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Editorial

This is an international issue, with contributions from Israel, the Netherlands, Germany and Austria, as well as from England. Myrna Herzog gave a stimulating talk to the Society in 2015 and her article here gives her the opportunity to expand on what she said then and which was summarized in The Viol No. 41. Jan Burgers introduces us to another polymath from the Netherlands, Johannes Thysius (1622-1653) to set alongside Constantijn Huygens. The discovery of a major collection of eighteenth century music for viola da gamba from Ledenburg Castle, now at Osnabrück, has greatly expanded both the repertory and our knowledge of late music for the instrument. Günter von Zadow has undertaken the publication of the entire collection (except for one or two incomplete works) and sets out its scope. Susanne Heinrich reviews the exciting find at the heart of the collection, Telemann’s twelve fantasias for viola da gamba, hitherto thought lost. Michael Fleming and John Bryan’s Early English Viols: Instruments Makers and Music arrived just too late for review in this issue, but will appear in the next. In the meantime it will be featured in The Viol.
The Division Viol, an overview

Myrna Herzog

Every viol player is familiar with the term division viol, widely understood as a kind of English viol described by Christopher Simpson (c.1602-1669) in his important treatise of the same name. The present article attempts to give an overview of this instrument, assembling the information available from first hand sources. What are its roots? How and when does it appear in contemporary sources? Is the six-string violin-shaped division viol portrayed in Simpson’s book one and the same instrument as the six-string bass violin described in James Talbot’s manuscript? As we shall see, not everything one is used to hearing or reading today about the division viol finds validation in the early sources.

Italian origins

Since the first part of the 16th century, England had experienced a vogue for things Italian, especially music and poetry. Italian madrigals were translated, paraphrased and parodied, producing two important offshoots at the turn of the 17th century: the English madrigal and the viol fantasy (its instrumental counterpart), which evolved into genres of great individuality and vitality.

In the realm of viol solo music, chordal practices typical of the Italian lyra da gamba seem to have inspired the English lyra-way genre of playing on the viol (suggestive of the former, with an abundance of chords) and ultimately, as a medium for this genre, a smaller instrument named lyra-viol. Another distinctive

---

1 This article is derived from Chapter IV of my Ph.D. thesis “The quinton and other viols with violin traits” (Israel: Bar Ilan University, 2003), developed under the guidance of Prof. Joachim Braun, to whom I am indebted. Portions of it were presented at a meeting of the New York Chapter of the Viola da Gamba Society of America on January 24, 2005, and at a meeting of the British Viola da Gamba Society on October 30, 2015, thanks to the support of the Israeli Embassy in London. A previous version of it was published in the book by Karnes, Kevin C. / Sheptovitsky, Levi (eds.), Across Centuries and Cultures, Musicological Studies in Honor of Joachim Braun (Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien, 2010). I wish to convey my gratitude the contributions of Eliahu Feldman, Thomas MacCracken, Ephraim Segerman, Benjamin Hebbert, Fred Lindeman, the late Dietrich Kessler and John Topham. Many thanks also to Charles Beare, Judith Davidoff, Michael Fleming, the late Michael Heale, William Monical, Katsuzo Niiyama, and Peter Trevelyan; to the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (Vera Magyar); The Royal College of Music, London (Elizabeth Wells); Bonhams London (Philip Scott); Sotheby’s London (Graham Wells, Catherine Bowder); and to the workshop of Morel & Gradolux-Matt Inc.


3 James Talbot, Music Ms. 1187 in Christ Church Library, Oxford.

Italian style of playing the viol introduced in England was sonar alla bastarda, rich in diminutions and embellishments, with a repertoire of virtuoso idiomatic instrumental composition (c.1580-1630). The adoption of bastarda practices in England generated a genuinely English genre — divisions upon a ground — and later also a medium for this genre, the division viol. In both cases, a specific musical function generated a specialised instrument to better serve it.

**The Divisions genre in England**

The practice of improvising a descant upon a ground or foundation (usually a recurrent melody in the bass) reached England in the late 16th century, becoming a trademark of English viol playing during the 17th century. More than 100 sets of the so-called divisions upon a ground can be found in English manuscripts, by a variety of authors of varied musical statures.

Giovanni Coprario (c.1575-1626) was the first Englishman to address the topic of divisions in an organised manner, setting forth the principles of diminution and embellishment in his composition treatise *Rules how to compose*, c.1610. Concurrently, Angelo Notari, an Italian musician in the service of James I, published in London in 1613 a set of viol divisions on a madrigal by Cipriano de Rore in bastarda style. The genre was aptly represented by John Jenkins (1592-1678), Henry Butler (d. 1652), Christopher Simpson (c.1602-1669), and Daniel Norcombe (fl. 1602-41). The writing was soloistic, making full use of the viol’s range (from the bottom string tuned a second lower, up to far beyond the frets on the first string), employing double stops (in the chordal style of the lyra viol), rapid passage work, and wide leaps.

Interbreeding of musical practices caused divisions to be written in tablature (traditionally associated with chordal music), and to be used for variety of texture in viol consort music, as expounded in Coprario’s treatise.

The old English Fancys were in imitation of an elder Italian sort of sonnata, but fell from the sprightliness and variety they had even in those times, into a perpetuall grave course of fuge; and if the fuge quickened into a little division... it was extraordinary.

Division writing was also present in the English favourite combination of violin, bass viol and continuo, employed extensively by William Young (?-1671), Coprario, Jenkins, William Lawes, and Christopher Gibbons (1615-
1676), in their ‘setts’ or fantasia-suites (consisting of three movements, fantasy, almain/aye, and galliard/corant/saraband).\(^{11}\)

As a genre, division playing suited the new spirit of music in England and for this reason was practiced by different instruments – such as the violin, the flute, the recorder – until the 1730s.\(^{12}\)

In this *Manner of Play* (which is the Perfection of the Viol, or any other *Instrument; If it be exactly performed*) a Man may shew, the dexterity, and excellency, both, of his Hand, and *Invention*, to the *Delight*, and *Admiration*, of those that hear him.\(^{13}\)

### Contemporary sources of information on the division viol

The term *division-viol* was first mentioned and addressed by Christopher Simpson in his 1659 treatise, *The Division-Violist*. Three other contemporary sources provide information on the instrument: John Playford’s *A Brief Introduction to the Skill of Music*;\(^{14}\) Thomas Mace’s *Musick’s Monument* (1676)\(^{15}\) and James Talbot’s manuscript (c.1690).\(^{16}\) The division viol was last mentioned in contemporary sources by an enigmatic writer, T.B., in his 1722 work *A Compleat Musick Master*.\(^{17}\)

Christopher Simpson was a brilliant instrumentalist and great improviser, a master of viol technique. He was also a teacher and a respected scholar. *The Division-Violist* was written as an instruction book for his pupils Sir John Bolles and Sir John St. Barbe. The threefold treatise – dealing with viol playing, musical composition and the manner of performing divisions,\(^{18}\) and containing a few precious illustrations – is a well constructed pedagogical tool and a valuable source of information on the English musical praxis of the time.

There has been much speculation about Simpson’s identity. Part of his life is still shrouded in mystery, owing to the fact that he was a Catholic and a recusant. Urquhart\(^{19}\) proposes that the mystery might be hiding the alter ego of the musician, Christopher Simpson the Jesuit, also a distinguished pedagogue,

---

11 The tradition of writing a concertante viol part in addition to the continuo seems to have also been borrowed from Italy, for it “can be found throughout the Italian sonata a tre repertory from the early 17th century to Corelli and beyond.” Peter Holman, correspondence, *Early Music* 6 (July 1978): 482.

12 In 1722 the division viol was still dealt with by T.B. in his *Compleat Musick-Master* (quoted in Robert Donington, “James Talbot’s Manuscript II. Bowed Strings,” *GfJ* 3 (1950): 41, 43); *The Division Flute* (anonymous) was published in the same year and apparently the last edition of Playford’s *The Division Violin* came to light in 1730.


14 Published in London in successive editions, available on microfilm at the New York Public Library, New York. The first edition to mention the division viol is the 1664 one.


17 Quoted in Donington, “Talbot’s Manuscript”, 41, 43.


who had studied for the priesthood in Rome. This would explain the musician’s intimacy with the Italian style, the European awareness in his works, as well as the unusual translation of his treatise into Latin for the second edition, so “that it might be understood in Foreign Parts”.21

The Jesuit’s séjour in Rome might also be at the root of his familiarity with violin-shaped viols [figure 1], which he considered to be the fittest for divisions22 – instruments similar to the ones he might have seen there, made by great Italian masters such as Antonio (1540-?) and Girolamo (1561-1630) Amati, Giovanni Paolo Maggini (1580-c.1630), Gasparo (1542-1609) and Francesco Bertolotti da Salò (1565-c.1624); and also by Pellegrino de Michelis Zanetto (c. 1522-1615), Domenico Russo (Ruffo? fl. c.1590), Ventura Linarol (1577-1591?), and Antonio Brensio (c.1520-c.1595).23 The Church was traditionally a client of viol makers and Jesuits, in particular, owned and used viols, also for performance during the Mass and celebrations.24

![Figure 1: Aurelio Virgiliano, Il Concerto delle Viole in Il Dolcimelo, c. 1660](image)

It is significant that in the second edition, among other updates such as removing his own hat from his portrait, Simpson renamed his treatise as The

---

21 Simpson, *Division-Viol*, second page of The Epistle Dedicatory.
23 For detailed information and pictures of viols with violin traits by those makers see Myrna Herzog, “The quinton and other viols with violin traits” (PhD diss., Bar Ilan University, 2003), vol. II.
Division-Viol (formerly *The Division-Violist*), moving the focus from the player to the instrument itself.

The second known author to address the division viol was John Playford (1623-1686), in his best-seller (first printed in 1654) *A Briefe Introduction to the Skill of Music for Song and Viol*. Between 1654 and 1730 this book had 17 or 18 editions and 22 reprints, being successively revised, its sections enlarged or cut out according to new demands, as a show-case of the latest fashions, trends and developments in English musical life. Playford’s *A Briefe Introduction* is a reliable indicator of what came into use – and when. It is enlightening to investigate the space and nomenclature allocated to viols, edition after edition, as years go by.

The division viol is first mentioned in Playford’s best-seller some years after Simpson had published his treatise. Although the term *division-viol* – and the concept of a special viol to play divisions – is already used by Simpson in 1659, it appears in other publications with a delay, as it often happens with novelties.

Playford’s first edition (1654) addresses only treble, tenor and bass viols, while the second edition (1655), to which “Mr. Christoph. Symson” is listed as a contributor, mentions also the *Lyra viol* and introduces a small new section on the Violin, “now an instrument much in request, & suits best to the Musick of this Age”, with a paragraph on the Bass Violin, tuned d G C.25 The third edition (1658) introduces a significant novelty: in addition to the usual “Directions for the Playing on the *Viol de Gambo*” we find “and also on the *Treble-Violin*”, labelled a “cheerful and sprightly instrument, and much practiced of late”.26

The following editions of Playford’s book, “*THE THIRD EDITION, Enlarged*” (1660) and the 1662 one, although acknowledging Simpson’s treatise, still refer only to “The *Viol de Gambo or Consort Viol*” of which there are three sizes (treble, tenor and bass) played from regular musical notation, and to the *Lyra-viol*, played from Tablature.27 Technical directions are omitted, “it being already done and lately published by a more Able and Knowing Master on this Instrument, viz Mr. Chr.Simpson, in his excellent book, entitled, *The Division Violist*”.28

Not until the 1664 edition did Playford distinguish between “three Sorts of *Basse Viols*, as there is three manner of ways in playing” – consort, divisions and lyra-way – each genre having its adequate medium.29

Over the next ten years the viol section of the book remains mostly unchanged, while the violin section is progressively enlarged. “Instructions and Lessons for the *Treble, Tenor, and Bass-Viols*” will be retained until the very last issue in 1730.

27 John Playford, *A Brief Introduction the the Skill of Musick* (London, 1660), 75.
28 Playford, *Skill of Musick* (1660), 78.
The division viol is also addressed by Thomas Mace (1612-1706), a lute and viol player and a clerk of Trinity College, Cambridge. His *Musick’s Monument*, published in 1676, when he was 64 years old, is one of the most important sources on 17th century English music and performance practices. It is divided into three parts, dedicated to the performance of sacred music, the lute (the bulk of the work), and “The Viol and Musick in General, giving Some Particular Directions towards a Righter Use of That Instrument, than is Commonly Known and Practised”, ending with a seven-page “coda” entitled “Musick’s Mystical and Contemplative Part”. It is a nostalgic book, a longing homage to the musicians and the music of former days. Listing Christopher Simpson among “our Best Authors deceased”, English and Italian, Mace’s treatise is turned to the past as much as Simpson’s is to the future.

Our last source of information on the division viol is James Talbot (1664-1708), a friend of the composer Henry Purcell (1659-1695), who was a fellow and Regius Professor of Hebrew (1689-1704) also at Trinity College, Cambridge. During the years 1692-95, Talbot engaged himself in the preparation of a treatise on musical instruments, addressing their history, description, dimensions, tablatures, and tunings. The manuscript was never completed, but Talbot’s annotations, recorded into a set of unbound papers, became one of the most important sources on English organology, preserved at Oxford’s Christ Church Library as Music MS 1187.

Talbot acquired information from books and also from prominent London musicians. This seems to be the cause of some conflicting data on viols in the manuscript, for it is possible that “there were two different sets of instruments with information probably given by different informants”. Some of the names of informants on string instruments are revealed, among them James Paisible and Edward Lewis for the Bass violin; and Gottfried Finger, for the treble and tenor viols, the double-bass, and the enigmatic *Viol di Corunna* (would it be the baryton, known also as *Viola Bordone, Paraton, Pardon*?). The informant on the division viol is unidentified.

Of all the 17th century sources presently known to us, Talbot’s manuscript is by far the richest in organologic matters, giving actual measurements in great detail.

We shall now cross-examine the information provided by the sources mentioned above, in our attempt to portray the division-viol in the most detailed way.

---

31 Mace, *Musick’s Monument*, 234.
33 Personal communication from Ephraim Segerman, January 2001. See also Segerman’s “The Sizes of English Viols and Talbot’s Measurements”, *GSJ* 48 (1995): 33-45. Talbot’s accuracy of measurements is discussed by Darryl Martin, “The Talbot Manuscript – better as it is than the book it never was?” (paper presented at a post-graduate seminar, Dept. of Music, University of Edinburgh, Scotland, 2005). The article is currently online at http://www.darryl-martin.co.uk/talanbetter.htm
Characteristics of the division viol

In England, as said above, divisions were performed by various different instruments, including viols. In the second half of the 17th century, a specific kind of viol became associated with the genre, as the ideal medium to fulfil this musical function. It was called *division-viol*[^34] and it had a special character: it was a soloistic, show-off instrument.

**Shape and construction features**

Two viols of different shapes are depicted in Simpson’s treatise and described as apt for the performance of divisions (figure 2).

![Figure 2: Simpson's viols, The Division-Viol, 1665](image)

Although portrayed playing on a viol of the second shape[^35] (commonly referred as “viol-shape”), Simpson advocates the first, the violin-shaped viol, as better suited for the purpose of divisions, being more resonant and having a lively, faster sound, “like a violin”. This is clearly stated in the section “What kind of viol is fittest for Division”:

[^34]: Simpson, *Division-Violist*, 1.
[^35]: Simpson, *Division-Violist*, 3.
The Sound [of the viol fittest for Divisions] should be quick, and sprightly, like a Violin; and Viols of that shape [violin-shape] (the Belyes being digged out of the Plank) do commonly render such a Sound. 36

Division viols should preferably have carved fronts (the Belyes being digged out of the Plank) like violins, in place of the bent fronts customary in English viol building. 37

The caption of the illustration of the two viols confirms the superior resonance of the violin-shaped viol: “Either of the two viol shapes is suitable for divisions, but the first is more resonant” (figure 2, above). 38

The back of the division viol is neither discussed nor depicted by Simpson. Our source of information on this respect is James Talbot, whose measurements, according to Ephraim Segerman, imply an arched back as well as front. Analyzing the data in the Talbot’s manuscript, Segerman concluded that:

The difference between the depth under the bridge and the depth at the sides, which should be the arching height, is twice as great as we would expect... This could be the result of the back being arched as well as the belly. His Division Viol may then be one of the type preferred by Simpson with ‘the Belyes being digged out of the Plank’ (and back as well) in a violin type of construction. 39

According to Segerman, Talbot’s measurements for the division viol imply also that the arched back had an upper cant, in the Amati-fashion, “because the body depth at the neck was 1 5/8’ less than elsewhere along the edge (there is no such entry for the bass violin”. 40

The presence of a cant together with the arched back is a feature characteristic of the Cremonese school of viol construction, present in viols made by the Amati Brothers, such as the 1597 bass (preserved at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, and that no longer has its cant), and the 1611 tenor (in the Russian State Collection, Moscow) and bass (in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford) made for the Medicis. 41 This kind of building found its way to Britain in the second half of the 17th century, and it can be seen in most of the surviving violin-shaped English viols of the period 1660-1730, made by a

36 Simpson, Division-Viol, 1.
38 “Forma Chelyos utravis Minuritonibus apta, Sed Prima resonantior”. Simpson, Division-Viol, 1665, caption of the illustration facing page 1.
40 Personal communication, March 2009.
maker of “the Richard Meares School” c. 1680, William Baker 1682, Edward Lewis I c.1685 and c.1690, Barak Norman 1708, and Edward Lewis II c. 1720 (figure 3).

42 Sotheby’s Catalogue 3/03/85 lot 73. This instrument had originally pointed corners, an arched back with a cant, and sloping shoulders. It was transformed into a cello, when wood was added to round the shoulders (“completing” them), and to annulate the cant.

43 All those instruments can be seen in Herzog, “The quinton and other viols”, vol II: “A Catalogue of Viols with Violin Traits”.

Figure 3. Viols with arched backs and upper cants: 1 – Amati Brothers viol 1611, Ashmolean Museum; 2 – Stradivari viol 1684 converted into a cello; 3 – viol of “the Richard Meares school” c.1680 converted into a cello; 4, 5 - Two Edward Lewis I (1651-1717) viols c. 1685 previously converted to celli, the first one before restoration; 6- Cello converted from a viol, attributed to Edward Lewis II (1697-a. 1742) c. 1720; 7 – Five-string cello converted from a viol by William Baker of Oxford (c.1648-1685); 8 – Cello converted from a viol by Barak Norman 1708.
All those instruments have been transformed into celli at some point (after viols fell from fashion), due to their violin-like outline. But still, the presence of the cant on their arched backs kept identifying them as former viols, as we can infer from the note below, taken from the diary of Alfred Hill:

"Miss Helen McGregor, the rather attractive little Scottish violinist ...... is taking up, for teaching purposes, the cello, and we have recently sold her an interesting instrument of small dimensions made by Barak Norman in 1708, which is a curious blend of Gamba and cello - the back, although modelled, cants off at the top like that of a Gamba. The price we are getting for this cello is £40, payment to be made by instalments!"  

45  As noted in the diary of Alfred Hill (currently in the possession of Charles Beare) on February 22, 1919; courtesy of Charles Beare.

Makers would go into considerable pains to insert cants in viols with arched backs, cants with no practical function as in flat-backed viols because, as I believe, and Hill points out, the cant functioned as a viol trademark. It is interesting to note that arched backs with upper cants – often enhanced by purfling – appear solely on violin-shaped viols like Simpson’s, and this is certainly to mark them as viols.

Makers would go into considerable pains to insert cants in viols with arched backs, cants with no practical function as in flat-backed viols because, as I believe, and Hill points out, the cant functioned as a viol trademark. It is interesting to note that arched backs with upper cants – often enhanced by purfling – appear solely on violin-shaped viols like Simpson’s, and this is certainly to mark them as viols.

Figure 4: Arched backs with upper cants in two viols by Edward Lewis c. 1685.

All the surviving violin-shaped English viols of the period (known to me) have arched backs with cants, with two exceptions: an instrument with flat back and a cant by Thomas Cole 1678, and an instrument with an arched back without cant by Barak Norman c.1722. All the viols with arched backs display also the

44  The ones by Edward Lewis the father have been restored as viols again.
45  The cant became part of viol construction during the 16th century, when the depth of flat-backed viols was greatly increased relative to other body dimensions; it was devised to avoid a longer heel on the neck (to diminish the size of the area for insertion of the neck) and to facilitate holding and playing the instrument.
47  For details see Herzog, “The quinton and other viols”, vol II.
overlapping edges of table and back typical of the violin family, which seem to be present in Simpson’s picture of the violin-shaped division viol as well; the flat-backed 1678 viol by Thomas Cole (fl.1660-90) has flush edges. Cole’s viol is one of the instruments that most resemble Simpson’s picture, with pointed corners, rounded shoulders, and double purfling on front and back.  

Although depictions of viols are rare in British painting, in the scarce 16th and 17th century British iconography the incidence of viols with violin traits is surprisingly high. Michael Fleming suggests that the form of those English instruments could have been influenced by imported Continental paintings and prints, so that “viols based on these designs would be dominated by ‘cello-shaped’ instruments, the sort favored by Christopher Simpson”. And he adds: “This helps to explain the mass disappearance of English viols, because instruments of this shape are most easily transformed into violins and cellos”. Violin-shaped viols could as well have been inspired on instruments brought to England, import being a common practice at least until 1660. Harvey notes that English makers flourishing by this date “must have been heavily

![Figure 5: viol by Thomas Cole 1678](image)

---

48 Cole also made instruments with so-called viol-shaped bodies. Personal communication from Thomas MacCracken.


51 *Ibid*.

influenced by the instruments then coming from northern Italy, not least those of the well-established Amati family.”

