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SUMMARY

Though an acknowledged constituent part of 18th century musical life, no satisfactory collective study of the composing aristocrat in that era has hitherto been undertaken.

The primary aim of this thesis is to identify as many dilettante aristocratic composers as possible, to establish how much of their output has survived, and where - especially in the case of manuscript survivals - the source material is housed. Postwar relocation, war loss and damage, as well as simple error in existing works of reference, have made the locating of source material in some cases problematic, and the present study has been able to update some of the information given elsewhere.

Without entering into debate as to the qualitative aspects of much of the music, the study, in the light of the source material, has been able to question the factual basis of information given and judgements cast by reference works and scholars during the past hundred years, and to chart the reception accorded to some of these dilettanti by encyclopaedists, editors and commentators of the past three centuries. The thesis also notes and categorises the extent to which individual aristocratic composers related to the music of their own time.

A secondary aim of the thesis is to attempt to explain why the 18th century saw such a relative profusion of aristocratic composers, and why - prima facie, the German lands were such a fruitful breeding ground for them, in comparison with France or Britain.

While accepting in principle the fact that many of the composers here identified may well have sought the guidance of a "professional", the thesis assumes all works ascribed to "an illustrious hand" to be largely genuine, unless specific doubts may be raised. The pursuit of such doubts has led to the identification of mis-attributions in the case of Emperor Joseph of the Habsburgs, Frederick the Great and Prince Anton of Saxony. One "composer" is seriously challenged as being one at all, and an open verdict is cast in the case of another. On a more positive note, some composers, and primarily Frederick Lewis, Prince of Wales, are discussed for the first time in relation to their musical talents, and new or unconsidered material has been brought to light in the case of Frederick the Great, Count Losy, and arguably Prince Johann Ernst of Weimar.
Although the conclusion of this thesis must be that relatively few of these composers exerted any real influence on the evolution of music in the 18th century, the omnipresence of the composing nobility — especially in the musical landscape of the German lands — justifies the collective study of the genre.
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ARISTOCRATIC COMPOSERS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The study of a category of composer and its relationship to the musical life of its time and its reception by a musical Establishment both in the 18th century and more recent times.

INTRODUCTION

The existence of the dilettante - frequently aristocratic - composer, both before and since the 18th century, is a well-known fact and arguably adequately documented. In particular the role of royalty and the aristocracy as "patrons" of the arts has been well served in more recent times by Christopher Hogwood's (1) Music at Court and by Yorke-Long's (2) earlier work of the same title. Neither work, however, concentrates on the creative efforts of these very "patrons" as composers themselves, nor do they bring the reader to any conclusion as to whether the fact of an active, sumptuous or indulgent musical life for Court consumption had any real bearing on the evolution of music in a wider context.

The relationship between the aristocratic devotee and musical life in general is uniquely hinted at, as we shall see, by Telemann in the moving Preface to his publication of six violin concertos by the young and talented Prince Johann Ernst of Saxe-Weimar, who died tragically early at the age of 18 in 1715. MAY THE REPUBLIC OF MUSIC GIVE LASTING HOMAGE TO THE MEMORY OF THIS INCOMPARABLE PRINCE wrote Telemann.

This Republique de Musique appears to be Telemann's own coinage, for no other title-page or dedication in a contemporary publication of Musique de chambre in France, surely the most likely source of the term, uses the expression. Telemann, however, as the very epitome of the well-read and cosmopolitan child of the Enlightenment, will have been grounded in Plato and also aware of progressive French philosophical thought such as culminated in Montesquieu's De l'Esprit des Lois (1748).
In the former's Republic an ideal society is seen as a "true aristocracy" or "rule of the best", in which each man, irrespective of rank, has a specific contribution to make. For Montesquieu a "republic" is a society "animated by integrity" (vertu).

The primary concern of this thesis is to identify aristocratic dilettante composers in the 18th century, and to indicate known archival or secondary sources of their music. Those included bore hereditary titles, in descending order from Emperor down to Baron (Freiherr). The quality of the music is not a criterion for selection. Much of the music may be dismissed as trite, clumsy or conventional. Value judgements as to the quality of the music, in so far as they are made at all in the context of any particular composer, are more likely to be made with regard to the secondary concern of this thesis, namely the relationship between the compositional activity of any given dilettante and the stage of evolution in which mainstream music of the time found itself.

Clearly, the more comprehensive picture we have of a composer, the greater validity any value judgements may be accorded. Consequently much effort is given to the location of source materials and to comparing that factual information with what may be found elsewhere in existing works of reference. It will be seen that the objective factual basis on which judgements appear to be dependent, is, in varying degrees, inaccurate or incomplete.

As a shorthand, reference is made intermittently, à la Telemann, to the "Republic of Music". Whatever Telemann actually had in mind, for the purposes of this thesis it enjoys a two-fold definition. First, it is related to knowledgeable opinion of its time - the world of the contemporary practitioner and/or aesthete. Secondly, however, it refers to a different sphere of influence, but one that is no less significant in our assessment of any durable contribution.
made by these dilettanti, namely the lexicographers, scholars and editors of the intervening centuries. Whether Telemann envisaged this manifestation of a musical Establishment as part of his "Republic" is open to debate, but the treatment meted out to the aristocratic composers under review by this particular Establishment, in terms of their worthiness to be accorded entries in the major lexicographical works of reference, from Gerber to Grove, and the accuracy of those entries, gives us insight into a world of fluctuating fortunes and fashions.

Likewise the worthiness of the music of some of these composers to find its way into the major anthology collections of the past one hundred years, throws up questions not only as to the durable qualities of the music, but also as to the durable qualities or otherwise of the aesthetic judgements that lay behind the decision to include them, and also of the views of commentators at various points of time.

We shall see that there are varying degrees of conflict between the received wisdom of even the most recent of reference works, and archival fact. Likewise it will be seen that the few monographs that do exist are of questionable reliability. However, whereas with mainstream composers there is an on-going process of self-correction, with minor composers the one existing work of reference is accorded canonic status, and misleading or inaccurate information perpetuates itself in the vacuum that lies between that sole existing monograph and any eventual successor.

Inevitably the question poses itself in connection with compositions alleged to be the work of royal or aristocratic personnages: can one be sure of their true authorship? Here we are reminded of the scepticism voiced by Reichardt, Thayer and above all Brahms in the caveat: You cannot be too careful when judging a work composed by a Prince, because you can
never know who actually wrote it\(^{(3)}\). Where there are archival grounds for challenging an ascription, or the source gives inadequate cause for confidence in an ascription, the authenticity of a composition as being of aristocratic authorship has been reviewed. By this process spurious works inter alia by Emperor Joseph of the Habsburgs, Frederick the Great, Prince Anton of Saxony and the French Count Tallard have been identified, and an open verdict recorded in the case of Electress Maria Antonia of Saxony. On the positive side new concordances in the case of Count Losy and possibly hitherto unconsidered arias by Frederick the Great have been brought to light. Likewise the published version of a harpsichord concerto by Wilhelmine of Bayreuth, a sister of Frederick the Great, has been exposed as corrupt, and reconstructed from the surviving source material.

In principle, however, an ascription has been allowed to stand unless there are contra-indications, though the hand of a conveniently placed professional can clearly never be ruled out completely.

The present thesis is the first to concentrate exclusively on royal and aristocratic dilettante composers. Two previous attempts at apparently the same task fail utterly to live up to the expectation warranted by their titles. These are the "radically new version" of a lexicon of Fürstliche Musiker published in 1952/53 by Felix von Lepel\(^{(4)}\) and a lengthy article published as No 10 of a collection of musical papers by W.J. Wasielsky\(^{(5)}\) in 1879. The utter brevity of the former - a mere six pages of text - and the biographical inaccuracy of both, allow us to dismiss them as serious scholarly contributions to the subject.

The structuring of such a thesis presents a problem. One possibility would have been to group these dilettanti according to type - perhaps by degree of interaction with mainstream
music at the time, perhaps according to the perceived quality of their output, or in ascending or descending order of the sheer volume of their music. The disadvantage of all these approaches is that it would necessitate tedious repetition of much of the background material, should, for example, father and son, or siblings then have to be allotted to different chapters.

Instead, a dynastic and/or regional approach has been preferred. In this way, in addition to obviating the need to repeat material or persistently refer back to other chapters, the interaction between contemporary dilettanti - in so far as this has occurred - becomes more immediately apparent than may otherwise have been the case.

The question of some kind of classification according to the nature of interaction with mainstream music is dealt with in the Conclusion, where an attempt is made to order the dilettanti discussed into recognisable groupings into which this manifestly heterogeneous collection of composers may be seen to fall.

The period under review is defined in the title as the 18th century. Some latitude, for pragmatic reasons, has been allowed to invade that time-span. Emperor Leopold of the Habsburgs - the main figure in the opening chapter - has compositions to his credit covering the period from the mid-1650s till November 1699. One might justify his inclusion on the grounds that he did survive into the 18th century. The main reason for including him must be, however, that his output is so considerable and his collaborations with established composers of the time so germane to the thrust of this thesis, that to have omitted him would have devalued it. Likewise the compositions of Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia all date from the early years of the 19th century, though for most of his short life the Prince was a citizen of the preceding century. Again, the nature of his output and the continued survival of
his music in the bourgeois musical life of the 19th century, both warrant his inclusion.

Two further secondary issues will be tentatively discussed in the Conclusion, namely the reason why the vast majority of the identified aristocratic composers are of German or Central European provenance, and why the 18th century saw this particular category of composer in such abundance, with vastly decreased representation in the two subsequent centuries.

Attached to the thesis is a separate Supplement. This takes the form of an anthology of works presented in the same chronological order as the thesis itself. The works included are either facsimiles of manuscripts or first impressions of compositions that have not subsequently been published in "modern" editions, or they are transcriptions of source material into more accessible form: lute or organ tablatures converted into modern notation; works extant only in individual parts converted into score form. Obversely, lute compositions available in modern anthologies in now discredited transcriptions are given in their original form. In some cases unprocessed source material is given as it stands, for the sake of interest, or in order that anyone interested enough might transcribe for him/herself. Some of the transcriptions are by the author of this thesis; some have been made by friends and colleagues, often for performance purposes over the years. In whatever form the works appear in the Supplement, it is hoped that they will serve as an illuminating adjunct to the main body of the text.

