadlmann 1737 in Wien repariert. Länge 90 cm. "Lute, ebony body with bone inlays, richly perforated, princely crown and P. Work of Thomas Edlinger, Augsburg about 1670, repaired by Daniel Achatus Stadelmann in Vienna in 1737. Length 90 cm."


One recognized the thanks registered in the document of the Musicology Institute of the University of Leipzig of March 11, 1933 and the letter of the People’s Education Ministry of March 20 for the donation of the old musical instruments formerly in the Lingner Foundation."

\textsuperscript{41} "14 Instrumente aus der Barockzeit, aus dem Nachlaß von K.A. Lingner der Instrumentensammlung des Instituts für Veranlassung des Ministeriums für Volksbildung überwiesen von der Lingner-Stiftung in Dresden," Universitätsarchiv Leipzig, UAL,Phil.Fak.B1/1427 (Bd.1 Blatt 54) as well as Stadtschularchiv Dresden, Hauptkanzlei 271/20. Dir.Reg. I.A. Nr.7 (Stadtschularchiv zu Dresden, 1920)." 

"14 instruments from the Baroque period, from the estate of K. A. Lingner of the Instrument Collection of the Institute, handed over by the Lingner Foundation in Dresden at the instigation of the Ministry for Popular Education," Universitätsarchiv Leipzig, etc.).

I thank Frau Susanne Roeßinger, Stiftung Deutsches Hygiene-Museum, for several helpful pieces of information.

\textsuperscript{42} Universitätsarchiv Leipzig, UAL RA 1438-1443 (25.10.1933).
instruments in its educational programs. Concert programs and photos testify to this activity. In this connection, the decision in December 1932 of the Lingner Foundation is important: "Dr. Seiring proposed to turn over the valuable instruments from the Lingner Foundation to some Saxon institution, be it the Musicology Institute in Leipzig or some other museum in Dresden."

In a collection of noteworthy contributions to the Musicology Institute and Instrument Museum of the University of Leipzig from 1933 there is found a reference to this event: "Teaching tools: 14 instruments from the Baroque era, from the estate of K. A. Lingner."\textsuperscript{43} We assume that the Lingner collection was acquired for actual music-making and that the instruments were loaned out for practical use. This probably happened with lute MML-3319.

Then World War II broke out and difficult years followed. The leader of the Collegium musicum and director of the institute and of the museum, Professor Helmut Schulz (1904-1945), died during the war. The museum suffered very great losses, among them the library and all old documentary records. Afterwards the personnel tried laboriously to reconstruct indexes, which necessarily would contain gaps. As a result, later museum personnel could have known nothing of the previous possession when in 1956 they bought the Edlinger lute from a private party for the museum. The seller declared that he had inherited the instrument. In his offer he did mention the fact that the instrument stemmed from the Lingner collection,\textsuperscript{44} but he obviously did not know that this instrument had earlier belonged to the museum, otherwise he certainly would not have proposed to sell it back.

Occasionally history repeats itself, for in the 1980s the lute was again used for practical music-making. C. C. Voigt was contracted in 1981 to restore the instrument in the old style. The other Edlinger lute (MML-497) served as a model for the reconstructed belly and rosette. For the barring, Voigt used a lute soundboard by J. C. Hoffmann, which was stored separately from the instrument, so that it was possible to place it at the luthier's disposal. Voigt also replaced the bass rider and carried out other necessary repairs. The custodian of the museum wrote to Voigt: "Your chief goal was to achieve a new soundboard like the original belly of No. 497. Moreover, preservation and restoration procedures were to

\textsuperscript{43} Universitätsarchiv Leipzig, Phil.Fak.B1/14, Bd. H.54.
\textsuperscript{44} Purchase offer of 29 September, 1956. Archive of the Musikinstrumenten-Museum der Universität Leipzig.
be performed, it was to be strung with a new set of strings, etc. (...) We are happy to have at our disposal, in this instrument restored by you so conscientiously, a baroque lute of secure playability and extraordinarily beautiful sound. The instrument will very shortly serve the concerts and musical presentations of our Museum."