Relative size

Christopher Simpson addressed the size of a division viol in relation to other viols:

I would have a *Division-Viol* to be of something a shorter *size* than a * Consort-Basse*…The *Strings*, a little bigger than those of a *Lyra-Viol*…

The same ratio is confirmed in John Playford’s book (1664 edition):

There are three Sorts of *Basse Viols*, as there is three manner of ways in playing. First, a *Basse Viol* for *Consort* must be one of the largest *Size*, and the strings proportionable. Secondly, a *Basse viol for Divisions* must be of a lesse *Size*, and the strings according. Thirdly, a *Basse viol to Play Lyra way* which is by *Tablature*, must be somewhat lesse then the two former, and strung proportionable.

In his viol classification scheme, James Talbot also places the division viol as an intermediate size between the consort bass and the lyra viol. This proportion is repeated further on:

NB. That the Consort Viol is longer than the Division Viol 1′ in the Neck and Body: it is broader at the top of the Belly [figure illegibly corrected; 2/3 ?] & in the sides 1/2′ at the bottom 1′: its Bow 3′ or 2 1/2′.

Lyra Viol bears the proportion to the Division Viol, viz., it is shorter in the Body and Neck 1′: in the sides 1/2′: it is narrower at the top of the Belly 1/2′: at the bottom 1′: its Bow 30′.

The measurements given by Talbot agree with the proportion above, although there are discrepancies between the detailed measurements of individual viols. Ephraim Segerman notes that there are too many differences to consider them to be measuring or scribing errors, although Talbot did make occasional errors in individual measurements. He suggests that it is likely that two different sets of viols were involved. Viol measurements were never absolute, they varied according to maker, the needs of the client, and within each size of viol, although the sequence of sizes (from the smallest to the largest: tenor, lyra, division, consort) largely followed. An instrument in the outer limit of its size range could be used as a substitute for the instrument in the category just above or below it, as exemplified by Thomas Mace’s advice to use the bigger lyra viols as division viols:

Add to all These 3 *Full-Siz’d Lyro-Viols*;… Let Them be Lusty, *Smart-speaking Viols*; … They will serve likewise for *Division-Viols* very properly.

54 Simpson, *Division Violin*, 1-2.
55 Playford, *Skill of Musick* (1664), 88.
57 Talbot in Donington, “Talbot’s Manuscript”, 32.
59 Personal communication, March 2009.
60 Mace, *Musick’s Monument*, 246.
The actual dimensions of the division viol

I would have a Division-Viol to be of something a shorter size than a Consort-Basse, that so the Hand may better command it; more or less short, according to reach of his Fingers who is to use it: but the ordinary size, such as may carry a String of thirty Inches from the Bridge (duely placed) to the Nutt. 61

Simpson refers to the ordinary division viol as having a string length of thirty inches (76.14 cm), allowing some variation to accommodate the playability needs of the violist. Such string length is reiterated in 1722 by T.B. (who might be simply reproducing Simpson) in his Complement Musick-Master: 62

A Viol of Division size, which ought to carry a string of thirty inches from the Bridge to the Nutt, may serve to play in Consort or a single lesson, or both as you will have it strung...

Talbot’s string length for the division viol is 27 inches (68.52 cm), which is comfortable for all but the smallest hands. But Simpson’s string length of 30 inches (76.14 cm), given in both editions of his treatise, leaves it abundantly clear there is no reason to call the division viol a “small bass viol”, as some writers do. 63 On the contrary, Simpson’s division viol was very large from a modern perspective.

Did Simpson and Talbot use inches of different lengths? The answer is no. In the period between 1658 and 1824 England used one single standard, the Queen Elizabeth Yard. The original yardstick defining this standard survives but has been broken, so it can’t be measured accurately; another one from 1659 “has been measured to give a foot length of 304.563 mm” and the inch as 2.5380 cm instead of the modern 2.54 cm. 64 But even if Simpson had used the earlier standard from 1497, the difference would be negligible, for the earlier foot was only slightly shorter, at 304.490 mm. 65

Talbot also gives us other figures for his division viol: body length of 69.16 cm, body widths of 35.53, 25.38 and 40.60 cm respectively, neck length of 39.34 cm, fingerboard length of 46.95 cm and tailpiece length of 27.92 cm.

Wishing to have also at least a rough idea of the other dimensions of Simpson’s violin-shaped division viol, I asked Ephraim Segerman to project those dimensions by scaling Simpson’s drawing based on the measurements provided by the author. He kindly did so, using as departure point the distance

61 Simpson, Division-Violist, 1-2.
62 T.B. is quoted in Donington, “Talbot’s Manuscript”, 41,43.
64 Darryl Martin, “Talbot’s Manuscript”. All conversions from inches into cm in this article have been made according to this standard.
65 Darryl Martin, “Talbot’s Manuscript”.
between hair fixings on the bow, given by Simpson as 27 inches. This factor (measured as 9.7 cm) produced a body length of 30.1 in. (76.4 cm), a neck length of 14.2 in. (36.1 cm), a fingerboard length of 20.7 in. (52.7 cm) and a projected string stop of 29.4 in. (74.6 cm), which, “corrected for the angle of the strings leads to very close to the 30 inch string stop that Simpson reported”.

Segerman then made a cross-checking projection of the same viol, scaling from the string stop (30 inches), arriving at measurements similar to the ones he had obtained scaling from the bow hair length.

Now, in order to compare those figures with Talbot’s, it is necessary first to address what seems to be a mistake in Talbot’s figures for the division viol: his total sum of nut to tailpiece via bridge figure (104.70 cm), does not relate as it should to his total sum of neck and body lengths figure (108.50 cm).

The mistake seems to lie in the disproportionately large figure given for the neck length. It does not make sense for the division viol, classified by Talbot as smaller than the consort bass and the double bass, to have a neck longer than both (see also Talbot quotes above) – especially taking into account that Talbot offers a second set of measurements where the division viol is smaller than the consort bass and the double bass in every parameter.

It is possible to correct Talbot’s mistake with the help of his own data: one takes his “nut to tailpiece end via bridge” figure (104.70 cm), deducts 2% to account for the increase caused by the angle (arriving at 102.61 cm) and then subtracts the instrument’s body length. The result is a figure of 33.44 cm for the neck-length. Translated into inches, this means that the neck-length recorded by Talbot of 1 foot 3 inches 4 lignes should have been 1 foot 0 inches 4 lignes, i.e. 3 inches shorter.

Once the mistake in Talbot’s neck-length figure has been corrected, and once we have projected Simpson’s division viol, it is possible to roughly compare those two instruments. This is done in Table 1. Simpson’s viol has been scaled down to Talbot’s string length, and Talbot’s viol up to Simpson’s string length, so that by having viols of the same string length side by side, it is easier to see the similarity or contrast between the other parameters.

---

66 Simpson, *Division-Violist*, 2, referring to picture on page 1.
68 The first figure should in fact be greater than the second, “because of the longer route caused by the angle over the bridge”. Segerman, “Sizes of English Viols”, 37.
69 A hypothesis considered but dismissed by Segerman. He suggested that the problem was with the fingerboard length figure of 1 ft 6 in 4 lignes, which should have been bigger, 1 ft 9 in. 4 lignes, matching “the string stop specified by Simpson and T.B.”. Segerman, “Talbot’s Measurements”, 58-9.
70 I am indebted to Ephraim Segerman for his help in this calculation.
71 Figures in italics are deduced from other statements. The body and neck length of Simpson’s viol are deduced by Segerman from Simpson’s drawing, using the bow hair and string length as scaling factors; its body widths and fingerboard length were measured and calculated by myself using Segerman’s factor. They are approximations. The scaling factor is 7.07 full-scale mm = 1 picture mm.
The table above shows us that Talbot’s measurements for the division viol and the ones inferred from Simpson’s drawing are surprisingly close in their proportions. In both, the string length is slightly smaller than the body length – a tendency to be enhanced during the 18th century, and a change from the early viol proportions, when body length was usually smaller or equal to string length.72 The main differences are due to the viols’ outlines: Simpson’s is proportionally narrower in its upper part and waist, and wider in its lower part.

The sizes of Simpson’s and Talbot’s division viols are not absolute and represent only a range of acceptable sizes for this instrument. The division viol, with a body length varying from Talbot’s 69.16 cm to Simpson’s projected 76.40 cm, in a general taxonomy of bass viols (usually considered as ranging from 60 to 80 cms) would fit just below the consort bass.

**Type of finial**

Finial is the generic name for the end of the peg-box of an instrument, made in an ornamental way. Viols’ finials were usually in the form of a carved head, an open scroll, or a full-fledged scroll (like the one seen commonly on violins).

In Simpson’s illustration of two viols, on page one of *The Division-Violist*, we see two kinds of finial: the viol-shaped instrument has a carved head, and the violin-shaped one has a scroll. The scroll is shown with one broad turn visible, which is suggestive of an open scroll, commonly associated with viols.

Talbot mentions a carved head only in his measurements for the double-bass viol; for the other viols (including the division-viol), he writes: “from the top of the Scrowl to the Nutt…”

**Type of tailpiece**

Talbot’s manuscript describes two kinds of tailpiece attachment: the one usually associated with viols, with the tailpiece resting “on [a] square piece of

---

wood called term [hookbar]”,73 and the one typical of violins, the tailpiece attached to a button which he names breech 74 by means of gut or maybe even iron wire.

In Simpson’s engraving both tailpieces in seem to rest on a term. The tailpieces of Talbot’s tenor, lyra and consort bass viols rest on a term, unlike the one of his double bass viol, which is attached to a breech by tail gut or wire. There are no comments for the division viol, but Segerman has observed that

...in Talbot’s list of measurements [for the division viol], there is an entry ‘From the end of the Tailpiece to the bottom of the Belly’ which is crossed out, and no measurements are filled in. This entry tells us that there was no term.75

The presence of a term (hookbar) implies a projection of the tailpiece beyond the bottom of the instrument, producing what is called tailpiece excess, expressed in a figure deducted by Talbot from the whole length.76 The fact that this deduction is absent in his division viol measurements indicates that in Talbot’s division viol the tailpiece attachment was of a violin type.

It is possible, therefore, that either type of tailpiece attachment was used in division viols.

**Bridge, nut and soundpost**

The bridge for a division viol described by Talbot has 8.25 cm height, 9.20 cm breadth at the top and 8.88 cm at the bottom, narrower than the top. Talbot’s measurements for viol bridges increase in height proportionally to the size of the instrument.

The bridge of Simpson’s division viol is depicted in the same illustration of the two viols (see figure 2), and it seems to be in scale with them. If we project its dimensions by scaling to the same factor used before, we get 9.89 cm height at the center, 10.60 cm breadth at the the top (from both the isolated bridge and the bridge on the violin-shaped viol), and 11.31 cm at the bottom, wider than the top.

Since the bridge curvature is set according to the viol’s function (viols destined to play chordal music were usually equipped with a flatter bridge than those intended to play melodic lines, jumps and runs), Simpson recommended:

> The Bridge, as round as that of a Consort-Basse, that so each several String may be hit with a bolder touch of the Bow.77

One can presume from this statement that the lyra might have had a comparatively flatter bridge, more suitable for playing chords. Nevertheless, the height of the nut should be similar on both viols (lyra and division), “for

---

74 Talbot in Donington, “Talbot’s Manuscript”, 34.
75 Personal communication, January 2001.
77 Simpson, Division-Violist, 2.
ease and convenience of Stopping”.78 Fingerboard and bridge should match their curve, causing the strings to stand evenly distant from the fingerboard:

The Strings, a little bigger than those of a Lyra-Viol, which must be laid at the like nearness to the Finger-board, for ease and convenience of Stopping….The Plate or Finger-board[…]must also be of a proportionate roundness to the Bridge, so that each String may lie at an equal nearness to it.79

Thomas Mace comments on the due place of the bridge, alluded to by Simpson:80

The Best Place for the Bridge, is to stand just in the 3 Quarter Dividing of the Open Cuts Below; though Most, most erroneously suffer them much to stand too High, which is a Fault.81

This placement of the bridge, present in many viol iconography sources, is lower than today’s standards. Talbot, writing two decades later, advocates for the violin the placing of the bridge in its modern location:

Place bridge even wth Notch or f of the Sounding holes.82

Talbot refers also to two possibilities for the placement of the soundpost, the first being just opposite the foot of the bridge, an old practice referred to in treatises by Bagatella and Galeazzi in the 18th century and employed by 19th century Mirecourt builders, the second being the modern one (slightly away from the foot of the bridge).

Sound-post under treble string of the same between back and belly under the bridge or there about accordg to discretion of Artist.84

The Bow

According to Christopher Simpson:

A Viol-Bow for Division, should be stiff, but not heavy. Its Length, (betwixt the two places where the Haires are fastned at each end) about 27 inches [68.52cm]. The Nutt, short. The Height of it, about a Fingers breadth, or little more (see figure 1).85

The kind of wood used for the bow is not mentioned, but a bow “stiff but not heavy” possibly would not be made out of the dense piratinera guianensis (snakewood – so much fashionable nowadays among baroque players) and instead of one of the lighter woods which impair such a warmer sound to viols.

78 Simpson, Division Violist, 2.
79 Simpson, Division Violist, 2.
80 Simpson, Division Violist, 1-2. See quote on p.27.
81 Mace, Musick’s Monument, 246.
85 Simpson, Division-Violat, 2,
The manner of tensioning the hairs of the bow is also not mentioned. As the screwing mechanism was invented only in the 18th century, it is safe to assume that division viol bows had clip-in frogs. Although many think that the clip-in system as compared to the screw mechanism does not alter the functioning of the bow, the experience of this writer shows the opposite. It does affects it for the best, the inconvenience being the need of owning more than one frog in order to cope with differences in temperature and humidity, and the danger of loosing the frog by distraction.

The bow in James Talbot’s manuscript seems to be given in its total length: 30" [76.14 cm] for the lyra and division viols. The total length of Simpson’s bow, scaled from the drawing, is roughly 31" [78.7 cm], slightly longer than Talbot’s.

**Strings, Frets and Temperaments**

According to Simpson, the division viol has seven frets tied to its neck and six strings tuned as a bass viol, D-G-c-e-a-d’, addressing their relative gauge:

> It must be accommodated with six Strings; and seven Frets, like those of a Lute, but something thicker. The Strings, a little bigger than those of a Lyra-Viol... 88

Playford refers to the division viol as a “Sort of Basse Violl”, with the same number of strings, tuning, and number of frets. 89

The number and tuning of the strings of the division viol is not mentioned by James Talbot. In his manuscript, the staff allocated for this purpose is left blank, and Talbot reports only that the instrument’s lowest string is a D. 90 In a partially illegible note (the words in parentheses are uncertain), he informs us that the lowest strings of the viol and bass violin could be overspun (wound with metal), a fairly recent novelty which had an impact on the sizes of bowed instruments, as this new technology enabled smaller bodies to produce lower pitches:

> In low[est] Basses [mixed] with Copper or [Silver] Wire in lowest [    ] of Bass Violin or Viol. 91

Talbot documents the presence of movable frets, arranged in a variable way, according to the temperament chosen by the player:

> The Division Viol has 7 Frets placed at the discretion of the Master. Ag. 92

We now have a picture of the instrument. However, there are still some questions to be answered. One of them is: if Simpson advocated the violin-shaped viol as the best division viol, why was he portrayed playing a violin-shaped viol in his book?

---

86 Talbot in Donington, “Talbot’s Manuscript”, 43.
87 Simpson, *Division-Violist*, 4.
88 Simpson, *Division-Violist*, 2.
89 Playford, *Skill of Musick* (1664), 88.
91 Catch, “Talbot’s Viols”, 37.
92 Talbot in Donington, “Talbot’s Manuscript”, 32.
Here are two possible answers: 1. Perhaps because he did now own such an instrument, which he might have played mostly in Italy. 2. Perhaps because he did not own such an instrument, but wanted to encourage its building in England, convinced that it was the best for the performance of divisions.

**The Division viol as a bass for the violin consort**

Simpson’s *Division-Violist* was printed just before the Restoration of the Monarchy in England (1660), a time of transformation in the musical scene, with an increased interest in violin music, Italian monody and solo writing.

…upon the Restauration of King Charles [II], the old way of consorts were laid aside at court, and the King made an establishment, after a French model of 24 violins, and the style of musick was accordingly. So that became the ordinary music of the Court, Theaters, and such as courted the violin… This French manner of instrumentall musick did not gather so fast as to make a revolution all at once, but during the greatest part of the King’s reign the old musick was used in the countrys and in many meetings and societys in London: but the treble viol was discarded, and the violin took its place.

Partisans of the “old musick” such as Thomas Mace noted that this new music was noisy and carried an inbuilt imbalance, played by instruments “Unequally Suited; or Unevenly Numbred”, such as “One Small Weak-Sounding-Bass-Viol, and 2 or 3 Violins; whereas one (in Reason) would think, that One Violin would bear up Sufficiently against 2 or 3 Common-Sounding-Basses, especially such as you shall Generally meet with, in their Ordinary Consorts”.

The imbalance between the ordinary consort bass viol and the new-fangled “scoulding” violin probably could be felt as well at the “many meetings and societys in London”, dedicated to the performance of chamber music, where violins and viols played together. In order to solve the problem, and better dialogue with the violin, some partisans of “the Noble Base Viol” decided to employ the more resonant and powerful division-viol in place of the ordinary “weak-sounding” consort viol, as suggested by T.B. in 1722 (the word consort by that time meaning an ensemble with violins):

A Viol of Division size …may serve to play in Consort or a single Lesson, or both as you will have it strung...

So, in addition to its obvious role of a soloist performing divisions upon a ground, the division viol could also fulfil the role of an appropriate bass for a

---

93 While Italian solo violin music had been sold already since the 1630s, the arrival of German virtuoso Thomas Baltzar about 1656 certainly made an impact. Peter Walls, “The Influence of the Italian violin school in 17th-century England”, *EM* 18/4 (1990): 577, 579.
94 North, *Grammarian*, 349.
95 North, *Grammarian*, 351.
96 Mace, *Musick’s Monument*, 234.
98 Ibid.
violin consort. The passage above tells us that in principle the instrument should be strung differently for each function (possibly heavier when providing the bass for violins), although compromise stringing could be done.

This way, the viol, an instrument favoured by gentlemen, would find its place anew in the private corners of English society, in the exclusive gatherings of music societies (like the weekly concerts organised by Thomas Britton since 1678) and music meetings, well into the 18th century. 101

The six-string, violin-shaped division viol and Talbot’s six-string bass violin

A final question remains, concerning James Talbot’s manuscript report of a 6-string bass violin, tuned D-G-c-e-a-d’ like the division viol. What would be the difference between those two violin-shaped instruments, a bass violin and a viol, both with six strings, tuned the same way, considering that possibly not every violin-shaped viol would have the distinctive Amati-inspired round back with a fold?

Regarding the violin-like construction of the division viol, it has been proposed that “Talbot’s division viol was a converted bass violin” 102 or a small violone 103 or that Simpson’s viol was “a fretted six-string form of the bass-violin”. 104 On the contrary, it seems to me logical to assume that Talbot knew exactly what he was writing when he described the six-string bass violin and the six-string division-viol as two different instruments. I would also consider information given by Christopher Simpson, the pedagogue, the scholar, as accurate and reliable.

To my mind, the one obvious physical difference between viols and violins lies in the length of their necks relative to their bodies, 105 not in the shape of their resonance bodies, because viols can be built in at least four different shapes (guitar, violin, festoon, and the so-called viol shape). The neck length is crucial in establishing the string length, and therefore the string gauge of a bowed instrument. In a bass instrument, a short string length calls for thick strings in order to be effective at all; and the contrary is true for a long string length. Early cello necks are short, viol necks are long. Together with the number and tuning of strings, neck length is a decisive factor defining the sound output, nature and character of a bowed instrument.

---

102 Segerman, “Talbot’s Measurements”, 56, underlining is original.
105 This issue has been tackled in Herzog, “Italian Viol Building”, 147 and Herzog, “The quinton and other viols”, I, 62-5.
Talbot’s manuscript mentions bass violins with four strings (referred to as English), five strings (referred to as French), and six strings. Compared to his division viol, Talbot’s four-string bass violin has a bigger body and a shorter neck. Its body length is 71.06 cm, longer than that of his division viol with 69.16 cm, and its neck length is 25.38 cm, shorter than that of the division viol with 39.34 cm (using the seemingly mistaken original figure) or 33.44 cm (in the corrected measurement).

Five-string bass violins are listed by Talbot as French; such instruments were indeed extensively used in France, as part of the basse continue section of the Parisian Opera’s orchestra, being associated with Jean-Baptiste Lully’s music. They were bulky, larger than the modern cello, and tuned C G d a d’, with an added top string to expand the limited range and compensate for the lack of agility of the four-string instrument. In England, French five-string bass violins were also employed for performances of music “in the Babtist [Lully] way”, attended by “a society of gentlemen of good esteem”. The six-string bass violins reported by Talbot would have been an attractive alternative for viol players willing to perform French music, while providing a
more solid foundation to the violin ensemble. The tuning of the strings would probably remain the same, as well as the underhand bow-grip, actually not uncommon for cellists until quite late in the 18th century.\textsuperscript{110}

This could be the background behind the special six-string bass violin made by Edward Lewis, the father (1651-1717\textsuperscript{111}) for Lord Abergenny, reported by Talbot in a passage that has originated much controversy (see fig.6):\textsuperscript{112}

Lewis has a Bass Violin (made for Lord Abergenny) which has 6 strings: its neck is somewhat shorter than that of usual B. Violin [in order] to bear a Pitch: he says the treble string is of the same sound and size with the 3d of B. Violin (or B. Viol) it is louder than either. And tuned B. Viol way.\textsuperscript{113}

![Figure 7: James Talbot Manuscript](image)

Talbot wrote also on the same page: “Bass Violin all Venice Catlins”,\textsuperscript{114} possibly referring to the stringing of this instrument as all-gut.

Lewis was an important maker, with clients from the upper segments of society. His work today “stands in high repute, though extremely rare”, its scarcity being credited to the exchange of labels for Italian ones, “his originals passed off as Italian”.\textsuperscript{115} “Lewis is one of a group of distinguished English makers the absence of whose better work from any museum in Britain is a national tragedy”.\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{110} See Mark Smith, “The cello bow held the viol way; once common, but now forgotten”, \textit{Chelys} 24 (1995): 47-61.