In examining the reception of the works of these 18th century dilettante composers in recent times, the present work will make frequent reference to the two most important encyclopaedias in our time, namely "New Grove"\(^{(a)}\) and MGG\(^{(b)}\), as well as to such catalogues of sources as Eitner\(^{(c)}\), RISM\(^{(d)}\) and BUCEM\(^{(e)}\). Where appropriate reference will be made to such reputable (though not necessarily reliable) early lexica as Walther\(^{(f)}\), Gerber\(^{(g)}\) and Schilling\(^{(h)}\), Dlabacz\(^{(i)}\),
Ledebur\textsuperscript{(j)} and Lipowski\textsuperscript{(k)} have also been used as lexica with a particular regional basis, and Fétis\textsuperscript{(l)} also consulted.

General biographical material has been sought in such works of reference as the Dictionary of National Biography\textsuperscript{(m)} and Wurzach's\textsuperscript{(n)} Austrian Biographisches Lexikon. In the case of Dr Burney's\textsuperscript{(6)} 'General History', his 'Musical Tours' and 'Journal', modern editions by Mercer, Scholes and Poole, if used, are identified by the name of that modern editor for page references.

The collected editions and anthologies most frequently referred to are Adler's\textsuperscript{(o)} two-volume anthology of music by Habsburg emperors, Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich\textsuperscript{(p)} (to which Adler's anthology is repeatedly said to belong, though it does not!), Das Erbe deutscher Musik\textsuperscript{(q)}, Spitta's\textsuperscript{(r)} selection of works by Frederick the Great and Kretzschmar's "Louis Ferdinand"\textsuperscript{(s)}. All these, and the 1977 anthology of music composed by British royalty\textsuperscript{(t)} are given identifying sigla or abbreviated titles overleaf.

Where other works of reference re-appear in a subsequent chapter to the one in which it makes its first appearance, either it is re-listed, or reference is made to the original chapter and bibliographical number in that chapter, with an oblique line (/) separating the two numbers.
6. Charles BURNEY: In general three modern editions have been used for page referencing, and the respective editor's name given:
   *= in both cases all references are to Vol. 2.

ENCYCLOPAEDIAS and ANTHOLOGIES, COLLECTED EDITIONS etc


(c) Eitner = Robert EITNER: Biographisch-bibliographisches Quellenlexikon. Leipzig, 1900-04 - Suppl. 1912-16.


(e) BUCEM = THE BRITISH UNION CATALOGUE OF EARLY MUSIC printed before 1800 ... Ed. E.B. Schnapper (2 vols.), London, 1957.


(m) DNB = A DICTIONARY OF NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY (66 vols.), London, 1885-1901.

(n) Wurzbach = Constant von WURZBACH: Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Österreich ... 1250 bis 1850 (60 vols.), Vienna, 1856-91.

(o) MWK = Guido ADLER (Editor): Musikalische Werke der Kaiser Ferdinand III, Leopold I und Joseph I (2 vols.), Vienna, 1892-93

(p) DTÖ = Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich. Vienna, 1894-1959. Graz 1960 -.

(q) EDM = Das Erbe deutscher Musik. Leipzig, 1935 -; repr. 1953 -.

(r) SpFr = Philipp SPITTA (Editor): Friedrichs des Grossen musikalische Werke (3 vols), Berlin, 1889

(s) KrLF = Hermann KRETZSCHMAR (Editor): Prinz Louis Ferdinand: Musikalische Werke. Leipzig, 1910

(t) RC = N. FAIRBURN and C. UNGER HAMILTON (Editors): ROYAL COLLECTION: An historical album of music composed exclusively by Members of the Royal Family of Great Britain and Ireland (sic!). In celebration of the twenty-fifth-anniversary of the accession of HER MAJESTY QUEEN ELIZABETH II; Borough Green (GB), 1977.
LIBRARY SIGLA

The most frequently cited Libraries and Collections are sometimes referred to in abbreviated form. Although the context will generally make those forms clear, the following may be helpful:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>British Library, London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlem</td>
<td>Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Dahlem, W. Berlin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DStB</td>
<td>Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Berlin (DDR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHb</td>
<td>Königliche Haubibliothek of above library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nb</td>
<td>Nationalbibliothek, Vienna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLb</td>
<td>Sächsische Landesbibliothek Dresden (DDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weimar</td>
<td>Forschungs- und Gedenkstätten der klassischen deutschen Literatur Weimar (DDR).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

The Habsburg Emperors

LEOPOLD I (1640-1705) and JOSEPH I (1678-1711)
and their family and entourage

The Introduction conceded that there is a problem in including Emperor Leopold as an "eighteenth century" composer, but justified his inclusion on the strength of the volume of his output, the last dated work being composed in the dying weeks of the 17th century. A greater problem, as we shall see, arises in the precise location and identification of his output. Despite the efforts of Köchel, Adler, von Weilen and to a lesser extent Brosche (opera cit.) a precise compilation of Leopold's output, scattered as much of it is among the hundreds of stage works produced for the Court theatre in the latter half of the 17th century, still awaits realisation, though Adler's anthologies do afford a substantial global picture of Leopold's talents.

Emperor Leopold in NG, MGG

As we have come to expect, the entries in both MGG and NG give solid, largely accurate accounts of the musical output of Emperor Leopold, a prolific and gifted composer with a compositional life-span of nearly forty-five years. Commentators seem agreed that his works show consolidation rather than an evolution of style between his earliest and latest works, an assessment that bears closer examination, apart from the three funereal Lessons and the Miserere discussed in some greater detail below.

Minor discrepancies may be found between the information given in both major encyclopaedias. MGG considers as "cantatas" the three "stage" works listed by NG and designated "serenata" or "dialogo musicale". Likewise the "5 canzonettas" referred
to in MGG appear as "4 canzonettas" and a "madrigal" in NG. Neither entry lists among the bibliography a useful article by Paul Nettl with information on the first comic opera in Prague that has a bearing on Leopold as a composer. Both sources list an article by H.V.F. Somerset that not only admits to being heavily based on Adler's Preface (over half a century earlier!) to his two volume anthology of works by three Habsburg Emperors (MKW), it incomprensibly refers to these two mammoth anthologies as being "one of the volumes" of the Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich, though MKW just pre-dates the launching of DTO, and indeed has nothing whatever to do with it. The same misinformation is also offered by Lepel (op. cit.) in his dictionary of royal composers. This error presumably arises from Adler's concluding comments to the Preface to Vol. II of MKW, in which he makes reference to the imminent emergence of the project that bears the name Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich, proudly seeing his Kaiserwerke as being the harbinger of that series.

Since publication of MGG and NG invaluable work has been carried out by Seifert of Vienna University, with a Habilitationsschrift, now recently published, on the subject of opera at the Imperial Court in the 17th century.

MGG lists among the "secular dramatic works" as "dubious" the opera Gli amore di Cefalo e Procri that receives no mention in NG. Köchel's likewise invaluable list of works performed during the era in question lists that opera for 1668 (loc. cit., p. 492) unequivocally as a composition by Antonio Draghi. The Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz in W. Berlin possesses a set of parts (Violino Primo; Violino Secondo: Viola 1mo; Viola 2do; Violoncello; Violon), shelf number 12850, describing itself as:

Ouverture / zur Oper: Zephalus u. Procris / componiert von / Kaiser Leopold I.
Dr Seifert in correspondence has confirmed that the score and libretti in Vienna agree in their sole ascription to Draghi, and that the opening Sinfonia does not bear the Imperial initials. The W. Berlin source was not known to him* though the date on that source corresponds to the known date of composition of the opera.

MGG pre-dates the Werke-Verzeichnis compiled by Günter Brosche (6) listed in NG. Despite the pretensions of its title, Brosche's Verzeichnis is of limited value to the explorer of Leopold's music, since it takes the easy course and chooses to omit all those works composed by Leopold as contributions to operas and oratorios written by other composers (notably Cesti and Draghi). These Einlagearien (inserted arias) form such an important and above all characteristic part of Leopold's overall output, that their omission cannot be justified, and much more research of these sources is required before the complete picture of Leopold as a composer can emerge.

While Adler's MWK has long been considered the standard source of knowledge on the subject of the music of these Habsburg Emperors, the reliability of the two volumes should not go unchallenged.

Adler's MWK

It must first be remembered that as anthologies these two volumes are inevitably selective. For historic reasons it seems sad that Adler chose not to include Leopold's earliest known work, his setting of Sub tuum praesidium, written at the age of fourteen. From these early works Adler chose instead a setting of the Regina coeli for mezzo-soprano and five-part strings (MWK I/45-54), in which a fairly modest vocal part is enlivened by some notable instrumental writing provided by the Court composer, Bertali. A vigorous sonata for four strings (viole) is also to be found in the same collection of

* Subsequently Dr Seifert kindly compared the two sources on my behalf and concludes that the Berlin parts form an arrangement of Draghi's original, differing in presentation (note-values, clefs, repeats etc) though not in essence from the Vienna source, and dates perhaps from as late as 1800.
juvenilia. Given the relative dearth of fully composed instrumental works by Leopold, this sonata surely warranted inclusion. It is incorporated in a transcription (No. 1) in the Supplement to this thesis. Like the vast majority of Leopold's works, it is housed in the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna.

As we shall see later in reference to Joseph I there is reason to suspect Adler's reliability on the question of ascriptions. In the Revisionsbericht to Volume II (cf MWK II/307) Adler gives the following categoric assurance: (transl.)

Let it be said once and for all, that the compositions of the Emperors here published that appear in works by other composers, always bear the correct sign of authorship by an Emperor.

The "correct sign of authorship" generally means the appearance of the initials S.M.C. or the like. We shall see later that in one case, at least, that is not so. The matter is made more complicated by a parenthesis to a footnote in Howard E. Smither's (7) standard work of reference on the history of oratorio. Note 11, p. 369 of Volume I states simply that "Some of the selections given by Adler, however, are misattributed". Unfortunately personal correspondence with Professor Smither could throw no further light on the subject, since the information was apparently given to him by a research assistant, now Professor elsewhere, who has not responded to enquiry.

Correspondence both with Dr Brosche of the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna and with Dr Seifert at the Institut für Musikwissenschaft of the University in Vienna, both scholars well-acquainted with the sources, yielded no known examples of such misattributions, though Dr Seifert has now established Leopold as the author of two stage works ascribed elsewhere to other, or not previously listed.
In the absence of further concrete evidence for or against, it is perhaps worth comparing Köchel's vital Appendix (Fux, Beilage VIII, pp 485-520) with the ascriptions made by Adler in his MWK, where - despite the overall authority for identification quoted above - with some works positive evidence is offered of their Imperial authorship, as given in the source, while with others it is not.