Between 1982-1986 the instrument, according to the loan contract, was in the hands of the lutenist of the Capella Fidicinia. In 1986 another repair was performed, once again carried out by C. Voigt, who was at that time still active in Leipzig.

The great number of repairs —1735, ca. 1880, probably 1933 or 1934 in the museum’s workshop, possibly again after the war, 1981, 1986 (Voigt)— indicates an intensive use of the instrument. Certainly the regrettable condition into which it by then had deteriorated can be traced to this use.

Conclusions and comparison of the three lutes

The three lutes in Leipzig and Frankfurt represent the new type of 13-course lute with pegbox and bass rider for the expanded contrabasses that became common after about 1720. They share a remarkable set of very decorative elements, which depart from other known Edlinger instruments. The shells are built of 11 ebony ribs, with ivory spacers in between. The backs of all three necks are embellished with a wave-shaped triple stripe. The pegbox bears a decorative plate sawn out of ivory.

All three lutes had identically clipped labels, with no indication of profession, location, or date. It can be assumed that the labels were trimmed by Edlinger himself and that he deliberately omitted the missing information. Interestingly, there is a further example that Edlinger left off

45 Letter of 1 September, 1981 to the instrument maker Claus Voigt by Dr. Winfried Schrammek, the then custodian, later director of the Museum. (Letter is in the archive of the Museum.) Ihre Hauptaufgabe war, eine Decke gemäß der originalen Decke von Nr. 497 zu erneuern. Außerdem waren Pflege- und Restaurierungsarbeiten zu leisten, ein neuer Seitenbezug aufzuziehen usw. (...) Wir sind glücklich, in dem von Ihnen in so verantwortungsvoller Weise wiederhergestellten Instrument eine Barocklaute von sicherer Spielbarkeit und außerordentlich schönem Klang zur Verfügung zu haben. Das Instrument wird schon in aller Kürze den Konzerten und musikalischen Vorführungen unseres Museums dienen.

46 Repairs are visible on the second belly. "After removal of the non-original belly it became apparent that the entire body was lined with spruce and an isolating band. Removal of these two made many cracks in the body visible." (Nach Abnehmen der nicht originalen Decke zeigte sich, dass das gesamte Korpus mit Futter aus Fichtenholz u. Isolierband ausgeleimt war. Die Entfernung von beiden machte zahlreiche Risse im Korpus sichtbar."") From the repair report of C. Vogt, 1981.

the professional and place references: the repair label of the Unverdorben lute in the Lobkowicz Collection (1178 E), signed “Thomas Edlinger zu gericht ["repaired"] 1721.”

For dating the lutes we should consider more closely the question of when the expansion of compass in the bass became known. It seems more than likely that Silvius Leopold Weiss recommended to Prince Lobkowicz or Edlinger that the 11-course instrument be rebuilt to one with 13 courses with a bass rider.

Dated or rebuilt lutes with bass rider by Thomas Edlinger are known from 1721, at which time he had been in Prague for 30 years and made many instruments. In that year he modernized an instrument by Marx Unverdorben (Venice, 1607), which is now back in the Lobkowicz collection. It is possible that the prince, before he ordered new instruments with expanded bass strings, first had an old instrument rebuilt in order to try out its playability.

Edlinger modernized many old instruments from the Lobkowicz collection in this fashion, for instance a lute of Magno Tieffenbrucker of Venice (Lobkowicz no. 1409 E, date of rebuilding not indicated) and by Laux Maler (1408 E, rebuild date not indicated). From the same circle stem two more Italian instruments from the early 17th century, again rebuilt by Thomas Edlinger in 1724 and 1728. During the rebuilding he provided them with a new neck, pegbox with bass rider, and bridge.