\textsuperscript{111} I am indebted to Benjamin Hebbert and John Topham for these dates.


\textsuperscript{113} Talbot in Donington, “Talbot’s Manuscript”, 30.

\textsuperscript{114} Ibidem. The manuscript pages dealing with string instruments are available on the Internet at \url{http://www.greatbassviol.com/ntalbot.html}

\textsuperscript{115} Harvey, \textit{Violin Family}, 78.

\textsuperscript{116} Harvey, \textit{Violin Family}, 79.
Lewis’ special instrument would be louder than a viol or an ordinary bass violin; it would be strung with very thick strings, tuned like a bass viol. And if in Talbot’s manuscript the four-string bass violin had a bigger body and a shorter neck than the division viol, this proportion would be even more marked in the case of Lewis’ 6-string bass violin, its neck being “somewhat shorter than that of usual B. Violin”.  

Ephraim Segerman was the one to open the path to a full understanding of this passage, pointing out that Lewis’ six-string bass violin top string could only be of “the same sound and size” (i.e., same pitch and gauge) as “the 3d [string] of B. Violin or B. Viol” if he would be referring to a 5 string bass violin tuned to the high pitch standard of the violin band (described by Talbot as Chappell Pitch), which was a tone higher than that of the viols (Consort Pitch); in this case, the third string of the 5 string bass violin would have a nominal pitch equivalent in “sound and size [gauge]” to the third string of the bass viol, which has the nominal pitch e.

So the passage can be summarised thus: Edward Lewis made a special 6-string bass violin for Lord Abergenny. The instrument was intended to produce a powerful sound, to be louder than the bass viol and the usual bass violin. This was achieved by giving the instrument a very short neck, even “shorter than that of the usual B. Violin” which would enable it to hold a special D G c e a d’ stringing with very thick strings (the top d’ string being of the same gauge of a common viol third string e), working at high tension.

There was, therefore, a clear distinction between the six-string, long-necked, violin-shaped division viol and the six-string, short-necked, bass violin in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. Nowadays, nevertheless, nearly all the surviving instruments of both kinds have been converted into four-string celli, which means that their original necks are gone – and with them most of our chances to distinguish between the two instruments.

Of those violin-shaped instruments, only the viols with an Amati-like back can still be identified. The true identity of the other violin-shaped six-string instruments stripped from their original necks probably will be never known.

**Summary**

The division viol had its roots in Italy, in the virtuosic genre named sonar alla bastarda. The introduction of bastarda practices in England led to the creation of

---

120 Possibly a viol player, as were many aristocrats. Significantly, “Abergenny” is the name of a tune in Playford’s The dancing master; or, Directions for dancing country dances, with the tunes to each dance, for the treble-violin. The 10th ed. corrected; with addition of several new dances and tunes never before printed (London: J. Heptinstall, for H. Playford, 1698); it also appears in The Compleat Country Dancing-Master (London: Walsh, 1731).
121 This setting would strengthen the sound of the fundamentals at the expense of the overtones, while tenser strings would offer a louder output.
a genuinely English genre – *divisions upon a ground* – and later a medium for this genre – the *division viol*. The division viol was first mentioned in 1659, in Christopher Simpson’s treatise, *The Division-Violist*. The second edition of this book, in 1665, had its title significantly changed to *The Division-Viol*. Other contemporary writers who refer to the instrument are John Playford (1664-1730), Thomas Mace (1676), James Talbot (c. 1692-95) and T.B. (1722).

In his book Simpson depicts viols of two different shapes, held as suitable for playing divisions; he regards the violin-shaped one as more apt for the genre, being more resonant, and having a faster sound response, due to its violin-like construction, with a carved front like a violin. Violin-shaped viols were present in England much before Simpson’s time, as iconography attests, co-existing with other viol shapes.

The back of the division viol was either rounded, or rounded with an upper cant, in the *Amati-fashion*, according to the data in Talbot’s manuscript. The addition of the typical viol cant to the arched backs of violin-shaped instruments would have no function other than further characterising them as viols.

The division-viol was smaller than the consort bass and bigger than the lyra viol. It was a fairly large to *very large* instrument according to modern standards, its body-length varying between 69 to 76 cm, with a string length ranging from 68 to 76 cm.

The finial of the division viol could be plain, in the form of a scroll, or carved. Its tailpiece was attached either by a hook-bar or tail gut. Its bridge, placed three-quarters of the way down from the top of the soundholes, had a curvature similar to that used on the consort bass, matching the fingerboard. The soundpost was placed either opposite the foot of the bridge, or slightly away from it, in the modern position.

The division viol had six strings tuned D-G-c-e-a-d\(^\text{122}\) as a bass viol, and seven movable frets tied to its neck. Its lowest strings could be overspun with copper or silver. The bow had a clip-in frog, was not heavy but stiff, its length around 30" or 31" (76.14 or 78.7 cm).

The division viol appeared just before the Restoration in England, a period of great interest in violin music. The violin-shaped instrument was used not only to play divisions, but to provide a more solid foundation (than the consort viol or the viol-shaped division viol) to the violin ensemble, being strung accordingly. At the time, and with the same purpose, viol players began also to play six-string bass violins tuned as bass viols, powerful instruments heavily strung, bearing very short necks. At the end of the violin era, most (if not all) of those violin-shaped viols and six-stringed bass violins were transformed into four-string celli.

---

\(^{122}\) Simpson, *Division-Violist*, 4.
The only violin-shaped viols still recognizable as such after having lost their original necks are the ones with an *Amati-like back*, arched with an upper cant. The majority of them are still kept as cellos, because of market considerations. When described in auctions, their viol identity is at most distantly suggested by reference to an “Amati concept” of arched and canted back instruments – conveniently omitting the word *viols*…\(^{123}\)

As William Shakespeare said, “*There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, Than are dreamt of in your philosophy*”.\(^{124}\) Similarly, there are so many areas in the realm of string instruments to be researched, more than we can dream of. It requires all our unprejudiced imagination. I hope to have provided a fair point of departure for the division viol.

---

\(^{123}\) One such instrument was sold by Christie's in 1992 as “an English violoncello, attributed to Edward Lewis the son (1697-a.1742), circa 1720…This instrument may originally have had five, or even six strings, being converted when the scroll was replaced”. It was sold again by Sotheby's in March 1995 as “an English cello c.1720” made by “a follower of Barak Norman” with a certificate by John & Arthur Beare Ltd., London, dated 19/08/94, noting that “Antonius and Hieronimus Amati originated the concept of this instrument”. Viols being the only Amati instruments with cants in their arched backs, the Beares acknowledged in this oblique way that this instrument was originally a viol, similar to the Amati ones.

\(^{124}\) *Hamlet* Act 1, scene 5, 159–167.
An Amateur Viol Player in the Dutch Golden Age:
Johannes Thysius (1622-1653)

JAN W. J. BURGERS

Music was an important aspect of the rich culture of the Dutch Golden Age. In all layers of society, at all possible occasions, songs were sung and instruments played. In the upper classes the ability to sing and to play one or more instruments was considered an integral part of accepted social convention. Children were at a young age taught to sing and received lessons on various instruments. In the first half of the seventeenth century not all instruments were considered appropriate for the well-to-do amateur: favourites were the lute, the viol, the recorder and the harpsichord.

The best-known amateur musician of the Dutch Golden Age is the diplomat, civil servant and poet Constantijn Huygens (1596-1687). He was an avid player of the lute, the harpsichord and the viol, for which instruments he also composed much music, which is nearly completely lost; of his hundreds of compositions there remain only his single – anonymous – publication *Pathodia sacra et profana*, containing sacred and profane songs for solo voice and theorbo, another song in a manuscript, and just one piece for viol solo. Huygens was committed to the viol throughout his entire long life, and in his correspondence we find the names of professional viol players with whom he had contacts in person or in correspondence, such as John Coprario, Walter Rowe, Nicolas Hotman, Dietrich Stoeffken and a certain Betkofski. Huygens was well acquainted with English viol music, consort works as well as the solo style played in the ‘lyra-way’. In both

---

1 An earlier version of this article, not explicitly focussing on the viola da gamba: Jan W.J. Burgers, ‘Johannes Thysius and his music’, *Tijdschrift voor de Vereniging van Nederlandse Muziekgeschiedenis*, 66 (2016), is in the press. I am grateful to Tim Crawford, who carefully read the first draft of the present contribution.


3 For an overview of the role of music in Huygens’s life, see Burgers, *The Lute in the Dutch Golden Age*, 73-87.


practices the viol was widely recognised as typically English; the Dutch knew the instrument as the ‘Engelsche viool’. In Dutch manuscripts with viol music, many pieces by English composers are found.8  

In the following article, we will have a look at another amateur viol player from the Dutch elite: the Leiden-based jurist Jan Thijs, or Johannes Thysius, the Latinised version of his name that he adopted after the fashion of the time. Thysius was born in 1622 as the son of a wealthy Amsterdam merchant who originated from the Southern Netherlands. In 1634, after the death of his parents, he moved to Leiden, where he lived in the house of his uncle, Constantijn l’Empereur (1598-1648), who was a professor of Hebrew at the university. Following his education at the Latin school, Thysius studied in the faculty of arts and subsequently in the faculty of law. He then left on an eighteen-month Grand Tour of France and England. On his return to Leiden, he obtained his doctorate and was all set to embark upon a career in society when he died at the age of just 31.9 In his last will and testament, he had stipulated that his large book collection should be kept in a new building, to serve as a public library; as such it still stands as the Bibliotheca Thysiana on the Leiden Rapenburg canal.10 Thysius’s personal archive was also kept together with his library; it consists of his correspondence and his private administration, including the cashbooks he kept during his lifetime, in which he recorded the things he bought and the price he had paid for them. This archive, which is now kept at the Leiden University Library, was recently made available for scholarly research thanks to a new inventory.11 It yields much information about Johannes Thysius’s musical upbringing, activities and tastes, and his relation to the viol.

---

7 Tim Crawford, ‘Constantijn Huygens and the “Engelsche viool”’, Chelys., 18 (1989), 41-60.
8 In the so-called Goëss manuscripts, a series of five books of music for lute, viol and theorbo, which were written in Utrecht in the third quarter of the seventeenth century, and which are now kept at the Austrian castle of Ebenthal; see The Goëss tablature manuscripts: Theorbo book (ca 1650-1670): Pieces for theorbo/archlute – Pieces for lute, ed. T. Crawford ([München], 1996), ‘General Preface’. In these books are inscribed many viol pieces by John Jenkins, Simon Ives, Charles Coleman, William Lawes and William Young. Huygens’s single viol piece is also recorded here. See Crawford, ‘Allemande Mr. Zuilekom’, 175-177. The viol pieces are in Goëss MSS A-C, published by Tree Edition.
The earliest sources of information about Thysius and music are found in his correspondence, namely in the short letters that the young Johannes wrote as a schoolboy at the Latin school, which he copied in the oldest of the two books containing drafts of letters.\footnote{ATH 423 and 424. The early letters written as a schoolboy are in ATH 423.} In these early letters, addressed to various family members and often sent as New Year's greetings, he gave an account of the progress he had made in his studies – his family was spending a lot of money on his schooling, and was therefore entitled to periodical reports. As was to be expected for an upper-class young man, Thysius's studies also included music.\footnote{Later, his half-sister Levina learned to play the harpsichord. In a letter from Thysius to Barbara Boddinkx van Laar, dated 6 July 1643, Thysius asks the addressee to send him his sister's}
The oldest letter in the book was sent by Thysius to his father and stepmother in 1634. Johannes starts his account of his studies with his musical activities: ‘I continue with my harpsichord and every day have hours to play; and if it pleases my father, I will also learn Music, in order to have a better understanding of the theory of playing’. Thus, while he was diligently playing the harpsichord, he seemed less inclined to study music theory. He continues with a report on his other occupations: he sews and mends his own clothes, writes, does arithmetic, and rehearses the catechism and the psalms.

On 1 January 1637, young Thysius sent New Year’s greetings to his ‘cousin and niece van Swol’ and to his uncle Petrus Boelius (Pieter Boel). In the letter to his cousins he gives a short account of his progress at school, and says that he ‘practises daily on his instruments’. The letter in Latin to his uncle is more informative: ‘I practise in the privacy of my home in singing and playing the stringed instruments and also the recorder and the harpsichord, especially when I am tired of my studies; sometimes I go out to take a walk in the countryside.’ In another New Year’s letter to his cousin and niece, in which the year is not mentioned (it is probably from 1638 or 1639), Thysius makes another general comment on his musical studies: ‘Further, concerning my music, I practise playing daily’.

In a letter written on New Year’s Day 1640, sent to his cousin and stepmother, we again find a short remark on his daily practising, but now with the hint that he had temporarily suspended his musical studies; this might have been in connection with the start of his academic schooling in the autumn of 1639. He adds that he hopes that there will be an opportunity, after the weather has improved, for his music book for the harpsichord (‘speelboeck op de klaversingel’) and her belt (ATH 423, unfoliated).

14 ATH 423, on a separate leaf, pinned to a page that contains a letter dated 15 October 1643. In 1634, Thysius’s father died and he also bought the harpsichord he mentions (see below), so the letter can not have been written before or after that year.

15 ‘... continuerende mijne claversingel en hebbe dagelijks uren om te speelen; en soo het vader gelieft sal oock musieck daer bij leeren om dien gront van het speelen te beter te verstaen’.

16 ATH 423, unfoliated: ‘Vorders wat aengaet mijn instrumenten, oeffene mij in die dagelijks’.

17 ATH 423, unfoliated: ‘Voce et fidibus canendo tum fistula et monorchia memet intra privatos parietes exerceo, tum praceipue cum studendo defessus sum, aliquando etiam rus exeo dambulatum.’ The word ‘fidibus’ (‘strings’) could refer to various instruments; we shall see that Thysius played the violin as well as different types of viol. The puzzling word ‘monorchia’ is probably a misspelling of ‘monochordia’ (or rather: ‘monochordio’); the term ‘monochordium’ could indicate various keyboard instruments, especially the clavichord, but here it is clearly referring to Thysius’s harpsichord.

18 ATH 423, unfoliated: ‘Vorders wat aengaet mijn musicieck, oeffene mij noch dagelijcks in het spelen’.

family to come over so that they can hear his progress. The New Year’s letters of subsequent years make no mention of music; it seems that his music lessons stopped, to be replaced by other studies. In the letter of 1 January 1643, to his cousin and mother, he writes that his ‘daily practice’ consists of fencing, dancing and riding, and that he has also made a start at learning French.

_Thysius’s instruments_

In these letters, Thysius mostly speaks of his music lessons in general terms. Only the harpsichord, the recorder and ‘stringed instruments’ are specifically mentioned. But there is another source that gives more detailed information of the instruments he was playing in his school days. In one of his cash books, he recorded his purchases of musical instruments, including the date, the price and often details such as provenance, the name of the maker or the year the instrument was built (Table 1). Here we find the acquisition of four violins, four pochettes (small violins used for the accompaniment of dancing), five viols, a harpsichord and a lute.

Thus, his musical education as a schoolboy can be traced by way of the instruments he bought. The first instrument that the young Johannes played was the ‘superius’ viola da gamba, the treble viol, which obviously best fitted a child’s small hands; it was purchased in 1630. This was followed in 1632 by a violin (a small instrument, as is stated explicitly), and in 1633 by a pochette. A year later, Thysius started to learn the harpsichord. After this, it took some time, until the first half of the 1640s, before new acquisitions are recorded: in 1642 and 1645 he bought no fewer than three new violins, in 1643 a tenor viola da gamba, and in 1646 another pochette. Between 25 October 1646 and 1 May 1648 Thysius made his Grand Tour, which took him to Paris twice and eventually also to England. During this journey, he bought a considerable number of instruments. In Paris he purchased two pochettes, in 1646 and in 1648, and a lute in March 1648. He took advantage of his short stay in England in April 1648 to buy three viols. Hereafter, no more acquisitions of instruments are recorded.

From the correspondence and this list of instruments we may infer that as a youth Thysius was instructed on the viol, the violin, the recorder and the harpsichord.

---

20 ATH 423, unfoliated: ‘Wat aengaet de musiec, oeffene mij noch dagelijcks en hervat het weder. Hope als het weer wat getemperder is dat wij de eer sullen hebben van cousijns en moeders overkomste nevens de sussjes en broeder; so sal cousijn kunnen horen wat ick gevordert hebbe en moeder wat ick kan.’ The ‘little sisters and brother’ (‘sussjes en broeder’) are Levina, Catharina and Pieter Thijs, the children from Johannes’s father Anthoni Thijs’s second marriage to Magdalena Belten. She thereby became Johannes’s stepmother; he never knew his own mother, who died shortly after he was born.

21 ATH 423, unfoliated: ‘Wat aengaenden mijn dagelij克斯se oeffeningen, hebbe nu mijn recreatie int schermen en dansen, als ook in het te paerden te rijden, ... ick hebbe mij oock begeven tot d[e] fransche taal’.

22 ATH 434, p. 152. The list of instruments is printed in _Het Luitboek van Thysius_, I, 62.

Later, as a university student, he had obviously become a serious amateur player with a predilection for the violin; he seems to have given up the recorder, as that is not mentioned in his list of instruments. His playing the violin is rather remarkable, as in the first half of the seventeenth century the instrument was still somewhat frowned upon by the elite, associated as it was with the dance music of the lower classes and with professional musicians. Judging from the pochettes also bought by Thysius, it seems that he had no aversion to dancing, unlike many of his compatriots. As an adult, he seems to have gradually turned to the viol, judging from the purchase of four instruments in the 1640s. Although he bought a costly lute and, as we shall see, a number of lute books, it is unlikely that Thysius played this instrument.

Thysius’s notes also give us an insight into the quality of his collection, which can be inferred from the prices of the instruments and the names of their makers. The cheapest are the simple pochettes, most of which cost 6 guilders; just one, bought from Pierre Leduc in Paris, costs twice that amount. More expensive are the violins, most of them recently made, which vary from 12 guilders to the substantial sum of 20 guilders. Thysius’s most costly instruments, at 80 guilders each, were his harpsichord and his lute. The two-manual harpsichord was made by the famous builder from Antwerp, Andreas Ruckers (1579-after 1645). The lute was an old instrument by the Bolognese maker Laux Maler (1485-1552), obviously adapted to modern taste; Maler lutes were very much sought after by connoisseurs throughout Europe in the mid-seventeenth century.

There is much variation in the price of viols. The small treble, by the Leiden instrument maker Asseling, was bought for 15 guilders, the larger tenor viol for double that amount. It is interesting that in the latter case the cash book mentions a bass, a tenor and two treble viols, made from the same wood, each with a headpiece in the form of a helmet (probably a decorative armet). Afterwards, the bass and the two trebles were crossed out; it seems that Thysius first intended in 1643 to buy a complete chest of viols and then changed his mind.

Rather expensive (equivalent to more than 60 guilders apiece) were the three viols built by John Rose the elder and the younger that Thysius bought in England in April 1648: a small bass (made in 1576) and a treble by the elder Rose, both in a

---


25 The Calvinist Church and many civic authorities considered dancing sinful and tried to ban it from public life. See Burgers, *The Lute in the Dutch Golden Age*, 60-61.

26 Het Luitboek van Thysius / The Thysius Lute Book, i. 48-49.

27 Pierre Leduc was active in Paris in 1647, where he mainly produced expensive pochettes decorated with silver and ebony inlay (Het luitboek van Thysius, i, 64).

28 Or perhaps Andreas’s son, Andreas Ruckers II (1607-before 1667); but instruments by the latter are only known from 1640 onward.

29 Constantijn Huygens also tried to buy one of these (Burgers, *The Lute in the Dutch Golden Age*, 145-150; Het luitboek van Thysius, i, 48).
good case, together for 11 pounds sterling, and a larger bass by Rose the younger, dated 30 August 1584, for 5½ pounds sterling. From the fact that Thysius was willing to purchase these instruments at such a considerable price we may infer that the names of John Rose the elder (fl. 1552-1561) and his son John Rose the younger (fl. 1568-1602), both active in Bridewell near London, were already known to him as makers of fine instruments. Perhaps the bass by the elder Rose was a counterfeit: the date of the instrument is difficult to reconcile with Rose's supposed year of death.  

Thysius purchased the Rose viols in London: his book of draft letters records that when he was staying there, at a certain Mr. Joen's, he received a letter from Mr. Poyer, on behalf of Mr. Ruisceau, to pay 180 francs to Mr. de Hont on 30 April, on account of the fact that he had withdrawn a significant sum of money over a short period for purchases including woollen cloth, ribbons, and three viols for a total of 16½ pounds sterling. 

As is still the case today, the antiquity of an instrument or the fame of its maker often determined its price — it is not for nothing that the year of origin and the maker are often mentioned in Thysius's list. Moreover, local Leiden-made instruments were generally cheaper than those from Paris or England. All in all, it is clear that Thysius was wealthy enough to buy an expensive collection of instruments. Even as a schoolboy, he already possessed instruments of high quality, the most obvious example being his Antwerp-made harpsichord. Later, on his Grand Tour, he bought the costly Rose viols and the Laux Maler lute.

Thysius's collection also throws some light on the contemporary local and international trade in musical instruments. Many of his bowed instruments were made by Andries Asseling from Leiden (active between 1602 and 1658), who practically had a monopoly as the town's instrument maker. The pochette from Paris and the violin from Krakow that he bought in the 1630s must have reached Leiden by way of an intermediary trader, or perhaps in the baggage of a university student. The Antwerp harpsichord must have been brought to Leiden, too; the fact that Thysius does not mention when it was built suggests that it was a new instrument, possibly commissioned directly from Ruckers. Thysius bought the

30 See J. Dilworth, ‘Rose, John’, GMO (accessed 20 October 2016), where it is stated that Rose senior died c. 1562.

31 ATH 424, p. 32: ‘Deux lettres d'avoir receu de Londres: chez Mr. La Doce de la part de Mr. Gon pour payer a Mr. Muyssert la somme de 360 francs Tournois, 16 avril 1648; et de Mr. Poyer á Londres de la part de Mr. Ruisceau pour payer a Mr. de Hont la somme de 180 fr. le 23 avril, ce que je tant tiray en si peu de temps, c'est que hormy d'autres choses comme de drap et des rubans 2 violes de 16½ lb. sterling, 1 superius de gambe de Roos, ches Mr. Joen.’