For the period from 1660 to the end of the 17th century Köchel lists about 275 dated scores of sepolcri, oratorios and operas performed (presumably) during those years.

In addition to those works composed solely by Leopold - comprising 9 stage works and 10 sepolcri or oratorios - 32 works are said to include inserted numbers composed by the Emperor. Adler in MWK offers a further 7 sources of inserted music by the Emperor in works listed by Köchel, but lacking the rubric mit einer Arie or mit Arien des Kaiser/Leonold I. In addition Adler (cf MWK II/79-83 and p. 313) offers two Entremes en Musica (i.e. Intermezzos to Spanish texts) not given in Köchel, and dated without comment between 1667-73, and also two further sources (MWK II/77-78) likewise not listed by Köchel. Paul Nettl (op. cit., p. 292) has identified MWK II/77 as deriving from an opera Il rato delle Sabine composed in 1676, but Köchel lists no such work for that year. Five operas listed by Köchel contain Einlagearien by the Emperor that appear to have escaped his attention, but have been included in MWK. In the case of Cesti's Il pomo d'oro Adler has drawn attention to the scena composed by the Emperor to be found in the edition of that opera for DTÖ (Vols 6 & 9; 1896/77, repr. 1959).

Overleaf is a table of the works listed by Köchel, the numbers given being those in his Appendix VIII, pp 488-520. All the MWK numbers refer to Volume II of the anthology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Köchel No.</th>
<th>Title*</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Köchel</th>
<th>Adler MWK II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>La Mascherate</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>&quot;mit Arien ...&quot;</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Il Pomo d'oro</td>
<td>Cesti</td>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>not included; cf DTÖ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Le Disgrazie d'Amore</td>
<td>Cesti</td>
<td>&quot;mit Arien ...&quot;</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Gli Amore di Cefalo</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Apollo deluso</td>
<td>? Sances</td>
<td>&quot;Musik von Kaiser ...&quot;</td>
<td>30-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Gli Amore di Clodio</td>
<td>? Draghi</td>
<td>&quot;Musik von Kaiser ...&quot;</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>La Prosperità</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>cf Köchel 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Leonida in Tegea</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>&quot;mit einer Arie ...&quot;</td>
<td>34-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Aristomene Messenio</td>
<td>Sances</td>
<td>&quot;mit einer Arie ...&quot;</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>La Gara di Genij</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>&quot;mit Arien ...&quot;</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Cidippe</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>La Felicità ...</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>&quot;mit Arien ...&quot;</td>
<td>36-38; 97. Repeat of K 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Il Trionfo della Croce</td>
<td>Sances</td>
<td>&quot;mit Arien ...&quot;</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Sulpizia</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>39-41; cf Köchel 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Il Paradiso aperto</td>
<td>Sances</td>
<td>&quot;mit Arien ...&quot;</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>La Lanterna di Diogene</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>&quot;mit einer Arie ...&quot;</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>I Pazzi Abderitti</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>&quot;mit Arien ...&quot;</td>
<td>42 &quot;Di.S.M.C.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Adriano ...</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>&quot;mit Arien ...&quot;</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Chilonida</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>&quot;mit Arien ...&quot;</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Creso</td>
<td>? Leopold</td>
<td>&quot;Mus. von Draghi&quot;</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Leucipe Festia</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>&quot;mit Arien ...&quot;</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Enea in Italia</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>&quot;mit Arien ...&quot;</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Il Vincitor magnanimo</td>
<td>Draghi</td>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>cf Köchel 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adler MK II</td>
<td>Köchel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not included</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not included</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not included</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not included</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-46</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not included</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-51</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not included</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-63</td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not included</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-60</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not included</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-60</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not included</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not included</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-41</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not included</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The erratic orthography and use of capital letters in general follows Köchel, on the assumption that he found the titles thus in the source material.*
The above table helps to highlight the discrepancies that exist in the findings of those two major 19th century scholars. Where "no comment" appears against Köchel's findings, we may simply assume that he overlooked the identifying initials against one or other aria. "Not included" in the MWK II column cannot, of course, imply any more than that Adler chose not to select the given aria or arias, even assuming that he had noticed them.

Whatever else the table might help us to understand, it will give us sympathy with Rinck's assertion, for all its overstatement, that (loc. cit. Vol I, p. 57 f.):

* Adler (and Wurzbach) refer to him also as a flautist (= recorder player)
51. Il Pomo d'oro (Cesti; 1668)

Although Köchel overlooked them, there are various numbers that bear the Emperor's initials. Adler did not incorporate any of them into MWK, but in his edition of those acts of the opera available to him at that time, he made due note in DTÖ 9. The Emperor's contribution consisted of the whole of Scene 9 of Act II, a duet between Venus and Amore carried out in an airborne carriage ("sopra un carro in aria" in the score and "auf einem Wagen in dem (sic!) Luf't" in the German word-book). These recitatives and arias are easily accessible via that "modern" edition, and all necessary information is given by Adler in the detailed Prefaces.

Eitner lists among his sources a collection of arias by the Emperor in the Biblioteca Estense in Modena. The manuscript comprises 60 Scene diverse con Musica di S. Mta. Cesarea Leopoldo 1. Imperatore di Germania. Anyone conversant with Adler's above edition of Cesti's famous opera will note that the character names given on the front Index against most arias accord with the main characters in Il Pomo d'oro. What the Modena source gives us, in fact, is a complete set of arias belonging to Cesti's opera, including, happily, the missing Acts III and V not available to Adler at the time of his DTÖ edition.

Omitting the recitatives (DTÖ pp 45-46) the Modena manuscript (Nos 22-24) clearly identifies Amore's aria Su l'età che più s'apprezza and Venus' response Anderò, Spaccierò and the aria Ah quanto è vero as compositions by Leopold with the initials "di Sua M. C." The only minor discrepancies between the sources are a reference only to accompaniment by strings ("Violini") and Ritornelli between the verses ("Violi") in the aria
Ah quanto è vero ("questo" instead of "quanto" in the Modena manuscript).

The "missing" Act V, however, also contains an aria by Leopold. It is No. 57 in the manuscript, the text *Amante disprezzata et offesa* (*Musica di Sua MC*). A full account of the importance of this manuscript is given by Carl B. Schmidt(9) in his article in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 1976. That article includes a transcription of part of Leopold's "new" aria. The *Supplement* (No. 2) has the aria in full in facsimile, since it is otherwise accessible only in Modena.

66 Gli Amore di Cefalo e Procris (Draghi; 1668)
As mentioned above, MGG lists an opera of this name as being a composition by Leopold of dubious authenticity. NG has dropped it from the list of works. Adler, too, (MWK I, XIII (2)) dismisses the aforementioned Berlin source as being spurious.

70 Apollo deluso (? Sances; 1669)
The composer Draghi was involved in this opera as the librettist. Of the three Acts, in separate volumes, the cover to Act I and the title-page to Act II give Leopold (*Di S.M.C. and Musica Di Sua Mtà Ces*.) as the composer. The libretto, however, both on the title-page and in the Preface, gives the newly appointed F. Sances as the composer. NG describes the work as a collaboration with Sances. Adler (MWK II, p. 308) is prepared to ascribe all three Acts to the Emperor, apart from the opening **Licenza** (*Sinfonia*). Brosche (pp 65-67) incorporates the work in his **Verzeichnis** on the grounds that the source material does bear his name, though he casts doubt on that judgement. Seifert (pp 67-68) inclines to
the conclusion that Act II alone is by the Emperor, and the remainder by Sances. He is reinforced in this belief by internal evidence: in Act II alone the instrumental parts are written out in full and not in two-part sketches as elsewhere. In other operas Einlagearien by Leopold are likewise written out in full, whereas those by the main composer appear in sketched form. If Seifert is correct, as seems likely, Adler was most fortunate in his choice for MWK, for all four arias selected are from Act II and are therefore unlikely to be the misattributions referred to by Smither in his "History of the Oratorio", as discussed earlier.

72 Gli Amore di Clodio e di Pompea (Draghi; 1669)

Köchel gives this as being by Leopold. The score, however, attributes the main part of the work to Draghi, noting at the same time the Imperial hand in the composition and performance of the opera: Sua Maestà Cesarea compose tutte le Sinfonie e Ritornelli / e si compiacque di sonare il Cembalo per tutta l'Opera.

75 La Prosperità di Elio Sejano (Draghi; 1670)

86 La Felicità di Sejano (Draghi; 1671)

Despite their slightly differing titles Köchel refers to No. 86 as being a repeat of No. 75. For neither entry does he make any reference to insertions by Leopold. Adler offers no fewer than three arias (MWK II, Nos. 36-38) from the 1671 score, without any reference to the score of one year previous. He also includes a Sonata avanti la Licenza (MWK II, No. 97) without any specific reference to the Imperial initials.

* Cf Joseph Mantuani: Katalog der Musikhandschriften in der Wiener Hofbibliothek Vol. 9, Vienna, 1897, p. 245.
92/325 Sulpizia (Draghi; 1672)

Köchel makes no reference to any insertions. Adler (MWK II, p. 309) includes again three arias (Nos 39-41), and draws attention to the fact that two scores exist in manuscript of the last two of the three Acts. It is unclear whether or not Act I is lacking in both scores. The ritornelli apparently differ slightly in both sources. No specific mention of the Imperial initials is made.

141 Creso (? Leopold; 1678)

Köchel ascribes the whole opera to Draghi. The score and libretto fail to mention the composer and generally Köchel's ascription has gone unchallenged. Seifert (p. 85) cogently argues for Leopold as the author, basing his ascription not only on the testimony of a visiting diplomat, nor to the oblique clue given in the libretto (... all'ora viene essaltato sa un AUGUSTO.), but again to the fact that in the score all the numbers are written out in full and not as sketches; this is the hallmark of most insertions in operas of others of those contributions made by the Emperor himself.