---

33 (1999). I am grateful to Mr. Čepeláč for this information. I wish further to note that instruments with clipped or pasted-over labels are also known from other workshops. See Peter Király, "Some new Facts about Vendelio Venere," The Lute (1994), p. 26; and Klaus Martius, Leopold Widhelm und der Nürnberg: Lauten- und Geigenbau im 18. Jahrhundert (Frankfurt a/Main, 1996), p. 99 and 103.

48 There is a similar example from piano building: Ignatz Kober, who otherwise labeled his instruments, left out the label for a delivery to the Viennese court (Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Sammlung alter Musikinstrumente no. SAM 364). I am grateful to Klaus Martius and A. Huber for this reference. See also [Victor Luithlen], Sakenklaviere. Katalog der Sammlung alter Musikinstrumente, Teil 1 (Vienna, 1966), p. 27.


50 Between 1850 and 1997 the instruments were in the National Museum in Prague. I am grateful to Dr. Bohuslav Čižek for this information. See also note 47.


52 I owe this insight to Dr. Bohuslav Čižek of the Prague National Museum and luthier Jiří Čepeláč of Prague.
The tendency to modernize old lutes and rearrange them for the new style can often be seen from about 1650 into the seventh decade of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century. In this manner many lutes underwent expansion of their compass, for instance in the workshops of Matthias Hummel, Sebastian Schelle,\textsuperscript{53} and Leopold Widhalm in Nuremberg;\textsuperscript{54} Johann Christian Hoffmann in Leipzig; Andreas Bär (Beer) in Vienna; and Joseph Joachim Edlinger in Prague.\textsuperscript{55}

The presence of three special lutes, built after the same schema, allows yet another presumption. Not only the decor, but also the history of the instruments shows us that they belong together. There is a special event which could have caused the prince to order three instruments of the new construction.\textsuperscript{56} This is his second marriage, to the excellent lutenist and Weiss pupil, Countess Anna Maria Wilhelmine von Althann in 1721. Moreover, it is known that Weiss dedicated several works to her and also that she particularly liked to play on 13-course instruments.\textsuperscript{57}

The instruments thus moved in 1734, together with other possessions of the prince's widow, from Prague to Vienna and remained there, although no longer together. One lute was in the Amerling collection until it was sold to a German collection in 1916; Paul de Wit acquired the other two in Vienna between 1890 and 1892. Both of them stemmed, according to de Wit's notes, from the Makart collection. This assertion could not be verified, but could indicate that they possibly belonged to another large collection of a painter.\textsuperscript{58}

The preference for old forms in that era probably influenced the choice of wood, the form of the body, and the decor. Thus the lovely lute

\textsuperscript{53} For instance the theorbo by Vendelino Venere (Tieffenbrucker). Musikinstrumenten-Museum der Universität Leipzig, Inv. Nr. 3357, rebuilt in 1723 and 1726 by Schelle, and a lute by the same master rebuilt in 1732 by Josephus Joachimus Edlinger (Inv. Nr. 492).

\textsuperscript{54} See Klaus Martius, Leopold Widhalm und der Nürnberger Lauten- und Geigenbau im 18. Jahrhundert, (Frankfurt am Main, 1996).

\textsuperscript{55} Lute of Vendelino Venere (Tieffenbrucker). Musikinstrumenten-Museum der Universität Leipzig, Inv.-Nr. 492, rebuilt by J. J. Edlinger in 1732. See also note 57.

\textsuperscript{56} As long as no other documents are found, we must entertain the possibility that the instruments were not built at the same time, but rather at intervals of a few months or years, after 1720 (the date of death of the prince's first wife, Eleonora Carolina Lobkowicz). The lute no. 3319 was perhaps the first to be built, the other two somewhat later, after the prince's second marriage.