33 On the family business owned by Andries Asseling and his sons Hendrik and Melchior, see Burgers, *The lute in the Dutch Golden Age*, 151-154.
other foreign instruments in Paris and London during his European tour. The old Maler lute already had travelled from Italy to France some time before.

**Correspondence with Job Ludolf**

A good deal of information on Thysius’s musical interests can also be found in his correspondence from the late 1640s. In the letters he wrote himself, as far as they have been studied, he seldom seems to have touched on the theme of music. In a letter to his L’Empereur cousins, written from Paris on 30 April 1647, he describes a performance of the story of Orpheus and Eurydice that he had attended at the ‘Comedie du Roy’, given by Italian musicians playing in four and five parts.

References to music are more often to be found in the letters sent by others to Thysius, and this is especially true of the letters from his friend Job Ludolf. Ludolf (1624-1704) was a descendant of one of the leading families in the German town of Erfurt, and he would become a prominent scholar of Eastern languages. For his linguistic and philological schooling he had moved to Leiden, where he studied Hebrew with Thysius’s uncle and warden Constantijn L’Empereur. He lived in his professor’s house, together with Thysius, and the young men became close friends; Ludolf accompanied Thysius on his Grand Tour. In September 1648 Ludolf left Leiden for a journey to France, Italy and Sweden, in the service of the Swedish ambassador to Paris. Thysius and Ludolf would never meet again, but they kept writing to each other. Ludolf’s letters touch on diverse subjects: he writes about political developments, his travel plans and incidents that occurred during his journeys, and frequently about musical matters. The latter was clearly a subject of common interest for them.

Ludolf’s passion for music is documented in a biography, based on Ludolf’s autobiography, which was published in 1710 by Christian Juncker. From this, we learn that Ludolf was an enthusiastic amateur musician. In 1640, during an illness, he started to learn to play the cittern, lute and viol, as well as the shawm and trumpet. He would be an active and ‘excellent’ musician throughout his life.

---

34 For this article, it was not possible to make an exhaustive examination of the two rather sizable volumes containing drafts of the letters that he wrote to many different people (ATH 423 and 424).

35 ATH 424, 3-4.

36 The correspondence between Thysius and Ludolf is addressed in Mourits, ‘Johannes Thysius en Job Ludolf’, but Mourits pays little attention to the musical aspect of their friendship.

37 Chr. Juncker, Commentarius de vita, scriptisque ac meritis illustr. viri Jobi Ludolfi, consiliarii quondam serenis. Saxoniae ducum intimi ... (Leipzig, 1710). Based on this work is the biographical part of J. Flemming, ‘Hiob Ludolf. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der orientalischen Philologie’, in Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, 1 (Leipzig, 1890), 537-582 (a portrait opposite the title page); 2 (Leipzig, 1894), 63-110; the biography in 1, 537-560.

38 Juncker, *Vita*, 16-17: ‘... sed musicae etiam arti, quam ita quidem edoceri voluit, ut cithara, testudine, fidibusque, & tibia, tubaque canens, multos excellens.’ It is difficult to identify the exact instruments behind the Latin terms; we can only say with certainty that the ‘testudo’ is a lute.

39 Juncker, *Vita*, 155: ‘Musicam iuvenis, & iam vir factus, excellenter tractabat, elegantique litterarum picturae sic indulserat, ut senex etiam non deflecteter ab eadem.’
Love of music is already apparent in the first letter that he wrote to Thysius from Paris on 8 January 1649. He had paid a visit to the queen-regent and had been very busy with politics: ‘For our recreation we have music. We play in ensemble with two, three and four lutes. Monsieur Hotman has played with me pieces for viola da gamba. Others at our court [namely of the Swedish ambassador] play the tromba marina, guitar and various other instruments.’ Monsieur Hotman is of course the well-known viol player Nicolas Hotman (before 1614-1663), mentioned earlier as an acquaintance of Constantijn Huygens.

Ludolf’s letters from Stockholm, where he stayed in 1650, contain a striking number of references to music. On 18 March he sent Thysius a set of strings for his Maler lute, and he frequently mentions the ballets, balls, ‘noces’ and concerts he has attended. He often describes the dances played: ‘simple and diminished courantes’ and bransles, and, during the festivities for the coronation of the Swedish queen Christina, ‘branles et courantes à la Française’ in alternation with German dances, ‘to please also those who had not learnt the French dances’. In another letter he mentions two Italian singers ‘of exquisite voice’ who were rumoured to be castrati. Still later, after he had moved to his native Germany, he gives an accurate description of two remarkable instruments he had seen in Nuremberg. The first was a ‘Geigenwerck’, a kind of harpsichord in which the tones are generated by means of rotating discs, functioning as bows, resulting in a sound similar to that of an ensemble of violins or viols. The second ‘very beautiful musical invention’ was the baryton, reportedly an English invention:

It is effectively a viola da gamba, but behind the neck it has metal strings used as a bass, which one plucks with the thumb while playing the diminutions on the viol, which has the effect of a wonderful concert. The master told me that it was an English invention, in England commonly called a Paridon.

---

40 ATH 396 (ad 8 januari 1648): ‘La recreation que nous prenons est de la musique. Nous faisons des concerts a deux, trois, quatre luths. Mons. Hotman joüera avec moy les pieces de la viole de gambe. Il y a d’autres en nostre cour qui jouent de la trompette marine, de la guiterre, enfin de plusieurs autres instruments.’

41 On Hotman, see Stuart Cheney, ‘Hotman [Autheman, Haultemant, Hautman, Otteman], Nicolas’, GMO (accessed 22 October 2016).

42 ATH 396, letter d.d. 12 March 1650: ‘Tout ce qui se passe icy sont des comedies, des noces et des ballets; then he gives a detailed description of a ballet entitled ‘Ballet des Proverbes’, which on the next day was followed by ‘noces,’ during which the queen herself danced ‘toutes sortes de courantes simples, figuries, bransles, avec une franchise admirable’.

43 See the preceding footnote.

44 ATH 396, letter d.d. 12 November 1650: ‘On ne dança point les deux premiers jours, si ce n’est le troisieme, et premierement des bransles et courantes à la Françoise, puis apres des danses a l’Allemande deux a deux paslemesle, pour concenter aussi eux qui n’aurois point estudié la danse Francoise.’

45 ATH 396, letter d.d. 15 July 1650: ‘... les comedies de machines, les ballets et les musiques ne manqueront point. Il y a deux Italiens icy qui ont une voix tresdelicates; on dit que ce sont des châtez.’

46 ATH 396, letter d.d. 20 December 1651, sent from Erfurt: ‘Autant que finir cette-cy, il faut que je vous donne part de deux fort belles inventions de Musique, que j’ay veu en mon dernier
From Ludolf’s letters we can conclude that he and Thysius shared a passion for the viola da gamba. On 17 August 1650, Ludolf writes that he has taken up the study of the viol again, because there are some good players in Stockholm who are in the service of noble gentlemen. On 24 September he gives a more lengthy report: he plays with two others in a viol consort (a ‘concert de violes d’Angleterre’). His companions are musicians of outstanding quality; one of them had studied with ‘le sieur Stevijn’, who was in the service of the Elector of Brandenburg. ‘Sieur Stevijn’ is probably the same Ditrich Stöeffken we met before as a friend of Constantijn Huygens. Stöeffken, whose name is spelled in many different ways in the sources, travelled throughout Europe as a virtuoso viol player; around 1650 he was indeed in the service of the Elector of Brandenburg. Stöeffken’s pupil had brought some good music with him, including two-part pieces by John Jenkins; Ludolf promised that he would send some of them to Thysius at the first opportunity. Ludolf is referring to music manuscripts; we know that Jenkins’s music circulated in England in this way in the mid-seventeenth century, but it was clearly also valued on the continent.

This appreciation of English viol music is also clear from a letter sent by Ludolf from Erfurt on 20 February 1652, in which he draws Thysius’s attention to the fact that his (Thysius’s) half-brother’s stay in England would be an opportunity to obtain ‘some more beautiful pieces for viol by Monsieur Bing’. Stephen Bing (1610-1681) was not a composer, but a viol player, singer and music copyist at Saint Paul’s cathedral in London; he copied music for the viol, among others. Ludolf writes further: ‘I have collected a good number [of pieces by Bing], and...’

47 ATH 396: ‘Je commence aussi a me remettre a l’exercice de la viole de gambe, car il y a quelques bons joueurs icy, qui sont au service de quelques grands seigneurs’.

48 ATH 396: ‘... et comme nostre concert de violes d’Angleterre est complet a cet heur, si j’estois aussi bon joueur comme les autres deux, il seroit parfait. L’un d’eux est au service de Monsieur le Comte de la gardie, et a pour maistre le Sieur Stevijn qui est a l’Eleccteur de Brandenbourg; il est bien pourveu de bonnes pieces et en tient beaucoup a deux parties faites par J. Jenkins. Je vous en envoyeroy un eschautillon a la premiere commodité’.


50 Ashbee, ‘Jenkins, John’.

51 ATH 396: ‘Puis que Monsr. vostre frere est a present en Angleterre, vous aurez moyen d’obtenir encore quelques belles pieces de viole en partie de Monsr. Bing’.

employ them, just like you, during my hours of musical recreation. From this, it follows that Thysius was also actively playing the viola da gamba.

**Thysius's collection of music books**

As Johannes Thysius played the viola da gamba, the violin, the harpsichord and also as a youth the recorder, it is to be expected that he owned music for those instruments, whether in print or in manuscript form. It comes then as a surprise that the Bibliotheca Thysiana, at least in its present state, holds hardly any books or manuscripts of music (Table 2). Besides the famous lute manuscript that still bears Thysius's name, this collection contains only three short vocal works composed by Cornelis Thyns Padbrué and Cornelis Helmbreecker on the occasion of marriages or other feasts. Thysius probably acquired these booklets in connection with those festivities, not because of their musical contents.

The present-day Bibliotheca Thysiana also contains a couple of tracts on music theory and some books in which music theory is combined with other sciences, such as mathematics and medicine. These works show that Thysius clearly had a certain interest in music theory, but this inclination should not be exaggerated. His book collection reflects broad interests, with its many works on theology, law, history, philosophy, classical literature, mathematics, medicine, astronomy/astrology, natural history, botany and the art of fortification, next to which the number of books on music theory appears very modest indeed. Moreover, some of Thysius’s books in this genre were rather antiquated, and therefore possibly the acquisitions of a book collector rather than of someone who was really interested in this matter. We saw above that the young Thysius was quite unconcerned with acquiring a theoretical understanding of music, and this lack of enthusiasm seems to have persisted into adulthood.

Still, Thysius was an active amateur musician and must have possessed music books. We already saw that Job Ludolf alluded to music manuscripts, and moreover promised to send him music. These were probably manuscripts that were not incorporated in Thysius’s library after his death and were subsequently lost, as has happened to so many music manuscripts. A well-known example is that of the manuscript books of lute music by Constantijn Huygens, which were seen

---

53 ATH 396: ‘J’en ay amassé bonne provision, et employe de mesme que vous mes heures de recreation a la musique.’


55 Included in Thysius's library after his death were two works from the 1690s by the composer Hendrik Anders: *Trioos, Allemande, Courante, Sarbando, Gighe ...* (Amsterdam, [1696]) and *Symphoniae introductoriae trium et quatuor instrumentorum* (Amsterdam, [1698]) (Thysia 2148 and 2220 respectively).

56 In P.A. Tiele, *Catalogus der bibliotheca van Joannes Thysius* (Leiden, 1879), the chapter ‘Toonkunst’ covers less than two pages (319-320). In the *Catalogus librorm bibliothecae Thysianae in Academia Lugduno-Batava* (Leiden, 1852), the works are not grouped thematically.
for the last time in 1738 and have since disappeared without trace. Only rarely did a collection remain intact, such as the Goëss manuscripts mentioned before.

Indeed, Thysius’s cashbooks show that he possessed a rather large collection of music, most of which has since disappeared from his library. The cashbook of 1635-1653 contains two extensive lists of books he had purchased, and in the first of these we find three series of music books (Table 3). On 4 December 1643, at an auction of the goods of a certain Snellius, he bought six books of Italian madrigals, a madrigal collection by Peter Philips and a book of vocal works by Sweelinck (nos. 1-6). On 26 October 1648, he purchased four books (nos. 7-10) from the estate of his uncle Constantijn L'Empereur: three volumes of lute music (including the lute manuscript that is still present in the library) and a book of polyphonic Italian canzonas. Unlike Thysius, L'Empereur clearly did play the lute.

Much more extensive is the third list, which contains music books bought by Thysius ‘on and off before 1649’, thus when he was a schoolboy and university student. The second part of this list, which refers to the books of a certain Mr. Rogier, which Thysius purchased from a certain Asseling, seems to be a later addition (nos. 30-35). This collection is probably a close reflection of Thysius’s musical taste. Here, again, we find works for vocal ensemble (nos. 11, 14-16, 20), but the list consists mostly of instrumental music. Many of these instrumental works are in two to eight parts, with or without basso continuo. Some publications were already quite old (for instance, the madrigal collections by Pallavicino and Marenzio, nos. 14 and 15), but most were more recent, and some even brand new.

As one would expect, there are also manuscript books in the collection (nos. 24-28, possibly also 31 and 32), including the music intended for his study of the harpsichord (no. 24) and the viola da gamba (no. 32). It is difficult to interpret item no. 27: it seems that Thysius is referring to luxurious (‘rare’) and costly small blank books, given as presents to his music teachers, in which they could write music.

There is a sizeable collection of books for viol, mostly in manuscript form. The only exception seems to be the printed copy of the Konincklycke Fantasien (Royal Fantasies) with three-part viol consort music by Thomas Lupo, John Coprario, William Daman and Orlando Gibbons, published in 1648 at Amsterdam. Much of the other instrumental ensemble music in the list (such as nos. 13, 21-23, 25, 30, 33-35) could of course also have been played on a consort of viols, and that even goes for parts of the vocal works. The ‘Coleraturen van Norcum en anderen’ (no. 32) probably is a manuscript of divisions for viol by Daniel Norcombe ‘and others’; there is another book with exercises of diminutions in various keys (no.

---

58 See footnote 6 above.
59 ATH 434, 112-127 and 318-344.
60 Ibid., 117, 121 and 127.
61 Thysius’s family members included a certain Adrianus and Godefridus Snellius, but they were still alive in 1645 and 1649 respectively; see ATH 476 and 480.
Three manuscripts with viol music by ‘Lauwes’ in two and three parts and by Stephen Bing (no. 28) are explicitly mentioned as being in tablature (‘in letters’). ‘Lauwes’ is of course William Lawes (1602-1645). Stephen Bing we met before; it seems that he was just the copyist of the three manuscripts (the wording is not completely unequivocal). These are relatively expensive volumes, most probably commissioned in England. Other manuscripts in the list were presumably copied by Thysius himself; in the cases of nos. 24 and 25 this is explicitly stated.

The printed volumes and manuscripts mainly contained music from Italy, France and England, the countries that dominated musical taste in the Dutch Republic; the works for viol especially are mostly from English composers (and copyists). However, Thysius music collection also included publications from the Northern and Southern Netherlands (nos. 20, 21, 29 and 11-13 respectively) and even a work from Germany (no. 35).

**Conclusion**

Music played an important role in Thysius’s life. As a child he received the musical schooling that was customary for members of the upper classes, including tuition in singing and on various instruments. In his case, he first learned to play the violin, and then the viola da gamba, recorder and harpsichord. As an adult he remained a serious music lover and amateur player, as is clear from the instruments that he bought, including a few very expensive ones. The music that he played he either obtained from his friends or purchased at auction, from booksellers and from music copyists. His taste was international, but works from his native country were not absent from his collection. At first he seems to have preferred the violin, but later in life it was the ‘Engelsche viool’ that became his favourite instrument, as can be inferred from his correspondence with Ludolf, and from the instruments and music he purchased. He owned at least four viols, three of which were from the renowned father and son Rose. He also obtained a sizeable collection of music for viol, mostly compositions by the well-known English masters, and partly also copied in England. Thus, the case of Johannes Thysius once again goes to show how the English viol permeated music in the Netherlands.

---

62 On Bing, see p. #8# above.
Table 1. Musical instruments in Thysius’s cashbook, UBL, ATH 434, p. 152.
The left-hand column shows the year in which the instrument was bought, the right-hand column its price.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Instrument Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Een kleijn hantviooltjen, de rug ingeleijt</td>
<td>f. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Een kleijn ebbenhoute klopscheentje, te Parijs van Prevot gemaect anno 1630</td>
<td>f. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Een superius viool de gambe van Asleijn anno 1629</td>
<td>f. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Een dubbelde klavercingel van A. Ruckers, met een vout daer 2 laijen in sijn van hout</td>
<td>f. 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Een hantviool van Aslijn anno 1638</td>
<td>f. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>Een Bas, Tenor, twee Superius de gambes, uit eender hout, op elck een helm, anno 1622</td>
<td>f. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Twee hantviolen van Floran,3 d’eene Aslijn (dese gebruijckt Mr de Backer),4 [f.] 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d’andere van Andries Roswrits, Krakou 1629</td>
<td>f. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Klopscheentje van Aslijn met een custodie, 1645</td>
<td>f. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Klopscheentje, slecht en gebroocken, gekocht te Parijs</td>
<td>– –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Een ebbenhoute klopscheentje, boven op van hout,5 door Pierre de Duck a Paris</td>
<td>f. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Een lijte de Boulonge van Luijc Maller</td>
<td>f. 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Een Bas viool de gambe van den ouden Roos, anno 1576 in Brijdwell; is niet groot, en wierde mij gekoft f. 20 lb. steerlings6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noch een superius de gamba van de selfde, beijde in goede kassen, kosten samen f. 11 lb. steerlings</td>
<td>f. 126:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noch een bas, wat kloecker, van den jongen Roos, van den 30 Augusti anno 1584, kost 5½ lb sterl.</td>
<td>f. 63:5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Corrected from ‘1634’.
2 Part of the text crossed out.
3 This word is difficult to interpret. If it referred to a person, then perhaps this was the seller of the two violins.
4 Mr. de Bacher was one of Thysius’s cousins.
5 A wide space has been left before ‘hout’; obviously, Thysius was unable to identify the type of wood that was used on top of the pochette.
6 It is not clear what is meant by this sum. It is immediately followed by the comment that the two instruments by the elder Rose together amounted to 11 pounds sterling, and a sum of 20 pounds (some 230 guilders) would indeed seem exorbitant for a single viol. Moreover, Thysius wrote earlier that he had paid 16½ pounds for two viols (see p. #5# above).
Table 2. Music books in the present Bibliotheca Thysiana: an inventory on the basis of Tiele, *Catalogus*, and the *Catalogus librorum* of 1852. This does not include volumes of religious or liturgical music, such as books of psalms and the *Antiphonarium secundum morem sancte ecclesie, completum* (Venice: L.A. de Giunta, 1503) (Thysia 326). The left-hand column contains the modern shelf number. Omitted from the list are two music books published in the 1690s (see footnote 54, above).

### Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelf No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>‘The Thysius Lute Book’, manuscript.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Music theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelf No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1126:1</td>
<td><em>Monochordon symbolico-biomanticum; pulsuum doctrinam, ex harmoniis musicis dilucide, figurisque oculariter demonstrans […]</em></td>
<td>Samuel Hafenreffer, <em>Monochordon symbolico-biomanticum; pulsuum doctrinam, ex harmoniis musicis dilucide, figurisque oculariter demonstrans […]</em> (Ulm: B. Kühn, 1640).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1126:3</td>
<td><em>Carmen de musica</em></td>
<td>Sebastianus Pichselius, <em>Carmen de musica</em> (Speyer: B. Albinus, 1588).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Music books and manuscripts listed in Thysius’s cashbook, ATH 434, 152. For convenience, the items have been numbered. The right-hand column shows the price that Thysius paid. Additional information, identifying composers or prints, has been included in square brackets; unless stated otherwise, this has been obtained from GMO. Where necessary, abbreviations have been written out in full and put in round brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Libri musicali from the Snellius auction, 4 December 1643 [p. 117]</th>
<th>Musici from the auction of Constantijn L’Empereur, 26 October 1648 [p. 121]</th>
<th>Volgen de musieck boecken so nu als dan gekocht voor 1649 [p. 127]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rimes Francoises et Italiennes [J.P. Sweelinck, Amsterdam, 1619]</td>
<td>Testudo Spiritualis door Dan. Lelium [Daniel Laelius], sijnde psalmen op de luitj [Arnhem, 1617]</td>
<td>[Jan Baptiste] Verrijt Paduanae, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 instr. cum B.C. [lost]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Madrigali de Petro Philippi [three volumes: Antwerp, 1596, 1598, 1603]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 2. 3. 4. instr. cum B.C.  [Antwerp, 1632, lost]⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lauro verde [collection of madrigals, Ferrara, 1583]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Benedetto] Pallavicino Madrigali a 5 voci [seven volumes, Venice 1581-1604]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Madrigali 8 voci [possibly Madrigali a otto voci de diversi eccellenti et famosi autori, Antwerp 1596, repr. 1597]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luca Marentio Madrig. a 4 voci [Rome, 1585]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Nicolaes a] Kempis [Symphoniae] eerste deel a 1, 2, 3 cum B.C. [Antwerp, 1644]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Tarquinio] Merula Sonate a 2 &amp; 3 cum B.C. [Venice, 1637]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uscellini [Marco Uccellini] Sonate a 2 &amp; 3 cum B.C. [Venice, 1642]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kussjes van [Jacob] Westerbaen door Cornel(is) Thijmans. [Padbrué] [Haarlem, 1631, augmented edition Amsterdam, 1641]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21 [t Uitnemend] Kabinet van verscheidene fraije stukken a 1 & 2 met een B(as) [Amsterdam, 1646] f. 2

22 2 Livres Equivoques du Sieur de Chami [Francesco Guami, Ricercari a 2, Venice, 1588] f. 1

23 Air a 4 parties de Mr. [François] dela Roche [first book, Paris, 1648] f. 1:10

24 Een klaveringel boeck in fol. van mij f. 1:10

25 Noch een in 4° of allerleij Airs, Courantes, Sar(abandes), door mij geschreven3 -- --

26 Noch 5 boeckjens in wit parquement, met een custodi van root leer daerom, van selver uut teschrijven, voor de rariteijt, de meesters gegeven f. 15

28 Noch 3 boecken met letters [in tablature] in O op de viool de G(ambe) van Lauwes [William Lawes] van 2 en 3 partijen, en van Binck [Stephen Bing], voir uutschrijven f. 15

29 Van Pauwel Mathijs. de 20 stukken van Hugens met de 9 fantasien van Gibbens [XX Konincklycke Fantasien … door T. Lupo, I. Coprario, W. Daman. En noch IX Fantasien … door Orlando Gibbons … (Amsterdam, [1648]),4 willen vereren f. 2:2

Van Aslijn de boecken van Mr. Rogier

30 Bicinia bij Phalesius gedruckt [three volumes: Antwerp, 1590, 1609, 1648] f. 0:15

31 Een boeck van diminutien op alle verschillende noten [a manuscript?] f. 7:7

32 Coleraturen van Norcum [Daniel Norcombe, diminutions for viol, which circulated in manuscripts] en anderen f. 4

33 Almandes, Courantes van Mr. Rogier en andere f. 2

34airs en andere stickjens van Mr. Rogier en andere f. 1

35 Paduanen, Galli(arden), Couranten a 5 instr. van Zubern [Gregor Zuber, Lübeck, 1649]5 f. 2:5

1 This lost work is not mentioned in modern studies.


3 This item was later written between the lines.


5 This item was added later.
The Works for Viola da Gamba in the Ledenburg Collection

Günter von Zadow

Summary
The State Archive of Lower Saxony (Niedersächsisches Landesarchiv) located in Osnabrück (northern Germany) houses the ‘Ledenburg Collection,’ a collection of music manuscripts and prints from the 18th century, which was not known to scholars until now. The main focus of the collection is music with viola da gamba. Most remarkable among its contents is an original print of the twelve fantasias for viola da gamba solo by Telemann from 1735, which was thought to have been lost. The collection also contains three hitherto unknown gamba sonatas by C. F. Abel. In addition there are ten solo sonatas, five trios and four concerti with viola da gamba as the main instrument. The majority of these works are transcriptions of compositions for other instruments by G. Cervetto, P. Castrucci, J. B. Pla, G. Tartini, F. Schwindl and K. Gretsch. Stylistically the works can be assigned to the early Classical period. The collection might have developed from around 1750.

The Ledenburg Collection
In the year 2000 numerous historical documents from the archive of the Ledenburg manor were transferred to the State Archive of Lower Saxony in Osnabrück. A small part of these documents in the section “Literature, sheet music, drawings” contains music from the 18th century. We refer to this part, which is distributed over nine shelf numbers, as the “Ledenburg Collection.”

Table 1. Components of the Ledenburg Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelf no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>“Graue,” only Basso Secundo part</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>Carlo Antonio Campioni (1720–1788), 6 duets</td>
<td>V+Vc</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Anonymous trio in C major</td>
<td>V+VdG+Vc</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>Carl Heinrich Graun, L’Europa Galante (Berlin, 1748), selection, only Violino Primo part</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Günter von Zadow is the owner of the music publishing house Edition Gütersberg, located in Heidelberg, Germany, which was founded in 1999 by Günter and Leonore von Zadow, and publishes mainly literature for viola da gamba.
2 The complete shelf numbers are given in the “Catalogue” on page 59.
3 B=Basso, V=violín, VdG=viola da gamba, Vc=violoncello.
The Ledenburg Collection comprises about 350 pages, with 28 works in different sizes, counting the bass part of the songs and dances (no. 622) as one work. Most of them are manuscripts; only two works are printed.

**The Works for Viola da Gamba**

Music for viola da gamba is strongly represented in the Ledenburg Collection in 23 works and is therefore of special interest for gambists. It extends the repertoire with important works which can be assigned to the early Classical period, except for the fantasias by Telemann.

The viola da gamba works can be divided into four groups: one for viola da gamba solo, thirteen sonatas for viola da gamba and bass, five trios for viola da gamba, violin or flute and bass, and four concertos for viola da gamba and strings. The following table gives an overview.\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Concordance</th>
<th>Original for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>Telemann, 12 Fantasias</td>
<td>VdG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) For further details see the Catalogue on page 59.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solos with Basso</th>
<th>527.1</th>
<th>Anonymous, Sonata in C major</th>
<th>Fl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>527.2</td>
<td>Anonymous, Sonata in D major</td>
<td>G. Cervetto</td>
<td>Vc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.3</td>
<td>Anonymous, Sonata in G major</td>
<td>G. Cervetto</td>
<td>Vc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.4</td>
<td>Anonymous, Sonata in B major</td>
<td>G. Cervetto</td>
<td>Vc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.5</td>
<td>Anonymous, Sonata in G-Moll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.6</td>
<td>Tartini, Sonata in B flat major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.7</td>
<td>P. Castrucci, Sonata in G minor</td>
<td>Fl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.8</td>
<td>J. B. Pla, Sonata in B flat major</td>
<td>J. B. Pla</td>
<td>Fl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.9</td>
<td>Anonymous, Sonata in G minor, fragment, can be reconstructed</td>
<td>Tartini</td>
<td>V/Fl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.10</td>
<td>Ruge, Sonata in G major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.11</td>
<td>Abel, Sonata in G major</td>
<td>VdG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.12</td>
<td>Abel, Sonata in A major</td>
<td>VdG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.13</td>
<td>Abel, Sonata in B flat major</td>
<td>VdG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trios</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous, Trio in C major</td>
<td>[attributed to Abel]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schwindl, Trio in A major</td>
<td>Schwindl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gretsch, Trio in G minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous, Trio in G major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous, Trio in G major</td>
<td>[attributed to Abel]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anonymous, Trio B flat major, fragment, can be reconstructed</td>
<td>Abel/J. Stamitz.(^5) V/Fl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concertos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardeck, Concerto in F major, fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milling, Concerto in D minor, fragment, can be reconstructed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raetzel, Concerto in A major, Fragment, can be reconstructed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anon., Concerto in A major, fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ten works appear anonymously, but we could identify five of them (Cervetto (3), Tartini Sonata in G minor, Abel/Stamitz). In addition we could attribute two works to a known composer (Abel Trios in C major and G major). As a result, three works remain anonymous for now (Sonata in C major, Sonata in G major, Concerto in A major).

Six works are incomplete, but we can reconstruct two of these from other sources (Tartini Sonata in G minor, Abel/Stamitz). For two concertos the missing part can be reconstructed from the context (Milling, Raetzel). Therefore only two concertos remain incomplete for now (Hardeck, Concerto in A major); we can make all other 21 works available in editions for today’s players.

\(^5\) For the Trio no. 528 we have both, one concordance to Carl Friedrich Abel and one to Johann Stamitz.
Among the works are many transcriptions for viola da gamba. In the column “Original for” in the table above we indicate the original instrumentation of the viola da gamba part, if it is known.

With seven works an additional source enabled us to identify them. These are transcriptions, i.e. works which were originally written for other instruments, but are to be played in the Ledenburg version on viola da gamba. Other manuscripts are explicitly designated as transcriptions. Thus, we know that the viola da gamba part in six cases was originally written an octave higher for flute or violin (Anonymous Sonata in C major, Castrucci, Pla, Tartini Sonata in G minor, Schwindl, Abel/Stamitz), and that three of the viola da gamba sonatas were originally written for violoncello (Cervetto). On the other hand we can be certain that of the remaining works at least four were written originally for viola da gamba (Telemann, Abel).

That such transcriptions were quite usual at that time, can also be seen in a remark by Charles Burney about his visit to the Nymphenburg castle in the year 1772: ‘After this the Elector [Maximilian III] played one of Schwindl’s trios on his Viol da gamba, charmingly: except Mr. Abel, I never heard so fine a player in that instrument; ...’

The trio mentioned could very well be the Trio no. 529 of the Ledenburg collection.

---

6 Charles Burney, The Present State of Music in Germany, the Netherlands, and United Provinces... Vol. 1 (London 1773) p. 139.
No. 527.11 Abel, Sonata I in G major for Viola da Gamba and Basso, pages 1 and 2

The Composers

Some dates of the composers of the works for viola da gamba are given in the following table.
### Table 3. Dates of the Composers in the Ledenburg Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Main work place</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Date of work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Carl Friedrich Abel</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1723–1787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georg Philipp Telemann</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>1681–1767</td>
<td>1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Pietro Castrucci</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1679–1752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giacobo Cervetto</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>1681/1682–1783</td>
<td>1682–1783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johann Konrad Gretsch</td>
<td>Regensburg</td>
<td>ca. 1710–1778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juan Bautista Pla</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>ca. 1720–after 1773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filippo Ruge</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>ca. 1725–after 1767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friedrich Schwindl</td>
<td>Germany, Netherlands</td>
<td>1737–1768</td>
<td>1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johann Stamitz</td>
<td>Mannheim</td>
<td>1717–1757</td>
<td>1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giuseppe Tartini</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>1692–1770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Johann Carl (I.) Graf zu Hardeck (Hardegg)</td>
<td>Germany (Lower Saxony)</td>
<td>1703–1752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anton Milling</td>
<td>South Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anton Raetzel</td>
<td>North Germany</td>
<td>ca. 1724–after 1760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We can divide the composers of the works for viola da gamba into three
categories:

1. Georg Philipp Telemann and Carl Friedrich Abel have undoubtedly
   written the four works in question for the viola da gamba. These
   composers are among the generally known composers for this
   instrument.

2. The second category consists of Pietro Castrucci, Giacobo Cervetto,
   Johann Konrad Gretsch, Juan Bautista Pla, Filippo Ruge, Friedrich
   Schwindl, Giuseppe Tartini and Johann Stamitz. These composers,
   although familiar names, are not known until now to have written for
   the viola da gamba. In most cases we know or assume that the works in
   question have been transcribed for viola da gamba, however in this
   category there may still be original compositions for this instrument.

3. The third category consists of Johann Carl Graf (I.) zu Hardeck
   (Hardegg), Anton Milling and Anton Raetzel, who are largely unknown
   today. We have attempted to gather all available information about
   these persons, but our knowledge is still incomplete.

With the exception of the Fantasias by Telemann, which were published in
1735, the printed works which served as models for the Ledenburg copyists are
from the years 1750, 1764 and 1765. Outside the group of works for viola da
gamba we find in the Ledenburg collection the Duets by Campioni, which
were printed in 1765, and a copy of a single part of the opera by Graun which
was performed first in 1748. The dates of death of the composers for viola da
gamba lie between 1752 (Castrucci) and 1787 (Abel).

These dates, together with the stylistic attribution of the works to the early
Classical period, suggests to us that the Ledenburg collection was developed
from the year 1750; the Telemann print of 1735 could also have been
purchased later.

Here is some information about the composers in categories 2 and 3, who are
probably unfamiliar to gambists.7

**Pietro Castrucci**

Pietro Castrucci was born in 1679 in Rome and died in 1752 in Dublin. From
1715 he lived in London. He was a student of Corelli and an excellent violinist,
who conducted Handel’s orchestra for 22 years. Numerous violin sonatas by
him came down to us, of which are two are also playable on the viola d’amore.

Pietro Castrucci had a younger brother, Prospero Castrucci (1690–1760), who
also could be the composer for the Sonata no. 527.7.

**Giacobo Cervetto**

The cellist and composer Giacobo Cervetto (1681/1682–1783) was born in
Verona and later went to London, where he gained a great reputation. He was
one of a group of London-based Italians who popularized the violoncello as a
solo instrument in England. At the age of about 70 he began to publish several

---

7 More information can be found in the prefaces of the Güntersberg editions of the
Ledenburg Collection, see “Editions” on page 57.
compositions for cello, which were quite successful and are still played today. He died at over one hundred years of age. Giacobo should not be mixed up with his son James (1748–1837), who was also a well-known cellist and composer in London.

**Johann Konrad Gretsch**

Johann Konrad Gretsch (ca. 1710–1778) was a cellist and composer in Regensburg, Germany. From 1770 he was employed there as violoncellist in the Hofkapelle Thurn und Taxis. He composed several works for cello.

**Johann Carl Graf zu Hardeck**

Carl (I.) Graf zu Hardeck (Hardegg) (1703–1752) is little known. A certain “Giovanni Carlo Conte Hardeck” appeared in the year 1724 in Vienna as cellist at the opera performance of *Euristo* by Caldara. Hardeck was not known as a composer until now.

**Anton Milling**

No biographical data of the composer Anton Milling are known. Two English horn concertos by him are preserved in the court library of prince Thurn und Taxis in Regensburg, and in Kroměříž there are seven works for winds.

**Juan Bautista Pla**

The Spanish brothers Juan Bautista and José Pla were oboe players, who in the middle of the 18th century were famous for their art, their interaction, and their virtuosity not only in their home country but in all Europe. Juan Bautista Pla (ca. 1720 – after 1773) was employed at the court of Württemberg in Stuttgart for many years. Many works of both brothers for two oboes or flutes have come down to us, but there is just one solo sonata which is not identical with the Sonata no. 527.8.

**Anton Raetzel**

Anton Raetzel (Retzel) was born in Braunschweig around 1724, became bassoonist and composer and later Capellmeister in the service of the duke of Holstein in North Germany. He died after 1760. Several works by him are listed in the Breitkopf catalogues, among them are four cello concertos, which are all lost.\(^8\)

**Filippo Ruge**

Filippo Ruge was born in Rome about the year 1722. He became a flautist and at the age of 22 went to Paris, where he lived presumably until his death sometime after 1767. Many of his works in different genres are preserved, and several of these are still popular today.

**Friedrich Schwindl**

Friedrich Schwindl was born in Amsterdam in 1737 and died in 1786 in Karlsruhe. He was an extremely well known and popular composer, who

---

published among other things 28 symphonies, six operettas and over 50 chamber music works. He worked in many European cities.

**Johann Stamitz**

Johann Stamitz (1717–1757), of Bohemian origin, is believed to be the founder of the Mannheim School. Numerous works bear witness to his creativity, including 69 Symphonies.

**Giuseppe Tartini**

The Italian violin virtuoso Giuseppe Tartini (1692–1770) is extremely well known for his concertos and sonatas for violin. In contrast to the other composers in category 2 and 3 there is a relationship between Tartini and the viola da gamba: The *Concerto per Viola con Quartetto e due Corni accompagn: da Giuseppe Tartini* in D major has been thought of as a solo concerto for viola da gamba or violoncello.\(^9\) The attribution to viola da gamba however is controversial.\(^10\) Besides this concerto in D major there is also a concerto in A major which has the same difficulty with the solo instrument.

**The Ranges**

The range of each viola da gamba part in the Ledenburg Collection is displayed in the following survey. Each x represents a semitone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Range of each gamba part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) incl. movement II and III from other source
2) b=bass in tutti parts

The normal range of the 6 string viola da gamba is fully utilised in the genuine works for gamba (Telemann fantasias and Abel sonatas) and in the works whose origin is the literature for violoncello (Cervetto).

The anonymous solo sonata in G minor also requires the range of the 6 string gamba. The range of the Tartini Sonata in B flat major suggests that it could originally have been a violin sonata. We know that the sonatas by Castrucci, Pla, Tartini in G minor, Ruge and Anonymous in C major were originally written for flute or oboe, and this is confirmed by their range.

In the trios the part of the viola da gamba has the range of a flute or oboe (to be played an octave lower). We know at least that the gamba part of Schwindl and Abel/Stamitz was originally for flute or violin.

If the concertos for viola da gamba were originally written for another instrument, we can say this looking at the range: only the Raetzel Concerto could have been played on flute or oboe, those by Hardeck and Milling are too low. It is interesting that the range of the viola da gamba part in all concertos is rather small; the Raetzel concerto has a range of less than two octaves.

**The Fantasias by Telemann**

The original print of the twelve fantasias for viola da gamba solo by Georg Philipp Telemann is without doubt the most important discovery in the Ledenburg collection. The work was self-published by Telemann in the year 1735, and it was sold through a distribution network. Before the discovery of the Ledenburg Collection however, all copies were thought to be lost. Together with the solo Fantasias for flute and violin they belong to the most important instrumental solo works of Telemann.

Our Edition contains much information on the fantasias.\(^{11}\) Therefore we describe here only the original print.

The original print is a thin booklet in upright format of 21.8 x 28 cm with a sturdy cover. It contains 13 sheets: one title page and 12 pages of music. All sheets are printed on one side only, each containing one fantasia. The printed page is on the right. The paper is relatively thin.\(^{12}\) The original print shows no signs of usage.

The sheets 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 bear the watermark that is reproduced here (height 8.5 cm, width 5.0 cm).


\(^{12}\) On the photographs of the State Archive some music has occasionally printed through, e.g. on the title page. This music is from the sheet underneath and not from the back of the same sheet.
The print space is offset from the centre, i.e. it starts on the left close to the stitched margin and leaves a broader margin at the right. For example in Fantasia 1: left margin 5 mm, right margin 14 mm.

The original print of the music pages consists of three layers of two double sheets (sheets twice as large which are folded in the middle). Each layer thus consists of 8 pages, which contain 4 Fantasias. The outer double sheet holds Fantasias 1 and 4, the inner Fantasias 2 and 3, etc.

We know that every two weeks Telemann offered two fantasies, namely initially Fantasias 1 and 2, then 3 and 4 etc. This can be explained in that the print was done on single sheets which had a margin on the left of about 2 cm, that was folded up. These sheets could be distributed separately at first. Two such sheets could be later combined to form one double sheet, and the double sheets could then be bound together as described above.

The sheet containing the title page was added in front of the layers. There is no empty sheet that might belong to the title sheet after Fantasia 12.

When the booklet was given to the State Archive in 2000, only some parts of the original front cover existed. Thus the original print was restored and newly bound. During the restoration the sheets have been conserved chemically. The bookbinding process has not altered the original layers, but mainly added a new cover. During the restoration the leaves have not been cut back.

The Ledenburg Castle

The place of discovery of the Ledenburg Collection is the Ledenburg Castle in the neighbourhood of Osnabrück in northwest Germany. Since 2000 the collection has been housed as a deposit in the State Archive of Lower Saxony (Niedersächsisches Landesarchiv) located in Osnabrück. In the 18th century Ledenburg was the home of the families von Grothaus and later von Münster. At the beginning of the previous century Walter Schwarze gathered much information about the castle and the family.

Eleonore Elisabeth Helene Sophie von Grothaus was born in 1734 in the Ledenburg castle, where she also spent most of her childhood. She was a poetess, but she also had great interest in art, music and the sciences. Schwarze writes “Among the rhetorical arts... music took the first place, and much handwritten music for piano, viola d’amour, flute and voice was in her repertoire, which was crowned by Handel and Telemann. The newest arias could be heard, and Eleonore wrote many a poem in this format or following existing melodies, and she expressed the impact of the music when she narrated how Orpheus sang:

13 Today mostly called „Gut Ledenburg“, Ledenburg manor.
14 Walter Schwarze, Eleonore von Münster (Osnabrück 1929).
Es neigten sich der Bäume Wipfel
bei seiner Leier Harmonie.
Selbst Leu und Bär verließ der Berge Gipfel,
der Töne Zauber drang in sie.

(The treetops bowed
To the harmony of his lyre.
Even the lion and the bear have departed the mountains
As the magic of his music enchanted them.)

Eleonore von Münster was married in 1759 to Baron Georg Hermann Heinrich von Münster. She died 1794 in Hannover.

Except for the above-mentioned quote we found no information on the musical life in Ledenburg castle around 1750. Schwarze refers in his appendix to the following volume in the library of Ledenburg as one of his sources “(Bd) 250 : Musikalien.” The Ledenburg library was in the 1920s partly moved to Derneburg and is now in the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz library in Hanover. In spite of intensive search in Hanover we were not able to find a volume with the number 250, or any other volume with musical contents.

The Ledenburg Collection has a clear emphasis on music for viola da gamba. This suggests that Walter Schwarze thought of the viola da gamba when he wrote about the “viola d’amour”. Music for viola d’amore does not exist in the collection. It is appropriate that Schwarze refers to Telemann, because today, the fantasias by Telemann are considered the most important work of the collection. However we did not find anything important by Handel, whom he also mentions; there is just a bass part in the “simple songs and dances” (no. 622) of a small aria by Handel. Schwarze correctly reports that the music in the Ledenburg collection is mostly handwritten. However, we did not find a single work which is explicitly written for piano.

Conclusion

The Ledenburg Collection could have been established by an aficionado of the viola da gamba, who gathered music for his or her own use, and who started doing this around 1750. As there were at this time almost no new original compositions for viola da gamba, except for works by Carl Friedrich Abel, he or she commissioned or bought transcriptions for viola da gamba of works from all over Europe. The selection shows a very good knowledge of music literature, and sufficient means. The transcribed works are well playable on the viola da gamba; the octave transposition is by no means detrimental to the harmony. The fantasias by Telemann were perhaps included in the collection as an important work of the past.

The works for viola da gamba in the Ledenburg collection are all written for one viola da gamba. Our person could thus have been a single gamba player who played together with other instrumentalists, but always played the main role, and knew the instrument quite well. The Ledenburg music copies lack bass figures, with a couple of exceptions.16—Because we know some of the

16 In the transcription of the sonatas by Cervetto (no. 527.2–4) the original figures were partly retained. The Adagio by Tartini (no. 527.9) also has figures.
original models we know however that such figures usually existed. Also, the collection has no obligato harpsichord or piano part.