148/282 Il Vincitor magnanimo in Tito Quinto Flamino (Draghi; 1678)

Köchel describes 282 as being a repeat in 1692 of the above opera. Adler (MWK II, p. 312) gives as his source only the 1692 score and makes no reference to the existence of an earlier score. Again three arias are included (MWK II, Nos 61-63) without further authentication. The titles vary apparently between the two sources; Adler points to the spelling of the main character's name as "Quintio", the earlier source according to Köchel spelt his name "Quinto".
Neither Köchel nor Adler make reference to an insertion by the Emperor. The Court having fled from the plague from Vienna to Bohemia (where it caught them up!), the opera was first performed not in Vienna, but in Prague. Paul Nettl (loc. cit. 1) has described the work and its background in some detail. Supplement. (No. 3) gives the one aria by the Emperor found in the score. Note the identifying Imperial initials, and also the sketched version of the concluding ritornello, when, according to Seifert (cf above), the contributions by Leopold were generally written out in full.

**224 Il Palladio in Roma (Draghi; 1685)**
Köchel makes no reference to any insertions by Leopold in this opera, written to mark the marriage of Archduchess Maria Antonia with the likewise very musical Bavarian Elector, Max Emanuel. According to Köchel, "seven Counts danced in the ballet". Adler includes three arias (MWK II, Nos 44-46), though the Critical Commentary (MWK II, p. 309 f.) makes no reference to the initials.

**322 Timone misantropo (Draghi; 1696)**
Köchel ascribes the whole opera to Leopold. Brosche (p. 34) has not incorporated it in the list of complete works by the Emperor and ascribes the work to Draghi (p. 29). The first Act has not survived, but Act II opens with an aria by Leopold, giving rise to the belief that the whole work is by him. Adler (MWK II, p. 312), while noting the absence of Act I, likewise assumed the opera to be by Leopold. Although not absolutely clear from his editorial note, it would appear that the aria included in his anthology is, in fact, the one that opens Act II, so that more by luck than skill, it is correctly ascribed to the Emperor.
Köchel makes no mention of any contribution by the Emperor to this Carnival opera. Adler includes one number (MWK II, 76) though the editorial comment as usual does not clarify whether or not this is the only one to be found in it, nor is any specific reassurance of the identification given (MWK II, p. 312 f.).

To the list should now be added the opera La Simpatia nell'Odio (1664) not found in Köchel, but recently identified by Seifert (cf pp 50 f. & 452) as by Leopold.

Two arias incorporated by Adler (MWK II, Nos 77-78) derive from operas not identified by him (cf MWK II, p. 313). Adler admits uncertainty in the case of No. 77, the aria Tazio, che tardi (and three others mentioned by him) as to their provenance. They have been identified by Paul Nettl (p. 292) as deriving from the opera Il rato delle Sabine which he dates as 1676, though he omits to clarify the composer. Presumably, as in the case of the opera (or "Festa musicale") I vaticini di Teresa Tabano, likewise performed in 1676 and in Prague but not Vienna (and therefore not included by Köchel), it is by Antonio Draghi.

Emperor Leopold was a highly cultured and cosmopolitan personality, and this is reflected by the languages ranged by his secular output: Italian (the main language of the Court, it appears [cf MWK I, p. x]), German, Spanish and French. For political reasons the link with France is the weakest, but MWK II, No. 73 is a wonderful example of the Air de Cour ("Aria Francese") Sombres bois, retraites solitaires. Symptomatic of this polyglot Emperor is No. 68, in which the various languages appear in
Despite this cosmopolitanism, his works are found in remarkably few libraries outside Vienna. Rinck (ibid.) maintains that "his compositions have come into the possession of most artists (= practising musicians) in Germany", seeing these as able to verify Leopold's excellence as a composer. Nevertheless, apart from a few survivals in Bavaria (cf MWK II, p. 313(78)) where through the marriage of one of his daughters to the Elector in Munich, a link was preserved despite the political vicissitudes of the time, and likewise in Dresden and one questionable survival in Berlin (SBR), Vienna monopolises the extant manuscripts.

Eitner (and also MGG) lists the Proske-Musiksammlung in Regensburg (BRD) as holding a score of the oratorio Il transito di S. Giuseppe (Köchel 187; 1681), but the Library assures me that it possesses neither that nor any other score by Leopold. In contrast, the Universitetsbiblioteket in Uppsala (Sweden) has been able to confirm and send on microfilm the three entries under its name in Eitner: a madrigal to three voices (SST) 2 violins and basso continuo ("Cembalo") in separate parts, entitled Sia sempre bel tempo per me; a setting of the Laudate Dominum, which has also survived in Vienna and was not incorporated in MWK I; three Balletti. These "3 Balletti @ 4 di S.M.C." give rise to some confusion.
The "three" works, globally dated 1688, comprise only two sets of dance movements, numbered "Balletto primo" and "Balletto 3°", the former consisting of only Intrada and Gavotte, and the latter of Buorea, Sarabande, Canario and Trezza. Both these 'suites' are in G major. A third "Balletto" does also exist, but it is clearly dated "li 5 de Marzo l'Anno 1685". This proves to be the correct date, for the opening movement of that title in the various Balletti selected by Adler for MWK II, Nos 98-125. The Canario in question (No.109) is dated by Adler at 1685, since it is taken from a Comedia der Hochadligen Hofdamen composed by Leopold in that year. The Ciaccona (MWK 110) is identical to the Uppsala movement of the same title that follows the Canario. Adler either overlooked it in the source, or it is not actually in the Comedia of 1685 and has been copied from elsewhere. The same applies equally to the Bourree (MWK 111) which proves to be identical to the "Buorea" of the Uppsala source, though Adler's Minuetto (MWK 112) differs completely from the Uppsala "Minuett". Adler's source gives the melody instrument, exceptionally, in the case of Nos 109 and 112 as recorder (=flauto), though Uppsala gives only the violin in the case of the Canario, and does not include the Minuetto.

Since all the Balletti given by Adler are for melody instrument and basso continuo alone, the Supplement (No. 4) gives the whole of this 1685 Suite in its four parts; whoever provided the parts, they surely accord with the performing practice of the time, the two-part versions, as in MWK, being merely shorthand. The complex issue of archival sources and secondary source references to Leopold is summarized at the end of this chapter. Meanwhile we proceed to subsequent members of the Habsburg dynasty.
Emperor Joseph I (1678-1711)

Leopold was succeeded as Emperor by two sons from his third marriage: Joseph, born 1678, died without heir in 1711 and was succeeded by his younger brother, Karl, born 1685, died 1740. Both were exceedingly musical, and a handful of compositions by Joseph are extant. A Miserere ascribed to Karl is not provenly by him. Adler (MWK II, p. 303 f.) after much thought concludes that the work must be by Leopold and gives the work in full (MWK I, pp 257-298). The question of authorship of this piece is entered into in greater detail below.

Although by no means as prolific as his father, and ignored as a composer by many lexicographers of the 18th century, Joseph displays admirable talent in those few works we know. Only one of them, an extended setting of the Regina coeli for soprano, strings and basso continuo (with a part specifically designated for the bassoon) is of substance (Adler MWK I, pp 293-328). A comparison with the music of Leopold is enlightening, though it is perhaps unfair to Leopold to compare his juvenile setting of the same text, composed with the assistance of Bertali at the age of 15 (MWK I, pp 45-54). Leopold's music remains firmly rooted in the mid-17th century mould, even those works composed in the dying years of the 17th century. Joseph's style is unmistakably that of the 18th century Italianate idiom found in the early operas of Handel and Bononcini. In fact a score of Handel's "Agrippina" (1707) seems to have been in the Emperor's possession (cf Adler MWK I, p. xvii²).

Of the six Einlagearien, one is from an unidentified sepolcro, scored for soprano, obbligato trombone and basso continuo (MWK II, No. 91). From the source material in the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice this aria (in fact an alternative to another setting presumably by the anonymous
composer of the whole work) is doubly authenticated, first by an announcement a few pages earlier of an imminent "Aria con il Trombone, Di S.M.C." and the legend "Quest'aria la pose in musica S.M.C." above the aria "Alme ingrate" itself.

Adler is, however, incorrect in transcribing the tempo designation as "Andante non Allegro poco" — whatever that might mean. The source has two indications, confused by Adler: "Andante non allegro" followed immediately in thicker pen by the words "poco organo", presumably a request for discreet organ accompaniment.

A further Einlagearie is found in Bononcini's opera *Endimione* (1706), "Si trova in tempeste" for soprano and basso continuo (MWK II, No. 93). The remainder, all given in MWK II (Nos 92 and 94-96) derive from works by M.A. Ziani. Questions of performance practice and problems of authentication arise over No. 96, a truly magnificent soprano aria, "Tutto in pianto", with obbligato chalumeau and basso continuo (consisting of "Basson de Chalumeaux e Contrabasso, senza Cembalo") from the opera *Chilonida* (1709). The most likely interpretation of the senza Cembalo directive is not that there should be no keyboard instrument to provide the chordal support specifically implied by the presence of figures in the bass part, and that this should be provided by a plucked instrument such as theorbo or archlute (that would be totally ineffective in the company of double-bass and bass shawm!), but that for this number, the omnipresent harpsichord should be replaced by the organ, most probably one of the claviorgana dating back to that time (one such instrument survives in the Imperial Schloss Ambras). With these instruments, one keyboard served both the harpsichord to which it was
inmediately attached, and an organ placed some distance away from the other instruments in the orchestra. Adler describes this in his Preface to Cesti's opera Il Pomo d'oro (DTO 6, p. ix). Elsewhere in the aria, where the solo "chalameau" is reinforced by "Tutti Violini, et Hautbois" the basso continuo part is likewise augmented by "Tutti Bassi, Fagotti, e Cembali".

Whereas all the other arias are identifiable without exception by the customary initials at the head of the number in question, in fact "Aria di S.M.C." in every case, Adler's No.96 in MWK II is preceded simply by the word "Aria" and the various instrumental specifications. An investigation of the source material carried out at my request by Dr G.Brosche of the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna, to see if any reason for this ascription by Adler could be found elsewhere in the score, failed to find any evidence whatsoever. Brosche concluded that Adler included the work merely because of the interest of the florid chalumeau part, and that the aria can only be attributed to Ziani himself. If that is the case, then it is an astonishingly dishonest act by so reputable a scholar, and one that cannot be justified on the grounds of the aria's intrinsic merit, irrespective of its true authorship.

Alexander von Weilen (10) in his invaluable study of stage performances in Vienna from 1626-1740, likewise appears to have had his doubts as to the authenticity of the ascription of this number to Emperor Joseph. In his entry for Ziani's "Dramma per musica" (p. 71) he adds in brackets "Mit Arie Joseph I?". It would appear that he overlooked the two arias Si, cor mio (of which Handel would have been proud) and the basso continuo aria Non è morta in me la speme, both of which clearly bear the
Imperial initials, and was puzzled by the one aria (NB "mit(einer) Arie!") that cannot prime facie be said to have stemmed from the Emperor.

