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Plate 2. D-Wa cod. VII B Hs Nr. 264, fol. Av.
The Earliest Source for the Lute:  
The Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature

BY MARC LEWON

Part 1—Introduction, Description, and Discussion

Introduction

In 2011 Martin Staehelin presented previously unknown manuscript fragments with musical notation that seemed to constitute an instrumental tablature in a hitherto seemingly unknown notational style. These unique fragments originated from the monastery of St. Cyriacus in Braunschweig and survived as pastedowns in the binding of its host codex, which is now in the Wolfenbüttel Staatsarchiv (cod. VII B Hs Nr. 264). The new discovery consists of two paper folios containing five

---

1 The findings in this article were pre-published in February 2014 as a series of posts on my blog site (http://mlewon.wordpress.com) and can be accessed directly via http://mlewon.wordpress.com/category/wolfenbuttel/. This article also features as a chapter in my dissertation thesis “Sources and Practices of Instrumental Music in Fifteenth-Century Central Europe” (University of Oxford, supervisor: Reinhard Strohm). After having reconstructed the missing parts of the three fragmented tablatures, I put all of the arrangements discussed in the present article to a practical test by performing them in concerts in the past two years. I also introduced them as teaching material and models to my students in the lute intabulation classes at the Schola Cantorum Basiliensis in 2015. In the course of my practical work with the fragments I undertook a première recording of the arrangements on the plectrum lute, which can be found on the CD Ensemble Dragma, Kingdom of Heaven—Heinrich Laufenberg, Ramée, RAM 1402, 2014: tracks 2 (“Myn trud gheselle”), 6 (“Gruß senen Ich im hertzen traghe”), 9 (“Cum lacrimis”), 13 (“Ellende du hest vmb vanghen mich”), and 15 (“Ich färe do hyn wen ef muß syn”).

2 Martin Staehelin, "Norddeutsche Fragmente mit Lautenmusik um 1460 in Wolfenbüttel," in Kleinüberlieferung mehrstimmiger Musik vor 1550 in deutschem Sprachgebiet: Neue Quellen des Spätmittelalters aus Deutschland und der Schweiz, Lieferung IX, ed. Martin Staehelin, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Neue Folge 15 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 67-88 (text and edition) and 141-44 (facsimile). I would like to particularly thank Martin Kirnbauer and Crawford Young, who made me aware of this article.
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intabulations of polyphonic secular songs, three of which are incomplete. In his article Staehelin provides a description of the host codex, a first interpretation of the tablature, a black-and-white facsimile of the fragments, and a preliminary transcription of the pieces. He convincingly argues that the tablature was intended for the lute by drawing a connection between the notation of the fragments and the so-called Kassel Collum Lutine (or “Kassel Lautenkragen,” i.e., “lute neck”), which describes the tablature notation for a five-course lute but provides no intabulated piece of music as example. Until Staehelin’s discovery no other notated example of this tablature system had been known.

The Kassel Collum Lutine (D-Kl, 2° Ms. Math. 31, fol. I, II, 1r-v) was first discussed by Christian Meyer in an article of 1994. In 2002 Martin Kirnbauer presented a new reading of this source and in 2003 included his interpretation in a joint publication with Crawford Young, complete with a detailed description, comprehensive analysis, and reduced color facsimile reproduction. With the emergence of the Wolfenbüttel fragments, the related Kassel Collum Lutine was brought again to attention to help describe a system of intabulation for the lute that predates all known lute tablatures.

Staehelin’s assessment of the Wolfenbüttel fragments, which in passing he calls the “Braunschweiger Fragmenten,” leaves plentiful material for further research, corrections, and additional observations, which he actively encourages. His preliminary transcriptions also allow for refinement and elaboration, so that under close inspection one will find the tablatures to be idiomatic solo arrangements of a popular vocal repertoire (monophonic and polyphonic secular songs from German sources) that

---


5 Staehelin, “Norddeutsche Fragmenten mit Lautenmusik,” 71. “... der Leser sei freundlich aufgefordert, die Vergleichsrecherchen selbständig zu unternehmen” (“I would like to politely encourage the reader to conduct their own comparative research”): ibid., 79.
had a wide distribution for a specific instrument (the five-course lute) and playing technique (plectrum technique). Analysis and performance have shown that the intabulations contain few mistakes and that the arrangements are not only fully playable on the instrument but also feature signs of an idiomatic and developed style. The settings consist of two voices (in essence: cantus and tenor) but include occasional chords with three or more notes as well as a contratenor voice that comes and goes—much as in organ tablatures of the time, with which the fragments have more than a fleeting connection. Furthermore, the arrangements provide new and maybe surprising insights into well-known contemporary songs.

The following article will provide a detailed discussion of the fragments, their notation, their relationship to the Kassel Collum Lutine, a transcription, and an analysis of the music, including its implications for lute practice, intabulation style, and playing technique.

**Physical Description of the Wolfenbüttel Fragments**

(D-Wa cod. VII B Hs Nr. 264, fols. A & B)

The fragments consist of two partly clipped paper leaves without watermarks of a larger source that was cut up for reuse as binding material. The size of the two folios is approximately 22 x 15.5 cm, and both are stained on the sides as a result of being glued as pastedowns to the inside of the boards of their host codex (i.e., fol. Ar and fol. Bv in modern foliation by Staehelin). They have since been removed from the binding and added as separate pages to the same codex. The fragments do not feature an original foliation, possibly due to the clipping of their top edges. Because their contents do not suggest that they are adjacent folios, their order in their original context cannot be reconstructed. Thus, Staehelin assigned them the more neutral foliation of A and B, rather than numbers.

The host codex—containing the *Statuta Ecclesiae ad Monrem Sancti Cyriaci 1483* (the monastery’s statutes)—came from the monastery of St. Cyriacus in Braunschweig and is preserved in the Niedersächsisches Landesarchiv-Staatsarchiv in Wolfenbüttel under the call number VII B

---

6 It should be self-evident that the term “organ tablature” applies to any music for contemporary keyboard instruments.

7 For a full reproduction of the source, see Plates 1-4. The information for the description of the fragments is taken from Staehelin, “Norddeutsche Fragmente mit Lautenmusik,” 67-69, where additional information on the host codex can be found.
Hs. 264. The main body of the codex was written in the monastery itself and, according to the decoration of the leather covers, was bound in Braunschweig ca. 1485. The fragments of the lute tablature must have been taken from a more substantial collection because, as stated above, their contents do not suggest they are adjacent folios and the lacunae between them can be estimated to have comprised at least several more pages. Furthermore, they show signs of experienced and professional copying, and the organization of the tablatures is dense and coherent, which is suggestive of a comprehensive compilation rather than casual jottings. The fragments could have belonged to a source from the monastery itself, since a second group of binding material in a sister codex from the same bookbinding workshop features pages from another of the monastery’s codices. In any case, they would have come from approximately the same region because the spelling of the incipits that serve as titles to the tablatures is Low German. It is possible that more fragments from this source will come to light in the future, possibly as pastedowns in other codices.

Stachelin dates the tablature to ca. 1460 due to the fact that most of the concordances to the pieces can be found in manuscripts between 1450 and 1465, and they must have been considered outdated by the time the collection was scrapped for binding material in 1485. The Wolfenbüttel fragments would therefore represent the earliest source of music explicitly for the lute in existence and would date from a time when the majority of lute iconography shows the use of a plectrum rather than the fingers to pluck the strings.

**The Kassel Collum Lutine**

(D-Kl, 2° Ms. Math. 31, fols. Ir-Iv & 1r-1v)

The Wolfenbüttel fragments comprise the only known example of a notational system described in the *Kassel Collum Lutine*. The *Kassel Collum Lutine* in turn “clearly is a technical key to help in writing and deciphering the musical signs of a notation that was intended for the

---

8 Ibid., 84.
9 For a full reproduction of the source, see Plates 5 and 6. The information for the description of the fragments is taken from Kirnbauer, “Frühe Instrumentaltablaturen,” and especially Kirnbauer, “Earliest German Sources of Lute Tablature.” See there also for additional information concerning the *Kassel Collum Lutine.*
The original function of the *Kassel Collum Lutine* was not always this clear. Before the discovery of the Wolfenbüttel fragments, Christian Meyer had no choice but to lament that a practical example of the tablature system outlined in the *Kassel Collum Lutine* was sadly missing, while Martin Kirnbauer suggested an alternative interpretation that it might have served as a key for lutenists to read contemporaneous German organ tablature.\(^\text{11}\)

The *Kassel Collum Lutine* is a drawing on a single folio-sized paper leaf with the dimensions of 28 x 41 cm that was “originally intended as an independent item which only by chance was later incorporated into the codex.”\(^\text{12}\) It contains on one side the inscription “COLLV[M] LVTINE” confined to quarto format, thus confirming that it was kept as a twice-folded single leaf. On the other side it features the partial drawing of a five-course lute with half the body and a complete neck surrounded by notational signs and explanations. At some point, “half of the page was glued onto the front inside cover of the codex and served as a preliminary page. It was removed during the recent restauration [sic] of the manuscript and then rejoined, now with the folio numeration 1r-v & 1r-v.”\(^\text{13}\)

The paper features an incomplete “ox head” watermark, which, however, cannot be dated or placed any more precisely than to the fifteenth century and the area of Piedmont / Vosges / Upper Rhine, partly because it is now bound to the front of the host codex, and the fold hides some of the details. The codex came to the Kassel library from the nearby Chorherrenstift St. Peter in Fritzlar when it was secularized in 1804. It contains a *Quadrivium* compendium with mathematical, astronomical writings and a musical treatise on plainchant. The provenance of Fritzlar is backed by a number of clues, such as a known scribal hand from the town and local names mentioned in the codex. Due to the paper, the handwriting, and the fact that five-course lutes were in use until the beginning

---

10 “... das Kasseler Lautenkragen-Blatt ist seiner Funktion nach offenbar ein technischer Schlüssel, der helfen soll, musikalische Zeichen in der hier intendierten lutenmusikalischen Notation zu schreiben oder zu lesen ...”: Stachelin, “Norddeutsche Fragmente mit Lautenmusik,” 72. As Kirnbauer points out, similar representations of lute necks with essential “information for tuning and basic music terms are often seen in manuscripts and prints from the sixteenth century, and they were apparently an important part of lessons on instruments.” Such diagrams were also sold separately, sometimes for surprisingly high prices; see Kirnbauer, “Earliest German Sources of Lute Tablature,” 188.


12 Kirnbauer, “Earliest German Sources of Lute Tablature,” 175.

13 According to Kirnbauer the foliation is “I, II, 1r + v.” Ibid.
of the sixteenth century (although outdated by then), Kirnbauer dates the *Kassel Collum Lutine* to the second half of the fifteenth century with a terminus ante quem of ca. 1500.\(^4\) A color reproduction of the opening showing the *Kassel Collum Lutine* (fols. Iv-1r) is given in Kirnbauer’s publication in reduced format. The back half of the leaf, which carries the title “COLLV[M] LUTINE” (fol. 1v) is reproduced in black and white.\(^5\)

In the top left column of folio Iv the *Kassel Collum Lutine* features a list of signs that are named and provided with written out examples. They are *singna equivalencia* (signs for marking alternative fret positions), *suspiria* (semiminim rests that can also function as ties for dotted rhythms), *semitongis* (signs for chromatic alteration), *cardinalia* (fermata or “pausa” signs), *singna sursum traxionis* (indicating an upstroke pluck), *reincepciones* (repeat signs), *mordante* (ornamented notes), and *concordancie* (two or more notes tied together in chords).\(^6\) Some of the multiple examples provided for every symbol demonstrate different manifestations of the same sign (*semitongis, mordante, concordancie*), while others are clearly repeated to follow a layout pattern (*singna equivalencia, suspiria, singna sursum traxionis*), in some cases featuring alternative shapes without apparent differences in meaning (*cardinalia, reincepciones*) but always with three examples.\(^7\)

The column at the top right of fol. Iv gives a list of mensural notes, starting with the *longa* and—added later—rests of different values with their corresponding signs. The list omits a sign for the *breve*. This might be because it would normally appear only in final positions and therefore usually in chords; ergo, these *breves* would be bound in *concordancie*, which in this system are always connected by stems making the *breves* almost indistinguishable from the *longs*. The sign for the *semibreve* is furthermore erroneously named “brevis,” which is probably a scribal error due to the gap in the system: *longa*, [semi]brevis, minima, semiminima, *tripla*, *fusela*.\(^8\) The rests are provided without names, but

---

\(^4\) All of the information pertaining to the *Kassel Collum Lutine* and its host codex are taken from *ibid.*, 171-204.

\(^5\) *Ibid.*, 172 and 177.

\(^6\) *Ibid.*, 178, n. 11: “The singular spelling of ’singna’ (instead of ’signa’) and ’semitongis’ (instead of ’semitonis’) could be an indication as to the origin and context of the scribe.” Kirnbauer does not entertain any further thoughts concerning this observation.

\(^7\) A full description, explanation, and contextualization of the signs can be found in *ibid.*, 179-82.

\(^8\) Kirnbauer suggests that this inconsistency is a special variant of certain tablature notations: “At first glance this could be interpreted as a simple error, but the same ’error’ occurs
are given with the signs and values of a perfect breve (3 semibreves), a long (6 semibreves), a semibreve, and a minim. The semiminim rests are represented by the above mentioned suspiria from the left column. An addition to this column explains the principle of using a clear hierarchy of stems and flags for the short note values in tablature notation as opposed to the custom of using empty and filled note heads in mensural notation:

![Tablature Notation Diagram]

The space below the lute neck is taken up by a tree chart demonstrating the division of tempus perfectum as it is commonly found in treatises on mensural notation. Just as in the column of note values, the level of the breve is omitted with the longa taking its place. Next to the tree chart on the right is another column of carent semitongis (a list of chromatic alterations that are seemingly missing on the lute neck) and claves (names of clefs, but without the corresponding signs for Gamut, c, f, c', g'). Most of these signs point to classical mensural notation of some description (cardinalia, rein-cepcciones, note and rest names, the tree-chart, and most of the clefs), while others seem to additionally point to the practice of notating top lines in German organ tablature (suspiria, semitongis, mordante). Yet, a few do not only draw a connection to later lute technique and practice (singna equivalencia, singna sursum traxionis, the label “in lutis,” and indeed suspiria again) but seem to have no parallel in other sources (concordancie and the clef on Caut). These last two

In another source, the south German organ source mentioned above (D-Mbs Clm 7755). In that manuscript semiminim, minim, longa and duplex long are labeled as 'Figure organisatorum’—missing are semibrevis and brevis—and the corresponding signs for the so-called long and duplex long are in fact the semibrevis and brevis signs.” (Ibid., 182.)

19 See ibid., 182-84, for a thorough description.
20 Some similar examples of concordancie, notes tied by a common stem to represent chords, can be found in the Wroclaw Tablature (PL-WRu I F 687), the Tablature of Wolfgang de Novo Domo (D-Hs ND IV 3225, fol. 13r), and the Erlangen Tablature (DERu 554, fol. 127r), but they are employed sparsely and always only refer to notes of the upper and middle voices, never including the tenor, which is always provided in letter notation. Kirnbauer acknowledges that “a clef for Caut (c) is also indicated which . . . is not found in any other source”; see his “Earliest German Sources of Lute Tablature,” 184. Expecting mensural notation to only feature in the monophonic cantus lines of organ tablatures, he attests that the concordancie “refer to an element of polyphony” (ibid., 182).
items were the only specific characteristics in the *Kassel Collum Lutine* of a tablature system that significantly differs from any known specimen until the discovery of the Wolfenbüttel fragments.

The depiction of the lute itself shows a five-course instrument with nine strings, arranged in four double courses and a single top string. Kirnbauer notes, “The two lowest courses each feature a thicker string on the bass side, thus demonstrating the practice of using octave strings on low [courses].”\(^{21}\) The lute neck has seven visible frets—an arrangement consistent with the fretting of the lute neck given by Virdung in 1511—but Kirnbauer reports that an 8th fret position for the middle course is marked in the fold, and a new high-resolution photographic scan of the source I have consulted confirms this.\(^{22}\)

The lute neck features markings on all fret positions, much like later diagrams of German lute tablature (Figure 1). However, instead of indicating the positions with letters or ciphers they are marked with corresponding pitch names from the Guidonian hand, starting with Gamut for the lowest open course (the pitches of the unfretted strings are marked on the instrument’s rosette on the far right) and going up through almost the entire hand to aalamire on the 7th fret of the top string, the first note of the *superacute*. The inflected pitches are marked with the Latin abbreviation for “-is” in the form of a loop—the diesis sign as it is also used in German organ tablature, where the lower voices are given in letter notation. The only exceptions to this are the already mentioned *singna equivalencia*, which are given as simple note names (f, f-diesis, g, etc.) under an “equivalence sign,” and the *carent semitongis*, the positions below the natural mi-fa-places: b-flat and e-flat. On the *Kassel Collum Lutine* these positions are unconventionally marked with a diesis sign on the next higher note, implying an alteration downwards rather than upwards. In the letter notation of the lower voices German organ tablature allows for this distinction of an alteration upward or downward only for the natural diatonic positions of b-fa (notated as b-rotundum: b) and b-mi (notated as b-quadratum: h). In order to mark the position of e-flat, it uses the pragmatic approach and gives it as d-diesis (d-sharp). The seemingly pedantic approach in the *Kassel Collum Lutine*, however, has a very practi-

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 178. Other depictions from the same time confirm the practice of octave strings on the lowest two courses of five-course lutes, e.g., *Madonna and Child Enthroned* by Giovanni di Piermatteo Boccati, ca. 1455 in the Galleria Nazionale dell’ Umbria, Perugia.

\(^{22}\) Sebastian Virdung, *Musica getutscht und aufgezogen* (Basel, 1511), fol. M1v. Virdung also marks an eighth fret position at least for the top string, however.
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23 In practice this does not pose a real problem, however, since an altered B or E could not have been raised to B-sharp or E-sharp at the time. The upper voices of the German organ tablatures are confronted with the same problem, albeit only for a single line and not the whole polyphonic setting, as is the case in this lute tablature notation.