Many things suggest that the so called “aficionado of the viola da gamba” was Eleonore von Münster, however we did not find solid evidence for this. We have only the information in the book by Walter Schwarze (see above).

It is astonishing that the viola da gamba was played so intensively in north western Germany around 1750. Until now it was thought that the composers of the Berlin School around the gamba virtuoso Ludwig Christian Hesse (1716–1772) were the last to deal with the viola da gamba. However we do not find in the Ledenburg Collection any of the viola da gamba works of Johann Gottlieb Graun, Christoph Schaffrath, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach and the others. It is also apparent that the Ledenburg works in general impose fewer demands on the player than the gamba compositions by Johann Gottlieb Graun.

It is also astonishing that we found four concertos for viola da gamba and strings in the Ledenburg Collection which were until now completely unknown. It was thought that except for the gamba concertos by Telemann, J.G. Graun, Pfeiffer and Tartini nothing else existed in the genre. Apparently however, as well as the virtuoso concertos, there were others which could be mastered by amateur players. We regret that none of these concertos has been preserved in its entirety.

Editions Edition Güntersberg plans during the year 2016 to publish the 21 works for viola da gamba which are complete or can be reconstructed. These will be practical editions distributed in 13 volumes. Co-editors are Thomas Fritzsch and Günter von Zadow. In these editions the Ledenburg Collection is identified by the logo given above. The graphic used in the logo is taken from a manuscript of the collection (no. 527.1)

The edition of the fantasies by Telemann also includes the complete facsimile of the original print. If the additional models contain bass figures these are transferred to our edition. The 13 solo sonatas have an additional score with a realization. The missing parts in the concertos by Milling and Raetzel will be reconstructed by Wolfgang Kostujak.

Besides Berlin we find Franz Xaver Hammer (1741–1817), Joseph Fiala (1748–1816) and Andreas Lidl (?) – before 1789.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Composer, title</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Edition no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Telemann, 12 Fantasias</td>
<td>VdG</td>
<td>G281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.2</td>
<td>Cervetto, Sonata prima in D major</td>
<td>VdG+B</td>
<td>G285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.3</td>
<td>Cervetto, Sonata secunda in G major</td>
<td>VdG+B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.4</td>
<td>Cervetto, Sonata terza in B major</td>
<td>VdG+B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.6</td>
<td>Tartini, Sonata in B flat major</td>
<td>VdG+B</td>
<td>G283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.9</td>
<td>Tartini, Sonata in G minor</td>
<td>VdG+B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.8</td>
<td>Pla, Sonata in B flat major</td>
<td>VdG+B</td>
<td>G289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.1</td>
<td>Anonym, Sonata in C major</td>
<td>VdG+B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.10</td>
<td>Ruge, Sonata in G major</td>
<td>VdG+B</td>
<td>G284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.5</td>
<td>Anonym, Sonata in G minor</td>
<td>VdG+B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.7</td>
<td>Castrucci, Sonata in G minor</td>
<td>VdG+B</td>
<td>G287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.11</td>
<td>Abel, Sonata I in G major</td>
<td>VdG+B</td>
<td>G282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.12</td>
<td>Abel, Sonata II in A major</td>
<td>VdG+B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527.13</td>
<td>Abel, Sonata III in B flat major</td>
<td>VdG+B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Abel attributed, Trio in C major</td>
<td>V+VdG+Vc</td>
<td>G295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529.7</td>
<td>Abel attributed, Trio in G major</td>
<td>V+VdG+B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529.2</td>
<td>Schwindl, Trio in A major</td>
<td>VdG+V+B</td>
<td>G293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529.4</td>
<td>Gretsch, Trio in G minor</td>
<td>VdG+V+B</td>
<td>G296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recordings

Several works of the Ledenburg-Collection have already been recorded on CD:

**Georg Philipp Telemann, 12 Fantaisies pour la Basse de Violle**
528 Telemann, 12 Fantasias

**Carl Friedrich Abel, Ledenburg**

- 527.11 Abel, Sonata I in G major
- 527.12 Abel, Sonata II A major
- 527.13 Abel, Sonata III B flat major
- 524 Abel attributed, Trio C major
- 529.7 Abel attributed, Trio G major
- 529.8 Abel or Stamitz, Trio B flat major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>529.8</th>
<th>Abel/Stamitz, Trio in B flat major</th>
<th>VdG+Fl/V+B</th>
<th>G294</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>529.3</td>
<td>Milling, Concerto in D minor</td>
<td>VdG+2V+Va+B</td>
<td>G297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529.6</td>
<td>Raetzel, Concerto in A major</td>
<td>VdG+2V+Va+B</td>
<td>G298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 524 Abel attributed, Trio C major | 527.11 Abel, Sonata I in G major | 527.12 Abel, Sonata II A major | 527.13 Abel, Sonata III B flat major | 524 Abel attributed, Trio C major | 529.7 Abel attributed, Trio G major | 529.8 Abel or Stamitz, Trio B flat major |
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Catalogue

This catalogue lists all works in the Ledenburg Collection for viola da gamba. The items are given in the order of the shelf numbers of the State Archive of Lower Saxony. To facilitate the overview the two collections no. 527 and no. 529 have been subdivided into sub-numbers like 527.1.18

Each entry is structured the same way:

- **signature**
- **type** manuscript or print, number of pages
- **composer**
- **title**
- **work catalogue**
- **format** score or separate parts
- **description**
- **comment** e.g. similarity with other works in this collection
- **concordance** also attributions, if applicable
- **edition** Gütersberg number

524 Anonymous [attributed to Abel], Trio in C major, V+VdG+Vc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>signature</th>
<th>D-OSa19 Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 524</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>type</td>
<td>manuscript, 16 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composer</td>
<td>Abel: A5:3A20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title</td>
<td><em>Trio per violino viola da gamba e violoncello</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work catalogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 Our subdivision of the shelf numbers no. 524 and no. 529 will possibly be adopted by the State Archive in their catalogue.

19 Identification of the State Archive of Lower Saxony in Osnabrück (Niedersächsisches Landesarchiv – Standort Osnabrück) in RISM.

20 Peter Holman, *Charles Frederick Abel’s Viola da Gamba Music: A New Catalogue*, The Viola da Gamba Society Journal, vol. 8, 2014 or later versions. All A-numbers are from this work catalogue.
The viola da gamba part exists twice, in alto clef and in treble clef. The anonymous Trio in G major, no. 529.7 is by the same hand. The trio was attributed to Carl Friedrich Abel by Thomas Fritzsch and Peter Holman on the basis of stylistic features.

**Sonatas for Viola da Gamba**

signature D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 527
type manuscript, 72 pages, several copyists
The pages are numbered on one side. “5” = 5 recto, “5v” = 5 verso.
composer several, see below
title no common title
format bound book in the format of 31 x 24,3 cm with a solid cover
The collected volume contains 13 sonatas for viola da gamba and basso by various composers. The instrumentation “Viola da Gamba and Basso” is only mentioned explicitly in four of the sonatas (Ruge and Abel). It can be assumed for the other sonatas as well because of the consistent use of the alto clef for the solo part.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>527.1 Anonymous, Sonata in C major, VdG+B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>signature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>composer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>work catalogue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>format</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>concordance</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Musical notation images](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>527.2 Anonymous [Giacobo Cervetto], Sonata prima in D major, VdG+B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>signature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>composer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>work catalogue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>format</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
description

comment The three sonatas by Cervetto, no. 527.2–527.4, are in the same hand.

concordance RISM A/I C 1726
Giacobo Cervetto (1681/1682–1783), Twelve solos for a violoncello, with a thorough bass for the harpsicord, Sonata I, London ca. 1750

edition G285

527.3 Anonymous [Giacobo Cervetto], Sonata secunda in G major, VdG+B

signature D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 527, p. 6v–9v (10 empty)
type manuscript, 7 pages
composer Giacobo Cervetto

title [S]onata [secunda]
work catalogue Cervetto: op. 2.2
format score
description

comment The three sonatas by Cervetto, no. 527.2–527.4, are in the same hand.

concordance RISM A/I C 1726
Giacobo Cervetto (1681/1682–1783), Twelve solos for a violoncello, with a thorough bass for the harpsicord, Sonata II, London ca. 1750

edition G285
527.4 Anonymous [Giacobo Cervetto], Sonata terza in B flat major, VdG+B

signature D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 527, p. 10v–13

composer

title [Sonata terza]

work catalogue Cervetto: op. 2.3

format score

description

comment The three sonatas by Cervetto, no. 527.2–527.4, are in the same hand.

concordance RISM A/I C 1726

Giacobo Cervetto (1681/1682–1783), Twelve solos for a violoncello, with a thorough bass for the harpsicord, Sonata III, London ca. 1750

edition G285
527.5 Anonymous, Sonata in G minor, VdG+B

signature | D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 527, p. 13v–14v

composer

work catalogue | Sonata

format | score

description

concordance | G284

edition


527.6 Tartini, Sonata in B flat major, VdG+B

| signature | D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 527, p. 15–16v |
| type      | manuscript, 4 pages                           |
| composer  | del Sigr. Tartini [Giuseppe Tartini (1692–1770)] |
| title     | Sonata Solo                                   |
| work catalogue | Brainard: not included^{21}                |
| format    | score                                         |
| comment   |                                               |
| concordance | G283                                          |

^{21} Paul Brainard, Die Violinonaten Giuseppe Tartinis (Göttingen 1959).

527.7 Castrucci, Sonata in G minor, VdG+B

| signature | D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 527, p. 17–19v |
| type      | manuscript, 6 pages                           |
| composer  | del Signor Castrucci [Pietro Castrucci (1679–1752)] |
| title     | Fl. trav. Solo                                |
| work catalogue | score                                       |
| format    |                                               |
| comment   | It is also possible that the composer was Pietro’s brother Prospero Castrucci (1690–1760). |
| concordance | G287                                          |
| edition   |                                               |
527.8 Juan Bautista Pla, Sonata in B flat major, VdG+B

signature D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 527, p. 20–22v (23 empty)
type manuscript, 6 pages
composer del: Sigr: Juanna Batta Pla: [Juan Bautista Pla (ca. 1720 – after 1773)]
title e Flauto trav. Solo Transp
work catalogue Dolcet: not included
format score
description
comment
concordance CH-BEb22 Mss.h.h.IV.182 (11)
edition G289

---

22 Burgerbibliothek, Bern.
527.9 Anonymous [Tartini], Adagio in G minor, VdG+B

signature D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 527, p. 23v–24
(type manuscript, 2 pages)
composer
title Adagio
work catalogue Brainard g7
format score
description fragment: Only this Adagio has survived in the Ledenburg Collection.
comment The anonymous Adagio is the first movement of a sonata by Giuseppe Tartini (1692–1770):  
1. I-Pca23 1905 Nr. 58  
   Sonata a Violino e Basso Del Sig. Giuseppe Tartini  
2. CH-BEb Mss.h.h.IV.182 (27)  
   Flauto Solo et Basso Del Sig. Giuseppe Tartini  
title line on the first page of music: Flauto o Violino Solo et Basso  
For more concordances see Brainard.
edition G283

23 Biblioteca Antoniana con Archivo Musicale, Padua.
1) The incipits of the second and third movement have been taken from the Padua source.

**527.10 Ruge, Sonata in G major, VdG+B**

- **signature**: D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 527, p. 25–28 (28v empty)
- **type**: manuscript, 7 pages
- **composer**: del Sigr: Ruge: [Filippo Ruge (ca. 1725 – after 1767)]
- **title**: Viola di Gamba | Solo. et Basso (title page)
  viola di Gamba Solo (first page of music)
- **work catalogue**
- **format**: score
- **description**
- **comment**
- **concordance**
- **edition**: G284

**527.11 Abel, Sonata I in G major, VdG+B**

- **signature**: D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 527, p. 29–32 (32v empty)
- **type**: manuscript, 7 pages
- **composer**: Del Sigr: C: F: Abel. [Carl Friedrich Abel (1723–1787)]
**Sonata I. à Viola da Gamba Solo. e Basso.**

**work catalogue** Abel: A2:52

**format** score

**description**

The three sonatas by Abel, no. 527.11–527.13 are in the same hand.

**concordance**

**edition** G282

---

**Sonata II. à Viola da Gamba Solo. e Basso.**

**work catalogue** Abel: A2:53

**format** score

**description**

The three sonatas by Abel, no. 527.11–527.13 are in the same hand.

**concordance**

**edition** G282
527.13 Abel, Sonata III in B flat major, VdG+B

signature  D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 527, p. 38–41
type  manuscript, 7 pages
composer  Del Sigr C. F. Abel. [Carl Friedrich Abel (1723–1787)]
title  Sonata III. | à | Viola da Gamba Solo. | e | Basso.
work catalogue  Abel: A2:54
format  score
description  The three sonatas by Abel, no. 527.11–527.13 are in the same hand.
concordance  G282
528 Telemann, Twelve Fantasias, VdG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>signature</th>
<th>D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 528</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>type</td>
<td>print, 13 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composer</td>
<td>Telemann [Georg Philipp Telemann (1681–1767)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title</td>
<td>FANTAISIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work catalogue</td>
<td>Telemann: TWV 40:26–37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>format description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment</td>
<td>The print was self-published by Telemann 1735 in Hamburg. This is the only extant copy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concordance edition</td>
<td>G281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Sheet music for Fantasia 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7](image.png)
529 Concertos and Chamber music with Viola da Gamba

signature       D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 529
type            manuscripts
composer        several, see below
title           no common title
Format          collective folder
description     The **collective folder** contains several single compositions which are mostly grouped in small folders.

529.1 Hardeck (Hardegg), Concerto in F major, VdG+V1+V2+B

signature       D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 529, Mappe Hardeck
type            manuscript, 7 pages
composer        Del Sigre Hardeck [presumably Johann Carl (I.), Graf zu Hardeck (Hardegg) (02.09.1703–26.01.1752)]
title           CONCERTO | a | Viola di Gamba | Violino Primo | Violino Secundo | et | Basso
work catalogue  format separate parts
description     comment fragment: The basso part is missing.
concordance     edition
529.2 Schwindl, Trio in A major, VdG+V+B

signature D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 529, Mappe Schwindl

type manuscript, 11 pages

composer Del: Sigr Schwindl [Friedrich Schwindl (1737–1786)]

title Sonata | Viola da Gambo Primo | Violino Secondo | et | Basso

work catalogue Schwindl: op. 3.4

format separate parts

description

comment

concordance RISM A/I S 2570

Six Sonates a Deux Flutes & Basse Continue, Sonata IV.

Amsterdam ca. 1765

edition G293

529.3 Milling, Concerto in D minor, VdG+V1+V2+Va+B

signature D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 529, Mappe Milling

composer Del Sigre Milling [presumably Anton Milling]

title CONCERTO | à 5 voc | Viola di Gamba | Violino Primo
| Violino Secundo | Viola et | Basso
work catalogue
format separate parts
description fragment: The viola part is missing
comment Anton Milling’s biographical data are not known.
concordance edition G297
529.4 Gretsch, Trio in G minor, VdG+V+B

signature: D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 529, Mappe Gretsch

type: manuscript, 12 pages

composer: Del Sigrer Gretsch [Johann Konrad Gretsch (ca. 1710–1778)]

title: TRIO | Viola da Gamba | Violino | Basso Continuo.

work catalogue: format separate parts

description: concordance

edition: G296

529.6²⁴ Raetzel (Retzel), Concerto in A major, VdG+V1+V2+Va+B

signature: D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 529, Mappe Raetz-zel

type: manuscript, 17 pages

²⁴ The signature number 529.5 is missing on purpose. It belongs to the fragment of a quartet by „Bruchhausen“ without viola da gamba.
composer: Del Sigre Rætzel [possibly Anton Raetzel (Retzel, Rätzel, Rätzle) (ca. 1724 – after 1760)]

Title: CONCERTO | a 5 voc | Viola di Gamba | Violino Primo | Violino Secundo | et | Basso [In the title “Viola” is missing.]

Work catalogue: separate parts

Description: fragment: the part of the Violino Secundo is missing.

Comment: concordance

Edition: G298
529.7 Anonymous [attributed to Abel], Trio in G major, V+VdG+B

- **signature**: D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 529, Mappe Anonymes Trio
- **type**: manuscript, 12 pages
- **composer**
- **title**: Trio per violino – viola da Gamba é Basso
- **work catalogue**: Abel: A5:4A
- **format**: separate parts
- **description**
- **comment**: The anonymous Trio in G major, no. 524 is in the same hand.
- **concordance**: none. The trio was attributed to Carl Friedrich Abel by Thomas Fritzsch and Peter Holman on the basis of stylistic features.
- **edition**: G295

529.8 Anonymous [Abel or Johann Stamitz], part in B flat major, VdG+?

- **signature**: D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 529, Mappe Viola da Gambo
- **type**: manuscript, 4 pages
- **composer**
- **title**: Viola da Gambo (part name)
work catalogue  Abel: A5:5A, WKO 110d
format          separate part
description     fragment: Only the viola da gamba part exists.
comment         
concordance     The anonymous part is the first part of a trio which is either by Carl Friedrich Abel (1723–1787) or by Johann Stamitz (1717–1757):
1. S-Uu\(^{26}\) Instr. mus. i hs. 11b
   \(N^o\) 4 | Trio | Traverso Primo | Traverso Secondo | Basso
dell Sigr. Abell
2. F-Pn\(^{27}\) VM 17 1021, 4th trio
   print Paris 1764, SIX | SONATES | EN | TRIO |
   Pour une Flûte, un Violon et Basse. Oeuvre Posthume |
   DE STAMITZ. Only the first part exists.

edition         G294

\(1^1\) The second and third parts are taken from the Uppsala source (Abel).

---

\(^{26}\) Uppsala Universitetsbibliotek.
\(^{27}\) Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris.
733 Anonymous, Concerto A-Dur, VdG+

signature D-OSa Dep 115b Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 733

type manuscript, 7 pages

composer

title Viola de Gamba (title page)
Concerto Violo de Gambo (first page of music)

work catalogue

format separate part

description fragment: only the viola da gamba solo part exists.

comment The solo part includes the bass during the tutti passages.

concordance

edition

Allegro moderato

Adagio

Allegro
Temperaments

STEWART M‘COY


In this important book on the use of unequal fretting on fretted instruments, Dolata acknowledges the work of Ross Duffin, How Equal Temperament Ruined Harmony (and Why You Should Care) (New York: Norton, 2007) and Mark Lindley, Lutes, Viols & Temperaments (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984). Lindley describes how historical temperaments were used, and has a leaning towards equal temperament; for example, he concludes on page 22 that Valderrábano’s duets for vihuelas tuned a third apart must involve equal temperament. On page 19 he writes: “Most theorists between 1550 and 1650 regarded lutes and viols as equal-temperament instruments.” Dolata is passionate about unequal temperaments. He acknowledges what theorists had to say, and accepts that equal temperament was used by some players, notably Vincenzo Galilei (c.1520-1591), but he argues that for the most part they were only amateurs or ‘less refined players’ (p. 54), and that good players would move frets to fine-tune their instruments. Dolata’s aim is to encourage today’s players to think about temperament and to use unequal fretting systems themselves. He asks, ‘What is the point of having moveable frets if you don’t move them?’ (p. 1).

Dolata begins by looking at the historical evidence for unequal temperaments, and there is plenty of it. He describes situations where fretted instruments were played with keyboard instruments. In Italy the viol and theorbo were played with keyboard instruments, for example in Cavalieri’s Rappresentazione di anima, e di corpo, and in Monteverdi’s Orfeo. In England viols were often played with the organ. In France, Marin Marais specified in his Pièces de viole (1689) that the harpsichord or theorbo were the ideal instruments to accompany his viol pieces. In all these cases, the keyboard instruments would have been tuned in some kind of unequal temperament, so what was the viol player meant to do – perversely stick to equal temperament and be hopelessly out of tune, or move his frets to be as closely in tune with the keyboard as he could? In Spain Luis Milán and Enriquez de Valderrábano both advised vihuela players to move the fourth fret depending on the key of the next piece. Dolata agrees with Antonio Corona-Alcalde that Milán’s fretting would have been close to sixth comma meantone. In his Compendium of Practical Music (1667) Christopher Simpson writes that some viol players had an extra first fret, meaning that some of them used unequal fretting systems. The problem with this kind of evidence is deciding to what extent equal and unequal temperaments were used. Dolata suggests that many players kept quiet about fretting, for fear of letting slip a trade secret.

In Chapter 2 Dolata describes the fretting of instruments which had fixed frets: the cittern, orpharion and bandora. None of the surviving instruments is fretted equally. The English cittern now in the National Music Museum of the
University of South Dakota, is clearly fretted in a meantone tuning, with a wide space behind the first and third frets, and a narrow space behind the second and fourth frets. Interestingly the frets of some instruments are closer to equal temperament high up the neck, but in the lower positions meantone prevails. As before, what would the viol and lute players do when playing music from Morley’s *Consort Lessons* (1599 and 1611) in a group with a cittern and bandora? Would they adjust their frets to be in tune with the wire-strung instruments, or would they scrape on regardless in equal temperament and out of tune?

In Chapter 3 Dolata examines evidence from paintings, looking for unequal fretting and slanted frets. He describes ‘sharpening’, how a player’s left-hand fingers sharpen notes slightly when they press strings down onto the frets. The fatter the string, the more notes are sharpened. To counter this, frets were sometimes slanted across the fingerboard, closer to the nut on the bass side. There is a photo supplied by Richard Carter of one of his treble viols with what at first looks like crazy fret spacing: all the frets are spaced unequally; each of the two strands of the second and fourth frets are separated so that notes like F# and G flat on the third string are both available in tune; and the third and fifth frets are slanted towards the nut on the bass side to counter the effect of sharpening. It may look weird, but having played viols with Richard and Johanna Carter in Austria, I can confirm that their tuning is unbelievably good. Their close attention to details of fret-spacing creates a special sweetness of tone, which would be impossible to achieve otherwise. Unfortunately artists in the 16th and 17th centuries tended not to reproduce these subtleties in their paintings, and most pictures of the viol show equal fretting. Undeterred, however, Dolata tries to explain how this came about, discusses what evidence we can glean from paintings of fretted instruments, and argues that players in the past would have moved their frets much as the Carters do today.