A further confusing factor in the question of attributions, is Adler's statement that "only three compositions by Joseph are extant, one sacred and two secular" in the Preface to MWK I (p. xvii) and reiterated in the publication of that Preface as a scholarly article (11) (loc. cit., 268 f.). In fact, Adler published no fewer than eight compositions, of which two are independent works (one sacred and one secular) and six are insertions (and one of those, as we have seen, is spurious). If under "compositions" Adler meant, like Brosche more recently in reference to Leopold, only independent works, it would be good to know which the third piece is. Otherwise we must assume that he wrote the Preface before the ultimate compilation of the anthology, and simply failed to bring the information up to date.

In addition to the vocal works described above, Adler also includes a short lute solo (MWK II, No. 126) described in the source (cf facsimile MWK II, opp. p. 272) as an "Aria Composée del' Empereur Josephe". That formulation, if we excuse its slightly wayward orthography, makes it clear that the work is a piece said to be composed by the Emperor himself, as opposed to a piece written for him, or liked by him, as is the ambiguous case with other pieces in the same collection, a lute-book belonging to, or copied out, by Count Casimir von Werdenberg (whose initials come in for scrutiny in the following chapter) and dated 1713. Adler surmises (MWK II, p. 316 f.) that all or most of the pieces in that collection, including this one, are arrangements
rather than original pieces. Whether we have here an original composition by the Emperor (a song, perhaps; that has failed to survive) or a piece by someone else arranged by the Emperor as a lute solo, is not discussed. Neither possibility is wholly plausible. Joseph is manifestly too good a composer to have written so inconsequential a vocal piece himself, and likewise it would seem improbable that he would have felt this material to have been worthy of arrangement, unless it had been written as a simple melody by another member of the Imperial family. The likeliest solution is surely that the work is not an arrangement at all, but an original composition by the Emperor, written in the simplistic style that typifies much of the lute repertoire of the time, as we shall see later.

At the time of compiling MWK I & II, Adler (cf facsimile in MWK II, facing p.272) correctly located the source of the lute "Aria" as the Benedictine monastery in Raigern (now Rahgrad, CSSR). Since 1945, however, Casimir's lute-book has been housed in the secular surroundings of the Moravian Museum in Brno (cf Pohlmann (12) p. 76).

Rinck (13) describes the musical activities of Leopold's heir in such effusive terms that it is surprising that so few of his compositions have come to light (I, p. 39 f.).

*Just as the great Leopold often composed arias and other cantatas, Emperor Joseph was likewise so consummate in this Science, that in his leisure hours - and without detriment to major matters of State - he composed the most perfect of pieces, that everyone then delighted to hear. He himself was an immaculate harpsichordist, played the recorder, and played so many other instruments so well that even professional musicians had to concede that they were not better than him, their only advantage being that they were able to play them all day.*
The danger of relying on such anecdotal sources as Rinck, and their potted versions in Wurzbach and elsewhere, comes to light when comparing the information given on the various musical Emperors, each one to some extent reading like a carbon copy of the other. A striking example of the apparent confusion brought about by such anecdotal material is afforded by the following extracts. H.V.F. Somerset (p. 213), talking of the musical talents of Emperor Karl VI, informs us, without disclosing the source that:

Fux himself is reported as saying on one occasion to the Emperor: "It is a pity that your Majesty was not a virtuoso" (meaning, one supposes, "a professional") to which, however, the imperial majesty replied: "Well, never mind, it's better as it is."

His source is, of course, Adler's Preface to MWK I, p. xxi. A lengthy quotation acknowledged on the previous page as deriving from Mattheson's Der musikalische Patriot, published in Hamburg in 1724, describes the Emperor's participation in a performance of Caldara's "Euristeo", gleaned from English sources. Adler follows it with a short quotation pertaining to similar circumstances in a performance of Fux' opera Elisa. It is not clear whether the subsequent quotation comes from the same source, and Somerset clearly decided to play safe and give credit neither to Mattheson nor to Adler as his source of information. The passage reads as follows:

Bei der Aufführung der Elisa soll Fux, entzückt von der Vortrefflichkeit des Accompaniments und der Direction des kaisers, ausgerufen haben "Es ist Schade, dass Eure Majestät kein Virtuose geworden sind", worauf der Kaiser sich umdrehte und mit trockenem Humor erwiderte "Hat nichts zu sagen, hab's halt so besser!"
(Translation: At the performance of Elisa Fux, delighted at the excellent way in which the Emperor had accompanied and directed the work, is alleged to have exclaimed "O, it is a shame that Your Majesty did not become a professional performer", whereupon the Emperor turned round and answered wryly, "That's neither here nor there - it's better for me like this!")

Compare now the above extracts pertaining to Karl VI with Wurzbach's entry (Habsburg-Leopold, p. 428) in reference to Leopold:

Sein Capellmeister ... machte ihm einst das Compliment: "Wie Schade ist es, dass Ew. Majestät kein Musikus geworden sind." Gemäthlich antwortete der Kaiser: "Thut nichts, haben's halt so besser!" ...

(Translation: His maestro di capella ... once paid him a compliment, saying: "What a shame that Your Majesty never took up music professionally". The Emperor calmly replied: "No matter - it's better for me like this!"

Emperor Karl VI: Author of a Miserere?

Whereas all the major musical sources of the time extol the praises of Emperor Karl VI as a musician, no single piece undeniably written by him survives. Considerable confusion arises over one piece, a setting of the Miserere ascribed to him in various sources. As has been said, Adler gives the full work in MWK I (pp 257-298) and his reasons for attributing it not to Karl VI, but against the evidence of all the sources, to Leopold (cf MWK II, p. 303 f.). Whilst conceding that the internal evidence points to a later era or a more advanced style than that manifested in general by Leopold, Adler accepts diplomatic and paleographic indications that would place the work as early as the 1680s in the case of one source, and the late 1690s in the case of another; other sources are later. In all sources but one Adler describes the insertion of the composer's name as being by later hand. The watermark has been identified in the case of one of the sources as being in use in the last decade of the 17th century (cf Eineder (14) loc. cit, plate 119) in the territory of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Such
evidence is, however, unreliable, as paper remained in use for up to 20 years, leaving the issue therefore still open.

Köchel lists for the liturgical music for the Friday following Ash Wednesday a Miserere with Organ and Instruments, composed by Emperor Karl VI (loc. cit. p. 137) whereas for Maundy Thursday a Miserere, composed by Emperor Leopold @ 4 voices (without organ), lyra, two viole da braccio [zwei flinfsaitige Violinen] and other instruments.

A possibility not advanced by Adler, yet fully plausible, would be that the two works just described are in fact the same work, an original composition by Leopold, arranged for more opulent resources at a later date by Karl VI.

The Maundy Thursday setting of the Miserere, as described by Köchel does, in fact, accord with the setting provided by MWK I. Adler's sources give two "Violette", a term often used to distinguish the pardessus de viole or viola da braccio of five strings from the violin or four-stringed tenor/alto viola. Köchel's list informs us that that setting was to be performed "without the organ" and that a "lyra" was among the instruments used.

The number of monodic section given by Adler makes it extremely unlikely that the work could have been performed without a basso continuo instrument, and indeed, the bass part is actually figured. Two distinct possibilities emerge: either the rubric "without organ" refers only to the great organ (the performance took place in the "great Court Chapel"), but permitting use of a discreet
positive organ or other keyboard instrument, as was the case, for example, with the Chapel Royal in the late 17th century (cf Schmidt (22), op. cit., p. 208-157), or under "lyra" we have to understand a bass viol, played lyra-viol fashion, i.e. with continuous multiple-stopping. In the latter case the chordal support for the solo numbers will have been performed by the viol, and a small band of violins will have been used colla parte in the choral sections. Such a performance will have been totally compatible with the austerity prescribed for that season of the year.

For the third day of Lent, however, no such austerity was laid down. It is therefore not inconceivable that Karl VI at some stage added a more opulent instrumental accompaniment in the form of trombones I-III, bassoon - and explicitly organ. Performed in this manner the Miserere, though originally composed by Leopold, was referred to by the name of its arranger, all the more desirable to do so when that person is the current Emperor. This mode of ascription is, in fact, in essence no different from the persistent and accepted reference to J.S. Bach's "Concerto for four harpsichords (BWV 1065) to the total exclusion of Vivaldi as its originator in the form of a concerto for four violins, or likewise to "Bach's" adaptation of Pergolesi's Stabat Mater to a vernacular metrical version of Psalm 51 (BWV deest).

The above hypothesis goes some way to solving the dilemma, and could account for the two hands apparent in the source claimed to date back to the 1680s. It does not, however, take into account the more advanced style than that found generally in the works of Leopold, if he is to be considered the original author of the work. Adler himself may unwittingly have provided us with an answer.

The solemnity of Psalm 51, the Miserere text, may well have inspired Leopold to an extraordinary composition. Stylistically
the Miserere is not quite as unique as Adler would have us believe; it has much in common with the Tres Lectiones I Nocturni (MWK II, pp 181-230) composed by Leopold for the funeral of his second wife, Claudia Felicitas, in 1676.

To quote from Adler himself (cf MWK I, p. vi):

In none of his compositions is there such profound subjective feeling as in the three Funeral Lessons for Claudia Felicitas, his second wife. Full expression is given to his grief, and the normally self-contained Emperor steps outside himself in this elegy, giving himself up to his grief. The work was later sung at his own funeral, as he was laid to rest on May 5th, 1705. It was also performed at the funeral of his third wife, Eleonore Magdalene, and his sons Joseph I and Karl VI as Emperors had the Lessons sung annually on the anniversary of their father's death.

In short, the composer of these three Lectiones was well able to have been the originator of the Miserere in question. Adler, it would appear, may therefore conceivably be correct in giving Leopold the credit, but the version given in MWK I is in all probability not an Urtext, since it does not totally accord with the work required to be performed on Maundy Thursday. The version given should perhaps give credit to Karl VI as its orchestrator, or alternatively the work should be performed by strings (and possibly chamber organ or harpsichord) alone, without the "added" trombone parts. It seems unlikely that instruments with an obbligato function should simply be described, as in Köchel's source of information, as "other instruments", in a context in which the use of "five-stringed violins" is made explicit and more likely that "other instruments" in this context applies to the more perfunctory colla parte function.