24 Kirnbauer, “Earliest German Sources of Lute Tablature,” 189.
played top part and/or to perform the lower parts (tenor and contratenor) of a piece[, T]he use of pitch names rather than tablature symbols allows the possibility of reading said lower parts in the same manner as in German organ tablature.”25 He thus connects the concept of the Kassel Collum Lutine with the idea of the fifteenth-century lute duet and the very plausible idea that the intabulations in keyboard sources such as the Buxheimer Orgelbuch (hereafter Bux) and the Lochamer-Liederbuch (hereafter Loch) could have also been performed by a lute duet and may have even been intended for this double usage.26

Although these notions are justified and German organ tablatures could indeed be read by lutenists employing a system similar to what was laid out by Kirnbauer in his interpretation of the Kassel Collum Lutine—soloistic or otherwise—the discovery of the Wolfenbüttel fragments has shown that the Kassel Collum Lutine in fact describes a hitherto unknown tablature notation intended for polyphonic solo arrangements on the lute. It clearly borrows elements from German organ tablature but also employs elements unique to later lute tablature notations.

According to Stachelin the scribe of the Wolfenbüttel fragments was clumsy, yet his hand was practiced and the notation contains few errors. Therefore, he concludes that this notational system was by no means experimental or individual but that the two sources at hand actually represent the sole surviving testimonies of a notational system for the lute that was more widely spread prior to the advent of German lute tablature. Once established around the beginning of the second half of the fifteenth century (propagated and possibly invented by Conrad Paumann [ca. 1410-1473]), the system of German lute tablature seems to have dominated the transmission of lute music in German-speaking countries.27 The fact that both sources can be so closely connected, combined with Stachelin’s assessment and the observation that the five-course lute standard belongs firmly in the fifteenth century, puts pressure on the

25 Ibid., 186.
26 D-Mbs Cim. 352b (Buxheimer Orgelbuch, Munich; ca. 1470); D-B Mus. ms. 40613 (Lochamer-Liederbuch, Nuremberg, ca. 1450). One case in point, which the secondary literature keeps citing as an indication toward alternative performance options for these tablatures, is the notation for Bux no. 7, “Jelayamors” (fols. 7r-8r)—“In Cytcars vel etiam In Organis”—that can be interpreted as “suitable to be performed on lutes (possibly a lute duet) and on organs.” For further bibliography on the subject, see also Kirnbauer, “Earliest German Sources of Lute Tablature,” 189, especially n. 61; and Kirnbauer, “Frühe Instrumentaltabulaturen,” 169, especially n. 36.
27 Stachelin, “Norddeutsche Fragmente mit Lautenmusik,” 77 and 83-84.
dating of the *Kassel Collum Lutine*, pushing it back more towards the middle of the century.\textsuperscript{28}

Staehelin also notes that a comparable repertoire from northern Germany is missing from this time, since the repertoire of the Wolfenbüttel fragments can only be connected to southern German sources.\textsuperscript{29} However, the connection to *Schedels Liederbuch* (hereafter *Sebe*) via one concordance and an anecdote (see below the sections on “Myn trud gheselle” and “Gruß senen Ich im hertzen traghe”) that was begun in Leipzig provides a starting point, as do the few organ tablatures that contain a similar repertoire from the Low German regions, such as the *Winsen Fragment* from 1431 (D-B theol.q.290, fols. 56v–58r) and the *Tablature of Adam Ileborgh of Stendal* from 1448 (Paris, private collection).\textsuperscript{30}

**Arguments for a Lute Tablature**

The Wolfenbüttel fragments do not provide any direct indication regarding which instrument they were intended for. At first glance their similarity to organ tablatures seems striking, and Staehelin has pointed out that both systems share a notational language and concept. Both Meyer and Kirnbauer have also helped working towards opening the boundaries between the seemingly independent instrumental worlds of organ and lute, convincingly showing that they share common elements in their notational systems as well as in their stylistic features.\textsuperscript{31} Not only do the tablatures in the Wolfenbüttel fragments have a number of shared notational signs in common with organ tablatures, they also present numerous features in the instrumental treatment of preexisting material, which can be linked to typical organ arrangements from the same time, namely, those of *Bux* and *Loch*. Surviving Italian organ tablatures from the fifteenth century even seem to share the concept of purely mensural tablatures—such as the *Codex Faenza* (I-FZc 117) and the *Perugia Fragments* (I-PEc MS 3410, 1-2-3-4-5-6). Unlike the latter, however, the notation of the Wolfenbüttel fragments combines all voices into one system, and unlike all of the above it does not depict

\textsuperscript{28} Johannes Tinctoris was the first to mention a six-course lute ca. 1480 in his treatise *De inventione et usu musicæ*; see Kirnbauer, “Frühe Instrumentaltablaturen,” 168-69, n. 33.

\textsuperscript{29} Staehelin, “Norddeutsche Fragmente mit Lautenmusik,” 75-76.

\textsuperscript{30} D-Mbs cgm 810 (*Schedels Liederbuch, Leipzig/Augsburg/Nuremberg* ca. 1460-1470).

\textsuperscript{31} Staehelin, “Norddeutsche Fragmente mit Lautenmusik,” especially 73.
voice leading and does not feature “tactus” lines at regular intervals (usually breve or tempus units).

A comparison with the diagrams of the Kassel Collum Lutine answers the most pressing questions surrounding the notation of the Wolfenbüttel fragments: the distinction made in the Kassel Collum Lutine between individual notes and chords (concordancie) makes it clear that the Wolfenbüttel fragments present a notation that neither differentiates between individual voices nor shows voice leading, which is left to the discretion of the players who would discern it by ear from the musical context. Instead it presents—like all later lute tablatures—a notation that only shows the placement of the next note or chord in relation to the preceding one or, in other words, the initial impacts of notes and chords, a notation that I refer to as “strike notation.” At first sight the notation appears overwhelmingly confusing and decisions about whether notes are meant to be played together or separately seem difficult. But once it is realized that notes not bound in concordancie (i.e., individual notes) are always intended to be played one after another and that chords are always combined with a stem to form concordancie, the musical text becomes decipherable.

Another striking feature—the eight-line system—indeed occurs similarly (often with seven lines) in a number of German organ tablatures but usually with only three clefs (f, c', g') and never intended for the notation of the tenor, which is always given in the standard letter notation. The only comparable system for organ tablature that combines all voices in a nine-line system, albeit with different colors for different voices and with clear voice leading, can be found in the anonymous composition treatise Natura delectabilissimum from ca. 1476 (D-Rp Th. 98, p. 342). It comprises just one line of music and features four clefs (c, f, c', f') including the rare case of another Cfaut-clef. When all of the claves from the Kassel Collum Lutine are applied—with the lowest resting on the bottom line and the highest on the top line—the result is an eight-line system, which is exactly how the Wolfenbüttel fragments present it (Figures 2 and 3):

---

32 Not to be confused with “stroke notation,” a simplified form of mensural notation working with the concept of adding the basic units of the notation in order to form longer note values, thus enabling musicians not learned in the intricacies of mensural notation to read certain types of it by merely counting its units.
The Wolfenbüttel fragments feature an array of five clefs at the beginning of each system (g, c, f, cc, gg), corresponding to the claves in the Kassel Collum Lutine (Gamaut, Cfaut, faut, cc, gg). The clef for the lowest line is slightly misleading in that it is a lowercase “g” instead of a capital “G,” or better, even a “Γ” (Gamut). The context, however, clarifies that the “g” stands in lieu of a Gamut, since the next higher octave is represented by lowercase letters, where the same sign (a lower case “g”) would have appeared again. The Wolfenbüttel fragments do not stand alone in this: Bux has a very similar solution for notes below “c” in the letter notation of the lower voices, which are not specifically marked but receive the same letters as in the octave above and must be distinguished by the musical context. Both the position of the unusual Cfaut-clef in a space rather than on a line and the lowercase “g” to represent Gamut add to the confusion of the notation in the Wolfenbüttel fragments and led to a number of misreadings in the first transcription of the tablature by Stachelin.  

One of the most unsettling features of the notation is that it does not seem to provide a specific setting on the fingerboard of the instrument, as is the case with every other known lute tablature system. Instead it gives the impression of pure mensural notation, a “Klangschrift”

---

Stachelin, “Norddeutsche Fragmente mit Lautenmusik,” 85-88. All the tablatures are transcribed one octave too high, leading Stachelin to observe that the intabulations seem to have been transposed up as compared to the vocal models, possibly in order to stay within the range of the lute (ibid., 73-74). With the correct reading of the clefs, however, it turns out that, on the contrary, the pitch level of the intabulations appears to be transposed down for reasons that will become apparent later. Furthermore, numerous cases of Sekundverschreibung (slips of the pen by the interval of a second) in the transcriptions can be attributed to an editorial misreading of the position of the Cfaut clef to an adjacent line rather than the intended space.
(sound notation) rather than a “Griffschrift” (notation of fret positions), as Staehelin puts it. Lute tablatures usually work like coordinate systems, where the courses are represented by a range of parallel, horizontal lines while the intended fret positions are indicated on said lines by letters or numbers. German lute tablature has a very different appearance but employs the same system, in essence, combining the information for the horizontal (which string) and vertical position (which fret) into one symbol that represents both and therefore does not require horizontal lines. These systems do not tell us which finger should be put where, but they convey information on where on the fingerboard the intabulator intended a certain note to be fretted, which is crucial as there often is more than one possibility. However, as Kirnbauer observes, the “principle that the Kassel page shows is in fact not unlike that of German lute tablature: in both systems one sign shows one fret position, whereas in Italian and French tablatures two sign elements are required.” Even more so, since the Kassel Collum Lutine applies unambiguous names rather than signs to the different fret positions, including alternative fret positions for the same note (marked as singna equivalencia), the mensural notes of the Wolfenbüttel fragments can be linked to exact positions on the fingerboard. Thus, although the notation appears to be a “Klangschrift,” the key to reading it—by the use of “strike notation” and clearly named fret positions—renders it virtually a “Griffschrift.”

As will be shown in the transcriptions below, alternative fret positions are needed in a minimum of five places throughout the surviving notation to render the settings in the Wolfenbüttel fragments playable. Even though the system appears to allow for their designation using the singna equivalencia, the alternative positions are not marked in the surviving notation. This may be due to the fact they are rarely necessary and usually fairly obvious in the surviving arrangements. Also, it is hard to imagine how the singna could have been applied to the notation, especially for individual notes within chords. It may be that these signs were merely reserved for didactic purposes such as the marking of written-out note names on the lute neck in lute tutors and not intended for the ac-

35 Kirnbauer, “Earliest German Sources of Lute Tablature,” 188. The appearance of the Kassel Collum Lutine alone is another case in point, which seems to fulfill the exact same function as the numerous depictions of lute necks with marked fret positions in the German lute tutors by Virdung, Agricola, Gerle, Newsidler, and others.
tual notation. Nevertheless, the application of *equivalencia* in the *Kassel Collum Lutine* clearly indicates awareness on behalf of the inventor or the scribe that certain notes need to be portrayed in different “equivalent” ways on the lute.

Another aspect strengthens this interpretation. Kirnbauer has noted on several occasions that the “given tuning—Gam(maut), Cfa(ut), Ela(mi), alam(ire), dla(solre)—can be interpreted in two ways: either as the relative interval sequence from low strings to high as fourth, third, fourth and fourth, in other words, the five upper courses of a six-course lute. Alternatively the tuning gives the sounding pitches G-c-e-a-d₁ as the lower five courses of a six-course G-lute.”³⁶ (See Figure 4 below.) The problem with the second interpretation is the position of the third, which disagrees with the surviving evidence on early lute tunings. Kirnbauer notes, “The noticeable difference with the third course, e instead of f, is difficult to explain for the tuning G-c-f-a-d₁ is already given in 1482 by Bartholomé Ramos de Pareja for a five-course lute (“lyra”) in his *De Musica Tractatus sive Musica practica*.”³⁷ This conundrum can be solved when the low tuning with “e” instead of “f” is viewed as the “normal” setup for the upper five courses of a bass lute in D: (D), G, c, e, a, d’. If the open course “e,” however, were changed to “f,” some of the *concordancia* in the Wolfenbüttel fragments would be rendered unplayable. Furthermore, taken literally as sounding pitches, the tuning would result in a very low-pitched instrument, fit for playing the lower parts of a composition in a middle register, as Kirnbauer has also suggested, but entirely uncharacteristic of solo arrangements as they are presented in the Wolfenbüttel fragments.

---

³⁶ Ibid., 186, but see also Kirnbauer, “Frühe Instrumentaltabulaturen,” 168. In Kirnbauer d₁ = d’.
³⁷ Kirnbauer, “Earliest German Sources of Lute Tablature,” 186.
It appears that Kirnbauer’s first assumption was correct: the note names of the open strings in the *Kassel Collum Lutine* must refer to the relative intervals of the courses, while the lowest possible note on the instrument was simply named “Gamaut” regardless of the actual pitch level of the instrument. Such a practice can be traced back to the three vielle tunings given by Hieronymus de Moravia in his *Tractatus de Musica*, where the string tuned to the lowest pitch is always labeled as “T” (Gamut), despite the fact that no string on a vielle played in the customary *da braccio* style of his time could have sounded anywhere near a pitch level that for a singer would have been associated with Gamut—even when assuming a wide and flexible range of pitch standards at the time.\(^{38}\)

The resulting tuning fits the evidence neatly: the later system of German lute tablature clearly supports the idea that the lowest course—the sixth—was added last and without which would leave us with the five-course lute that was standard for much of the fifteenth century. The five-course instrument would have had its lowest string at a pitch around c or d, thus sounding a fourth or fifth higher than notated. The notation of the Wolfenbüttel fragments thus turns out to be transposed with regard to the sounding pitch of the instrument. This does not necessarily mean that players themselves were expected to transpose when reading the tablature but rather would have learned the note names on their instrument, starting with Gamut on the lowest string, and then played the already transposed tablatures. Since the tablatures appear to be transposed down in relation to the notation of the intabulated songs in the parallel sources (see n. 33 above), these transpositions would cancel each other out, resulting in the tablatures sounding at the original pitch of the songs in performance. The synoptic editions of the tablatures below will exemplify this process more clearly.

It is possible that the use of the lowest note, Gamut, for the open fifth course in the tablature system of the *Kassel Collum Lutine* and the Wolfenbüttel fragments could have been instrumental in its ultimate demise: the system was not open for changes in the setup of the lute—such as an added sixth course—without the necessity of redesigning the whole system. A new lowest course would have resulted in at least a nine-line system and a transposition of all other courses to accommodate the new Gamut. As a result, everybody who had learned to read this system would

---

\(^{38}\) Despite the vague idea of pitch levels in an era without standardization, Gamut would have been associated with one of the lowest singable notes.
have to relearn it, and all “lute neck” drawings would have been rendered null and void.

Since the note names on the lute neck in the *Kassel Collum Lutine* likely do not represent sounding pitch, they move another step closer to the concept of fret positions and away from a “Klangschrift,” confirming that this notation indeed is a lute tablature. It is probably needless to say that at no point is there a note placed below the pitch of Gamut in the Wolfenbüttel fragments, a fact that would have seriously compromised the argument in favor of a pure lute tablature system and render that note unplayable without a scordatura tuning. On the contrary, when played on a five-course lute with the third placed between the second and third course (e.g., the upper five courses of a lute in G: c, f, a, d’, g’ or, probably more common in the fifteenth century, in A: d, g, b, d’, a’) it turns out that every note and chord of the tablature is playable without much effort as will be shown by the transcriptions below in French lute tablature, a system that assigns clear fret positions. This is another strong point in favor of attributing the tablature to the lute, since not every imaginable chord that uses notes from the tessitura of the instrument can actually be played on it. This contrasts with the “lute tablature” by Sebastian Virdung, which presents the player with a multiplicity of impossible fingerings where multiple notes are meant to be played simultaneously on the same string and which therefore is not practical for performance—though it may be argued that Virdung merely tried to show the first steps in an intabulation process, leaving out the subsequent steps of conflating the rhythms and employing alternative fret positions for impossible fingerings.39

Two more signs from the *Kassel Collum Lutine* can be found in the Wolfenbüttel fragments, establishing the relationship between the two sources even further: one case of a *cardinalis* (fol. Bv) and two instances of *reincepciones* (fols. Ar and Br), which are very similar in shape to their equivalents in the *Kassel Collum Lutine*.

Putting aside the evidence of the *Kassel Collum Lutine*, one could make the argument that the Wolfenbüttel fragments could have been meant to be played at pitch using a standard six-course lute in G—after all, it starts with a low G and was the standard lute from the beginning

---

of the sixteenth century. However, as has been shown above, this would result in a slightly different internal setup of the lute strings, and although most of the surviving notation in the Wolfenbüttel fragments would be rendered performable, three chords in the intabulation of “Cum lacrimis” (A, c-sharp, e, a [original]—e, g-sharp, b, e’ [transposed]—in bars 55, 56, and 60 of the transcription below) would be unplayable. Additionally, the top string would be almost unnecessary because hardly any of the intabulations would touch it. This would be very unidiomatic because the “quintsait” (“fifth string,” as the highest string was named in later German lute tutors: more evidence for the notion of an early five-course standard) had the brightest sound and was amply used in lute arrangements.  

The presented evidence conclusively proves that the Wolfenbüttel fragments constitute the unique examples in a notational system that is laid out in the Kassel Collum Lutine and thus were clearly meant for the lute rather than another instrument (which does not mean that they cannot be played on other instruments such as keyboard instruments or the harp). It also shows more specifically that the intended instrument was a five-course lute set up like the upper five courses of the (later) six-course lute with the highest course probably tuned to the pitch a’. The piece-by-piece transcription and analysis below will seek to answer questions concerning tuning and transposition, and furthermore show that the intabulations are not only idiomatic for this instrument but that they also concur with a playing style that was still the standard in the mid-fifteenth century, which suggests that this source could have been intended for performance using a plectrum.

It should not be surprising to find that not all of the signs laid out in the Kassel Collum Lutine are also found in the Wolfenbüttel fragments. Some of these signs (suspiria, mordante, the note value of the tripla, and all the rests) may simply not have been needed for the intabulations at hand; others (singa equivalencia, singa sursum traxionis), however, are particularly idiomatic for the lute, and one can only muse about why they were not used (see above). Furthermore, some of the signs found in both sources (cardinalia, reincepciones, semitongis) have

40 “The open strings are designated by the numbers 1 to 5 from the lowest to the highest, the highest sounding course significantly referred to as the ‘quintsait’ even after more strings had been added to the instrument,” Hiroyuki Minamino, “Conrad Paumann and the Evolution of Solo Lute Practice in the Fifteenth Century,” Journal of Musicological Research 6 (1986): 299-300.
slightly differing though recognizable shapes, and it may be worth noting that, just like in German organ tablatures, not all of the necessary chromatic alterations are actually marked (as will be shown in the transcriptions below), especially in extensive fusela runs of the cantus line.