\textsuperscript{58} At that time there were several large art collections in Vienna, assembled by painters. In addition to the one of Friedrich von Amerling already mentioned, there was for instance that of Stephan Delhaes, who possessed an important collection of plucked instruments, among other items. This collection has been in the Hungarian National Museum in Budapest since 1902.
of Magno Tieffenbrucker,\textsuperscript{59} made of 11 ebony ribs with ivory spacers, could have inspired Edlinger to choose ebony as material for the shell. The \textit{à jour} decoration of the pegbox may also have been inspired by an older instrument. One such example could be the lute of Hans Burkholzter from the year 1596.\textsuperscript{60} The Burkholzter also stemmed, according to the museum catalog, from “an old Prague possession,” where it allegedly remained until 1830. It has “on the rear of the pegbox \textit{à jour} tracery of ivory, in it the presumed owner’s emblem.”\textsuperscript{61} It bears a repair label by Thomas Edlinger from the year 1705. Possibly at this time he rebuilt it to an 11-course lute with baroque tuning. The pegbox is, however, like the fingerboard, too narrow for an 11-course lute. This suggests again that Edlinger retained the old pegbox and only altered it where absolutely necessary. Similar integrations of older parts can be observed in several instruments from the middle of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, for instance, lutes from the workshop of Sebastian Schelle (a theorbo of 1721) or Leopold Widhalm (theorbo, 1755).\textsuperscript{62}

Construction and stylistic details give cause for suspicion that the next rebuilding of the Burkholzter lute to a 13-course configuration was not made by Edlinger, but rather after his death, in the 1730s.

The \textit{à jour} scrollwork motif of the Edlinger lutes, especially MML-497 and GMF-234, shows many similarities to the decoration of the Burkholzter lute, whereby the type of lines in the tendrils is quite noticeable. To be sure, the elaboration in all three Edlinger instruments

\textsuperscript{59} Handwritten label: “Magno dieffopruchar a venetia,” printed label: “Josephus Joachimus Edlinger / me reparavit Pragae An: 1732” (32 is handwritten.) 13 courses, 11 x 2, 2 x 1. Shell of 11 ebony ribs with ivory spacers. Rothschild Collection, formerly in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, SAM AR 969. This instrument was formerly in Prague, testified to by the repair label of Joseph Joachim Edlinger from the year 1732. The lute was rebuilt in 1732 to a 13-course configuration, but it may have been in the Edlinger workshop earlier for smaller repairs. For information about this instrument I am grateful to Hofrat Dr. Rudolf Hopfner, Vienna.

\textsuperscript{60} Kunsthistorisches Museum, Sammlung Alter Musikinstrumente, SAM 44. For information about the instrument, including the following quotes, I am grateful to Dr. Rudolf Hopfner. "The label is similar to de Wit, vol. 2, plate 8, no. 85: Antiqua script with capital letters and adjoining comma, then handwritten ‘zugricht 1705’. The type fonts in Wit are somewhat different than ours. Ours are much finer and more modern looking." [„Der Zettel ist ähnlich, wie bei Wit, Bd. 2 Tafel 8, Nr. 85: Antiqua-Schrift mit Majuskeln mit anschließendem Beistrich, dann handschriftlich „zugricht 1705” „Die Drucktypen bei Wit sind etwas anderes, als jene bei uns. Unsere sind viel feiner und moderner aussehend.”] I am especially indebted to Frau Eveline Küllner for the photos.

\textsuperscript{61} “...an der Unterseite des Kragens \textit{à jour} gearbeitetes Rankenwerk in Eifenbein, darin das vermutliche Besitzersignum.” Julius von Schlosser, \textit{Die Sammlung alter Musikinstrumente} (Vienna, 1920, reprint 1984), p. 57. Old Inv.-Nr.: NE 48 or 4056, new number SAM 44.

is simple, while on the Burkholzter the leaves are formed more gracefully and imaginatively. The motif of the lute MML-3319 is symmetrical, but that of the other two is not. In spite of the similarities listed here, there are also considerable differences that allow us to conclude that the scrollwork motifs of the Edlinger instruments — perhaps made after a model from a book of patterns\(^6\) — were drawn freehand and possibly carried out by different hands.