Archduchess Magdalene: Another Habsburg composer?

While historians have vexed themselves with the Miserere and with which member of the dynasty to associate it, another composer from within the Habsburg ranks in this era appears to
have gone undetected.

In the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel (BRD) is a manuscript motet for solo tenor and basso continuo by an "Archiduchessa Maddalena" (Cod. Guelf, 152 Musica Hdschr.), defined by Eitner no more closely than "early 18th century". Investigation of the various dynastic genealogies within the time-span concerned reveals Maria Magdalene (1689-1743), the eighth child from Leopold's third marriage, and younger sister both of Joseph I and Karl VI, as the only serious contender. The motet appears in score transcription in the Supplement (No 5).

It bears all the traditionally held hallmarks of the talented amateur, in its blend of the conventional and the unpredictable. The melismas are overlong, the sequences repetitive, and the vocal range makes it at times uncomfortably low for a high tenor, and unsingably high for the more baritonal variety. Its most startling feature, however, is its departure from the initial Eb major to the distant key of A major for the final section.

The manuscript gives separate parts for tenor, organ and violone. The violone and organ parts are completely concordant, the only difference being the figuring and a few bars of chordal realisation of the basso continuo part, so that the transcription, for reasons of economy, has reduced the two parts to one system throughout.

Freiherr von Strall

Rinck, in his famous biography of Leopold (op. cit., p. 57 f), informs us that of Leopold's musical entourage "many ... were barons who were paid such that they could live in keeping with their station". Three such barons warrant at least passing attention. Köchel (loc. cit. (15), pp 69 and 159) lists a "Freiherr von Strall" as active in Vienna from 1702-1710. We come across him later in neighbouring Bavaria (cf K.G. Fellerer (16) pp 121 and 123 and R. Münster (17) pp 306 and 314), if we may assume that he is identical with the musician mentioned in those sources as Hofmusikintendant.
Freiherr Franz Johann von Strall (sometimes Straal), appointed in 1727 and promoted to the Privy Council in Munich in 1732. One composition by a Sig. Stral is listed by Eitner. It is part of a collection housed since the war and the division of Berlin into East and West by the Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz in West Berlin, though protracted correspondence there and with the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin (DDR) proved necessary before the work could be located. It is a cantata for voice, chalumeau and basso continuo. Given the nature of the obbligato instrument it seems unlikely that this could be the work of a provincial Bohemian church musician of the same surname listed by Dlabacz(18) in his Lexikon. The confusion arising in the location of the work is that Eitner's shelf number: Mus. ms. 9065 no longer obtains. The work is found on pp 109-112 of Mus. ms. 30 226.

We may fairly safely assume that the work derives either from the Imperial Court in Vienna or the Electoral Court in Munich. The manuscript (cf Suppl. No 6) is an excellent example of the radically shorthand presentation of much vocal writing of the period, the ritornelli (almost in the literal sense of any repeated material) being recognisable only by the gaps purposely left blank in the score as déjà vu.

Freiherr Wenzel Ludwig von Radolt

Another Baron - or "Freiherr" to use the German title - active in Vienna at the turn of the 17th/18th century is Wenzel Ludwig Freiherr von Radolt. His collection of consort pieces for various combinations of lutes, violins and viols, dedicated to Leopold's heir and successor to the Imperial crown, Joseph, in 1701 are his only known compositions, though von Radolt describes them as "this my first Opus". The title-pages give varying titles, that of the first lute giving:
The part-books for 2nd and 3rd lutes and for second and third violin or viola da gamba are described, on the other hand, as:

**DER ALLER TREUESTEN / Verschwigenesten und noch so wohl / Fröhlichen und traurigen Humor sich richtend / FREINDIN / Zu Ihren Affecten mit helffente Gesbillinen**

(The playmates, helping THE MOST TRUE and most discreet LADY FRIEND who serves both merry and sad moods to achieve her emotional affects)

whereas the bass part describes itself, in more conventional terms perhaps, as the "Lady Friend's" Grund Vestung und Fundament - "solid fortress and foundation".

It becomes clear from the varying titles that the key-figure to these works is the first lute - the "Lady Friend" herself, and that the other instruments are her "vassals" and accomplice "playmates".

In fact they represent - and herein lies perhaps their greatest historic importance - a very rare example of consort music of the period. Rare as such printed publications are, iconographic evidence abounds showing lutes played in consort with other instruments of the time, and this collection can by taken as an exemplar of the way in which music for the lute may have been arranged for domestic ensemble playing.
The five individual part-books are described in von Radolt's own introduction to the "Geneigter Leser" - the "Kind Reader" as:

1. **Die Erste Lautten** - the first lute
2. **Die Lautten, so die Mittel-Stimm fühert** (sic!) - the lute that takes the middle part
3. **die Erste geigen oder flautten** - the first violin or recorder
4. **Die Mittel Stimmen in der geigen oder Gamba** - the middle part(s) for violin(s) or gamba
5. **der Bass**

The surviving part-books, scattered round the libraries of Europe (other than Violin I), describe themselves slightly differently. The use of melody instrument(s) other than the violin and viola da gamba is not made explicitly clear from the part-books (and will have been self-evident a practice, one suspects), but the part-books make clear that in some pieces fuller combinations of instruments are envisaged than the composer's introduction implies (up to three violins and two viole da gamba in addition to the bass are actually deployed in the widely varied combinations offered).

In 1919 two Suites from this collection were published within DTO 50 by Adolf Koczirz. Then, as indeed now, no single library possessed all five part-books. Koczirz availed himself of a set comprising all but the 4th book, containing the second violin (and also third violin and viola da gamba). That source, then housed in the Benedictine Monastery in Rahjrad (Raigern), appears to be lost.
Ironically the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna itself actually possesses a set comprising all but the 3rd book, that for the first violin (or recorder), a fact either unknown to Koczirz at the time, or it is a later acquisition. Pohlmann (loc. cit.) offers "Bratislava" as the only source for the otherwise now missing first violin part, but personal visits both to the University Library in Bratislava and to the libraries in nearby Brno have failed to trace it. A pirate copy is currently in circulation among the lute-playing fraternity in London, though I have not seen it, and its real provenance remains, perhaps deliberately, obscure.

Koczirz edited for that DTO volume two works that he felt could stand on their own without the missing second violin part: No. 6, a "Concert" or "Parthie" in C, based on a given "Aria" and No. 8, a "Contra-Parthie" in F. The subsequent availability of that "missing" part allows us to establish that it is merely a less-decorated version of the second lute part, played an octave higher than the lute. This is an irritating feature of most of the available literature for lute with another melody instrument, for the lutenist is called upon to perform intricate ornamentation that is rendered inaudible by the higher and louder violin part, with which — apart from the embellishments — it remains concordant throughout at the lower octave.

Although Koczirz has published Radolt's own notes on the performance of this "Parthie" (cf DTO 50, p. 84 f.) it is not abundantly clear that he has actually understood their true implications. If that is not the case, it must be said that the version of the work printed in DTO 50 is of little help to the performer.
The opening "Aria" is given in all the part-books, since Koczirz found it in the now missing first violin part, and it is to be found in the second violin part that was not available to him. Not only does that "Aria" (i.e. 'melody') precede the Suite into which it leads (comprising Allemande - Courante - Sarabande - Gavotte - Bourée - Manuette - Guigue (sic!)) it is manifestly to be played concurrently with it. Koczirz claims that the piece is complete without the missing second violin part, and it is this statement that makes us sceptical that he has comprehended the structure of the work, for the function of the second violin (or other melody instrument) is to play the melody throughout the seven dance movements of the Suite. In practice, the piece may either be played simply by the two lutes (and a gamba bass, si placet), or the two melody instruments are required to emphasise the contrapuntal concept of the whole piece, the first violin providing a counter-melody to the omnipresent "Aria" played by the second instrument.

For the sake of clarity I present here a paraphrase of von Radolt's own admittedly jumbled directives, and show in the Supplement (No 7) by superimposing on Koczirz' version as printed, the omitted melody throughout. The superimposed part comprises a stave for the main melody and a stave in the bass clef to be played by the second lute and the bass viol.

Von Radolt informs us:

The whole of the following Partita is constructed over this present Aria, which is to be played in every movement; but much judgement will be required in playing it, especially in those movements in triple time;

Koczirz takes this to mean simply that rhythmic precision is called for, but the element of judgement referred to by von Radolt ("gute Discretion")
is the need to adapt the written notation of the "Aria" to the different unwritten demands of each movement, a need that becomes most critical in those movements not in common time, namely Sarabande, Menuette and Gigue, as well as the ambivalent Courente, in all of which the given rhythm of the "Aria" has to be adapted by ear, according to the skill and taste of the players.

The Index reiterates much of the same information:

In C major, on an "Aria" and a bass throughout, in such a way that although notated for only two parts (i.e. lute I and violin I) it makes a fully concerted piece. One of the lutes and one of the violins plays the "Aria" throughout, and the remainder play the next seven movements, one after another.

Koczirz' assumption that this Aria part, since it appears in both lute part-books, probably also appears in the then "missing" second violin part, is not only correct, it also again indicated his misunderstanding of the work. Since the part-book containing the first violin part gives the counter-melody for the seven movements of the Partita, then the second violin part clearly has to incorporate the "Aria", to enable it to be played throughout.

Von Radolt continues with important details on the execution of the work from the unwritten material:

The bass to this melody also plays in every movement, and everything has been worked out correctly to fit in exactly with the counterpoint. In those movements that begin before the bar-line (Allemenale; Courente; Sarabande; Bourree) the Aria does not enter until the bar-line.
On the question of instrumentation, von Radolt makes the following suggestion:

A good effect can be achieved by using two different instruments in consort, i.e. a viola da gamba, two or three recorders, or an oboe for the "Aria" specifically, while the violin and lute play the seven movements of the Suite.

Two practical details emerge from the above: the second lute, if used at all, does not attempt to fit the florid written part of the "Aria" to each movement, but would play simply the chords inherent to the bass, and the use of "two or three" recorders must surely mean instruments of different size (descant, treble, tenor) according to the mood of each movement, rather than all three in unison.

If the work is performed with the same melody instruments (i.e. two violins) it is a good idea, and pleasing to the ear, if after playing one section of a movement, it is repeated without the melody instruments, and played by the two lutes, one playing the "Aria" and the other the written part.

On the question of tempo (and this has been borne out in practice!):

Because of the [speed of the] "Aria", this Allemande has to be played a bit quicker than usual [for an Allemande].