On the other hand, all of the signs in the Wolfenbüttel fragments are also explained in the *Kassel Collum Lutine*—with one exception: the *Kassel Collum Lutine* is missing one vital symbol that is featured in the fragments, namely, a way to mark chromatic alteration for notes bound in chords. It may have been forgotten and thus excluded from the lists. The way to mark musica ficta for single lines was taken over from German organ tablature, and in the *Kassel Collum Lutine* it consists of a downward stem from the note in question (the Wolfenbüttel fragments feature an additional slightly tilted dash crossing the downward stem, thus visually amplifying the sign). This principle can not be applied to *concordancie*, since a (crossed) downward stem would be too unspecific, either suggesting that all of the notes in the chord should be altered or leaving the matter undecided as to which notes are meant. The solution in the Wolfenbüttel fragments is elegant and simple: since the note heads in the *concordancie* consist merely of short parallel lines to the left of the combining stem, the scribe used the empty space to the right of the stem to add identical lines (I refer to these as “double note heads” below) to those notes that needed to be altered (Figure 5).

![Figure 5. Wolfenbüttel fragments [WolfT], fol. Ar. Chromatic alterations in concordancie (second note heads to the right of the shared stem).](image)

As has been shown, the identification of the Wolfenbüttel fragments as a five-course lute tablature does not solely rely on confirmation from the *Kassel Collum Lutine* either. The use of “strike notation” (which cannot be found in any of the organ tablatures, but which is the standard in all systems of lute tablature), the fact that all voices of the arrangement are condensed into one system (which is extremely rare in organ tablatures but again to be found in every other lute tablature), the idiomatic lutenistic character of the arrangements and fingerings (laid out below), and the observation that every note in the source lies within the tessitura of the five-course lute and every chord is playable on the instrument complete the picture to prove without reasonable doubt that the Wolfenbüttel fragments indeed are lute tablatures.
The minor differences between the Kassel Collum Lutine and the Wolfenbüttel fragments (which therefore likely were not directly connected) only support Staehelin’s notion that this tablature system was a mature and widespread tool, susceptible to change and adaptation, rather than an individual, experimental, and isolated case of a transcription for an instrument.\textsuperscript{41} Or to put it in other words, the diversity of this notational system between different sources is proof of a living practice and directly indicates that it might have been more common in the fifteenth century than the scarce sources imply. The evidently more widespread German organ tablature in its coherent corpus of parallel sources displays a comparable range of variations in layout and use of signs in such sources as Bux, Loch, the Ileborgh Tablature, the Windsheim Fragment, and many more.\textsuperscript{42}

**The Wolfenbüttel Fragments and Organ Tablature: Sharing a Musical Language**

Meyer, Kirnbauer, and Staehelin have repeatedly emphasized that a majority of the signs employed in this tablature system are similar or identical to the signs of German organ tablature. It is obvious that this well-established notation for keyboard instruments provided symbols that were adapted to accommodate the necessities of this lute tablature notation. Therefore, both share common ground. This observation adds to the mounting evidence towards a shared instrumental language in the fifteenth century for instruments on which solo polyphonic performance was possible, namely, the organ (as a pars pro toto for keyboard instruments), the harp, and the lute. Conrad Paumann himself must have been proficient on all three as his tombstone in the Church of Our Lady in Munich bears witness as well as his alleged invention of German lute tablature, which apparently was to supersede the earlier lute tablature of the

\textsuperscript{41} Staehelin furthermore points out that even though the provenance of both sources is northern Germany, Braunschweig and Fritzlar are geographically far enough apart (about 180 km) to assume that they were written independently from one another: see his "Nord-deutsche Fragmente mit Lautenmusik," 83-84. "Diese Einsicht schwächt jeden Gedanken etwa der Art, daß in den Braunschweiger Fragmenten eine bloß individuell-experimentelle und einzelfall-bedingte Umschrift vorgelegen haben könnte . . .": ibid., 83; see also n. 27 of the present study.

Kassel Collum Lutine and the Wolfenbüttel fragments. It is only logical to assume that also the musical and notational styles were shared—of course always allowing for the necessary adjustments to the possibilities, idiomatic aspects, and constraints of the respective instruments.

When the lute first made an appearance as an instrument for polyphonic solo arrangements in mid-fifteenth-century central Europe, the organ could already look back on well more than a century of polyphonic extemporization and a documented practice of instrumental arrangement of vocal music. It therefore seems plausible for the early solo lute repertoire to have been oriented on the example of organ intabulations, especially since the first prominent arrangers of solo lute pieces themselves were also organists. The exchange between solo lute and organ practice must have been particularly fruitful, the former usually taking from the latter, and can be traced well into the sixteenth century, when Hans Newsidler states in the first part of his 1536 lute tutor “for the beginning student” (“für die anfahenden Schuler”) that his arrangements were “set in the manner of the lute and the organ,” which is to say “decorated with short runs and figures.” And his comment to the second part bears more than a hint pointing to the leading role of organ practice even in this time: “Fancies, preludes, psalms, and motets, which were held in highest esteem by the most illustrious and best of organists, are here transformed with particular diligence in the organistic manner and ornamented for the proficient and experienced in this art and presented for the lute.”

The earliest extant examples of lute music in the Wolfenbüttel fragments were consequently approached in much the same way as the

---


44 “... nach Lutanistischer vnd auch Organistischer art... gesetzt” and “mit leufflein vnd Coloraturen gezyert”: Hans Newsidler, Ein neugeordent künstlich Lautenbuc (Nuremberg: Johann Petreius, 1536), fol. a3r. Noteworthy is the obvious orientation of the art of lute ornamentation to that practiced by organists.

45 “Fantaseyen / Preambeln / Psalmen vnd Muteten / die von den Hochberümbten vnd besten Organisten / als einen schatz gehalten / die sein mit sonderm fleyß auff die Organistisch art gemacht vnd coloriert / für die gebülen vnd erfarnen dieser kunst / auff die Lauten dargeben.” Hans Newsidler, Ein neugeordent künstlich Lautenbuch. Der an- der theil des Lautenbuchs (Nuremberg: Johann Petreius, 1536), fol. A1r. For the transfer from organ to lute technique, possibly initiated by Conrad Paumann, see also Minamino, “Conrad Paumann and the Evolution of Solo Lute Practice,” 297.
organ intabulations from the same time: the largely two-voice structure of the intabulations, which is only expanded to a fuller texture when idiomatically suitable, the opening pickup gestures, the cadential ornamentation of the cantus line, the rhythmic play between cantus and tenor, and the occasional bursts of fuselae all bear a semblance to arrangements in Bux and Loch. However, the influence between organ practice and notation and that of the lute, particularly the notational system of the Wolfenbüttel fragments, might not have moved in one direction only: it has long been surmised that the early keyboard tablatures were also suitable for performance on other instruments with the lute taking the lead.

The oft-quoted colophon to Bux, no. 17, “In Cytaris vel etiam In Organis,” might hint at the possibility that a performance of this arrangement (and probably others like it) was intended for the lute just as much as it was for the organ.46

Finding a Name: The Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature (WolfT)

Since both the newly found Wolfenbüttel fragments and the tablature system itself—which is explained in the Kassel Collum Lutine—do not yet have official names, I propose the following terminology: the tablature fragments D-Wa cod. VII B Hs Nr. 264, folios A & B are to be summarized under the name Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature (English) / Wolfenbütteler Lautentabulatur (German) and abbreviated as WolfT. The notation of the tablature system receives a name combining the two currently known sources with this notation: “Kassel-Wolfenbüttel Tablature System” (English) / “Kassel-Wolfenbütteler Tabulatursystem” (German).

46 See especially Robert Crawford Young and Martin Kirnbauer, Frühe Lautentabulaturen im Faksimile/Early Lute Tablatures in Facsimile, ed. Thomas Drescher, Practica Musicale 6 (Winterthur/Schweiz: Amadeus, 2003), 12, n. 10 as well as Kirnbauer’s suggestion of performance with a lute duct: see n. 26 of the present study. “Another interpretation could see the subtitle as a reference to Genesis 4:21—‘et nomen fratris eius Lulab ipse fuit pater cantentium cithara et organo,’ ‘and his brother’s name was Jubal, he was the father of all who play on strings and wind instruments’ (i.e., of all musicians)—by way of praising Binchois [the composer of the model of Bux no. 17, “Je loe amours”] as the greatest master of music.” Crawford Young, “The King of Spain ‘una bassadanza troppo forte,’” Lute Society of America Quarterly 48/1 and 2 (2013): 40–61, especially 47. This interpretation would also fit the depiction that shows the two most famous composers of their time facing each other and holding one of the possible translations of “cytara” in the fifteenth century—a harp—(Binchois) and the other one with an organ (Dufay): see F-Pn fr.12476, Martin le Franc’s Le champion des dames, fol. 98r.
The Contents of the *Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature*

*WolfT* features five polyphonic intabulations of secular songs, three of them incomplete due to the fragmented nature of the source. All of them can be found in concordant sources of the time as monophonic or polyphonic songs or in instrumental arrangements for keyboard instruments. The concordances are comprehensively listed in Fallows’s *Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs*.\(^47\) I have kept Staehelin’s foliation for the fragments (fols. A & B), but for convenience’s sake I introduced a continuous numbering for the pieces (*WolfT* 1-5), aware of the fact that the order of folios A and B could have been reversed in the original source and that there will probably have been a significant gap between *WolfT* 2 and *WolfT* 3:

1. **Cum lacrimis** (*WolfT* 1, fols. Ar-Av): End of the *secunda pars* and the entire *tertia pars* (marked “3a pars Cum lacrimis”) of an intabulation of Johannes Ciconia’s ballata “Con lagrime bagnandome nel viso,” which cannot only be found several times in song collections but also in reworked tablature settings, four times in *Bux* and once in *Loch* (Fallows, 509).

2. **Myn trud gheselle** (*WolfT* 2, fol. Av): *Prima pars* of the German song “Mein traut geselle,” which can be found in *Loch* and *Bux* in almost identical three-voice settings but differing from *WolfT* (Fallows, 467-468).


4. **Ich fare do hyn we[n] eß muß syn** (*WolfT* 4, fol. Bv): Complete tablature of “Ich far dahin,” which is otherwise only transmitted as a monophonic song in *Loch* and as a quotation in two quodlibets from the *Glogauer Liederbuch* (hereafter *Glog*) (Fallows, 449).\(^48\)

---


\(^48\) PL-Kj Mus. 40098 (*Glogauer Liederbuch*, Monastery of Sagan in Silesia, ca. 1480).
5. Ellende du hest vmb vanghen mich (WolfT 5, fol. Bv): Beginning measures of “Elende du hast umfangen mich,” which only survives in a monophonic version in Loch and has a number of organ intabulations: one in Loch and six in Bux (Fallows, 434; the “new setting of similar T” on 435 concerns a different melody and has no connection to the arrangement at hand).

These five tablatures will be presented in the next five sections in facsimile reproductions, diplomatic transcriptions, polyphonic and synoptic editions and will be converted to French tablature notation with additional new information that feeds back into our understanding of the process of intabulation as well as of the model songs. The remainder of this article is dedicated to additional findings on the early lute idiom and the notation of the fragments. The analyses will frequently refer to and contextualize details found in the Kassel Collum Lutine.

The first step in the editorial process is a partial diplomatic transcription in which the eight-line system, the clefs, the absence of tactus lines, the layout of the notes on the system and the arrangement of the musical lines are retained, whereas the notational symbols and ficta signs are transcribed to modern equivalents with halved values (long/breve = whole note, [semi]breve = half note, minim = quarter note, semiminim = eighth note, fusela = sixteenth note). This is to monitor and verify the reading of the original text. All apparent mistakes in the notation are marked with an asterisk (*) and annotated.

The next step is a polyphonic transcription of the musical text into modern notation, separating the individual voices and reconstructing the voice leading. Simultaneously, the score is transposed up by a fifth in order to raise it to sounding pitch when assuming a five-course lute in nominal A tuning. The surprising result is that three out of the five tablatures end up at the same pitch as their concordances (WolfT 2: “Myn trud gheselle,” WolfT 3: “Gruß senen Ich im hertzen traghe,” WolfT 5: “Ellende du hest vmb vanghen mich”), while the concordances of “Cum lacrimis” (WolfT 1) are higher by a third; the pitch level of the concordance of “Ich fare do hyn wen eß muß syn” (WolfT 4) in Loch remains unclear due to the lack of a clef, but it appears to have been intended a fourth lower. It seems that in the cases of these last two tablatures that the arrangements were simply placed in a more comfortable range on the instrument.

The transposition of the Wolfenbüttel notation to a proposed sounding pitch results in requiring an f-sharp for all systems where there is none in the original. This can look paradoxical when the tablature uses
flat signs to cancel out the prescribed accidental. The resulting natural
sign, however, stands in place of a b-flat in the untransposed tablature,
and one should keep in mind that WolfT is essentially a “Griffsschrift,”
showing positions on an instrument that are not necessarily tuned to the
pitches the notation seems to indicate, even if it has the appearance of a
notation providing absolute pitches.

In the final step of the editorial process the polyphonic transcrip-
tion is combined with a transcription of the respective song from a
concordant source into a synoptic edition in order to facilitate the com-
parison of the model and its reworking. Of the two songs that are trans-
mitted at a different pitch level, one is transposed to the reconstructed
sounding pitch of the tablature (WolfT 1), while the tablature for the
other (WolfT 4) is transposed down a fourth. The tenor line, the most
stable voice part in these reworkings, is presented in black notes on the
lower staves with note stems pointed down throughout, again facilitating
comparison; the contratenors are presented on the same staves in gray
with note stems up.

Most of the necessary chromatic alterations in WolfT are marked
in the manuscript. A number of necessary and other likely alterations of
individual notes, however, were not notated and in the following trans-
scriptions are written above the corresponding notes, thus marking them
as suggestions by the editor.

In order to visualize how the tablatures of WolfT sit on a five-
course lute and in order to put them to a practical test, I chose to transfer
them to a tablature notation that makes the fingerings graphically visible
(in this case the already mentioned French tablature). To facilitate the
identification of voice leading, I also added lines to indicate the duration
of sustained notes. In most cases the transfer was straightforward using
the standard fingering positions. Very rarely, however, equivalencia need
to be applied to render a certain chord playable. These instances are easy
to spot in the tablature for the trained eye, but I also point them out in
the accompanying text. Occasionally, the use of equivalencia might be
advisable in order to make a fingering more comfortable or to support
voice leading. The chords generally tend to fall on adjacent courses, thus
making it easy to play them not only by plucking with the fingers but
also by strumming them with a finger, thumb, or plectrum. In a few
cases, the natural fret positions would result in “split chords,” meaning
that the player would have to bridge an intermediate string that is not
part of the chord. This is of course easy enough when plucking the strings
with fingers. However, when using a plectrum or a technique employ-
ing something between finger and plectrum playing, as is suggested by
the overwhelming presence of idiomatic left-hand fingerings in the tablatures, these chords can usually be realized by either muting the intermediate string, by fretting it (adding a note that is not in the tablature), or by using an equivalent position.49

Part II—The Transcriptions

WolfT 1: Cum lacrimis (fols. Ar-Av)

On folios Ar-Av WolfT contains the second half of a lute arrangement of Johannes Ciconia’s two-voice ballata “Con lagrime bagnandome nel viso,” “the most widely transmitted of Ciconia’s secular works,” with a text by Leonardo Giustinian.50 It is a lament on the death of Francesco Carrara, who died in 1393 while a prisoner of Gian Galeazzo Visconti in Pavia and who was buried in Padua.

Since the beginning of the arrangement in WolfT is missing, having once stood on the now lost verso page of an original opening, it is by sheer luck that the Latinized incipit to this arrangement has survived: it was repeated with the caption to its third part as “3a pars Cum lacrimis.” The numerous concordances, according to Fallows’s Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs, also include four intabulations in Bux (nos. 38, 137, 138, 139) and one in Loch (no. 73).51 Apparently, this Italian composition was popular in German-speaking lands, particularly as an instrumental arrangement. This is surprising, because the contrapuntal effects of the song, which draw heavily on aesthetics from the bygone Trecento era, appear to be particularly idiomatic for a vocal interpretation and do not seem to lend themselves easily to performance on a solo instrument. Perhaps the success of this song as an instrumental arrangement was owed to the many slow hocket passages where the voices take turns singing short phrases against one another. This effect must have had a certain appeal, especially when performed as a sort of question-and-answer game, resulting in something like an “alternating monophony”—a technique that also suits the plectrum lute.

49 I have made use of all these possibilities in the première recording of the Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature (see n. 1 above). But since this is a matter of personal arrangement and technique, I did not give these alternative fingerings in the transcriptions.
50 See Margaret Bent and Anne Hallmark, eds., The Works of Johannes Ciconia, Polyphonic Music of the Fourteenth Century 24 (Monaco: Éditions de L’oiseau-lyre, 1985), 120.
51 Fallows, A Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs, 1415-1480, 509.
There might yet have been a nonmusical reason responsible for the popularity of "Con lagrime" as a keyboard intabulation in German sources. Hermann Poll, a medical doctor from Vienna who had completed his wide-ranging studies in Pavia in the 1390s—the place and time of Gian Galeazzo Visconti's musical patronage—and in 1400 became the physician of the new German king, Ruprecht of the Palatine” in Heidelberg, was credited in 1397 with the invention of the clavicembalum. “At this time, not only the political tensions, but also the cultural connections between the Carrara dynasty of Padua and the Visconti of Lombardy focused precisely on the alliance with or against the German king, who was preparing to campaign in northern Italy.” A campaign eventually took place in 1401 in which, incidentally, the young Oswald von Wolkenstein was also to be involved. After having been convicted of attempting to poison the king, Poll “was executed in Nuremberg in 1401, leaving behind the memory of ‘an outstanding physician, handsome, well-mannered, 31-year-old master of arts, very literate and a doctor of medicine, an excellent musician on the organ and other musical instruments.’”

The keyboard player and inventor Hermann Poll was in the right place at the right time and with the right instrument at his disposal to take on the keyboard arrangement of a highly topical composition. His subsequent travels to Heidelberg and Nuremberg, despite his short-lived career and tragic end, might have been the main cause for a piece in a strangely outdated style to be so firmly implanted in the German instrumental repertoire of the fifteenth century. Most of the tablatures for this song add a third voice to the two-part texture, thus changing the sound of the setting significantly in an attempt to adapt it to the aesthetics of fifteenth-century counterpoint, which includes the principle of horror vacui: a fear of gaps and emptiness in an arrangement that is filled with additional sonorities, flourishes, ornaments, and runs. The version in WolfT covers a middle ground between the original and the versions extant in German organ tablatures by mainly keeping the two-voice structure while occasionally adding full chords—probably partly to enrich the

---

52 For the citations in the following paragraph, see Reinhard Strohm, *The Rise of European Music 1350-1500* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 92-93, who is also to be credited for pointing out this possible connection (private communication).