In Chapter 4 Dolata turns to musical theory, the circle of fifths, and how the pure fifths of the middle ages were replaced by the pure thirds of the renaissance. He explains how pitch is measured in Hertz, and describes the harmonic series. This can be daunting stuff for the uninitiated, but Dolata explains things in simple terms without dumbing down the content. He comes over as a good teacher. My only quibble with his use of language is when his style becomes too chatty: ‘... all bets are off’ (p. 58); having claimed to have won the argument against Galilei, ‘Game, set, and match!’ (p. 31); in the introduction to the third part of the book, ‘Now the fun begins.’ (p. 131). The description of different intervals would be difficult to follow without the actual sound, so Dolata has created audio files which may be accessed via the Indiana University web page, [www.iupress.indiana.edu](http://www.iupress.indiana.edu). I tried accessing this material on that web page, but unfortunately I could not find it.

Chapter 5 deals with different tuning systems – Pythagorean tuning, quarter comma meantone (with its ‘Big Bad Wolf’), irregular temperaments (in particular Vallotti), and equal temperament. The third part of the book is about how the history in the first part, together with the theory in the second, can be used in practice to tune one’s own lute or viol. The use of gut or nylon for strings and frets, the tailpiece, the bridge, the nut, the pegs, humidity, all can affect tuning (Chapter 6). There is much useful practical advice on the tuning
of open strings, setting the position of frets, using electronic tuners, tastini, split frets, slanted frets (Chapter 7), and playing continuo (Chapter 8).

Chapter 9 is of particular interest to viol players. Using a bow and playing single notes for much of the time, enables the player to fine-tune notes in a way which would be impossible with a lute. Dolata refers to Ortiz, Galilei, Marais and others for evidence of unequal fretting on the viol, and to Ganassi, Cerreto, Playford, Gerle and Mace for historical approaches to tuning. There is advice on tuning a consort of viols. At the end of the 16th century Ercole Bottrigari recommended that one person should tune the entire consort. I have seen Johanna Carter do this to good effect before concerts given by her students. Alison Crum suggests having one player tune first, and then the others tune to that instrument – open strings first, and then check the frets.

I think this is an excellent, well-written book. There is a wealth of information about how players of fretted instruments found different solutions to the problems of tuning; the section on the theory of temperaments is a good read in spite of the dryness of its subject matter; and there is much good practical advice to help us improve our playing by getting our instruments well in tune.
This study is the companion volume to Michael Robertson’s *The Courtly Consort Suite in German-Speaking Europe, 1650-1706*, taken together the two volumes are an expansion and development of the author’s Ph.D. dissertation, ‘The consort suite in the German-speaking lands, 1660-1705’. The subject matter of the two volumes is closely entwined, this new publication therefore does not stand alone, but must be read and appreciated in conjunction with the previous issue. Similarly, this review follows on from and refers back to its companion from 2010.

Town Musicians is laid out in a broadly similar manner to Courtly Consort—two chapters of historical scene setting and musical preliminaries are followed by five containing detailed discussion of dance music collections. Three of these are organised chronologically, the following two focus on selected towns of particular importance. All are illustrated by copious musical examples and comprehensive tables of contents. Two further chapters focus on what might be called ‘matters arising’—a brief survey of the keyboard suite, and the question of note blackening. There is an impression of the material here being somewhat more intractable than the courtly suites, the narrative often does not flow so easily. This may be partly because in general the composers are even less familiar, and many of the published collections described survive incomplete. Others are judged along the way to be of inferior musical quality, and questions regarding the competence and musicality of copyists, arrangers and typesetters form a running thread in the book. However, these matters can hardly be laid at the author’s door, and Michael Robertson marshals the information with admirable clarity, drawing attention to neglected treasures, and showing that there is always something to learn, even from incomplete, second rate sources.

Chapter 1 (‘Towns and town musicians: Governance, status and performance’) begins with a very useful historical overview of German-speaking Europe in the aftermath of the Thirty Years War—although it must be understood that this volume, even more so than its predecessor, confines itself to the area which became Germany, excluding the Habsburg lands. A presentation of the nature of the governing bodies of towns, and issues of sovereignty and jurisdiction moves seamlessly onto the daily life and working conditions of musicians employed by...
municipal authorities, comparing their lot with both court musicians and lowly itinerants. Finally, the nature and purpose of publishing dance collections is considered. Robertson has cast his net wide, and, in addition to the ‘usual’ sort of archival research, draws here on the satirical novels of Johann Kuhnau, Daniel Speer and Johann Beer. Kuhnau’s Der musicalische Quack-Salber (Dresden, 1700) yields valuable information on the day to day life of musicians, and especially the Collegia musica, the institutions which were important purchasers of the printed dance collections. Speer’s Simplicianischer lustig-politischer Haspel-Hannß (1684) fulfils a similar role for the professional town musicians, and Beer’s Teutsche Winter-Nächte (Nuremberg, 1682) illuminates the relations and rivalries between court and town. These texts also provide a useful reminder that these dance suites were mostly performed by versatile musicians—at whatever level—equally able to turn their hand to violins, viols, cornets, trumpet, dulcian, zither and so on.

Chapter 2 (‘Dances, collections and national styles’) examines the nature of published dance collections in closer detail, dealing with both the building blocks—the individual dances—and the architecture—the ways in which they were combined into pairs, sequences or suites. The role of instrumentation, the twin poles of French and Italian national styles, and the characteristically German synthesis of them, are considered in depth, along with further issues such as ordering by key, or possible freedom for the performer in movement selection and ordering. A special place is given to the bransle suite and the German adaptation of it.

Chapter 3 (‘The aftermath of war: 1648-59’), the first part of the historical survey of the music, documents the revival of German music publishing and introduces the reader to dance collections by Andreas Hammerschmidt (Freiberg), Georg Zuber (Lübeck), Johann Neubauer (Kassel, neither a municipal nor a court post is documented), Johann Rudolf Ahle (Mühlhausen), Lüder Knoep (Bremen), Hans Hake (Stade, later Hamburg), Nicolaus Hasse (Rostock) and Matthias Kelz (Augsburg—a grocer, later a government official).

Chapter 4 (‘Concepts of careful organisation: 1660-75’) presents a period Michael Robertson describes as a Golden Age, beginning with the series of three Exercitium musicum compendium editions assembled for and published by Balthasar Christoph Wust in Frankfurt, which drew heavily, albeit anonymously, on Playford’s Courtly Masquing Ayres—there are detailed concordance lists here. Lüder Knoep features again, along with Georg Wolfgang Druckenmüller (Schwäbisch Hall) and Hieronymus Kradenthaller (Regensburg). Further collections from this period are covered in the later chapters on Leipzig and Hamburg.

Chapter 5 (‘A time of decline: 1676-1700’) deals with published collections by Kradenthaller, Jacob Scheiffelhut (Augsburg), Daniel Speer (short-lived appointments in various towns), Johann Friedrich Meister (Flensburg, previously a court musician), Johann Pachelbel (Nuremberg) and, in manuscript, the single surviving suite by Dieterich Buxtehude (Lübeck). The decline is judged to be of quantity rather than quality, again we are referred to the Leipzig and Hamburg chapters for further material from this period.
Chapter 6 (‘Leipzig’) briefly outlines the factors affecting the town’s musical life after the Thirty Years War—Robertson mentions the slow recovery following the privations and hardships of the conflict.3 Discussion of the music begins with the substantial output of Johann Rosenmüller and continues with works influenced by him from Werner Fabricius and Johann Pezel. The ambitious six-volume Parergon musicum by the physician and amateur composer Johann Caspar Horn receives due attention, and two manuscript sets, one possibly by Sebastian Knüpfer, the other definitely by his brother Georg, are briefly considered. A discussion of Pezel’s music for wind ensembles follows—Pezel was a Stadtpfeifer for most of his working life—the chapter ends with the sixth volume of Horn’s Parergon, polychoral music set for separate choirs of wind and string instruments.

Chapter 7 (‘Hamburg’) describes the special circumstances of the city and introduces some of its prominent musicians. A brief discussion of the influence of Froberger’s keyboard suites prefaces the main substance of the chapter which covers the works of the prolific Dieterich Becker. Johann Adam Reincken’s Hortus musicus and a manuscript suite by Johann Theile (Hofkapellmeister in Gottorf and Wolfenbüttel, active as an opera composer in Hamburg) are also discussed.

In Chapters 3 to 7 a huge quantity of material is compactly presented, which—when teamed with the parallel chapters in Courtly Consorts—not only provides a valuable and comprehensive overview of the consort suite repertoire, but also proposes a framework in which to analyse and assess it. Michael Robertson has done a great service in bringing this all under one roof.

Chapter 8 (‘Keyboard suites by town composers’): the author writes in the Preface that ‘The keyboard suite is considered, but only in the context of its relationship with the consort suite.’ Dance suites by Reincken, Buxtehude, Matthias Weckmann (attr.), Johann Kuhnau, Johann Krieger, Benedict Schultheiss and an unattributed collection issued by Roger in Amsterdam containing suites possibly by Georg Böhm, Reincken and Christian Ritter are called to bear witness both to the interplay between consort and keyboard writing, and to the pervading influence of Froberger, especially in the widespread adoption of his favoured Allemande-Courante-Sarabande-Gigue sequence. The aspect of the relationship which emerges most clearly is that both keyboard and consort suites are idiomatically conceived, and suites for one medium do not appear ever to have been arranged for the other. The chapter then gets rather side-tracked onto the impact of music engraving techniques on the printing of keyboard works—interesting enough, but its relevance to consort dance music is not made clear.

Chapter 9 (‘Note blackening and mensural notation’): the continued use of note blackening in triple time movements long after mensural notation had apparently gone out of use is a feature of the German consort suites which, despite being properly understood by Karl Nef in 1904 (p.206), went on being wrongly...
transcribed during the 20th century. I am still occasionally faced with 1950s editions of Rosenmüller which render a blackened minim-semibreve sequence as a crotchet followed by a tied note worth five crotchets, so this airing of the topic is welcome. Robertson goes into the contexts in which blackening is used, and how it might be interpreted: briefly, occasional use flags up displaced stresses, entire movements in black notation imply a faster pulse. The notion that all blackened semibreves should be stressed is, I think, too restrictive—a well-turned cadential hemiola also calls for subtle removal of stresses. At the same time he acknowledges that 'In spite of the obvious importance of note blackening, composers, printers and copyists throughout the German lands were remarkably casual in its use' (p.205). On the question of retaining blackening in modern editions—a matter on which modern editors have not reached a consensus—Robertson is firmly in favour, but offers no thoughts as to how the casual inconsistencies should be treated. The restricted scope of the discussion, solely in the context of German dance music, does however limit its usefulness. Without ever having actively pursued the question, I have encountered inconsistent note blackening around 1550 and an accusation that Anthony Holborne used it wrongly, and it occurs frequently, often idiosyncratically applied, in English lyra viol manuscripts. Michael Robertson also cites its use by William Brade, there is clearly an opportunity for a broader study than could be accommodated here.

17th century Germany, with its patchwork of Kingdoms, Principalities, Dukedoms, Bishoprics and Free Cities, challenges the historian and musicologist alike. The nature of the beast will tend to favour a patchwork approach. To cite Ludwig Finscher:

These circumstances hardly favoured stylistic uniformity, as did the different conditions prevailing in the 18th and especially the 19th centuries. On the other hand, the small scale and the diversity of these musical ‘urban landscapes’ meant that a composer had considerable scope to develop his individuality.

Robertson clearly does not see this as the obstacle it might seem, and adopts a unifying approach. His writing looks for—and finds—links and mutual influences, continuity and interrelated development, almost of ‘schools’ of composition, and aims for an integrated overview of a repertoire much of which is still not widely known. The varied relationships he identifies between published collections mirror the relationships between individual dances in the variety of the movement-linking techniques which he pursues with equal enthusiasm. The consort suite—the term has more-or-less had to be invented for this study—faces a double challenge in emerging from the shadows. First, despite the works of some composers receiving attention—Hammerschmidt and Rosenmüller spring to mind—it is still something

---

4 In the Cancionero del Duque de Calabria, 1556 (sometimes known as the Cancionero de Upsala)
5 Peter Leycester, in A Booke of Lessons for the Lyro-Viole, GB-CHEr DLT/B 31, c.1640-70
6 e.g. The Manchester Lyra Viol Book, GB-Mp BRm 832 Vu 51, c.1660
7 L. Finscher, ‘Germany’ §§1, 2. 1648-1700, GMO (accessed 17th Jan. 2017)
of a Cinderella genre, and second, the concept of the 17th century itself as a valid ‘period’ of music history, distinct from the ‘Renaissance’ on the one hand, and ‘Baroque’ on the other, has only slowly emerged, hand in hand with a recognition of the shake-up in the nature of ensembles and genres around 1700. This two volume survey will take its place as a valuable store of information and methods of approach on the shelves of anyone studying, editing or performing this music.

In my review of Courtly Consorts I expressed serious reservations about Michael Robertson’s division of the repertoire along a strict demarcation line between ‘court’ and ‘town’ composers. Naturally, I was curious to see whether the presentation in Town Musicians would convince me otherwise. The majority of topics in both volumes are handled in a flexible manner which allows the complexity of the material its full and diverse expression. In contrast, the treatment of the two matters on which the author has decided to make a stance—the other being the rigid 20th century perception of the central role of the Allemande-Courante-Sarabande-Gigue suite—is de facto less nuanced, as the author has to repeatedly negotiate obstacles of his own making.

Robertson is surely right to challenge the perception of the suite as a poor relation of the sonata, and the A-C-S-G suite as a benchmark for spurious value judgements on other dance movement sequences, but his over-insistence on the ‘non-supremacy’ of the A-C-S-G suite threatens to throw the baby out with the bath water, denying its importance as a touchstone to which composers in many traditions and lands returned, generation after generation. An investigation into why this should have been the case, and what its significance was, would make a fascinating study.

Treating all ‘town musicians’ together risks losing a good deal of detail. Church organist, Cantor, Ratsmusikmeister, Obermusicus, Stadtpfeifer, Musikdirector and so on were all distinct positions which made different demands on their incumbents—these matters are indeed covered in Chapter 1, but they are not allowed to interfere with the court/town dichotomy, and the extent to which many composers’ career trajectories moved freely between various municipal posts and those at court is often underplayed. Ultimately, what unites the composers in Town Musicians is that they were not employed at court, or at least, not at the time the relevant works were published.

Citing Ludwig Finscher once more:

Although it is difficult to draw strict distinctions between the history of musical composition in towns or cities and at court, some genres were clearly associated with the development of court culture.  

This asymmetry is, I think, borne out by Robertson’s findings, as presented in these books. Ballet music, that is, functional dance movements or suites which originated in a stage performance, requiring individual choreography and

---

8 Finscher, op. cit.
professional dancers, but which would stand up to ‘concert’ performance, and the works of the German Lullists are shown to have clear court connections. On the other hand the collections of abstract dance-based suites for instrumental consort emanate from composers active in both town and court environments.

There are examples throughout both volumes which blur the proposed distinction between town and court, and—at least to this reviewer—progressively undermine the usefulness of the strict demarcation. Here are a few, mostly from Town Musicians, to illustrate my point:

Clamor Heinrich Abel's Musicalische Blumen are categorized as ‘town’ style and format, but are discussed in Courtly Consort, separated from comparable collections which are covered in Town Musicians. Abel held a court post in Celle at the time of publishing, he was later employed by the municipal authorities in Bremen.

The Exercitium musicum collections published by Christoph Balthasar Wust (Chapter 4) are here treated as ‘town’, despite them containing many pieces lifted from Playford's Courtly Masquing Ayres. This apparent anomaly is not addressed. The first of Wust's collections is in fact also discussed in Courtly Consorts (p.93ff), in a briefer treatment emphasizing its courtly aspect.

On p.81 striking similarities between collections by Lüder Knoep (‘town’) and Adam Drese (‘court’) are emphasized.

In Chapter 5, introducing works by Meister and Pachelbel:

The last two printed collections under consideration in this chapter are the work of composers who had court experience before taking up posts as municipal organists. Despite the court influence, both collections are firmly rooted in town music, … (p.99)

The choice of dance type clearly shows Pachelbel's court background; … (p.102)

Philipp Heinrich Erlebach’s trio sonata collection—which consists of consort suites with many similarities to Pachelbel’s—is however given only a cursory mention, which is to be found not here, but in Courtly Consorts.

Johann Rosenmüller enjoyed a particularly colourful career which defies easy categorization; while serving as municipal organist at St Nicolai (Leipzig) he was promised the post of Thomaskantor, at the same time he was director of music in absentia at the court in Altenburg. Fleeing Germany after a homosexual scandal he worked at San Marco and at the Ospedale della Pietà in Venice, on his eventual return to Germany he was Kapellmeister at Wolfenbüttel.

To have to offer what amounts to an apology for including a reference to a collection which is absolutely germane to the discussion is a curious position for the author to put himself in:

While Johann Krieger was a court musician for most of his career, putting him ostensibly outside the scope of this survey, his Sechs musicalische Partien clearly
demonstrate the continuing influence of the earlier consort tradition even more strongly than collections by town musicians such as Kuhnau. (p.190)

Michael Robertson’s discussion (Chapter 1) of the likely performers of consort dance suites, and the occasions of performance—among them the Collegia musica, student ensembles, domestic music making, Tafelmusik at court, for weddings, or for civic occasions—indicates some of the complexity of the situation. The desire to look for ways and means to bring more order and structure is understandable, we need a framework and some terms of reference in order to be able to write about the subject. 17th century Germany provides more than enough terminology to describe the position and status of the composers, but is unhelpful regarding genre questions and the music. To begin with, as Robertson explains in the introductory material in both volumes, they did not even use the word ‘suite’ in the way we want to use it nowadays. Early 20th century musicology came up with the hierarchy of sonata and suite, and the particular yardstick of the A-C-S-G suite, now being set aside as not subtle enough, and unnecessarily judgemental. A new terminology which reflects the various strands in the consort suite repertoire is needed. For one area at least, we have the term German Lullist, which is ideal—it identifies the genre without implying or forcing a context. Fair enough, it is closely associated with court and court musicians, but the terminology can accommodate a composer employed in a municipal post who published works in that style without needing to make an exception. Turmmusik, outdoor music explicitly for the Stadtpfeifer to play from tower balconies, is another helpful term, which would not of itself create a problem if a court composer were to contribute to the repertoire—whether they did or not is not the point here. The remainder of the repertoire is however divided into two broad areas which are labelled ‘courtly’ and ‘town’, or ‘in the style of town musicians’. The survey presented in these two volumes shows that there is much truth in this division, and yet it is here where my difficulties begin. Each time a town musician is found to have composed in the former style, or a court composer in the latter, an exception has to be invoked, or a workaround found, and, more importantly, it means that some consort dance collections are allocated to the ‘wrong’ volume, with precedence given to the composer’s precise employment at the time of publishing, rather than to the genre of the composition.

To more mundane matters: the book is nicely presented and well laid out, navigation is easy, the peripherals—contents, lists of music examples, bibliography, cross references, index and so on—have not given any problems. Whereas the companion volume Courtly Consorts has footnotes, Town Musicians has (chapter) endnotes, this is presumably a house style issue connected to the recent absorption of Ashgate into Routledge, which took place during the preparation of the book. My personal preference is always for footnotes, avoiding the tedious turning to and fro, but there’s no denying the clean look of the pages which endnotes allow. Apart from this, the book is visually very much of a piece with the earlier volume. Typesetting is more accurate and copy editing and proof reading more effective than Courtly Consorts, there are only very few minor slips—Table 5.1 (p.100), for
example, includes an odd leftover ‘[delete space]’ instruction to the typesetter. The music examples are also well laid out and consistently presented, something which cannot always be relied on.

There will of course always be room for quibbles with translations from old German, the often colourful way 17th century composers expressed themselves sometimes challenges even native speakers. Most of the points I have noted are trivial, more to do with fine tuning and style than fundamental misunderstanding, but in a handful of cases I do feel a mistranslation has led to a misinterpretation. One such is on pp.124-126 and concerns the preface to Volume One of Horn’s *Parergon musicum*. Horn gives tempo recommendations for the various dance types—Allemande, Courante, Ballo and Sarabande—and goes on to write about ornamentation:

> Worbey man sich auch eines reinen Strichs/ nebenst einem netten Trillo/ gebrauchen/ und die Noten mit vielen colorieren und Gequerle nicht verdunckeln soll.

In these [i.e. the latter] one applies a simple [bow] stroke in the company of a pleasant *trillo*, and the notes should not be darkened with many colours [i.e. divisions] and restless ornaments [author's translation].

Robertson interprets these remarks as applying only to the sarabandes, the last mentioned dance type, but I see nothing to support that notion, nor do I feel that the instructions are necessarily ambiguous, as he also asserts—Horn asks for a straightforward (‘pure’ or ‘clean’) bow stroke and tasteful trills, but warns against obscuring the music with endless divisions and over-elaborate ornaments. Precisely what Horn means by ‘trillo’ is a tricky question; of the three options offered here—two-note trill, one-note trill (the classic Italian vocal *trillo*) or bow vibrato—the normal trill would be the obvious default. We should be open to the other possibilities, but a bow vibrato seems unlikely in this context.

A second example is also provided by Horn, this time in the fifth volume of *Parergon musicum*. Here there are passages in which the two violin parts play in unison—which Horn carefully marks with an asterisk in the partbooks (p.132):

> So ist darauff acht zu haben/ daß die Violinen sein gleich in einen Strich zusammen mögen gespielet warden.

The violins must take care to start each bow stroke at exactly the same time [author's translation].

I would suggest this is an instruction to violinists who were not familiar with playing more than one to a part to play together using the same bowing.