To round off the practical details of pairing the unwritten to the written, von Radolt warns where the "Aria" will need to be played with and without the initial repeats:

The repeats are different in the "Aria". In the Allemande, no repeats; in the Courante only the first and not the second; in the Sarabande only the second repeat. The Gavotte, Bourree, Menuette and Guigue all have both repeats.

Baron von Radolt does not appear to have been part of the musical entourage of Emperor Leopold, since Köchel makes no reference to him.
among lists of musicians in his employ. Despite the charm of the two items edited by Koczirz (the only ones that can be authentically reconstructed until the missing first violin part comes properly to light again), they cannot be compared with the bulk of works by Leopold, or those of Joseph I to whom they are dedicated. Their greatest value is the insight they give into possibilities of legitimately arranging lute repertoire of the time as ensemble music.

**Freiherr d'Astorga**

One more Baron appears historiographically, albeit in passing, in connection with Leopold*. More fiction than fact surrounds him, and the claimed connection with Leopold belongs to the more spurious aspects of his story.

In 1825 the German author Friedrich Rochlitz invented a story around the life of Emanuel Baron d' Astorga. That story was taken up, expanded, distorted and in general further romanticized by subsequent authors. The Darmstadt journal Die Muse for March 4th, 1853 contained a potted version of the story, together with an assessment of d' Astorga's music, under the heading "Ein musikalischer Aristokrat - aus W.H.Riehl's Musikalische Charakterköpfe, ein kunstgeschichtliches Skizzenbuch" (pp 137-140).

From such fields of fiction the story spread into the respectable realms of fact, in so major a work of reference as the 1st and 2nd editions of G.Grove's *Dictionary of Music and Musicians* dating 1878 and 1904, with entries on d' Astorga by no less eminent a scholar than C.F.Pohl, the

* A further "noble" composer at the Court of Leopold I was Prince Paul Esterhazy (1635-1714), discussed later in the pages concerned with Haydn's friend, the Earl of Abingdon.
early Haydn scholar.

The story given by Pohl is of one Emanuel Baron d'Astorga, born on December 11th, 1681, in Naples, the son of Marquis Capece da Rofrano, a leader of the independence fighters in Sicily who were beheaded by their Spanish overlords in 1701. Emanuel and his mother were forced to watch the execution. Emanuel's mother died in a fit of hysteria, while he himself fell into a coma. News of the occurrence filtered through to Princess Orsini at the Court of King Philip V in Madrid, and she had him brought to the convent in Astorga. Here he completed his musical education, having previously probably been in the tutelage of Francesco Scarlatti in Palermo. On leaving the convent he was given the title Baron d'Astorga by his patroness. He was sent on a diplomatic mission to Parma, where he made his mark as a personality and as a musician who sang his own compositions with feeling and technical perfection. A year later he had an affair with Elisabeth Farnese, a niece of the Duke of Parma, who discovered the affair and sent Emanuel to Vienna, to the Court of Leopold I, who received him with affection, but died before being of any real assistance to him. During the reigns of Joseph I and Karl VI he was much in Vienna, before entering on journeys that took him to Spain, Portugal and England, though he never again visited his native Sicily, that still had traumatic memories for him. In 1709 he performed his opera Dafni in Barcelona at the Court of Charles III, and in 1712 became godfather to the daughter of his friend Caldara in Vienna. In 1713 his Stabat Mater was performed in Oxford, having presumably been commissioned by the Academy of Ancient Music in London. In 1720 he appeared in Vienna again, before retiring to Bohemia. He died on August 12th, 1736, in the Castle at Raudnitz that had been placed at his
disposal by its owner.

The above version of the story tallies in most respects with the story printed in *Die Muse* in 1853, though the latter fills it out with a wealth of Romantic detail, while admitting that "Critics have cast some doubt over the authenticity of some aspects of his life's story. It contains too little prose, too few Philistines". The place and date of his death are left much vaguer in *Die Muse*: "He is thought to have withdrawn to a monastery in Bohemia, which one is not known, and to have died there, though it is not known when".

The adaptation of Pohl's entry in Grove (1) and (2) given above is taken from Volume 1 of Hans Volkmann's two-volume account of the life and work of d'Astorga. Only those passages quoted in italics are proven facts, the rest being mere invention. NG gives a much more factual account of his life, based on Volkmann's de-romanticising research. It is established that he was born in 1680, and died - far from Bohemia - probably in Madrid and probably in 1757. Indeed, Paul Nettl's study of the inventory of the collection of music in the Library of the Lobkowitz princes in Raudnitz gives no mention of a single work by the said Baron, making any connection whatsoever with the place even unlikelier.

The myths have unfortunately obscured his music, that in keeping with his provenly nomadic existence, is scattered in libraries across the whole of Europe. The Austrian poet Grillparzer wrote in his diary on March 12th, 1834, having attended a performance of d'Astorga's *Stabat Mater*: *Have not been so profoundly moved for a long time. What*
sort of people have been alive, for one such as he to be hardly known, even by name. (loc. cit. Vol II, p. 122. Cf also Volkmann, Vol I, p.1).

In fact, d'Astorga did build up for himself in his time an enviable reputation as a composer, not so much on the strength of his much praised Stabat Mater, but as the composer of vocal chamber music.

Volkmann praises him as such, lamenting that his fame disappeared with the decline of the chamber cantata as a popular musical form. In more Romantic terms Die Muse links the (unfortunately disproven) traumatic events of his late adolescence with the remarkable effects achieved in the Stabat Mater, notably at the words "Pertransivit gladius", seeing in them authentication of the legend. The author goes on to describe in rhapsodic terms d'Astorga's chamber cantatas:

Normally a Cantata a voce sola of the Baroque is tinkling pastoral music on the theme of love, a never-ending love-sigh puffed out with trills and fiorituras ...... In Astorga's cantatas the texts are as hackneyed as all the others, and they are just as clumsy in form. But we forget both with the profound warmth of expression that transcends the empty texts and pours forth in the music. We meet in these hymns of love the musical Tasso, enthusing at the Court in Parma over his Eleonore, and not the rigid schoolmaster, Nicolò Porpora, writing solfeggios to protestations of love. It is the Romantic fervour, the ardent timbre of the Mediterranean that distinguishes Astorga so clearly from most of his contemporaries, and makes him relevant still today ....

The above mélange of fact and legend highlights in extremis the problems inherent in the evaluation of much of the anecdotal contemporary, or time-honoured, material pertaining to many of the dilettanti aristocratic composers of the 18th century. Much of this material gains one way or another respectability and self-evidence in the relatively few studies devoted to the musical expertise of the aristocratic composer in question. Sycophancy on the one hand, and scepticism on the other, are almost
inescapable features of contemporary documentation and later evaluations. A chamber cantata by d'Astorga from the Universitetsbiblioteket in Uppsala (Suppl. No. 8) may give some insight into the musical talent of this forgotten 'Tasso' figure.

The Reception of LEOPOLD's Music in more recent times.

Adler's publication of selected works by three Austrian Emperors, and Spitta's commensurate anthology of works by Frederick the Great (of which there will be more to say in due course) both betray in their lengthy Prefaces a certain Nationalistic element, characteristic perhaps of the post-Bismarckian era in which they were produced.

In both cases the enthusiasm of the editors was not always matched by the reaction to the anthologies by contemporary critics. Eitner speaks disparagingly of Leopold's music, finding "his ability and powers of invention are weak", and the articles in the Monatshefte für Musikgeschichte to which he refers are generally lukewarm in their reception. This, however, reflects a widespread antipathy towards much of the 17th century repertoire still prevalent at that time. Sometimes the criticism does have factual rather than subjective basis. One reviewer objected to the realization of the missing violin parts in Leopold's Missa Angeli Custodis (MWK I, pp 55-104) on the grounds that they are undiomatic and show greater powers of invention than Leopold himself ever mustered.

Examination of those realizations does make us sympathise with the reviewer, at least on the former point. An ecstatic review in the Österreichisch-Ungarische Revue (Series XV, 1893/94) is generally ascribed to Wilhelm Freiherr von Weckbecker, though the article is in fact initialled "von M.R.". In it the author discusses in an illuminating manner this very point:
The two concertante violin parts to this Mass, the originals of which have not survived, have been sensitively realized by ... Josef Labor. However, there is no denying a certain artistic licence, despite the endeavour to make them accord with the style of the composition, and a modern element in these added parts. A musical restoration of this scale cannot, however, be meaningfully achieved without the individuality of the restorer making itself felt - and this cannot be divorced from the spirit of his own time. When this happens in so excellent and discreet a manner as with Labor, then it is surely not to the detriment of the work.

Weckbecker, who is presumably the general editor of the *Revue* rather than the author of this particular article, was heavily involved in Volume II of MWK. He is listed in the above article as one of those who realized the basso continuo parts. Adler's list of acknowledgements (MWK II, p. ii) confirms him as the author of the basso continuo parts of no fewer than 83 of the 126 numbers in MWK II. The enthusiasm for the project expressed in the review falls somewhere short of genuine objectivity, and that, coupled to the overtly Nationalistic tone of much of the article, gives it socio-historic rather than musicological interest.

The question of value judgements is indeed a difficult one, and not only in relation to the aesthetics of one particular era. Brosche in his *Verzeichnis*, where one might have expected more enthusiasm for Leopold's work than shown elsewhere, himself dismisses it, for all its charm and singability, as being "not comparable with the best music of its time". Despite that, a BBC transmission of the sepoltro *Il lutto dell'Universo*, directed by Rene Clemenčič, broadcast in 1981, met with so many unsolicited letters of approval from the British public, that it was repeated a year later. Perhaps the truth of the matter is best expressed in Schilling's Preface to his Encyclopaedia of 1836.
Here he distinguishes between "amiable" music (lieblich) and "great" music, coming to the conclusion that "amiable" music is not necessarily great, and that great music is certainly not necessarily "amiable". Leopold's music - indeed much of that composed by the dilettanti in these pages - will fall unequivocally into the former category, but only rarely, perhaps, into the latter. In the case of Leopold in particular, he is rarely less than "amiable", and just a few of his surviving works may be said to contain at least the beginnings of "greatness".