53 For the principle of horror vacui particularly at work in keyboard arrangements, see ibid., 124.
fabric of the setting and partly due to technical reasons, namely, to bridge over intermediate courses in order to enable the strumming of chords with one stroke of thumb or plectrum. It is interesting to note that the arrangement in WolfT is divided into three formal units while the original song has only two. Most of the organ tablatures agree with this tripartite form created by subdividing the first formal unit of the model after the 18th breve (or "tempus"). Even though only the latter half of the piece survives here, one can safely assume that the version in WolfT did the same for the division of prima and secunda pars. It is unique, however, in having a repetition sign after the secunda pars. The question of whether only the secunda pars was meant to be repeated or the prima pars as well (the only part that is repeated in some of the other organ tablatures (Bux nos. 137 and 138) must remain unresolved. The ballata form asks for a repetition of the B section and subsequent twofold repetition of the A section (i.e., prima and secunda pars in WolfT). Since the B section does not feature a repetition sign in any of the tablatures (including WolfT), it seems fairly certain that the original form was abandoned for the instrumental arrangement—a characteristic that can be regularly observed in reworkings of forme fixe chansons, be it instrumental (e.g., the organ tablatures such as in Codex Faenza, Bux, and Loch) or as songs (e.g., the contrafacta by Oswald von Wolkenstein).54

Despite the presence of glue stains, the surviving notation is clearly decipherable in the color scan.55

A partially diplomatic transcription (Example 1) in which the manuscript's spacing of the notes is enhanced reveals the nature of the "strike notation" typical for lute tablatures (see above). This piece is the one in WolfT that features the most mistakes and scribal corrections, all of which are marked in the diplomatic transcription below: in the middle of the second line of folio Ar, a concordancia with four notes has an erroneous ficta sign, indicating that a b-natural should be altered to b-flat although the b-natural would have been correct. At the end of the same line, two chromatic alterations appear to have been crossed out, although the first one is probably correct. The third and fourth lines feature three more notes that have a wrong note value. Towards the end of the third

55 For a full facsimile reproduction of the Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature, see Plates 1-4.
line, one note and a ficta sign in a concordancia appear to have been scratched out, even though the deleted note would have created a feasible harmony. Apparently, the scribe accidentally started to write this concordancia a line too low (a typical case of Terzverschreibung—a slip of the pen by one line or space and therefore by the interval of a third), then realized his mistake and replaced the note heads one line higher. A little farther along the same line, another note set a third too high was crossed out and replaced. In the first line of folio Av, a ficta sign in a concordancia was misplaced by a third, and finally in the second line of the same folio, just before the final cadence, a note within a concordancia was moved up by a step. In the latter case, the intabulator himself might have been confused by the fact that the C faux clef designates a space rather than a line. The reasons for the scribe’s insecurity, mistakes, and corrections might be that this arrangement is the longest and most complicated in WolfT, not least because of the position on the instrument for which this song was transposed in order to suit the range of the lute (assuming an lute in A, the transposition is down a minor third from an F mode to the pitch level of D), resulting in some unconventional uses of musica ficta and fret positions.

Example 1. WolfT 1, fols. Ar-Av. Diplomatic transcription of “Cum lacrimis.”
The polyphonic transcription (Example 2) shows how the polyphonic texture, with its complete cantus and tenor line, is embedded in the tablature. The voice leading is now entirely clear. The long, rhythmic hocket passages towards the cadences of each section, with their characteristic change of texture, are highly reminiscent of the intabulation techniques used in a number of pieces from Bux, where the contratenor voice rests while cantus and tenor are engaged in a battle of rhythmic wit. Also the slow hocket passage (bars 64-69), which is not visually apparent in the original notation, becomes quite apparent in the transcription.

Example 2. WolfT 1, fols. Ar-Av. Polyphonic transcription of “Cum lacrimis.”
A comparison of WolfT 1 with the original ballata by Ciconia reveals how closely the intabulation is modeled on the song (Example 3). For this purpose the song is here transposed down a minor third to match the pitch of the intabulation, resulting in the need to add several accidentals:

Example 3. Synoptic edition of passage from Johannes Ciconia, “Cum lacrimis,” F-Pn 568, fols. 52v-53r (top two staves); and WolfT 1, fols. Ar-Av (bottom two staves).
Example 3. Continued

2. O me do-len
3. Ay cru-da mor

2. O me do-len
3. Ay cru-da mor

3a pars Cum lacrimis

left cut in WolfT
Example 3. Continued

Admittedly, the intabulator took some liberties: for example in bar 49 (bar 48 of the song) the cantus motif is transposed down by a fourth, resulting in parallel thirds rather than the original parallel sixths. This could be due to a desire to avoid split chords (in this case dyads) on the lute and to place simultaneous notes on adjacent courses. This preference could suggest a playing technique that favors strumming over plucking. The tablature also omits or adds the occasional breve (see bar 44 of the tablature and bars 53-54 and 74 of the song), but the overarching structure that is common to the original and the arrangement can be traced well throughout the surviving parts.

The conversion of WolfT 1 into French tablature notation (Example 4) demonstrates that this arrangement fits the lute particularly well. The setting is arranged in such a way that nearly all simultaneous notes naturally fall on neighboring courses, enabling the player to strum
them with a finger or plectrum. Only in two places does a split chord occur (bars 47 and 59). The first of these (bar 47), however, can easily be circumvented by muting the intermediate second course with the same (the little) finger that frets the lowest string, which would happen almost automatically anyway. Alternatively, one could use a version of the chord with equivalencia that would place it entirely on adjacent courses. The second split chord (bar 59) can be resolved by merely fretting the intermediate string and thus adding a note. Three more places would benefit from an alternative fretting, in each case to assist voice leading. In bar 61, the lower note of the first chord (the tenor note of the dyad) could be fretted instead of played on the open course, thus allowing it to be held until the end of the bar rather than being interrupted by the entry of the contratenor note in the middle of the bar. This additional equivalencium would, however, result in a new split chord. The second and fourth notes of bar 64, if fretted as equivalencia, would support the impression that the first note is the arrival point of the cantus, whereas the following notes belong to the tenor. In bar 68, the two notes on the open third course (b in the transcription) could instead be fretted on the fourth in order to place all notes of this bar on courses that feature octave strings. Therefore, the line would sound more coherent and at the same time include the range of the cantus, which would otherwise be resting inexplicably. The only place in this piece where an alternative fret position is absolutely necessary is the lowest note of the chord in bar 57.

A striking feature of this arrangement is the use of full chords that often employ thirds even in cadence positions. One reason for this could be to create fuller sonorities, but it seems as if the intabulator mainly aimed to fill the intermediate strings between the tenor and the cantus notes of a dyad in order to avoid split chords so that they can be strummed. Another interesting feature hints at a very specific example of the potential idiomatic usage of the lute, namely, the use of the instrument’s octave strings of the lower courses for melodic purposes. The cantus diminution in bar 67 breaks off abruptly with the entrance of the tenor in bar 68. With the octave string resounding on the first tenor note, this “fissure” in the arrangement is filled in and disguised to a certain degree (even though this does not supply the actual missing cantus note). In bar 68, the tablature has an ornamented tenor line passage that should lead into the cantus on the first beat of the next measure. The entry of the cantus, however, is postponed and comes in a minim late.
With the octave strings the tenor note on the first beat of bar 69 already includes the cantus note, even though it is not notated in the tablature.\textsuperscript{56}


\textsuperscript{56} I would like to thank Ricardo Leitão Pedro for input on this feature during the “Intabulation Class” I held on the \textit{Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature} at the Schola Cantorum Basiliensis in the summer semester of 2015.
**WolfT 2: Myn trud gheselle (fol. Av)**

A note from Johannes Schedel—brother of the famous Hartmann Schedel (1440-1514), whose personal songbook transmits the concordance for *WolfT* 3 ("Gruß senen Ich im hertzen traghe") and who later in his life authored a widely distributed and comprehensive "Weltchronik" (first published in print in 1493)—informs us that he had learned to play the song "Mein traut geselle" on the harp on 18 November 1463.\(^57\) This places the existence of an arrangement of the work for an instrument other than the organ in exactly the same period that Staehelin dates *WolfT*, which contains a version of it on folio Av. Unfortunately, the lute version is not complete here. Though only a fragment, it still holds important information concerning intabulation techniques and the instrumental realization of a song form because it includes not only the entire *prima pars* but also the bridge to the *secunda pars*.

The diplomatic transcription (Example 5) provides an overview of the extant parts of "Myn trud gheselle." It is notated without any apparent mistakes, and it appears that all necessary chromatic alterations were marked. The notation of this piece also highlights a problem with this tablature system: there seems to be no sign designated to represent the *punctus additionis*. The *Kassel Collum Lutine* does not mention this feature and is therefore of no help. It would have been natural to use the standard sign of the dot from mensural notation, but that could perhaps have been confused with the "double note head," which is reserved for musica ficta within chords (*concordancie*). One could also have employed rests or *suspiria* to represent dotted rhythms, as is occasionally done in *Bux*, but *WolfT* contains no rests at all, even though the *Kassel Collum Lutine* clearly describes rests (if only as a later addition). Perhaps the intabulator meant to occasionally represent dotted rhythms by the combination of a note with its next lower value, much as in the case of minor color in mensural notation. However, these places are not indicated in the tablature by coloration or other means and would have to be

---

\(^{57}\) The note is found in D-Mbs cgm 409, fol. 1r and reads "Item der alt holezel ist verstorben / acht tag an sant / kathein tag / oder acht tag noch sant merten / tag 1463 / Vnn an dem selbigen tag / lernt ich auff der harpffen / zum aller ersten mein traut / gheselle." Quoted from Martin Kirnbauer, *Hartmann Schedel und sein "Liederbuch. Studien zu einer spätmittelalterlichen Musikhandschrift (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, Cgm 810) und ihrem Kontext*, Publikationen der Schweizerischen Musikforschenden Gesellschaft 242 (Bern: Peter Lang, 2001), 79.
inferred from the musical context alone. This situation occurs only with the combination of semibreve and minim. All other dotted rhythms in the music are expressed by a clever distribution of the rhythms of the individual voices as revealed in the polyphonic transcription (Example 6). A particularly tricky section of such counter rhythms can be found just before the final cadence of the A section (bar 8).

**Example 5.** *WolfT* 2, fol. Av. Diplomatic transcription of ‘Myn trud gheselle.’

---

**Example 6.** *WolfT* 2, fol. Av. Polyphonic transcription of “Myn trud gheselle.”

---

The text of “Mein traut geselle” was written by the Monk of Salzburg (fl. late fourteenth century), who had set it monophonically to a different melody. The later polyphonic arrangement at hand, however, is musically independent from the version by the Monk and is elsewhere transmitted only anonymously in *Loch* (no. 40, pp. 38–39) and *Bux* (no. 21, fol. 9v) in almost identical three-voice settings, though it is also cited
several times in other works.\textsuperscript{58} The \textit{WolfT} version of this piece is based on the same cantus-tenor framework. It occasionally includes additional notes or chords, which are idiomatic for the lute and help to thicken the texture but do not draw on the original contratenor, as can be seen in the synoptic edition (Example 7):


\textsuperscript{58} See Fallows, \textit{A Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs, 1415-1480}, 467-68.
Most curiously, the song version in *Loch* and the tablature in *Bux* both explicitly call for a repetition of the *prima pars*—a fact which is, however, not substantiated by the poetic form of the song text, which is also not underlaid in the source—while the *WolfT* arrangement continues directly into the *secunda pars*, even ignoring the musical meter (there is an incomplete metrical unit/measure in the tablature). This is surprising, since the Kassel-Wolfenbüttel Tablature System does possess a repetition sign. The intabulator is aware of this possibility and uses it to observe musical form in the case of “*Cum lacrimis*” and “Gruß senen Ich im hertzen traghe.”

As in “*Cum lacrimis*,” the present setting of *WolfT* 2 can easily be transferred to a specific fingering using only basic fret positions with no need for *equivalencia*: all chords fall on neighboring courses, avoiding split chords (Example 8).

**Example 8.** Conversion of *WolfT* 2, fol. Av, “*Myn trud gheselle*” to French tablature.

A new problem, however, occurs when one attempts to reconstruct the missing *secunda pars* using the versions of *Loch* and *Bux* as a basis and model: a few places in the second half of the tenor line would then require a note below Gamut, which by definition does not exist on the instrument since Gamut represents the lowest open string. Admitted-

---

59 A first incomplete strophe is written separately under the notation of the song in *Loch*. In order to accommodate a complete strophe, the repetition would be necessary despite the fact that the rhyme scheme does not suggest a repeated musical form (and the original melody by the Monk of Salzburg also features no repeats).

60 Even the cadential *concordancia* (bar 9) is too short and should have been notated as a breve or long instead of a semibreve. This could have been a mistake by the scribe. However, the shortened bar lends a certain attraction to the changeover into the B section and could have been intended, especially since the complicated counter rhythms toward that cadence lend this section an almost stumbling quality.
ly, most of these occurrences consist merely of ornamental notes, which can be omitted or realized differently. One of them, though, concerns a cadence point and therefore cannot be avoided. A scordatura tuning for the lowest string seems unlikely as it would render certain chords of the surviving bits unplayable and result in false fret positions for all the notes on the course, thus undermining the tablature system. In bar 12 of “Gruß senen Ich im hertzen traghe,” the intabulator gracefully solved a similar problem by simply transposing the unplayable note up a third (see below for further details and musical example). The same pragmatism can be seen in Bux: when the bass note of a penultimate chord would end up below the range of the instrument, it is transposed up by an octave, creating the contrapuntally wrong interval of a fourth against the tenor. The resulting chordal progression, however, must have been sufficiently recognizable to allow for this lapse in voice leading and counterpoint.\(^{61}\) Likewise, the solution in WolfT might have been to substitute a chord that satisfies the aural expectation but at the same time avoids the impossible note. I have applied this approach in my own reconstruction of the piece; it would have been most interesting to see how the original arranger had dealt with the situation.\(^{62}\)

**WolfT 3: Gruß sene[n] Ich im hertzen traghe (fol. Br)**

One of the only two complete pieces in WolfT fills the entire recto side of folio B. Its incipit reads “Gruß senen Ich im hertzen traghe,” and the notation confirms that it is an arrangement of a song that survives anonymously in Sche (fols. 57v-58r) under the same incipit (“Groß senen ich im herz[e]n trag”). Apart from this concordance, only two other citations of the song are listed in Fallows’s Catalogue.\(^ {63}\) Folio Br also features the only rubric in the fragment, obviously added into the free space between two systems after the music notation was completed: it reads “Joh:”; Staehelin suggests that this could be the signature of either Johannes Schorkop or Johannes Mysner, both of whom were canons at

---

\(^ {61}\) For a discussion of the implications of the “fourth-cadence” in Bux, see Marc Lewon, *Das Lochamer-Liederbuch in neuer Übertragung und mit ausführlichem Kommentar* (Brensbach: Verlag der Spielleute, 2008), 2:5.

\(^ {62}\) For a reconstruction and revised playing edition in French tablature notation favoring plectrum technique and including a synoptic transcription, see Marc Lewon, “A (Re-) Construction of the Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature-Fragments,” *Quarterly of the Lute Society of America* 51/1 (Spring 2016): 12-25.

St. Cyriacus at the time. It is also noteworthy that the incipit was added after the music was notated, as evinced by the space left between the words “im” and “hertzen” to allow for protruding note stems from the system below. It is fairly easy to detect that the text incipits to all the other pieces in the source were also added as a second layer, sometimes overlapping with the musical symbols that were written down before.

The diplomatic transcription (Example 9) confirms previous observations: the notation contains relatively few mistakes (one of which was corrected by the scribe and appears to have been another case of Terzverschreibung—the only other cases of corrected notation can be found in WolfT 1, “Cum lacrimis”) and they again lack the punctus additionis (which was missing already in WolfT 2, “Myn trud gheselle”). Apart from this, the notation poses no problems for transcription.

The polyphonic transcription (Example 10) presents a fully functioning arrangement with a complete structural core of cantus and tenor, with occasional contratenor notes wherever desired or considered idiomatic by the intabulator. Something, nevertheless, is amiss in bar 3: either the first two notes (b'-flat and a') should both be read as fuselae in order to fit into the bar (which, however, would render that place startlingly active, even hectic), or the note b'-flat is actually meant to be crossed out rather than altered and thus should be viewed as a mistake. A third option would be that the intabulator meant to expand this measure to a length of five instead of four minims, which is not unthinkable (and possibly another expression of a “Spielvorgang”) but quite unusual at least in written music of the time (Example 11).