\(^6\) The design of the pegbox with à jour scrollwork also characterizes the instruments by Joachim Tielke. Comparable motifs are seen in several instruments from the middle of the 18th century, for instance some lutes in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum. (Inv. Nr.: MIR 902, 903, MI 245.)
All three instruments are evidence of a change in musical taste, which resulted in an expansion of the lute to a 13-course instrument with bass rider. Since 1719 S. L. Weiss wrote works for 13-course instruments and played these presumably at his concerts (1717, 1719, and 1723) also in Prague.\(^{64}\) In later years he was often a guest at the seat of the Lobkowicz family in Raudnitz (Roudnice), and gave lessons to the talented Anna Maria Wilhelmine, perhaps also to the prince himself.\(^{65}\)

Naturally we cannot state with absolute certainty what transpired then, and even the considerations above leave several possibilities open. It would however be quite plausible that in 1721 Thomas Edlinger the Younger received a commission for three 13-course instruments:\(^{66}\) one lute for the princess, one for the prince, and one in the event that the king of the lute, Silvius Leopold Weiss, would again pay a visit to Raudnitz.

—Translated by Douglas Alton Smith

\(^{64}\) For this information I thank Tim Crawford. See also Eszter Fontana, "Rätselräten über einen Theorbenkasten in Leipzig," Die Laute (Jahrbuch der Deutschen Lautengesellschaft) vol. IV (2002), pp. 48-63.


\(^{66}\) Wilhelmine took them, as well as music by S. L. Weiss, to Vienna in 1734. See note 21. I thank André Burguete of Dresden for this information.

Stefano Pio, professional musician, researcher and violin dealer has published two books on Venetian lute and violin making. The first, which was devoted to the epoch from 1750 to 1870 and hence only to violin makers, may have been unnoticed by most of us lute enthusiasts. But the second we cannot ignore. In the era 1640-1760 it treats a long list of names well known to us as lute makers, even if not exclusively.

The book is well organized. After a general introduction to the social and musical background of the instrument makers, the next chapters are devoted to the individual luthiers and their families: the Sellas family, Cristoforo Coch, Pietro and Giovanni Railich, Giovanni and Paolo Recaldini, Marchio Vines, Nicolo Taiber, Michele Straub, the Kaiser family und then the famous violin and cello makers such as Matteo Goffriller, Giovanni Curci, Francesco Gobetti, Pietro Guarneri, Carlon Tonon, Domenico Montagnana, and Santo Serafin.

A glossary of Venetian terms, measurements and notes on the instruments (only instruments of the violin family), an index of selected personalities and a short bibliography round out the discussions of individuals.

In the introduction, Pio sketches a picture of musical Venice, made famous in that era by names like Legrenzi, Torelli, Tartini, and above all Antonio Vivaldi. The musical life took place in the theaters, churches, and the four *ospedale* — schools for illegitimate children, orphans, or simply girls of poor families, at city government expense.

The great merit of this book lies in its offering of source material that the author has collected in Venetian archives. We are given extensive information about the social structure of the luthiers, most of whom emigrated from Füssen, at the base of the Alps in modern-day southern Bavaria. Under the patronage of the respective church parish (with
German-language services) and under the umbrella of the guild, they formed in Venice— as in Rome and Bologna— a self-contained unity that preserved its traditions and customs. In these German town districts there were notaries and attorneys, who attended almost exclusively to the needs of the German minority (also goldsmiths, innkeepers and soldiers). In Venice the Todeschi (Germans) maintained a permanent branch office, the famous Fondaco dei Tedeschi, near the Rialto bridge. Today it serves as the main post office.