---

9 *Gequerle* is an obsolete term which the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* by the Brothers Grimm (Leipzig, 1854, digitised at <http://woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB/>), defines as a rotating or spinning motion. The *Vollständiges Wörterbuch der Deutschen Sprache*, ed. Theodor Heinsius (Vienna, 1840) defines it as the sound of frogs croaking, which is certainly a more colourful description of unwanted over-ornamentation!
What place does or could this repertoire have in musical life today? As Michael Robertson points out in his Preface, this is music for which talk of orchestral performance is anachronistic. There is little sign of a violin consort movement to match the amateur viol consort world, professional violin bands which specialize in 17th century music are rare, and those ensembles which serve up early 17th century dance music in a kaleidoscopic, sweetshop variety mix of instrumentations tend to ignore the straightforward violin band option. My experience with a modern day Collegium musicum—a mixed group of amateur and semi-professional string players who meet to explore baroque music under professional guidance—has usually been that any 17th century music is seen as a prelude to getting on to some ‘real’ baroque music later in the evening, and it is rare to spend an entire session with music by such as Locke, Purcell, Charpentier, Lully, Biber, Schmelzer, Horn or Rosenmüller. The dance movements can seem slight, when not presented in a suitable context. It is to be hoped that a book such as this will assist in raising the profile of the consort dance repertoire by demonstrating its riches and scope. It is clear from the bibliography that although some composers are served well, more editions are necessary: Michael Robertson is actively engaged in this field too.

Taking a narrow view for a moment, there is not much in these books of direct interest for viol players: in the Preface Michael Robertson explains his decision to omit consort suites for viols, and boundaries had to be set for obvious practical reasons. A handful of collections which involve the viol alongside other instruments are to be found here, including a bransle suite in Druckenmüller’s Musicalisches Tafel-Confect for three viols and continuo, two sonatas for two violins and viol, and one for two violins and three viols in Becker’s Musicalische Frühlings-Früchte, and Reinken’s sonatas for two violins with obligato viol and continuo, for example. Incidentally Druckenmüller adds an intriguing and informative instruction that the suite may be played on viols, but if there are no viols available, or if you prefer not to use them, or for accompanying dancing, it should be played an octave higher on violins (p.13). Other consort suite staples of the 17th century viol repertoire such as those by, for example, Johann Michael Nicolai for two or three viols and continuo, or David Funck’s Stritturae violae di gambicae (Leipzig, 1677) for four viols without continuo, are explicitly excluded. This allows the interested viol specialist to use these works as case studies, to examine how they fit into the evolution of the suite, and in the case of Funck’s collection, how they relate to the concepts of organisation presented here.

I have looked forward to the publication of this book and the author is to be congratulated on the completion of his project. I have doubts about two aspects which are given special prominence—the nature of the division into court and town, and the place of the A-C-S-G suite—which Michael Robertson has not been able to dispel. In a work of this kind which presents analysis, personal opinions and conclusions alongside straightforward information there are

---

inevitably matters for the reader to agree with or dispute. Challenging previously held views as he has done is an inevitable result of taking a fresh look at the sources, and a necessary one, if a lively scholarly debate is to be had. The debate must continue.

One final thought: I am sure that I am not alone in finding the price alarmingly high—however, I understand both volumes are due to be issued in paperback.
If you are a viol player you will already be in the picture about this exciting discovery, as this year (2016) you would have found it difficult not noticing the many platforms on which these pieces were exposed after lying in a dusty library for over 280 years, unnoticed: the Güntersberg edition (subject of this review), the CD by Thomas Fritzsch plus its reviews, and a performance of all 12 Fantasias at the International Festival for Viols at the RCM in November. The fact that there seems to be only one surviving copy of these pieces, lovingly preserved in a private collection until 2000, shows perhaps that Telemann might not have sold as many copies as he would have hoped. But, publishing 12 Fantasias for solo Viola da Gamba in 1735 is indeed an unusual move for a business man as shrewd and opportunistic as Telemann.

For the benefit of those who have missed the finer details of why this collection of pieces was hidden for so long, I shall recap some of the information (partly taken from the preface to the Güntersberg edition), and give some context of what position the viol found itself in Germany as regards popularity in 1735:

Telemann published the 12 Fantasias for solo Violin (TWV 40:14-25) and those for solo Viola da Gamba (TWV 40:26-37) in the same year (1735), as single fortnightly sheets with one Fantasia per page, which were available either individually as they were published, or, later, in a collection. A similar method had been employed when Telemann published the Getreue Musikmeister in bits a few years earlier, with single sheets made available to subscribers at regular intervals, except that with this much bigger and more flexible collection, as a subscriber you might find yourself with a sheet with half a song and one movement for keyboard one time, and then two movements of a flexible duet for all sorts of instruments the next time. It is interesting that, after that sizeable venture, Telemann saw the need to narrow down the market somewhat so that subscribers or other interested customers only receive music for their own instrument. This must have required a very different marketing strategy which perhaps didn’t work so well for the viol.

The better known collection of Fantasias is of course for flute (TWV 40:2-13) a couple of years earlier, and the evident success of these pieces may have sparked off the idea to repeat a similar venture for the violin and the viol. The viol fantasias were long thought lost, but recently it was discovered that one copy of
the ‘Fantasies pour la Basse de Violle, faites et dediéées à Mr. Pierre Chaunell, par Telemann’, originally acquired by the poetess Eleonore von Münster (née von Grothaus, 1734-1794) at Ledenburg Palace, near Hanover, migrated to the Lower Saxony State Archive, Osnabrück (Dep 115b, Akz. 2000/002 Nr. 528) in 2000. The timing of the migration of the Ledenburg library into an accessible archive meant that the viol fantasias missed inclusion in two important catalogues for solo viol music, both of which the result of doctoral research: Fred Flässig ‘Die solistische Gambenmusik in Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert’ (Cuvillier Verlag, Göttingen 1996), and Bettina Hoffmann ‘Catalogo della musica solistica e cameristica per viola da gamba’ (Antiqua, 2001). Unlike the other Telemann Fantasia collections, this one has a dedicatee in the Hamburg banker and businessman Pierre Chaunel (1703-1789). He is known to have purchased several of Telemann’s works, and was subscriber to the Musique the table in 1733, and later acquired an advance subscription to the Nouveaux Quatuors en Six Suites (1738). Chaunel was born in Altona (now part of Hamburg) in 1703, as the son of Huguenot immigrants from Montpellier. He was an important part of Hamburg business circles – of which many were French - and considered Hamburg’s richest businessman towards the end of his life. However, it is not known whether he played the viola da gamba. The title page of the viol fantasias underlines Telemann’s good connections with Altona and gives us an important clue as to his links with French music lovers in Germany. Telemann described himself as ‘a great lover of French music’ in a letter to Mattheson in 1717. However, it was not until 1737, two years after publishing these viol pieces, that Telemann took an extended trip to Paris. His two sets of Paris Quartets (1730 and 1738) are of course further proof that Telemann was a great fan of French music, the style of which he incorporated so well into some of his works, albeit making it very much his own.

Apart from Telemann using the viol in the Paris Quartets, two accompanied Sonatas, the big solo Sonata in D, and several Trio Sonatas, what was written for it around 1735? This is seven years after Bach uses the viol in the Matthew Passion, but possibly around the time Bach wrote his accompanied sonatas for Viola da Gamba and harpsichord. Ernst Christian Hesse (1676-1762) and his son Ludwig Christian Hesse (1716-1772) would have been around: Ernst Christian – the one who had lessons with Marais and Forqueray – in Darmstadt, and Ludwig Christian


initially also in Darmstadt, but from 1741 in Berlin. Johann Daniel Hardt (1696-1763) was also a prominent viol player, though quite some distance away from Hamburg, at the Württembergische Hof. Johann Gottlieb Graun (1703-1771) was already in Berlin and writing for the viol, however, only accompanied sonatas and concertos, as far as we know. In France, Marais had published his fifth book 10 years earlier, but we know that his works were very popular for a long time, evident in a reworking of many of the bass viol pieces for *pardessus de viole* by Vielleneuve as late as 1759. Forqueray had not published his *Pièces de Viole* (1747) yet, but if the theory by Dr Lucy Robinson is correct that they were actually written by Forqueray senior, they may have been created a bit earlier. Rameau was in full swing in 1735, concentrating mainly on writing operas, and not yet having published the *Pièces de clavecin* (1741) with a viol part written so badly within the texture, that it certainly helped the instrument into its grave in France. François Couperin had published his *Pièces de viole* in 1728 and Charles Dollé was working on his fiendishly difficult *Pièces de viole*, published in 1737. Young Carl Friedrich Abel was only 12 in 1735 and was possibly already singing in the Thomasschule in Leipzig, while his father, Christian Ferdinand maintained Bach’s former position as *Premier Musici* in Köthen.

As regards solo viol music without continuo, Telemann’s pieces fill a sizeable chronological gap between what was written before (Sainte-Colombe, Demachy, DuBuisson, Schenck) and after (Abel). Despite the presence of many gamba players (mentioned above - many of which also played the violin and often had a job as *Kapellmeister*) in good and prominent positions dotted around courts in Germany, the viol had already moved into the background. Mattheson was writing his *Capellmeister* at that time (published in 1739), and in one of his publications he mentions that the viol is often used to play a bass line in the orchestra, playing chords following the figures, but that ‘he has not heard it done well’. Alongside Abel’s success in London, there were some isolated attempts to revitalise the popularity of the viol in the second half of the 18th century, with accompanied sonatas by Carl Philipp Emmanuel Bach (1714-1788), several works by Christoph Schaffrath (1709-1763) and Johann Gottlieb Graun, and much later some viol players would have found employment opportunities if they could get their head around learning to play the Baryton and join Prince Esterházy’s court in Hungary. During that time Carl Ludwig Junker (1748-1797) makes some poignant remarks (1777) about the decline of the viol: ‘It is true that we have invented new instruments, we have improved some of the old ones and we have extended their limits by using them randomly. But why do we neglect, for example, the lute, the viola da gamba and the viola d’amore – instruments that are so close to the heart? Our taste truly deserves little praise. True, those instruments are difficult to learn;

3 Exact reference needed. Free CD for someone who finds it!
but seeing difficulty as the reason for the dereliction would mean accepting that our abilities have shrunk; I feel the reason perhaps lies in education. They are not really instruments to play along with. A self-determined youth has no interest to learn how to forget the daily grind in quiet twilight over the whispering lute, but seeks pride and applause in the world. And perhaps the last of those who inherited knowledge of these instruments and who should be our teachers have passed away.⁴ In the year Junker wrote this, Abel was an old man in London (died age 64 in 1787), Carl Philipp Emmanuel Bach had written his sonatas for viol quite some time earlier, both Hesses, Schaffrath, JG Graun and Hardt had died, Andreas Lidl (or Lidel) was about to move from Esterháza to London, via a brief stay in Germany, and Josef Fiala, a Bohemian musician who also wrote for the viol, had only just gained a position at the court in Munich.

So, if we think of the viol having its golden time as a solo instrument on the continent between 1670 and 1720s, and the later revival by some excellent composers and enthusiasts was a fairly isolated and ineffective attempt to show that the instrument could hold its ground against other still-developing (and therefore increasingly louder) instruments, the 1730s were an odd time to invest in writing 12 fantasias for the viol. Perhaps Telemann thought he could tap into the market of French people in Germany who were homesick for their old country, and/or older viol players who had not moved with the times (hence writing solo music for those who are no longer compatible with other, more modern chamber musicians).

However, following the huge excitement one feels when such a volume of music is discovered at a time when we thought we had already found all music that is worth finding for the viol, I have to be perfectly honest (and going against the grain) and say that these are not Telemann’s finest pieces. If one had to describe them in a few words, one would sum them up as ‘great first movements, lovely slow movements which are too short, and naff fast (last) movements’. In contrast, the flute fantasias are largely really wonderful, providing an extension to Bach’s flute
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partita in a minor, and showing the instrument in its best light, mysterious, sometimes a bit haunting, but also gutsy, fun-loving, rustic, and playing with the different styles, French, Italian, Polish etc really effectively. Those show the flute from its best side, they are idiomatic and one cannot but walk away thinking how impressed one is with the traverso and its versatility. The violin and viol fantasias however, make the impression of a rush-job, something that needs to be quickly put on paper, Telemann’s heart is not really in it, and the focus is on quantity rather than quality. There are some great pieces in there, but they could have been written for any instrument. I have to disagree with Thomas Fritzsch who writes in the preface to this edition: ‘Telemann demonstrates astonishing knowledge of the playing techniques of the gamba and of composing in an idiom suited to the instrument.’ Telemann displayed much greater knowledge of the viol in his great solo sonata from the Getreue Musikmeister (1728), and I think Mattheson is someone I would agree with more here, when he rather diplomatically wrote ‘these pieces can hardly be called anything but good ideas’. There are certainly countless of wonderful ideas here, in 12 different keys, and not all with just three movements. We find many different styles, just like in the other Fantasia sets, but it is so surprising that Telemann did not tap more into the French style, something the viol is so good at: his dedicatee was French and he himself had an interest in French music, and certainly was capable of writing in that style. The nearest solo viol music Telemann would have had as a possible model were Schenck’s (much earlier) solo sonatas which explore the German version of the French style very effectively. And we have the French craze with the Hesse family, and the exchange of music between Paris and Berlin (although this may have not happened until the 1740s). Telemann’s first two viol fantasias show a much thinner texture than all the others later in the collection, and perhaps he did get some feedback in the first month from a professional viol player. One definitely misses some accompaniment in those first two pieces, and also later, especially in the snappy short last movements, and often during melodic passages, sequences and scales, all similar to a viol part in a Telemann trio sonata, one feels a little empty without a bass, either provided by another instrument or by the viol itself. Occasionally, Telemann uses the viol effectively, writing in a brisé style or using an arpeggiated texture. It takes him four Fantasias to discover the full extent of the viol being a 6-string and not a 4-string instrument, but it has to be emphasised that the slow movements are idiomatic and effective and work really well on the viol. If one compares the snappy last movements with Schenck’s last movements (mostly Gigas) in his solo viol pieces, one cannot help but feeling as if Telemann had simply copied the successful principle of the ‘alla Polacca’-type last movements of the flute fantasias and came up with a few bars that put a smile back on your face after a slow

5 Mattheson, Capellmeister, S.88 ‘[.dass man diese Fantasien] schwerlich mit einem anderen allgemeinen Nahmen, als guter Einfälle belegen kann’
movement, and something that just fills the remaining space on that page, without much regard of there being 6 strings and huge potential of resonance. I would have rather had fewer fantasias, but longer slow movements and more substantial and more idiomatic last fun-movements, think of Telemann's last movement to Lessons 15&16 from the Getreue Musikmeister, or Abel's rustic A Major Allegro — pieces that work really well for the viol, create a great sound, are fun to play and tell us more about what the instrument is capable of. But that would have taken more than a single page. There are only very isolated moments where I thought when playing through the volume that a) I would pick one whole fantasia to play in a concert and b) it tells the audience (or the player) something about the instrument, what it can do, what it is good at, how it can sound best. The violin Fantasias also contain a few last movements which you finish playing, thinking 'what was the point of that?', but I am sad to say that the viol fantasia collection contains more of those.

However (and this is a big but!), this is a really important collection, and every viol player should have this on the shelf, even if it's only because there is a lot in there that would improve everybody's technique. I just wish Telemann had not felt so pressured by his business venture to cram it all on one page, and publish 12 fantasias in a very short amount of time. With more time and thought we would have had some really brilliant Telemann, with some substantial beautiful slow movements (rather than coming to the end of it thinking 'aw, that was too short!'), and generally more thought about what the viol can do. Fritzsch also writes in the preface that 'by 1735, full-bodied gamba chords that set disturbing limits on the course of the melody and all too often hinder *galant* elements had long been marks of an antiquated style which was felt to be unnatural and which dashed the expectations attached to the currently predominant style of writing fantasias: “§. 93. For this style is the freest and most independent of all imaginable variants, since once comes across this idea and that, with everything bound neither to words nor to melody, only to harmony […] bringing forth all kinds of unusual passages, hidden ornaments, ingenious turns and trimmings […] now rapid, now hesitating; now monophonic, now polyphonic […] not without intent seeking favour, rushing in and evoking wonder.”' I fear I have to disagree again, because what Mattheson seems to be saying here is that there should be a lot of variation and surprise in Fantasias. Chords (or double/triple stops) surely would be a great way of adding more interest, and more variety, and comparing the violin fantasias.

---

6 Mattheson, Capellmeister, S.88 ‘.§. 93. Denn dieser Styl ist die allerfreieste und ungebundenste Setz- Sing- und Spiel-Art, die man nur erdencken kann, da man bald auf diese bald auf jene Einfälle geräth, da man sich weder an Worte noch Melodie, obwohl an Harmonie bindet, […] da allerhand sonst ungewöhnliche Gänge, versteckte Zierrathen, sinnreiche Drehungen und Verbrämungen hervorgebracht worden, […] bald hurtig bald zögernd; bald ein- bald vierstimmig; […] doch nicht ohne Absicht zu gefallen, zu übereilen und in Verwunderung zu setzen.’
with the viol ones, I can almost see more double stops and chords written for the 4-string instrument, perhaps because it was more familiar to Telemann, or because he knew he would be selling more copies. I agree that chords can sometimes be in the way, but if composed with some consideration and played well it can actually help the flow and the performance of the whole piece, and if the fashion of the time dictates a gradual move away from the predictable one could draw much joy and effect from the huge range of possibilities an instrument with six strings offers.

There are two little-known German composers I have not mentioned here yet, mainly because they would have unlikely featured prominently in the viol world of 18th-century Germany, and therefore would have had next to no influence on Telemann’s works. But although they are very minor composers who could never reach the quality and polished compositional style of a Telemann, their music has something that is of interest: Johann Friedrich Ruhe (1699-1776) wrote four accompanied Sonatas for viola da gamba around 1740, and Johann Gottfried Mente (1698 – ca.1760) published a ‘Suite in a minor for Viola da Gamba and BC, 1759’. Ruhe’s pieces are fairly standard and pleasant baroque pieces, but some of his livelier movements could be mistaken for Telemann’s lower quality ones. Except that Ruhe adds a bass part which means that the lack of quality is not so exposed.

![Ruhe, 2nd movement of Sonata 2 (Facsimile by Walhall Verlag, EW259)](image)

Mente’s suite, at first glance, is only unusual in the date of its publication, but inside we find an accompanied sonata in four movements (Lamento, Scherzando, Menuet, Polonaise) which is in style not dissimilar to Graun or late Telemann, but with one very interesting difference: The first movement is a really good attempt to be as French and rhapsodic as possible. There are chords, long flourishes, and surprising moments, and one would almost not miss the bassline because the viol part is so full by itself. Obviously, this may seem a bad comparison for those who
take the labelling of ‘Suite’, ‘Sonata’ and ‘Fantasia’ very seriously, and in addition, nobody has heard of Ruhe or Mente, perhaps for good reason. But my point is that Mente managed to write a first movement that is exciting, fits the instrument well and sounds full and French and is satisfying to play. Why did Telemann not make more of what the viol does best?

There is no doubt that if the title page was missing from these Telemann pieces, we would still know that it is Telemann, as they show his very own and inimitable style, but yet, if we were less sure that they were composed by a great man such as him, the excitement would be not as great about this discovery, and they might shrink into the dimmer areas of our music shelf, just like Ruhe or Mente.

We viol players want so much to be part of the mainstream recognised classical music world, although we at the same despise its regularity and predictability. But every viol player who has been asked countless times to provide a solo viol piece (perhaps even with accompaniment) as part of the second half of a chamber music concert, knows what I am talking about: you find yourself the odd one out, the one with the piece by a composer that nobody has heard of before, the one that sounds and looks different, the one that has to tune all the time. Perhaps this is nowadays a very old-fashioned view, and we like to think that the world is now clued up about the viol, and that audiences don’t look at it a second time, or at least not as much as they used to. But if we think about what we have in our baroque repertoire that a standard concert-goer would recognise, find attractive, buy a ticket for and like, or someone who buys a glossy classical music magazine, or perhaps even a CD, or if the recording company says ‘great, you can play, so let’s have some solo music that sells’, we very quickly run out of options. The world would recognise Bach of course, and what he wrote for the viol is mostly quite difficult, and perhaps not as idiomatic as it could have been. CPE Bach may be a recognisable, if not household, name amongst bog standard audiences who are used to piano trios and string quartets. But his viol pieces are also unidiomatic for the viol and for the most part totally impossible to play. Handel – there is that sonata that is so bad that for a very long time we couldn’t believe that it was by him. And he forgot to write a lovely and indispensable viol part in the Messiah, something that would have kept players and the instrument in the limelight and business. Partly we want to ‘educate’ our audiences that there are other, lesser known, composers, who deserve their undivided attention. But it is a battle that can only be partially won in small niche-market festivals that have now largely disappeared for funding reasons. So, good middle ground would be to have a collection of attractive Telemann pieces that excite the standard listener, since Telemann has risen in the estimation of audiences in the last few decades. We want to have a worthwhile addition to the very slim solo-music section of our shelves, and we want to believe that this Fantasia collection is something that shows the world how great the viol is. Unfortunately, these pieces are not going to play that
role. But they are largely very playable and entertaining, although it is difficult to see what purpose they can fulfil other than providing some very worthwhile amusement on a Sunday afternoon within your own four walls (which is nothing to be sniffed at).

Looking at a comprehensive shelf of solo (also accompanied) viol music we keep finding ourselves repeatedly drawn to music written by viol players. Perhaps part of the reason for the viol's decline was not just fashion and lack of ‘street cred’ (like Junker seems to imply), but its complicated nature and lack of resilience when a composer comes along in a hurry who writes for it without fully understanding how it works best.

I should add that the edition is, as usual with Güntersberg, impeccable, clean and user-friendly and contains the bonus of having the Facsimile. There is a comprehensive preface by three people (Carsten Lange, Thomas Fritzsch and Günter von Zadow) which makes very interesting reading. I am really glad that Güntersberg are doing such a great job of concentrating on viol music and making it widely available to all.
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