**Example 10. WolfT 3, fol. Br.** Polyphonic transcription of “Gruß senen Ich im hertzen traghe.”
Example 10. Continued


As shown in the synoptic edition below (Example 12), the original song features a b-flat neighbor note at this approximate position, which would in any case speak for a version including the note. Furthermore, there is a problem with the rhythm in the second half of bar 5 just after the crossed-out minim. I opted for a version that minimizes the amount of dissonance while only using existing material, but other solutions are possible. The major third in the chord of bar 20 is not in the source. It could be assumed, though, that the intabulator felt the alteration of the same chord in bar 19 still to be in effect (even though the notation seems to require each chromatic alteration to be marked). Curiously, the intabulation features a number of unsupported fourths (bars 7, 9, and 19) that could have been avoided by choosing a different contratenor note. They might, however, be explained by the instrumental idiom: if the arrangement was to be played with a plectrum, then it would have been desirable for simultaneous notes to fall on adjacent courses, resulting in comfortable fingerings on the lute that can be strummed with little effort. In the first chord of the *secunda pars* (bar 9), only the bassus note g is missing, although it was played just before as part of the last chord of the *prima pars*. The intabulator might
have intended this note to be sustained until the beginning of bar 9, thus complementing the seemingly unsupported fourth.\textsuperscript{64}

The argument for a plectrum lute idiom slightly contradicts the fact that of all of the tablature arrangements in \textit{WolfT}, this one contains the most split chords (nine) when only using the basic fret positions and avoiding \textit{equivalencia}. These appear in bars 6, 9, 10, 11, 12 (twice), 13, and 16 (twice). At the same time this arrangement is the one where the most \textit{equivalencia} need to be applied to render the setting playable. These still amount to only a total of four: the first chord of bar 2, the third chord of bar 7, the final chord of bar 11, and the first chord of bar 23. The \textit{equivalencium} in bar 11 could even be avoided by substituting the missing note with the octave string on the lowest course: when struck, the low d would have its octave automatically resonating, thus making the alternative fretting of the high d superfluous in practice. Since the intabulator obviously used \textit{equivalencia}, it stands to reason that he also intended them to be used to circumvent split chords. Five of the nine split chords could thus easily be avoided using alternative frettings (bars 6, 9, 11, 13, and the second one in bar 16). In two cases (bar 11 and the first chord in bar 12), the notes responsible for split chords are supplied in practice by the octave strings of the respective fourth and fifth courses and might not even have to be fretted or struck separately. Other solutions for the remaining three chords might include already mentioned methods, such as muting the intermediate string(s)—a seemingly unnecessary effort—or filling the split chord with fitting notes, thus changing the arrangement in those places, however. It seems that the intabulator also employed the octave strings of the lower two courses for melodic purposes (for the credit see n. 64; see also the section on “Cum lacrimis” above): at the beginning of bar 3 there is a little figure (b'-flat, a') on the top string immediately followed by an f on the fifth course. Since we have to assume an octave string on this course (see the section above on the \textit{Kassel Collum Lutine}), the result, though not notated, would be the melodic figure of b'-flat, a', f', g', f'-sharp, g' (instead of b'-flat, a', g', f'-sharp, g') in the top line. A little further on, in the second half of bar 7, it appears as if the cantus line was abandoned, and the expected suspension on g' is therefore missing while the arrangement focuses on the descending tenor line.

\textsuperscript{64} I would like to thank Lukas Henning for this personal suggestion, which is also posted in the comment section of my blog for this piece (https://mlewon.wordpress.com/2014/02/27/gruss-senen/).
However, with the octave string on the fourth course, the missing note is automatically supplied in the middle of the bar when the tenor note g is struck. Again, the stringing of the instrument seems to have been used idiomatically to fill in missing notes without having to create unnecessary split chords.

It is surprising that all of the penultimate tenor notes for the most important cadences are missing in this intabulation (note a in bars 3, 8, and 24), even though they could have easily been playable with idiomatic fingering and even on neighboring courses. A reason for this might be that the intabulator tried to facilitate the busy pre-cadential positions for the player. Since the lone bassus note d in these places is always supplied with a simultaneous sounding octave, the sonority would still be fairly—maybe even sufficiently—rich to fulfill aural expectations.

Example 12. Continued

schaft das sie mich meiden thut. Nu beiss ich nicht, wer
ich do bin, das betrübet ser das herz mein. Ich
The synoptic edition shows that this lute arrangement is modeled extremely closely on the polyphonic song, even though the version in *Sche* is unlikely to have been directly consulted for the tablature. The tenor seems to be taken almost verbatim from the song, while the cantus is merely an ornamented version of the original top line. Both the occasional segments of a contratenor and the idiomatically “beefed-up”
chords are expected elements of this setting. The repetition of the *prima pars*, an aspect inherent to the song form, is clearly marked in the tablature.

On the second beat of bar 11 we encounter a problem of the instrument’s range: according to the song model transmitted in *Sche*, one would expect the tone below the Gamut of the instrument (c in the transcription), which is avoided here by an upward step. This solution could be the clue for sorting out the passage in the missing *secunda pars* of *WolfT* 2 (“Myn trud gheselle”; see above), where the intabulator had to solve a similar problem. Both the vertically oriented structure and the ornaments of this tablature—the double pickup ornament and the little bursts of fuselae—give this arrangement a strong resemblance to arrangements in *Bux*.

The only other piece of the Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature to have survived in its entirety is the simple setting of the anonymous secular song “Ich var dohin wann es muß sein.” This short melody must have been widely known since it is quoted several times in different sources and inspired a number of contrafacta.65 Surprisingly, there is only one other complete musical transmission of this piece: it is in Loch (no. 8, p. 9), where it is monophonic and presents a number of questions concerning its rhythm and — more significantly — its modality. The new concordance in WolfT helps answer those questions. Its tablature notation requires only the first two systems of folio Bv.

The diplomatic transcription (Example 14) reveals the passages where one would expect dotted rhythms that again are not notated due to the tablature system lacking the sign. One could assume that for this piece a tempus perfectum with minor prolation was intended, bringing rules of perfection into effect, in which case a dot would not have been necessary.


The polyphonic transcription (Example 15) suggests that the cantus line resembles a cliché improvisation upon a preexisting tenor using the familiar Bux pickup motif, a single standardized cadence figure, and hardly any ornaments. The arrangement consists primarily of two voices, with additional notes added only for initial and cadential sonorities. The whole arrangement in all its aspects appears extremely formulaic.

65 Concordances and citations are listed in Fallows, A Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs, 1415-1480, 449.

One curious item is the function of the fermata sign in bar 14: as shown in the synoptic transcription below (Example 16), this fermata marks the internal caesura in the middle of a line. Perhaps the intabulator wanted to mark a rhetorical climax in the song as a point of arrival, but this place does not seem predisposed for such a treatment. However, the song features a refrain, and maybe this sign was supposed to mark the end of the strophe as a signum congruentiae and thus the beginning of the refrain. If so, it was placed three bars too soon, for the final note of the strophe is in bar 17.

The tablature sits very high on the instrument but is fully playable. For the synoptic edition, however, I found it helpful to transpose the lute arrangement down a fourth in order to match the pitch level of the song. The transmission of the song in Loch lacks a clef. Adding a C4 clef, the most common for tenor voices at the time, results in exactly the same modality that is presented in the tablature and does not require the use of any musica ficta.

Because of the missing clef in *Loch*, the modality of this melody was never quite clear from the vocal sources: it was occasionally assumed to have been meant as a G Dorian mode but missing a B-flat or as a G Lydian mode but missing an F-sharp. The tablature solves this ques-

---

66 The assumption of a G Hypodorian mode was the most common interpretation for this song, seemingly supported by the quotation of the incipit and refrain in two quodlibets of *Glog*. (For a new insight into the *Glog* quodlibets, see the author’s blog at https://mlewon.wordpress.com/2012/11/03/quodlibets/.) However, in view of the new evidence at hand, the editions of the quodlibets *Glog* no. 118 and *Glog* no. 119 should be
tion: it is intended as a G Mixolydian mode with the typical plagal minor third in the lower register of the mode and the characteristic major third in the upper. The impressive but unusual melodic leap of a minor seventh in the first line of Loch has also been called into question, especially since the quotation of that line in the quodlibet “O rosa bella / In feuers hitz” (Glog no. 119) turns that leap into an octave jump. The arrangement in WolfT now affirms the version of the song in Loch: the leap of a minor seventh is indeed intended.

The following transcription into French tablature (Example 17) demonstrates that this setting is a prime example of a piece fitting the instrument perfectly for performance employing plectrum lute technique. It also does not require any *equivalencia* or feature any split chords. Also, the octave string on the second lowest course helps in creating a more elegant line on the first beat of bar 18 (resulting in g’, f’, a’, g’, f’ in bars 17-18 in the transposition of the synoptic edition), which otherwise would have sounded fairly empty and angular. It is by far the simplest and shortest of the extant lute arrangements in WolfT, completely avoiding the use of fuselae.

**Example 17.** WolfT 4, fol. Bv. Conversion to French tablature of “Ich fare do hyn wen eß muß syn.”

---

reviewed: they traditionally introduce b-flats in the tenor lines—even though the original does not have them—which at least for the “Ich var dohin” quotations should be omitted.
Transposing the tablature down to the apparent original range of the song also results in a fully playable version on the five-course lute (Example 18), and all dyads and chords still fall on neighboring courses—with the added bonus that another slightly awkward place in the piece receives a more elegant line because of a resonating octave string in bar 13 (g’, a’, f’-sharp in the transposed version). In this case, however, that consequence seems not to have been intended by the intabulator.


The generic and formulaic character of the polyphony of this lute arrangement, coupled with the observation that no other polyphonic version of the song survives, makes it likely that “Ich fare do hyn” circulated as monody and was only arranged polyphonically for this lute tablature. The arranger appears to have taken a somewhat similar approach to the last piece of the Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature (WolfT 5: “Ellende du hest vmb vanghen mich”).

WolfT 5: Ellende du hest vmb vanghen mich (fol. Bv)

Alongside the complete version of “Ich fare do hyn wen eß muß syn,” folio Bv also contains the beginning of another arrangement: “Ellende du hest vmb vanghen mich.” The title of this piece is well-known, and the Catalogue by David Fallows lists a fair number of concordances, most of which are instrumental arrangements in Bux (nos. 48, 49, 50,
94, 95, and 96) and in the instrumental part of Loch (no. 68).\textsuperscript{67} It seems, however, that no polyphonic song version has survived and that the only transmission of the piece as a song is found in the monophonic version in Loch (no. 5, p. 5), which itself appears to have been extracted from a tablature.\textsuperscript{68} A comparison of the concordances shows that all seven instrumental arrangements in Bux and Loch refer to the same tenor line even though the polyphonic realizations and their counterpoints are all unique. This indicates that they were not modeled on a polyphonic song but newly created upon the tenor alone. Our version in WolfT falls into that same category. Its treatment is related to that of “Ich fare do hyn wen es muß syn,” which precedes it.

The diplomatic transcription below (Example 19) reveals two specific features or intabulation strategies: fragmentation of the cantus and tenor lines that dominate the first line and relentless runs of semiminims that occupy the second half of the second line, reminiscent of arrangements in Bux. After these two lines the piece breaks off. Comparison with the concordances shows that little more than a sixth of the original piece survives in the fragment.


![Example 19](image)

The polyphonic transcription (Example 20) illustrates the voice leading obscured by the fragmentation of cantus and tenor. Apart from a typical instrumental effect, this is a very idiomatic way of portraying two-voice counterpoint on the plectrum lute when the voices cannot be

\textsuperscript{67} Fallows, *A Catalogue of Polyphonic Songs, 1415-1480*, 434-35. The “new setting of similar T” on 435 concerns a different melody and has no connection to the arrangement at hand.

\textsuperscript{68} For a deeper analysis of this tenor line and for a full edition of the Loch versions, see Lewon, *Das Lochamer-Liederbuch* 2:23-26 and 42-44.
placed on neighboring courses: rather than using full chords that can be strummed to bridge the intermediate strings, this arranging style involves two voices propelled individually by striking the strings separately in a hoquetus-like passage, creating a transparent texture. The next section explores a different method, using chords or dyads for every new tenor note with interlacing semiminim runs. Both of these techniques point to a more freely conceived cantus line upon a preexisting tenor and not an ornamentation of a fixed polyphonic setting. This approach differs radically from such settings as encountered with “Myn trud gheselle” (WolfT 2) and “Gruß senen Ich im hertzen traghe” (WolfT 3).


The synoptic edition (Example 21) shows that the intabulator used a version of the tenor melody that is very close to the parallel sources. Only at the end of the fragment, in bars 9-10, does the tablature deviate from the song version transmitted in Loch. The tenors of all other extant intabulations of “Ellend,” however, are much closer to the version in WolfT, so that the song melody in Loch, already suspect because of the difficulty of underlaying its text and for other musical reasons, appears to be the one that deviates from the original, rather than the other way around.
**Example 21.** Synoptic edition of passage from “Ellende du hest vmb vanghen mich” in *Loch*, p. 5 (top staff); and *WolfT* 5, fol. Bv (bottom two staves).

As in most of the *WolfT* contents, when this piece is transcribed into French tablature (Example 22), the resulting fingering is perfectly apt for the five-course lute and easily playable using plectrum technique: there are no split chords and no *equivalencia* are needed.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Figure 6. WolfT, fol. Av. Individual notes, not tied in concordancie.}
\end{center}
Many sources of the fifteenth century (especially songbooks and chansonniers) seem to prefer a simplified form of the originally rhomboid shape of all notes below the value of the breve. This almost triangular shape appears to have been the basis for the notes in the Kassel-Wolfnenburg system. Both the triangular and the “open head” form may have developed because they were quick to write. The latter is also slightly reminiscent of some note shapes in sources that have the most concordances with WolfT: Sche and Loch—and not in the tablature section of Loch, but in its song section (Figures 7 and 8).

Figure 7. Loch, p. 89. Partly open note heads.
Figure 8. Sche, fol. 82r. Open note heads.

A reason for the simplified shape of the note heads may have been the concordanie: it might have been considered too time-consuming to lead the stem from tip to tip of a string of note heads, which would have required multiple strokes of the quill. By simply drawing a vertical line of the desired length with short strokes on its left side to represent the note heads, however, the Kassel-Wolfnenburg Tablature System reduces the number of strokes to an absolute minimum (Figures 9 and 10).

Figure 9. Kassel Collum Lutine, fol. Iv. (“Ficta-less”) concordanie (overlapping signs in the source erased for clarity).
Figure 10. WolfT, fol. Br. Concordanie.

It has been mentioned above that the semitongis for individual notes (those that are not bound in concordanie) in WolfT and the Kassel Collum Lutine are not entirely identical, but both ways of notating musica ficta can also be found in German organ tablatures of the time. In the Kassel Collum Lutine it consists of an added downward tail to the note head, just like in Bux (Figures 11 and 12):
The Earliest Source for the Lute: The Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature

Figure 11. Kassel Collum Lutine, fol. Iv. Semitongis.

Figure 12. Bux, fol. 21r. Musica ficta (overlapping signs in the source erased for clarity).

WolfT adopts this sign and further distinguishes the simple, elongated downward stem with a crossing stroke such as that used in the tablatures in Loch (Figures 13 and 14).

Figure 13. WolfT, fol. Av. Semitongis

Figure 14. Loch, p. 60. Musica ficta.

According to the Kassel Collum Lutine a similar sign is reserved for ornaments: a downward stem ending in a loop that crosses the stem (Figure 15). This symbol cannot be found in the surviving notation of WolfT but is common to German organ tablatures such as Bux (Figure 16):

Figure 15. Kassel Collum Lutine, fol. Iv. Mordante (overlapping signs in the source erased for clarity).
The execution of such a mordante in German organ tablatures is explained by Hans Buchner ca. 1520 in his Fundamentum:

In this example, you see some notes on the staff, which have lines led downwards, of which some have a curved tail like this: [image of stem with loop], and others have a line across it: [image of crossed stem]. You will remember therefore that those notes that have curved lines are called mordents, where one must always observe that two [notes] must be touched at the same time. The one which is marked by the curved line [should be touched] with the middle finger, and the next one below it with the index finger, which, shaking, is however to be removed soon. That note which has a cross-line in this manner: [image of crossed stem], indicates a semitone.

Even though this description dates from some 50 years after Bux was written, the consistent use of the same sign might imply that the

---


70 “In hoc exemplo vides quasdam notas inter lineas, quae habent lineas deorsum ducatas, quorum aliae habent curvatum caudam in hunc modum [stem with loop], aliae lineam transversam hoc modo [crossed stem]. Memineris igitur eas notas quae curvatas habent lineas vocari mordentes, ubi observandum semper duas esse simul tangendas, ea videlicet quae per lineam curvam signatur medio digito, proxima vero inferiorque indice digito, qui tamen tremebundus max est subdendus. Ea vero nota quae lineam habet transversam hoc modo [crossed stem], significat semitonium.” CH-Bu F I 8a, 10-11): English translation by Frauke Jürgensen (private communication). See also Kirnbauer, “Earliest German Sources of Lute Tablature,” 181; and Jean Denis, Treatise on Harpsichord Tuning, ed. Vincent J. Panetta, Cambridge Musical Texts and Monographs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 98, n. 84 for slightly differing translations.
ornament was executed in a very similar way in \textit{Bux}. Adapted to the lute, which usually cannot have neighboring notes sounding simultaneously, this might translate in \textit{WolfT} to a trill from the main note to the next lower note using a rapid succession of “pull-offs” (performed by “pulling” a left hand finger off the string, causing a note to sound) and “hammer-ons” (performed by sharply bringing a left hand finger down behind a fret, causing a note to sound).