Because they kept bringing their relatives from their Swabian-Bavarian homeland, through apprenticeships, marriage and business contracts (for instance, wood imports, especially yew), they kept their community net tightly knit. Only after generations did a gradual integration occur through marriage with native Italians, for instance the wedding of Giorgio Sella’s daughter Victoria with the famous harpsichord maker Antonio Baffo.

Frequently the Swabian lute makers came as teenagers of about 13-14 years, or sometimes younger (Pietro Railich was 11, Giorgio and Matteo Sella were 12) to Italy, where they learned their craft for four or five years as garzoni (apprentices) with a direct relative or a luthier friend of a relative. At the end of this apprenticeship the young lute maker could either open a shop (bottega) himself as a maestro or work with another master as agente in his own name.

Most of the archival documents that Pio mentions were devoted to taxation or served to certify previous unmarried status to young instrument makers who wished to wed. In addition there are, however, other very interesting documents, for instance some by the brothers Giorgio and Matteo Sella, who were sending some guitar bellies and instruments (gotten from Germany) by ship to Portugal and Spain.

For me the high point of the book is the extensive inventory of Christoforo Koch from 1664. It was compiled in the context of a contract with Koch’s co-worker Giovanni Rauter, who was to operate the Bottega all’Aquila d’oro as manager while the master went on a four-year business trip. In contrast to inventories from the 16th century with their almost unmanageable stocks of lutes in all imaginable states of completion, in this one the instruments present in the shop are mentioned only peripherally. It lists, among other things, seven workbenches and tables, general tools (different saws and planes of various sizes, two wooden planes for scraping, two planes with tees) and special apparatuses for lute making and construction, even for the repair of instruments. A special emphasis in this inventory is the numerous molds of lutes and guitars. A small selection of
the list will suffice to illustrate. (Source and English translations are from the book.)

3 tables to bind base bars  
(tre tavole da batter le cadene)

1 table for repairing the body of lutes  
(una tola per giustar le corpi)

2 others to work the back [sic!] of instruments  
(doi dette per metter li fondi)

1 punch for pegs and bridges  
(un pantarol da sgagnelli)

14 small chisels for rosettes  
(quattordeci scarpelletti per rosette e fini),

18 wood wedges to bind bass bars  
(18 cugni da batter le Cadene)

100 wood wedges for instrument tables  
(100 detti da metter a Coperchi [?])

12 flower molds to use for decorations  
(dodeci stampe di fiori)

1 line to repair instruments  
(una riga da giustar li strumenti)

In addition, it lists 1 box for lute molds, 20 lute molds, 6 forms for colasciones, 3 for French lutes (liuti alla francese), 18 for theorboes, 51 for flat guitars, and 23 for guitars. (pp. 56-58).

Despite his conscientious references in the appendix, Pio often omits – probably for easier readability – an exact transcription of the sources. For instance, it is not always clear whether the explanatory additions in parentheses were added by the author. And unfortunately especially in the presentation of the inventory, another weakness becomes manifest: The English translation does not always help to understand the essence of the passage.

As an example, I refer to the error above of translating “fondo” with “back.” Fondo in all these sources means the belly or soundboard of the lute.

The rendition of lautter, the most frequent occupational title in these documents, as “violinmaker” shows another tendency of the author. As a reader of all these extremely interesting biographical reports about the luthiers, I feel always his actual interest, beyond the individual biography being discussed, namely to find the point where finally the violin enters.
the instrument-making scene of the city. Two such milestones are Pietro Railich's brother Matteo, who worked in Brescia as lute maker, and the friendly connection of Catharina Goffriller (who came to Venice in 1658), to Maria Kaiser, the widow of Matteo Kaiser (d. 1660).

This corpulent book captivates the reader with its sumptuous production and large, stately format. It is richly laden with full-page, color photographs. Not only the instruments are shown: many views of the homes, churches, and selections from the documents also provide a glimpse into the life of the instrument makers under discussion.