\section*{Dotted Rhythms and All the Rests}

Even though the organ tablatures of the time customarily feature dotted rhythms on all mensural levels, the \textit{Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature} does not seem to use them. On a closer look, however, dotted rhythms do occur. On the level of semibreve-minim these are clearly intended even if not marked. In the case of \textit{WolfT} 4, which is in triple meter, one could argue for perfection rules to be in effect, although tablatures do not tend to apply these refined rules of mensural notation. In all other cases I presume that the scribe was either working under the tacit assumption of a sort of minor color (in certain places when a minim is followed by a single semiminim, as was discussed above) or that the context was sufficient to imply a dotted rhythm. The latter would concur with a quotation from Newsidler regarding the difficulty to count a dotted rhythm, in that the added note value “is half as short as the previously mentioned rest / this is difficult to describe or measure / as when one takes a breath / in order to suck in a spoonful of soup.”\textsuperscript{71} Newsidler addresses not the professional musician, but the aspiring amateur when he adds this colorful description of a “Spielvorgang” (the inherently unwritten practice of a playing-process) to his definition: he calls these added values “suspiria” which fits the description (i.e., “deep breath / sigh”).\textsuperscript{72} The same term appears in the \textit{Kassel Collum Lutine} next to the associated symbol of a little hook, resembling a semiminim rest (Figure 17). It appears that rests are sometimes used in \textit{Bux} and \textit{Loch} instead of the \textit{punctus addi-}

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{71} Cited from Kirnbauer, “Earliest German Sources of Lute Tablature,” 179.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{72} For a definition of the principle of “Spielvorgang” and its notation as a “Nachschrift” (the transcript of a “Spielvorgang” rather than part of the compositional process), particularly in connection with the arrangements for a keyboard instrument, see Hans Rudolf Zöbeley, \textit{Die Musik des Buxheimer Orgelbuchs. Spielvorgang, Nachschrift, Herkunft, Faktur, Münchner Veröffentlichungen zur Musikgeschichte} 10 (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1964), especially 46-50.
\end{footnotesize}
tionis: the example of a practical application of suspiria in “Wilhelmus Legrant” (Loch, pp. 88-89; Bux, fol. 61v: Figures 18 and 19) adduced by Kirnbauer points to a function similar to that of a punctus additionis. Kirnbauer also quotes Hans Buchner, who singles out the suspiria, which are grouped with the rests, and mentions that dots of addition are often erroneously called suspiria. By implication it also might be possible that the suspiria sign was sometimes used in lieu of a dot:

It is not enough to know how long one should remain on any one touched key, since sometimes there should be silence (which silence they call rests), and sometimes indeed suspiria should be performed. . . . Mistakenly, they call suspiria dots which are placed between two notes of one or two tactus. Concerning these, this general rule [applies]: the dot is always worth as much as the following note, or half the preceding note.74

![Figure 17. Kasel Collum Lutine, fol. Iv. Suspiria.](image)

![Figure 18. Loch, p. 88. Applied suspiria.](image)

![Figure 19. Bux, fol. 23v. Suspiria or rests?](image)

73 Kirnbauer, “Earliest German Sources of Lute Tablature,” 179-80.
74 “Non satis est novisse quamdiu aliqui clavi tactae sit inhaerendum, verum cum interdum sileatur (quod silentium pausas vocant) interdum vero suspiria ducantur: . . . Suspiria abusive sumpta, vocantur puncta inter duas notas unius vel duorum tactuum interposita: de quibus haec sit regula communis. Punctus perpetuo valet tantum, quan-
An abundance of convincing cases of *suspiria* (and in a lute source, no less), is given in the early sixteenth-century tablature book of Stephan Craus (A-Wn 18688—Ebenfurt/Austria) (Figure 20):

![Figure 20. Stephan Craus Lute Tablature (A-Wn 18688, fol. 62v [6v]). Applied *suspirium* (circled).](image)

Despite the fact that the tablature system appears to allow for *suspiria*, *WolfT*—at least in its surviving parts—does not make use of them. Instead, the necessity of the sign is avoided by a clever placement of hocketing counter rhythms in the individual voices, thus giving the effect of a dotted rhythm without having to notate it. As the *Kassel Collum Lutine* demonstrates, the standard rests of mensural notation are also part of the tablature system (Figure 21), but—curiously enough—they do not feature at all in the surviving parts of *WolfT*:

![Figure 21. Kassel Collum Lutine, fol. iv. Rests added by later hand.](image)

The question remains whether the intabulator chose to express dotted rhythms by a clever placement of the voices because he did not have the option to notate them otherwise or because the arrangements did not make dotting necessary. This only applies to the semiminim-fusela level, where the intabulator could even have used *suspiria* to express dots, whereas on the level of semibreve-minim, as has been shown above, there is need of a sign for a dotted rhythm, and lacking that only context

tum sequens nota, aut dimidium praecedentis.” CH-Bu F 18a, 8-9, English translation by Frauke Jürgensen (private communication).
tells us where a dot has to be assumed. This concerns \textit{WolfT} 2, \textit{WolfT} 3, and \textit{WolfT} 4 (unless prolatio major applies here).

\textbf{On Idiomatic Aspects}

Even with only five mostly fragmented pieces on merely two folios, the variety of arrangements in the \textit{Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature} is intriguing: each intabulation features a distinct style, while sharing certain generic aspects. Thus, the repertoire appears both coherent and varied at the same time. While \textit{WolfT} 3 ("Gruß senen Ich im hertzen traghe") is more closely related to the arrangements in \textit{Bux}, including the pickup motif, bursts of fuselae and quick runs, \textit{WolfT} 4 ("Ich fare do hyn wen eß muß syn") appears almost mechanically simple and as if it was arranged as a general purpose student example over a preexisting tenor line. The latter always employs the same cadence formulae, makes no use of fuselae, and only has contratenor notes at the beginning and end of a melodic line in order to include intermediate strings between the cantus and the tenor notes. In some respects it resembles the more elaborate \textit{WolfT} 5 ("Ellende du hest vmb vanghen mich"), which likewise appears to have been created only upon a given tenor and which in its surviving part also does not employ note values beyond the semiminim. \textit{WolfT} 5 seems to prefer long and fairly slow runs, which is reminiscent of \textit{Bux} arrangements on the same tenor melody. As vocal works both \textit{WolfT} 4 and 5 only survive as monophonic songs in parallel sources. All polyphonic settings of "Ellend" in \textit{Loch} and \textit{Bux} were made for keyboard instruments and with every arrangement present a new counterpoint. It is therefore not surprising that unlike the other three arrangements in \textit{WolfT}, which clearly are intabulations of polyphonic songs and all of which are based on a preexisting cantus-tenor setting, \textit{WolfT} 4 and 5 seem to be new, purely instrumentally conceived polyphonic elaborations of the tenor only. \textit{WolfT} 2 is a mostly chordal setting, at least in its surviving sections. \textit{WolfT} 1 might be the most unusual of all: it has strange harmonic turns—possibly triggered by a desire to fill in split dyads with fitting notes, which then result in full chords including thirds (even in cadential sonorities)—as well as surprising uses of ficta; it also has contrasting chordal and monophonic passages. Despite its limited scope, the \textit{Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature} thus provides us with more than just a glimpse of early intabulation and playing techniques for the solo lute of the fifteenth century.

This study has shown that, on the one hand, \textit{WolfT} shares a number of characteristics with organ tablatures of the time, namely, the
use of similar signs in its notation as well as some elements of intabulation and diminution style. On the other hand, it has also been demonstrated that it features techniques that are idiomatic for a five-course lute as it is depicted in the *Kassel Collum Lutine*, which at the same time is the key to the notation of *WolfT*. The arrangements of *WolfT* hint at a consistent methodology of idiomatic pragmatism for handling problems of instrumental limitation by the intabulator. In particular, the fact that the lowest two courses show octave strings in the *Kassel Collum Lutine*, which suggests that the tablatures in *WolfT* were written for a lute with the same stringing, has certain implications as practical experiments have confirmed: the octave strings apparently were sometimes used by the intabulator to complete otherwise incomplete melodies in the cantus line (see the individual sections above on *WolfT* 1 and *WolfT* 3). Another example is the idiomatic filling out of *concordancie* to combine dyads consisting of widely spaced cantus and tenor (sometimes even contratenor bassus) notes with appropriate notes on intermediate strings: this results in chords that lie on adjacent courses on the lute, thus enabling strumming (this characteristic can be observed throughout the arrangements of the fragments, but especially in *WolfT* 1, 2, and 4.)

Yet another feature of the intabulations that speaks for the lute as the intended instrument is the arranging solution for notes that would fall below the Gamut (see especially *WolfT* 3) if the vocal model was strictly followed, which is a clear indication that Gamut represents the lowest possible pitch on the instrument—just as it is suggested in the *Kassel Collum Lutine*—rather than merely the note G, which is not the lowest possible note in the mensural notation of the time.

Other aspects also lend themselves to an early lute idiom, perhaps involving a plectrum, such as the rhythmic interplay between cantus and tenor, the technique of propelling both voices by striking cantus and tenor notes alternately, the way in which dotted rhythms are represented without the use of dots by a clever arrangement of the two voices, and the full chords followed by longer, monophonic runs in the cantus over a single tenor note. However, these aspects can be found almost identically, if with slightly more ambitious diminutions, in the German

---

75 For similar cases of idiomatic pragmatism concerning keyboard arrangements, see above and n. 61; for wind bands and the limitations on natural brass instruments, see Strohm, *Rise of European Music*, 108-11, on “Tuba gallicalis.”
organ tablatures from the same time (particularly in Bux and Loch). They are therefore not restricted to the lute, but are instead part of a pan-instrumental style in the fifteenth century for instruments on which solo performance of polyphonic compositions was possible—and that just happens to also idiomatically suit the lute.

**Playing Technique: Fingers versus Plectrum**

The transcriptions into French tablature notation have revealed a number of split chords in the arrangements—a characteristic that is directly connected to certain playing styles, suggesting some, precluding others. When only using standard fret positions the source features a total of eleven split chords, all of them single splits (meaning that the chord is only split once rather than twice), all of them with no more than one intermediate string, and all of them occurring in only two pieces: WolfT'1 (two occurrences) and WolfT'3 (nine occurrences), whereas the rest of the arrangements, at least in their surviving parts, do not feature split chords. It appears that the chords in those arrangements were deliberately arranged to avoid them. Since *equivalencia* are not marked in WolfT—the scribe regrettably ignoring the *singná equivalencia* described in the Kassel Collum Lutine—one can only assume where they might have been applied when not strictly essential to the arrangement. The tablatures feature no more than five places where an *equivalencium* needs to be applied in order to render the musical text playable on the five-course lute. Again, all of them only appear in the same two pieces: WolfT'1 (one occurrence) and WolfT'3 (four occurrences). Seven of the eleven split chords in those pieces could be avoided by the use of additional *equivalencium* or the idiomatic use of the octaves on the lower courses, leaving only four split chords and raising the amount of *equivalencia* to a total of eleven. While *equivalencia* are a natural part of lute technique and pose a problem neither for the player nor for the interpretation of WolfT as a lute source (save for the fact that they are not marked in the source), the remaining four split chords (three of them in WolfT'3) have stronger

---

76 “Córtese implies that the number of ornaments applied to the superius in solo lute style is generally fewer than these of the monophonic style. Perhaps the inclusion of extravagant ornamentation caused technical difficulty for the solo lutenist. The keyboard compositions of the Buxheim Organ Book stylistically conform to Córtese's description of solo lute style.” Minamino, “Conrad Paumann and the Evolution of Solo Lute Practice,” 298.
implications: they are the only impediment to an outright definition of *WolfT* as a plectrum source.

A few early sources of lute music have already been suspected to reflect arrangements for the plectrum lute.\(^7\) The *Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature*, however, appears to me the most convincing candidate by far, supported by the fact that the *singa sursum traxionis* from the *Kassel Collum Lutine* (indicating an upstroke pluck) could be another indicator for the use of a plectrum. The supporting evidence boils down to a number of characteristic tendencies: a reduction in the number of voices of the original songs from a three-voice texture to a contrapuntal core of cantus and tenor in the arrangements (and only to include contratenor passages whenever idiomatically suitable); propelling the counterpoint either by full chords, which are arranged so that they can be strummed with one stroke across neighboring courses and then following with intermediate, monophonic runs; or splitting up the two lines of cantus and tenor in such a fashion that the voices are driven along alternately. These features, taken together, describe a playing technique that lives up to its sixteenth-century name “Lautenschlagen” (“striking the lute”) and that lends itself to plectrum technique. Staehelin’s early dating of the *Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature* and his suggestion that the system might predate the invention of the German lute tablature also places the arrangements at a time when plectrum playing would have been the norm.

The fact that only two sources for this tablature system survive could indicate that they are the earliest witnesses of a change in lute technique that was just starting at that time: the paradigm shifting from memorized monophonic playing with a plectrum to written polyphonic arrangements played with the fingers. Hans Judenkünig’s remark of 1523

---

seems to suggest that the technique of plucking the lute strings with fingers came in conjunction with the invention of the system of (German) lute tablature and that the latter might thus be equivalent with the concept of portraying polyphonic arrangements as solos on the lute: "Everyone knows that in recent years, within a man's memory, tablature was invented for lute and [finger] picking, and the old players played everything with a feather, which is not [as] artful."  

However, Judenkünig might not have been familiar with solo lute techniques almost a hundred years before his time, which might have included polyphonic arrangements for the plectrum lute. Even though we have no clear evidence for it, it is technically possible, as has been demonstrated by the première recording of the works in Wolft, a convincing candidate for a source that was suitable for both plectrum and finger technique—albeit a finger technique that was only one step away from and still "within earshot" of the plectrum.  

In his article of 1986, Hiroyuki Minamino pointed out that 

The most important technical change leading to solo lute practice was the use of bare fingers for plucking the strings. This made possible the simultaneous playing of various polyphonic voices on non-adjacent courses. . . . Paulus Paulirinus in his Liber virginit artium, written in Pilsen between 1459 and 1463, reports the common use of plectrum among lutenists. Tinctoris is the first to mention finger technique. Iconographical sources also imply that the change to the new technique must have occurred during the third quarter of the fifteenth century and that the finger technique seems at first to have been employed as a substitute for the plectrum. . . . Within limits, polyphony on the lute can be played using either a plectrum or a finger.  

Minamino's assessment neatly lines up with the evidence of Wolft: it was written exactly at the time when Paulirinus attributes plectrum playing to lute technique and a generation before finger technique was first mentioned by Tinctoris, who was also the first to mention the

---

78 Cited from Kirnbauer, "Earliest German Sources of Lute Tablature," 187.  
79 The recording is Ensemble Dragma, Kingdom of Heaven: see n. 1 of the present study.  
80 Minamino, "Conrad Paumann and the Evolution of Solo Lute Practice," 295. Minamino may have been too strict in his reading of Tinctoris when equating plectrum technique with monophonic playing and finger technique with polyphonic playing and in placing the two practices in opposition to one another. A middle ground in which finger and plectrum technique are combined is a conceivable third option.
sixth course as well as solo intabulations for the lute—attributes that make up the bedrock of later sixteenth-century lute practice. Since WolfT and the Kassel Collum Lutine are for the earlier five-course lute, but WolfT at the same time contains solo arrangements, these tablatures must belong to the intermediate stage of lute technique in the 1450s-1470s. This mix of attributes hints at a similarly intermediate stage of right-hand technique. Minamino found several depictions that could refer to early finger playing, and one looks as if the player had only just laid down the plectrum:

A miniature in Valerius Maximus's De dictis et factis romanorum of ca. 1470 depicts a bath scene in which a lutenist provides entertainment. ... The placing of the lutenist’s right thumb and index finger on the strings shows that he can perform two-voice polyphony on his lute by plucking two separate courses simultaneously.81

With a thumb-plus-index finger technique (with the other three fingers possibly resting on the top), which indeed would be only one step away from pure plectrum playing, one can easily bridge the few simple split chords in WolfT by striking the bottom notes with the thumb and the top note(s) with the index finger, while chords on adjacent courses can simply be strummed with the thumb. Runs can be played with the classic sixteenth-century thumb-under technique that was first described by Petrucci and that still carries the signature hand and finger positions of the plectrum player.

Most of the tablatures in WolfT can be performed with the plectrum alone. However, the arrangement of WolfT 3 with its several split chords could imply that the intabulator might also have used the early thumb and index finger technique. Another possibility would be a mixed plectrum plus finger technique where a finger is only added to the plectrum when split chords are unavoidable, much like the versions in WolfT.82 With or without plectrum, with or without the use of fingers,

---


82 For modern lute practice, Crawford Young has developed such a technique that he teaches to his students and that was also employed in the recording Kingdom of Heaven (see n. 1 of the present study).
the arrangements of the *Wolfenbüttel Lute Tablature* indicate a stage of right-hand technique that is in transition from a monophonic playing style to contrapuntal playing on the lute and thus cannot be overemphasized as a missing link for the paradigm shift just after the mid-fifteenth century, when lute practice incorporated polyphony.

A medium for strummed love songs, sacred polyphonic vocal intabulations, social status, and even secret messages, the sixteenth-century guitar has a rich—and as yet mostly unwritten—history. Christopher Page has made headway with this volume, which provides valuable scholarship on some relatively neglected topics. Through seven chapters Page explores important social, literary, and musical issues. His eight appendices that follow the chapters are especially important: several offer crucial terminological definitions and heretofore unpublished information culled from archival research.

Page deals with thorny issues in his appendices, avoiding what would otherwise be lengthy explanatory passages or footnotes in the chapters. The most important issue is the name of the instrument itself, which is the topic of Appendices A and F. To unravel “gittern” *v.* “cittern” *v.* “mandore” he uses linguistic, iconographic, archival, and other types of evidence to arrive at his conclusion: the medieval gittern was a wire-strung pear-shaped instrument, but the sixteenth-century gittern generally (but not always) signified the gut-strung instrument today called the Renaissance guitar. The medieval instrument was smaller than a lute, fretted, plucked, carved out of a single block, and was known as the “gittern” in England and the “mandore” in France. The sixteenth-century gittern usually referenced the four-course gut-strung instrument moderns know as the Renaissance guitar, but then late in the sixteenth century leading into the seventeenth century, “the new and invented hybrid [wire-strung gittern or mandore] added the attraction of metal-string sonorities at a time when the gut-strung guitar was both acquiring a fifth course and shedding the old name ‘gittern’ in favor of ‘guitar,’ thus leaving the former [the hybrid] free to become attached to what was in effect a treble cittern tuned guitar-wise.”

Thus, Page uses the term “gittern” most often throughout the book as he works through Tudor period evidence, although he sometimes uses the modern term “guitar,” and makes clear that he finds the modern term “Renaissance guitar” satisfactory. Page’s goal, as he says in his introduction, is “to frame a social and musical history of the guitar in Tudor England by gathering the relevant literary, archival, and pictorial docu-
ments in a more comprehensive manner that has yet been attempted.” As promised, he examines these issues in the seven chapters that follow.

In Chapter 1 Page studies the Tudor guitar’s iconography through the six available English examples that he found, all of which show continental influence rather than any particularly native English style. He first establishes his stable typological criteria for the guitar’s image: curved sides tending toward a figure 8, with a single circular sound hole, fretted neck, fixed bridge, and flat or slightly rounded back. His examples include an engraved portrait of Robert Dudley (1568) attributed to Hogenberg and the elaborately inlaid Eglantine Table (ca. 1567) made for noblewoman Bess of Hardwick.

Interestingly, the small guitar on the upper left border of the Dudley engraving is partly covered by a book of four-line tablature. The guitar, along with various other images around the portrait, might be more than generic: Did this close friend of Queen Elizabeth own and play the guitar? Page also brings up Dudley in Chapter 4 as a possible dedicatee of Rowbotham’s 1568/9 guitar tutor.

Chapters 2 and 3 ask who owned and conducted business concerning the instrument. Appendix B supplements these chapters well with a list of all references to the instrument between 1542 and 1605 from a variety of property and probate archives, literary databases, and studies by scholars such as John Ward. Page looks widely across social strata from Henry VIII as the first apparent identifiable Tudor owner of a guitar to academics, yeomen, apprentices, and even a Tower of London resident who played his guitar during his imprisonment. Even better, Page examines what the guitar must have meant to these individuals and groups. In 1562 the academic Thomas Lorkin, for instance, advocated that scholars lighten their spirits with the lyra and cithara (which might refer to lute and gittern, respectively) to keep depression at bay.

More generally, the guitar was representative of “new-fangled,” rather than authentic and traditional, England. Its imported wood from the New World, the Mediterranean design of its rose, and its continental European music were cosmopolitan rather than domestic to the English. This gave the guitar associations with youth, foreign lands, and in some ways with the gentry class in spite of the fact that this ran counter to tradition, which made the guitar, more portable and less expensive than other instruments, especially attractive to young men across social strata. That very foreign and youthful aspect, however, brought with it negative associations as well: loose morals and vagabondage. This brings up some aspects of the hybrid nature of the guitar, which Page returns to throughout the book. In another chapter’s examination of who became students of
the guitar, Page refers to the “portrait class” as professionals who aspired to a higher status, showing in their portraits their clean hands that were not roughened by work: “Like a panel portrait in oils, first an aristocratic fashion, the gittern lay at the point where the refinement, ostentation and profligacy of the nobility met the aspirations, the moderation and the thrust of the middling sort.”

Page’s discussion of trade in Chapter 3 examines relevant economic factors as well as several individual merchants. The importance of London’s instrument and string dealer John White, who dealt in instruments from Antwerp and strings from Venice, and Thomas Whythorn’s business trail, which Page traces through “low Duchland [sic]” (Flanders and Brabant) and Italy, are especially interesting. The English economy was built on raw materials such as lead, alabaster, and pitch, rather than on the fine, finished materials needed for gitterns; therefore, makers were rare in Tudor England but plentiful in Spain and France. Political instability stopped trade in 1568 when the English impounded a Spanish ship and then Spain took reprisals against the English merchants. This effectively ended the importation of gitterns and most stringed instruments, although a market for strings remained. Page quotes Shakespeare’s *Much Ado About Nothing* on strings, which generally came from the entrails of rams or pigs: “Is it not strange that sheeps’ guts should hale souls out of men’s bodies?”

One of the most valuable features of this book is Page’s reconstruction of a lost sixteenth-century guitar tutor in Chapter 4. *The breffe and playne instruction to lerne to play on the gyttrom and also the Cetterne*, published by James Rowbotham (1568/9), is most likely the English translation of Adrian Le Roy’s 1551 lost tutor for guiterne.¹ This is important: it is the only published tutor specifically for guitar before 1600 in England and perhaps, save for the Parisian Le Roy original, in Europe. (Page rightly disqualifies the 1570 Phalèse publication that purports to include a guitar tutor because it was shown to be for cittern instead.) The Rowbotham tutor is lost with the possible exception, that is, of eight recovered pages from two different collections. Page pulls together these recovered pages and hypothesizes that they descend from a preliminary


arrangement of the material in one gathering for binding; he shows the
evidence in his illustrations, and provides an outlined reconstruction of
the Rowbotham guitar tutor.

Chapter 4 also includes a description of the tutor's tablature in-
structions, such as Le Roy's pointing system for the right hand, in which
dots—or their absence—signify whether the player uses right-hand fin-
gers, thumb, or a combination in "grip" style to pluck. The couvert sign,
which notates the holding of a bass note, is translated as "covered play."
One of Page's most interesting ideas is expressed most extensively in this
chapter: he finds evidence for various sizes of guitars from the tutor's tun-
ing instructions. Several other references are recalled, including the 1559
record of a set of three guitars designated as a gift to Queen Elizabeth I.
Instruments in groups of three would imply sets with different sizes and
complementary ranges. Page hypothesizes soprano, alto, and tenor guitar
tunings.

Chapters 5 and 6 provide descriptions of instrumental and vocal
accompaniment music, respectively, that would have been available to
English guitarists. Most prominent in his short list of sources are the set
of five Le Roy and Ballard French guitar books from the 1550s and the
c. 1560 Osborn Commonplace Book. Page offers much more, however,
than a mere list of English Tudor guitar repertory. He examines major de-
velopments across a broad swath of plucked string performance practice
history, including stylistic shifts between the earlier medieval drone and
"brushing play" (strumming) practices to later medieval reproductions
of vocal polyphony. Appendix E supports this with a description of the
late thirteenth-century tuning treatise Tractatus de Musica by Jerome that
suggests the use of drones and bourdons and that references longstand-
ing European narrative accompaniment practices. Page also notes the
sixteenth-century emergence of guitar performance styles and notated
guitar music that mined hitherto unwritten practices, such as those as-
associated with the frrottola and ground bass repertoires. He is rightly cau-
tious about the word "popular" to describe this music, which crosses boundaries of the too-sharply-defined modern dichotomy between "art"
and "popular" music. Page is able to make connections between the tex-
tures of the grounds and impromptu dance music he finds in the Osborn
Commonplace Book and some of these historical issues.

His examination of the French books features a description of
an ambitious Brayssing intabulation of Josquin, but he could also have
mentioned solo guitar works from these books that must have impressed
English readers, such as Brayssing's La guerre faitte à plaisir, Morlaye's
La Seraphine, or the Alberto da Ripa fantasies. He references a scholarly
disagreement regarding the second and fifth books in the series, both Le Roy chanson books with vocal parts and lyrics presented opposite guitar tablatures on facing pages. Should the guitar tablatures be played as accompaniments to the vocal parts on the facing pages, even though the guitar music doubles the melodies? Page advances his opinion that they can be performed as accompanied songs, and he describes the resulting heterophonic texture.\(^3\)

Guitar music in the Osborn Commonplace Book is in sharp contrast to that in the French books. The work of a single hand, which Page suggests is Arthur Blanchinden, this music represents in his words “native malt and barley rather than imported wine.” Its strummed and lightly textured plucked music is indeed simpler on the surface, but Page makes an excellent case for the likelihood that some of the music from this book is really accompanied vocal music. Using literary and rhythmic analyses, Page reconstructs and recreates music from the Osborn Commonplace Book into sacred and secular vocal works of various textures. His work here is especially valuable in that Tudor guitar music includes no extant English notated vocal accompaniment for guitar. As he says in his conclusion, “What looks like a simple exercise for a beginner might also be the genetic code for a whole body of lost Tudor song.”

The subject of Chapter 7 is Thomas Whythorne's A book of songs and sonnets, with long discourses set with them, of the child's life, together with a young man's life, and entering into the old man's life, ca. 1576. This is an especially fascinating book not only because it is considered the first autobiography in English but also because the subject happens to be a guitarist. The very fact that Whythorne took up the gittern, which along with the cittern was “then strange in England, and therefore the more desired and esteemed,” and “an instrument much esteemed and used of gentlemen, and of the best sort in those days,” leads Page to examine the social status of the Tudor guitarist, which was especially tricky for one who found himself in the already precarious circumstance as a tutor employed in aristocratic households.\(^4\)

\(^3\) See music and liner notes from the 2010 CD Ma Guitere je te chante (Nelson 884501278584), in which soprano Amy Bartram and I perform eight songs from this repertory with a variety of accompaniment styles to address this question.

Page emphasizes the guitar's importance to fashionable young men. The strangeness, or foreign aspect of the guitar, however, is ambiguous: Page points out England's complex social and political relationship with Catholic France, the source of most of England's guitar repertory and, indeed, guitars and lutes. Page understandably wonders how Whythorne, a tradition-minded musician, came to be so interested in the gittern. He finds an answer in the almost paradoxical coexistence in Tudor guitar music between the hyper-cultivated traditional polyphonic style and an independent, exuberant “dominion” of music that is the guitar's own. He provides a musical illustration of this hybrid style in a setting of the “Chi passa” ground from the *Mulliner Book*.

We find compelling personal stories in the memoir, including the story of the secret romantic message slipped between the strings of Whythorne’s gittern, which turns out to be from a servant girl in the household where he is employed as a tutor. Here Page brings up intriguing points about privacy, status, and the role of musical practice in sixteenth-century life: “It was the gittern that Whythorne practiced most intensely, virtually 'every hour of the day.’ No doubt he genuinely enjoyed playing the instrument, but it is hard to tell whether he is cultivating the instrument or the instrument is helping to cultivate him.”

I was surprised, however, that although Page tells us the servant fails in her suit, he does not report her fate. Whythorne says, “this matter brake out and was known all about the house where we were, the which made me to blush, and she more so. Then, this matter coming to her master and mistress' knowledge, and finding that she was so loving without provoking or enticing thereunto, she was discharged out of that house and service.” Page begins his book with the fine (and tantalizing) details of a nobleman's treasonous coded message in a guitar, but for the servant who inserted a love poem into the strings of Whythorne's guitar, Page does not tell us about the fateful consequence of her exposure and the loss of her job, nor does he examine what that fall from reputation and employment must have meant for the only woman, in Page's words, “in all our sources whom we find touching a gittern.”

---

Guage are preserved in the modern language edition, that edition would make Page’s book more accessible—and his excerpts less confusing—to a wider readership than the earlier edition, which uses old Anglo-Saxon letters as well as idiosyncratic spelling.


Page does much toward fulfilling his promise, however, to “frame a social and musical history of the guitar in Tudor England.” His careful archival research, literary insight, and musical imagination produce the excellent reconstructions that we find in this book, a valuable starting point for performers as well as for scholars. He takes great care with etymological and historical issues, and he looks well beyond the chronological and geographical boundaries of his topic in order to inform his main points, which makes his explanation of the development of the guitar and associated instruments ring true. While it provides us with more information, Page’s book also reminds of the nuanced meanings of musical style and society in sixteenth-century guitar history.

Jocelyn Nelson


Thomas Morley was undoubtedly one of the most distinguished musicians in Elizabethan England. He was the author of a musical treatise, a composer of madrigals and motets, of lute songs and keyboard music, a compiler and editor of consort music, and a publisher and printer of music. It is surprising that no monograph has been published before. Tessa Murray’s book evolved from her doctoral dissertation, “Thomas Morley and the Business of Music in Elizabethan England.”¹ She shows how, unlike Byrd and Tallis who first held the printing monopoly, Morley succeeded in making money from publishing and printing music. He did it by satisfying the appetite for recreational music making of the increasingly prosperous middle classes. Not only does Murray give a useful account of his publishing activities, but she also assembles as much about his life as she can find, filling in gaps with plausible suggestions where facts are scarce. She provides much background information to put things in context and never takes the reader’s knowledge for granted, explaining, for example, such things as the work of heralds, calendriers, clavors, and gospellers.

Murray traces Morley’s life from his birth in Norwich ca. 1557. He was one of 18 children, and the only one to become a musician. His father was verger at Norwich Cathedral, and although Morley’s name does not appear in the lists of choristers, Murray thinks it likely that his

earliest music making would have been as a chorister at the cathedral. This is one of many instances where there is no evidence but where Murray resorts to making intelligent guesses. Some may contend that such conjecture is inappropriate, but she always makes it clear what is fact and what is guesswork. There is certainly evidence that Morley was a chorister at St. Paul's in London, where he would most likely have learned descanting, musical composition, and playing instruments.

Morley's important treatise, *A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musick* (1597), is dedicated to William Byrd, and it is very clear from the dedication that at some stage Byrd was Morley's teacher. It is a pity Murray does not reproduce the whole text, which expresses Morley's gratitude to Byrd for his teaching, putting him in third place after God and his parents, for making him the man he was.

After a brief account of Queen Elizabeth's reestablishing Protestantism after 1558, Murray examines the evidence for Morley being a recusant and concludes that he was not. She dismisses as improbable the hypothesis proposed by Ian Harwood that Morley's setting of "Can I forget what reasons force" contains a crypto-Catholic message.

In 1583 Morley was appointed Master of the Children at Norwich Cathedral. He left suddenly in 1587, and Murray deduces that he probably went to Belvoir Castle as a household musician to the Fourth Earl of Rutland on the recommendation of Edward Paston. In 1588 he was awarded the degree of Bachelor of Music at Oxford University on the same day as John Dowland. In 1591 he travelled to the Low Countries, where he probably picked up ideas about music publishing. Murray examines the murky world of espionage, since Morley is known to have been in contact with Charles Paget, a Catholic double agent. Finally, in 1592, Morley was appointed Gentleman of the Chapel Royal. The Gentlemen were not paid very well, so many of them supplemented their income with other jobs. Morley turned to music publishing. He operated Byrd's monopoly from 1593 and held his own monopoly from 1598. He worked first with Thomas East and from 1597 with Peter Short. In 1599 he set up his own printing press with William Barley.

In Chapter 3 Murray describes the state of music printing in England before 1590. Single-impression was the preferred option because it was fast and cheap, although movable type, each with a note and a bit of a stave, produced less than elegant results. By the end of the sixteenth century, aristocrats were joined by wealthy people from the middle classes in a desire for recreational music making, and she refers to the Kytson family at Hengrave Hall. My only cavil is her acceptance of
Hector Sequera's hypothesis that Paston had "a range of lutes of different sizes." All the music in Paston's five extant lute books is for one voice (or very occasionally two) and a lute; the cantus is omitted from the tablature as with a Dowland lute song. It would be possible for other singers to join in for some songs as with a Dowland ayre, but there is no indication that they did or that other instruments were used. It is possible to play all the music on one lute, and the singer simply transposes to match the pitch of the lute, just as he would do for the songs in Bossinensis's two books of 1509 and 1511. The rubrics in one of Paston's lute books confirm transposition by the singer at least for songs in that manuscript.3

In Chapter 4 Murray turns to the control of printing by the Stationers' Company, the monopoly of Byrd and Tallis, and their Cantiones Sacrae (1575), which did not sell well. She explains why Morley stopped working with Thomas East and turned instead to Peter Short. She discusses Morley's Canzonets to Five and Sixe Voices and Dowland's First Booke of Songes, both published in 1597. (Robert Spencer once told me that these books were registered at the Stationers' Company on the very same day, although I cannot substantiate that.) Both books were dedicated to the Lord Chamberlain, Sir George Carey, Baron Hunsdon, and both have lute tablature. Murray explains that Morley sought the music monopoly because East and Short were benefitting from his music while he was not. It is interesting to see how Murray calculates Morley's income from 1593 to 1602, but the figures are conjectural, and she admits his sales figures are "pure guesswork." She describes the limited success of Morley's print shop at Little St. Helens, which he set up with William Barley.

Chapters 8 and 9 show how Morley's earliest publication was a collection of canzonets for three voices—lighthearted and not too difficult for his customers to perform. It was followed by books of madrigals

2 On p. 59 Tessa Murray writes, "It seems that the duplicated pieces, often at different pitches, provide for flexible ensemble performance to suit the forces available, supported by a range of lutes of different sizes." In support she cites Sequera, "House Music for Recusants in Elizabethan England: Performance Practice in the Music Collection of Edward Paston (1550-1630)" (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2010), 96-111. Murray is aware of the possibility of using one lute, however. When describing the contents of Morley's Canzonets to Five and Sixe Voices (1597) on p. 82, she writes, "Clearly, all Morley's pieces could be sung to a lute in G if the singers were to transpose their parts, but the composer's adoption of differently pitched lutes suggests a continental influence." She also notes on p. 82, "All Dowland's published songs have lute parts for a lute in G, and this seems to have set the standard for future English publications."

3 London, British Library, MS Add. 31992.
and ballets, which were also fun to sing. Murray dispels the myth that *The Triumphes of Oriana* (1601) was compiled in honor of Queen Elizabeth. Morley later broadened the scope of his publications to include other genres. Following the success of Dowland’s *First Booke of Songs*, Morley published his own collection of lute songs: *The First Booke of Ayres or Little Short Songs* (1600). Publication of *The First Booke of Consort Lessons* (1599) was an ambitious project, but it was without financial risk, since the printing costs were paid for by an anonymous “Gentleman,” possibly Richard Allison. It must have sold well because a second, revised edition was published in 1611, and it encouraged Philip Rosseter to have his own similar collection published in 1609.

Most extraordinary is Morley’s landmark treatise on music, *A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke* (1597), which was a massive undertaking to write and presented challenges in preparing it for printing. Reading through a dry, theoretical work would have been a daunting task, but Morley helps to make it more accessible by presenting the information in the form of a friendly, chatty dialogue. At the oft-quoted banquet, Philomathes felt socially inept since he could not sight-sing, and he could not join in the conversation about music, reflecting how important amateur music making had become by the end of the sixteenth century. Morley’s treatise is still being read in the eighteenth century: a new edition was published as late as 1771. Murray gives an account of music publishing in England after Morley’s death and assesses his legacy. In five appendices she gives bibliographical information for all Morley’s books, including information on paper, collation, and an annotated list of contents.

It has been a pleasure to read this book, not only for the wealth of information it contains, but also because, without dumbing down, it is written in good, clear English free from jargon and unnecessary verbosity.

*Stewart McCoy*


This book is very heavy, probably even heavier than any of the lutes the Hoffmanns built. It also is beautiful, and you can see immediately that it is something extraordinary. Indeed, it is a great pleasure to
turn the pages and look at the beautiful pictures of lutes, stringed instruments, details of the instruments, and images of musicians, especially the Baroque lutenists who knew the Hoffmanns.

After three greetings by the Leipzig mayor, the general director of the Nuremberg Germanisches Nationalmuseum, and a representative of the German violin and bow makers, the preface by the three editors gives a short summary of the volume.

The book consists of three main parts. The first, “Zum Leben und Werk der Familie Hoffmann” (On the Life and Work of the Hoffmann Family), gives some glimpses of the life and work of the Hoffmann family, who were active for nearly a century, from 1652 to 1750, as instrument makers in Leipzig. The second, “Zu den Instrumenten von Martin und Johann Christian Hoffmann” (On the Instruments of Martin and Johann Christian Hoffmann), includes articles by different authors on the instrument types they made and on some aspects of the techniques they used. The third, “Katalog,” systematically lists every known instrument made by Martin and Johann Christian Hoffmann.


Herbert Heyde starts the first part with a short chapter on the Hoffmann family and previous research on it. He claims that it is necessary to have a critical view of all judgments earlier researchers have made. They have been misled by the Baroque way of praising persons, even in church book entries, where many superlatives have been used. Also, the connection to Johann Sebastian Bach was the cause for many wrong views on the instruments Johann Christian Hoffmann made, for example, that concerning the viola pomposa, which led to the Hoffmanns becoming something like a myth in musical research.

To gain a historically founded image of the Hoffmanns, it is important to go back to the primary sources with a reflective and critical mindset. The book tries to fulfill this aim by looking for the sources and by close examination of all the instruments that have been made or have probably been made by them.

In the next chapter Eszter Fontana and Veit Heller give an overview of the musicians and instrument makers in Leipzig and in the orbit of the Hoffmanns’ workshop from the sixteenth century on. As there was no guild for instrument makers in Leipzig, they always had to strive for acknowledgment and legal security. Many of the instrument makers also had been employed as musicians or tried to achieve a title. Johann Chris-
tian Hoffmann bore the title “Königl. Pohln. and Churf. Sächs. zu Dero Capelle bestellter Lauten- und Instrumentenmacher” (Kingly Polish and Electoral Saxon for the Chapel Appointed Lute and Instrument Maker). The authors show the changing circumstances that influenced the living and work of instrument makers and musicians in Leipzig.