Yet while the violins and violoncelli appear in full views, top and rear, as well as in numerous detail views of the highest quality, taken by professional photographers, the photos of the lutes and theorboes (and in one case a gamba) are comparatively modest. They appear sparingly, in small format, often a bit out of focus, and there is seldom a detail view. Even the selection of the documented lute instruments seems somewhat random.

Here it becomes very apparent that we lute enthusiasts have still not achieved standards equal to those of the violin researchers, or even to demand them. More than with the instruments of the violin family, an appraisal of the illustrated lutes is missing. There are no data on labels or signatures, measurements, nor above all an evaluation of the changes and rebuilds an individual instrument may have undergone.

All in all, however, the book by Stefano Pio constitutes a very valuable complement to the Venetian instrument-making research of Stefano Toffolo, and contributes a great deal of interesting, new information to our knowledge of Venetian lute makers. It is a Must-Have book, not only for violin connoisseurs but also lutenists, lute makers and lute researchers. And we anxiously await (hopefully) a further book by Pio, which would take us into the heart of Venetian lute making in the epoch of its greatest flowering! In spite of the peripheral criticisms voiced here, I wish strongly to encourage the author to finish that project.

Klaus Martius

Translated by Douglas Alton Smith
Lyn Elder Workshop

Historically Accurate Lutes, Archlutes, Citterns, Bandoras and Guitars

Authentic Materials
Best Craftsmanship

74 North Street, Bristol, VT 05443, Phone 802/453-3625
e-mail: lynelder@gmavt.net
Sweet Division

The Venere Lute Quartet playing Vallet quartets from Secretum Musarum II, as well as their own quartet arrangements of 16th century music.

Marc Cramer, Renaissance Magazine

Palestrina’s Lute

Historical evidence indicates that Palestrina composed some of his music on the lute. The Venere Lute Quartet plays the entire Missa Brevis and several motets on four lute.

Please check the LSA web site for a detailed listing of the track selections on the recordings.

♦ $15.00 plus $2.50 S&H ♦ For fastest delivery order from the LSA web site or fax your order to 925 / 680-2582. ♦ Mail your order to: Lute Society of America, P.O. Box 6499, Concord, CA 94524. Include name, address and email. Mail orders can be paid by check or money order (it must be in US currency drawn on a US bank) or you can include credit card information (Visa or MasterCard, account number & expiration date).
Dues are $45 - 1 year, $85 - 2 years, $125 - 3 years, $40 - student 1 year, $500 - life. Members are entitled to receive the LSA Quarterly, the Journal, the Membership Directory, and to have borrowing privileges at the LSA Microfilm Library. To join the LSA, mail a check or credit card number and expiration date to: Lute Society of America, Garald Farnham -Treasurer, 255 West 98th #5C, New York, NY 10025 USA. Checks must be in US dollars drawn on a US bank.

Name __________________________________________

Address __________________________________________

City ___________________________ State __________

Postal code _________________ Country _______________________

Phone ___________________________ Email _______________________

Credit Card: VISA / Mastercard (circle one)

Account number ___________________________

Expiration date _________________ Total Charge _______________________

Signature ___________________________________________
A History of the Lute is a complete history of the instrument, its players and composers, its music and its cultural significance from Greek antiquity to the end of the Renaissance. It includes the author's evaluation and synthesis of previous lute scholarship by hundreds of writers, as well as new research.

- Approximately 400 pages
- 75 illustrations
- 50 musical examples

$85.00 PLUS $14.95 S&H

Please allow 4 to 6 weeks for delivery.

The Author Douglas Alton Smith received his Ph.D. in music from Stanford University in 1977 with a dissertation on music of the Baroque lutenist Silvius Leopold Weiss. From 1974 to 1982 he served as associate editor of the Journal of the Lute Society of America, and is currently guest editor of three issues of JLSA that will be devoted to the life and music of Weiss. Since 1973 he has published many academic studies on the lute and its music, including the article "Lute" in The New Harvard Dictionary of Music.