In the next chapter (“Die Häuser der Familie Hoffmann”) Doris Mundus and Eszter Fontana show where the houses of the Hoffmanns were located in the Grimmsche Vorstadt, a suburban area in the southeast of Leipzig. Many musicians and instrument makers lived in the neighborhood of the Hoffmanns, who resided in the Bettelgasse. Martin and Johann Christian Hoffmann counted as house owners among the better-known and well-off craftsmen of the city.

The next section of the book introduces the instrument makers of the Hoffmann family, who are described in short biographical chapters by Herbert Heyde. First, the family tree gives an overview of the many descendants of Veit Hoffmann, who probably was the first instrument maker in this family. Admittedly, we do not know exactly what profession his father had, but in the little village of Kammerberg near Illmenau in Thüringen, most people were involved in agriculture, simple handicrafts, or mining.

Veit Hoffmann was born before 1632. When he married Anna Maria Hieronymus in Leipzig in June 1652, he was called “lute and violin maker” for the first time in a document. As daughter of a townsman, Anna Maria brought a house in the Bettelgasse into the marriage. In 1654 Veit became a townsman too, and at least from this time on, if not earlier, he had his own workshop. In the Ratsleichenbuch from 1673 he is recorded as a “violin maker on the Bettelgasse.”

In the second generation his son Martin (bapt. 28 August 1654—15 April 1719) continued the Hoffmann workshop. Thirteen of his instruments still exist. Probably he knew Esaias Reusner the younger, who was working as a lute teacher at the university in Leipzig from March to November 1673. In 1676 Martin married Gertraudte Rosina Sibylla Janson, who became the mother of five children, among them the two sons who continued the Hoffmann workshop; Johann Christian and Christian Gottlieb. In the parish registers we find some musicians as godfathers, among them Christian Schuchardt, who was a lutenist, lute teacher, and jurist. It is possible that he taught the lute to Johann Christian and also to Christian Gottlieb. After the death of his first wife in 1698, Martin Hoffmann married again. His second wife, Magdalena Morgenstern (1676–1749), gave birth to another three children, but none of them became an instrument maker.
Martin Hoffmann also had apprentices and assistants, but only two of them are known by name. One of them, Hans Jacob Erpen (Erbten), probably was his assistant. Furthermore, Baron mentions Johann Gottfried Schmied (Schmid, Schmiedt, 1672–1720) as a pupil of Johann Christian Hoffmann, which might be a mistake as the dates suggest he was a pupil of and assistant to the father, Martin.

Martin Hoffmann died on 15 April 1719. He bequeathed a large inheritance that totaled 4,348 taler, including a house that amounted to 2,400 taler. The property was divided, as usual, in thirds: the first third for the widow, the second for the two sons from the first marriage (the other children already had died), and the final third for the three children from the second marriage.

Christian Gottlieb Hoffmann (bapt. 14 January 1691–27 April 1735), the younger of the two sons from Martin’s first marriage, lived a quiet, modest life. He never became a townsman, did not own a house, and was a perpetual student who never earned a certificate. Although there was an official interrogation in 1724 because of his long, ongoing study, he apparently was not exmatriculated since in 1731, when he married for the second time, his profession still was indicated as “studiosus juris.” In the interrogation records he remarks that he “makes a profession from music” and that he produces “in leisure hours, sometimes viola da gambas and lutes.” Unfortunately, we do not have much in the way of documents concerning his living as a musician and instrument maker. There is also the possibility that he sold instruments made by his brother as his own. In the parish register we find a connection to the Gleditsch family, which always had an affinity for lute playing; furthermore, the daughter of Johann Caspar Gleditsch, Maria Catharina, had stood as godmother for Christian Gottlieb’s daughter in 1723.

Martin Hoffmann’s most important son was his successor, Johann Christian Hoffmann (bapt. 2 May 1683–1 February 1750). Today we know of 39 instruments by him. He also was a practicing musician who knew many excellent musicians. Though he married two times—Susanna Justina Stein (1691–1731) in 1710 and Elisabeth Pabst (1701–1741) in 1736—he had no children. Probably not later than 1712 he was appointed Kingly Polish and Electoral Saxon Court Lute and Instrument Maker. His instruments were exported as early as 1715 to 1719 to Holland, England, and France.

After his father’s death in 1719, Johann Christian inherited the workshop. On 19 of November 1722, he became a townsman. This was the last important step to his real independence as a civic craftsman. He was closely connected to Silvius Leopold Weiss, who probably together
with Hoffmann, adapted the swan neck to the 13-course lute. It is possible the strong connection between Hoffmann and the Dresden court weakened since in 1742 Andreas Balthasar Jauch (1701–1785) was employed there as Courtly Lute Maker.

Hoffmann was a good friend of Johann Sebastian Bach and possibly even more close to the lutenist and notary Johann Christian Weyrauch. Both appear in the testament that Johann Christian Hoffmann made in 1748, which shows that he was commercially at least as successful as his father. His liquid funds added up to 1,835 taler.

A print of the text for a wedding cantata written for Hoffmann’s second marriage is reproduced photographically and discussed by Veit Heller. Unfortunately, the music hasn’t survived and we don’t know who composed it. On the title page only the initial of the author’s name is given as “W.” This might be Johann Christian Weyrauch.

The following two chapters collect the most important existing documents on the Hoffmann family. Most of these have been transcribed, but some have been reproduced as facsimiles. In the first of the chapters, accounts and instrument lists of Middle Germany show how widespread Hoffmann instruments were at the time. Many churches and courts possessed Hoffmann violins, viola da gambas, violoncellos, and lutes. Even if we only have a small amount of such documents that previously existed, they nonetheless show how important the family was for the areas, both near and farther away, surrounding Leipzig.

In the chapter “Ausgewählte Dokumente zu Leben und Werk von Martin und Johann Christian Hoffmann” (Selected Documents on the Life and Work of M. and J. C. Hoffmann), Manuel Bärwald, Eszter Fontana, and Klaus Martius have collected the most important sources so that other researchers can have access to them. They list 14 contemporary prints, among them Baron’s study on the lute, two prints for the second marriage of Johann Christian Hoffmann, and some sales advertisements.

The manuscript sources consist of three letters, one of them the important letter by Johann Christian Hoffmann to Johann Friedrich Armand von Uffenbach dated 10 April 1740, which mentions Mr. Weiss and the Weisssian way of converting a lute into a theorbo (“nach Mr. Weis seiner Ardt theorbirt”); two documents regarding the planning of two buildings on the property of Johann Christian Hoffmann (dated 1737 and 1747); the baptism entry of Johann Sebastian Weyrauch, son of Johann Christian Weyrauch, whose godfathers had been Johann Sebastian Bach and Johann Christian Hoffmann; three inheritance documents; and some church inventories and accounts. Although not complete and
mostly about the son, they give a good idea of the importance and status of the Hoffmanns.

Part 2. “Zu den Instrumenten von Martin und Johann Christian Hoffmann” (On the Instruments of Martin and Johann Christian Hoffmann)

Two-thirds of this book is dedicated to the instruments, and within this part Klaus Martius describes the lutes of Martin and Johann Christian Hoffmann. As he writes, the change of generations in the Hoffmann family marks the beginning of the last chapter in the history of the occidental lute. In Germany at the time, unlike neighboring countries, there was a last blossoming of the practice of this instrument. But in spite of great virtuosos like Weiss, Baron, and Falckenhagen, the instrument shortly afterward lost its importance and had to leave the field as mandorae and guitars became more prominent. Also, keyboards came into fashion more and more, and the lute seemed for many people too hard to play and maintain and also too soft in volume.

Instrument makers had to specialize, as the need for bowed instruments of the da braccio family was increasing. There only were a few lute makers left, like Edlinger in Prague, Schelle in Nürnberg, and Hoffmann in Leipzig. They built instruments according to the customer’s “fist” (“jedermann recht Faust = recht,” Baron), thus according to the customer’s express wishes. This custom-made production differs greatly from the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century practice of building lutes based on division of labor. Quite often lute makers in the eighteenth century probably had to rebuild or alter existing instruments rather than build new ones. But this was not the case with the Hoffmann workshop. There the number of newly built instruments seems to have been higher than the number of adaptations and repaired lutes, though quite a lot of the latter have been recorded.

Today five lutes of Martin Hoffmann (four lutes, one of them changed to guitar, and one theorbo, which always means a German theorbo in this context, probably one adapted as such by Johann Christian) and 14 lutes of Johann Christian Hoffmann (five lutes, of which two have been changed to guitars, eight theorbos, and one discant lute) have come down to us. One lute by Martin and seven lutes by Johann Christian seem to be lost, as are another handful of instruments mentioned in documents.

The lutes of the father have three main characteristics: a quite deep bowl; the ends of the endclasp with half-round hollows; and a spe-
cific, quite archaic soundboard barring with a slightly rounded bass bar in the shape of a “J.”

Johann Christian also used the deep bowls of his father and the same archaic barring. The ends of his endclasps are slightly changed with a round hollow. Characteristically, the transition of the fingerboard onto the soundboard of his instruments is not elaborated with simple peaks but has a slightly changed form. Furthermore, his theorbos have the first peg directly after the nut and not in the second position. There are other modifications in his instruments as well. Probably from 1720 on his lutes were mostly built with 13 courses with a bass rider, and possibly from 1727 on (although it cannot be clearly proven) most lutes were built as 13-course German theorbos with a swan neck. This innovation for the Baroque lute possibly was a cooperative effort of the lute maker with Silvius Leopold Weiss. There were swan-necked lute types before—we know of some angeliques that have such a neck—but Weiss was definitely the best advertising for this type of instrument even if he wasn’t its inventor.

Two theorbos of Johann Christian Hoffmann have shallower bowls than his other ones. Martius assumes that this change could have something to do with the repair of a lute by Magno Tieffenbrucker that Hoffmann did in 1741, which could have inspired him to build an instrument more in line with the older master’s design.

In the next chapter Klaus Martius describes in detail the different repairs and reconstructions undertaken by Johann Christian Hoffmann.

It should be mentioned that Martin and Johann Christian also were important German builders of the viola da gamba: by the father there are nine existing instruments; by the son there are 15 existing instruments, three of them reconstructed as violoncelli. Although their instruments differ, both were built in the English/Northern German style. In addition, Johann Christian built some viole d’amore.

Veit Heller describes in the next chapter the da braccio instruments that Johann Christian Hoffmann built. The father also probably built them, but there are few documents concerning his practice, and we do not know of any such instruments of his existing today. The instruments of the son show that he has to be one of the best German violin makers. His violins strongly resemble Stainer violins, although it would not be accurate to call them copies. Today we have 12 instruments by him in different sizes: violins, a viola, violoncelli piccoli, and violoncelli. As in the chapter on the lutes, the author describes and compares these instruments in great detail with many tables and pictures.
The existing labels in the different instruments are shown and compared in the next chapter. It is remarkable that Johann Christian Hoffmann did not use printed labels but instead always used handwritten ones. Detailed remarks and pictures also describe the decorations and varnishes that the Hoffmanns used. The results of dendrochronological examinations show that the origin of the wood used in their instruments probably originated in the Northern Alps.

Part 3. “Katalog” (Catalog)

The last part of the book is a catalog of all instruments built by Martin and Johann Christian Hoffmann. It is divided into sections for the different instrumental groups and the two makers. The instruments are sorted chronologically by using the dates of the labels, if existing, and by informed assumption for undated instruments. Every instrument is assigned a work number that mirrors this chronological order without taking into account the different instrument types (MH for Martin Hoffmann, JCH for Johann Christian Hoffmann).

The first part of the catalog is dedicated to the lutes. At the beginning of the entry for each instrument there is a table with all relevant information: work number, type of instrument, owner, previous owners, signature, overall length, string lengths, size of the body, size of the neck, width of strings at the nut, size of the rosette, varnish, disposition of strings, source of documentation and pictures, and literature on it. This gives a very detailed and complete overview of each instrument. An accompanying text gives further interesting insights. In addition, there are pictures of the whole instrument as well as photo details for each instrument, and sometimes construction drawings are included. Instruments destroyed during wartime are also described briefly based on all existing information about them.

A table showing original bridge widths is, unfortunately, somewhat hidden between the instrument descriptions. Among those described is one 11-course instrument (JCH 3) that has a bridge width of 123 mm. The 13-course instruments have widths between 139 mm (MH 9) and 149 mm (JCH R 7 = a reconstructed lute), and a 14-course instrument has a width of 154 mm.

In addition, one historical theorbo case from 1732 is described, but unfortunately the instrument it protected has not come down to us. It is dated and the year can be read on it. There are also two monograms, but it is not clear to whom they might refer. One of them reads “LW,” but to me it is not likely that it means Silvius Leopold Weiss. If he were
meant, the monogram should be “SLW.” Also, to read the second monogram as “JSW” as indicated by the book under review does not seem accurate to me and should be reconsidered. Thus, the stated conclusion that Silvius Leopold Weiss presented his brother with the theorbo seems to be wrong in all likelihood. Possibly in this case the wish that it were so was father to the thought.

The other parts of the catalog on the categories of viola da gamba, viola d’amore, and viola da braccio are also presented with the same system as the lutes.

Before the appendix there are two brief chapters on the environment of Leipzig. The first by Veit Heller describes the working environment and assistants of Johann Christian Hoffmann (“Umfeld und Mitarbeiter von Johann Christian Hoffmann”). In the second Klaus Martius shows and describes instruments from the areas surrounding Leipzig (“Instrumente aus dem Leipziger Umfeld”). The appendix also includes lists of abbreviations of museums and archives containing Hoffmann instruments and documents. There is a bibliography as well as an English summary of all important facts, which is followed by a short list of the instruments known today.

This study on the Hoffmann family and their instruments is a very informative and detailed book on all aspects of their work. It collects the most important documents regarding their history and workshop, and offers very detailed information on making lutes and other instruments. Especially important is the catalog, which gives an excellent overview of the work of these brilliant lute makers, and best of all, it gives detailed and very systematically arranged information on all the instruments. This makes it easy to compare the types and sizes of different instruments. It would be good to have such a systematic description of all historical lutes.

Though this book is very expensive, it is worth every cent for the collected information and the descriptions of the instruments it contains as well as for its impressive pictures of the instruments, their details, and documents. It is a must-have for anyone interested in Baroque string instruments and their construction and maybe even for anyone interested in lute music who wants to understand the instrument in more depth. To conclude, it is a sheer joy to turn this book’s pages and contemplate these artworks of the craft of instrument building. The editors of this fantastic book should be congratulated for their work.

Markus Lutz
Some Internet readers may have noticed recent allegations that the late William Powell Professor of Music at Harvard University, John Milton Ward, had “spirited away to America” some English cittern and lute manuscripts. These allegations unfairly suggest furtive transactions, such as purchasing the items for financial speculation, as often happens with rare music books and manuscripts. The owners often believe that sharing their treasures with others diminishes their worth, or if copied under harsh light, the old paper and ink might be damaged.

In this instance, nothing could be further from the truth.

In a brief unsigned note, I wrote that in 1985 Ward had generously donated three manuscript cittern tablatures, an Italian song manuscript, and a book of French chansons to Harvard University’s Houghton Library. Ward consequently nourished his scholarly curiosity for popular music from older times in a 234-page monograph dedicated to the memory of Charles Seeger, Sprightly and Cheerful Musick: Notes on the cittern, gittern and guitar in 16th- & 17th-Century England. Ward’s study included an inventory with tablature incipits for all of the considered manuscripts and prints—19 in all. One easily recalls Ward’s many contributions to the study of popular music, and especially his central role in forming the Archive of World Music and the Charles Seeger Room at Harvard’s Eda Kuhn Music Library. Four of the Houghton manuscripts are now available online in digital facsimiles, making them immediately accessible to a wider audience of scholars and performers. Links to digital facsimiles are cited in the notes below.

Between 1959 and 1981 Ward had acquired the manuscripts at public auctions and sales by recognized, reputable antiquarian dealers (noted at the end of entries 1-5 that follow here):
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1) *Sir William Boteler (d. 1656) Cittern Book* from the Bedford County Records Office, *olim* Sir William Boteler (or Butler) of Biddenham (d. 1656) (Houghton MS Mus 179). 49 ballad tunes and dances. (Christie’s auction, 2 April 1982.)


3) *John Ridout* (1608–after 1665) *Commonplace Book* (Houghton MS Mus 182). Cittern pieces, kitchen and medical recipes, spiritual and moral propositions, etc. 32 complete pieces and grounds in Italian tuning. (Sotheby’s catalogue, 15 June 1971, Item 1602.)


5) MS formerly belonging to Anne of Denmark (1574–1619), Queen of England (Houghton MS Mus 180). 18 French chansons (5 with lute accompaniment). (Sotheby’s catalogue, 28 March 1972, Item 309.)

Other online works of interest at Houghton (not ex-Ward) include the following:

6) *Elizabeth Cromwell: Her Gitarre Book 1685* (Houghton MS Mus 139). For 4-course guitar in re-entrant tuning: 40 dances and airs

---
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in punteado and rasgueado tablature. (Maggs Bros., London, 1988.)


8) Playford, John. *Musick’s Delight on the Cithren . . . being the Choicest of our late new Ayres, Corants, Sarabands, Tunes, and Jiggs* (London: W. G[odbid], 1666) (Houghton MS Mus 362.7*). 110 pieces with instructions and rules to observe in playing the cit-tern. Includes 1 folio of manuscript music.

The manuscripts may be examined in person at Houghton Library, where visiting scholars are welcome to evaluate for themselves what one reader described as “incoherent cittern scribblings” in the Boteler book and elsewhere in these volumes. On the other hand, Ward suggests such skeletal pieces may have served as aides-mémoire. The pieces would surely appeal to those modern scholars with ethnological instincts. Many are unique ballads. Ward’s generosity has made these fascinating documents available to readers and performers everywhere.

An English lutenist mentioned on the Internet his abortive attempts to examine the Boteler manuscript and Richard Mathew’s *The Lute’s Apology* (1652), both then in the Bedfordshire County Record Office. By no means did Ward “spirit away” the famous Mathew *unicum* as the lutenist reported: it was purchased by the British Library (shelfmark K.1.c.33).

---

7 RISM B vii, 80; WardS: 201-3. Online facsimile: http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:FHCL.HOUGH:13537685
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