Whatever the merits of his music, credit must be given to Leopold for the building up of the Chapel Royal in Vienna, and maintained by Joseph. Between 1705 (the death of Leopold) and 1741 (death of Fux) the level of numbers of performers was kept at the high level achieved under Leopold, fluctuating between 102 and 134. Maria Theresia, for all her love of music and skill as a performer, did not have Leopold's ability to disassociate political and economic necessity from personal cultural indulgence. By 1752 Köchel (loc. cit. 15, pp 135-143) informs us it had dwindled to 20, most of whom were invalids, and including one bass viol-player, 1 bassoonist, 1 oboist, but neither cellist, double-bass player, nor even organist. By 1772 the number had risen again to 40, and by Mozart's time to 50, comprising 18 singers, 12 upper strings, 2 cellos, 2 double-basses, and pairs of oboes, clarinets, horns, trombones - and one flute (the remaining 7 are not accounted for). The achievement of the four Habsburg Emperors brought to our attention by Adler's anthology is that they brought their Chapel Royal to a pinnacle that remained unsurpassed until the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire at the end of World War II.
Summary

The aim of this thesis is not, however, to extol the praises of aristocratic composers as "patrons" of the arts, but to examine the wider implications of their relationship to mainstream music and musical thought.

In the case of the two main figures in this chapter, namely the Habsburg Emperors Leopold I and Joseph I, we see that their musical activity did bring them into considerable interface with significant composers of their time. This becomes evident not only from numerous accounts of the musical life of the Viennese court at the time, and from their reported participation as composers - so much so that the biographers have either confused or conflated the images - but also from their compositional activities, in which they were seen to collaborate with composers such as Cesti, Draghi, Schmelzer, Ziani, Bononcini and Fux.

Such collaborations were, however, largely within the restricted confines of the Court's own musical activities. In effect their sphere of influence was limited in terms of the free evolution of musical expression and form outside the Court. If opera was to some extent a public musical activity, its clientele was still restricted to a very narrow social band. Other musical forms such as the sepoltro or the masque or musical drama were performed within the Court's own confines, for its own edification or amusement, often even performed by the Court personnel itself.

The taste manifested by the Court's overlord largely determined the musical output of the musicians associated with it. This becomes especially apparent when we consider the abrupt change of style in the compositional achievements of Leopold and his immediate successor, Joseph.

The former, even in the more adventurous Lectiones and in the Miserere - if indeed it is originally by him - belongs

* Cf Burney (History): Mercer Vol. 2., p.942
absolutely to the musical world of the mid-17th century. Almost overnight we see in the relatively few identifiable works of Joseph I the emergence of a new musical era, with compositions more akin to the works of the young Handel, unmistakable harbingers of the operatic style of the High Baroque era.

Despite Rinck's assertion that practising musicians of the time had sought to come into possession of Leopold's music, the number of locations at which such manuscripts have survived is so limited that there must be some cause to challenge its validity. Leopold's position in the "Republic of Music" does not appear to have been as secure as Rinck would have us believe. Despite the impressive volume of his output, Leopold's fame as a composer was manifestly short-lived. The major lexica of the 19th century give him little or no coverage, though Burney (ibid., p. 460) does make passing reference to him, albeit not in the short section devoted to dilettanti (ibid., p. 961 f).

Adler's anthologies did help to draw our attention to both Leopold and Joseph as able composers, but subsequent Establishment figures, beginning with Eitner, have been less than generous in their judgements. Brosche, whose work in compiling a Catalogue of Leopold's music might have led us to expect a somewhat more sympathetic attitude, is similarly lukewarm. For as long, however, as our knowledge of Leopold's music is restricted to what Adler selected for his anthologies, and for as long as there is no comprehensive list of all Leopold's contributions to works by other composers - his most characteristic musical activity - then the basis for any judgement must remain flawed.

In the case of Leopold, it is unfortunate that Adler's proof of authorship is less than watertight and not entirely
concordant with Köchel's findings. It is likewise unfortunate that Smither's assertion of misattributions was not immediately substantiated. This is all the more true in the light of Adler's apparently totally spurious attribution of the aria "Tutto in piante" from Ziani's opera *Chilonida* (1709) to Emperor Joseph I.

Two further composers dealt with in this chapter serve to underline the complex nature of the relationship between them, their contemporaries and subsequent times. The Baron Emanuel d'Astorga was a serious and nomadic composer of the early 18th century. The widespread of locations housing copies of his works confirms that assessment of him, and the fact that nearly 80 years after his death his *Stabat Mater* was still being performed and reprinted, at a time when "ancient music" was not in general on offer, and this particular composer had long since ceased to be a household name. The mixture of obscurity and aristocratic title gave Rochlitz' romantic tale the ring of plausibility, fooling even serious scholars at the end of the 19th century. Had the myth not been exploded, then the Baron d'Astorga's music might well have derived benefit from the overwhelming revival of "early music" in the 20th century. As it is, the latterday Republic has committed him to obscurity, with no new editions of his music published this century.

The Freiherr von Radolt, on the other hand, was never apparently associated with the musical Establishment of his time, though domestic music-makers will doubtless have delighted in the possession of his music. He was - as the next chapter will show - one of the many dilettante composers for the lute, a sub-species much despised by such an Establishment figure as Mattheson. Despite the generally unpretentious nature of his music - as manifested by one known collection of pieces (and incomplete
at that), he has found his way into one of the major music-historical anthology series of this century. Whether or not musical criteria alone can have warranted his inclusion, remains debatable. At all events, von Radolt's Allertreueste Freindin gives us insight, not so much into the musical preferences of the higher echelons of the Republic, but into the more prosaic world of domestic musical activity in Vienna, and elsewhere, during the latter years of the reign of Emperor Leopold of the Habsburgs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paul Nettl</td>
<td>Die erste komische Oper in Prague.</td>
<td>In: Beiträge zur böhmischen und mährischen Musikgeschichte, pp 27-33, Brno, 1927.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>G. Adler</td>
<td>cf Introduction: Encyclopaedias and Anthologies (o).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This amusing entry under the Latin term for the lute in the first known musical encyclopaedia, published by Thomas Balthasar in 1701, may be paraphrased as follows in English:

The **LUTE** is a most celebrated instrument in this area. Such is the superabundance of these lutes wherever you turn in this three-in-one Royal city (i.e. Prague) that with them you could help to build, from top to bottom, the roofs of goodness knows how many of the major Palaces, should the idea be given a try.

While Janowka speaks exclusively of Prague in the above, the Habsburg Emperors were in fact Kings of Bohemia, with their royal seat in Prague, and merely Archdukes in Austria, though Vienna functioned as the more important of the two capitals. There was, however, clearly much interplay between them, and
though the Bohemian aristocracy, at least in terms of the surviving lute tablatures, did seem to have an affinity with the lute, their peers in Vienna can be almost as well represented.

The major modern anthologies of works by these 18th century aristocratic composers for the lute (in one case, at least, the term dilettanti would not have been appropriate in its modern connotation) or other plucked instrument are as follows:

- DTÖ 50  Österreichische Lautenmusik zwischen 1650-1720

These will be referred to in the following in general simply by the abbreviation and number given above.

DTÖ 84: Wiener Lautenmusik im 18. Jahrhundert (1945, repr. 1966) draws our attention to what was originally planned as Volume 85, an anthology that would have included works by Count Losy (of the numerous variants such as Losi, Loschi, Logy etc., we will accept here Losy as the convention), as well as a Partie by a Graf Bergen and one by Fürst Lobkowitz, and a Menuet & Finale by Graf Gaisruck. More mention will be made of that "missing" volume of DTÖ and its publication elsewhere in 1942 in the ensuing pages.

DTÖ 50, edited by Adolf Koczirz (1919) contains, in transcriptions now loathed by the lute-playing fraternity, under the heading "Austrian", various pieces by the Bohemian Count Losy (including a Suite now considered spurious), and a
Suite by the French Comte de Ta'llard. As we shall see, it is highly unlikely that the said Ta'llard ever composed. The genuinely "Austrian" contribution among these three aristocrats, namely the Freiherr von Radolt, suffers, as described in the previous Chapter, by the fact that in the case of the "Aria" and Partita in C major Koczirz' notation does not make clear the composer's intention of making the opening melody serve as a "counterpoint" throughout the seven movements of the Partita. He has not included the melody in the full score, and no interpretation of the common time melody in the triple time movements is accordingly offered. Lute-players might also have been interested in reading von Radolt's own extensive notes, written in longhand, on the nature of the lute, on performance techniques, and on the difficulties of making music for the lute sound convincing on other instruments.

The difficulties involved in deciphering the script and in coping with the wayward orthography and idiosyncratic grammar (or the authentic Viennese dialect of the time!) have made these notes almost inaccessible to modern players.

Despite the apparently low level of invention of some of the works in it, the whole collection is surely worthy of a modern edition*, especially since the volume of surviving lute-consort music c. 1700 is very small indeed. As was concluded in the previous Chapter, it may well be, in the light of pictorial evidence of such music-making in a domestic context, that von Radolt has given us in print examples of the way in which original lute music was adapted as a matter of course, to make it playable by a wider circle of performers.

Koczirz' inclusion of a Suite allegedly by the Count Camille Tallard has led to the unquestioned belief that this

---

* The missing Violin I part - even without access to the 'pirate' copy in circulation - can surely be realized from the surviving Lute I part.
fascinating historical figure actually composed the music. As supreme Commander of the French army he led a campaign of devastation against the Imperial army of Leopold I, in an alliance with the Bavarian Elector, Max II Emanuel (himself a major musical patron).

The climax of Tallard's military career was the siege of the fortress of Breisach, whose unfortunate position on the "German" side of the Rhine, overlooking Alsace, between Basle and Strasbourg, has made it inevitably a repeated victim in struggles for power in Europe for nearly a thousand years. Tallard took Breisach in thirteen days in 1703. Just a year later another legendary figure, John Churchill, better known as the Duke of Marlborough, leading the Allied forces of England, Denmark, Holland, Austria and various German Electorates and Principalities, defeated Tallard at Blindheim in Swabia (anglicized peculiarly as 'Blenheim'). The notorious scourge of Imperial Europe was captured and taken to Nuremberg. He was brought from there to London, but having some time previously been a popular Ambassador in the English capital, he was transferred to Nottingham, lest attempts be made to secure his release. A decade later he was returned to France without ransom*.

No historical source known to the present writer refers to Tallard as being in any way musical, to composing for, or even playing the lute. In an era when popular balladry helped to create legends, it is hard to understand how the story of the Marshall's rise and fall, his years of imprisonment made sufferable by playing and composing for his beloved lute, did not enter the folklore of Europe. Even more difficult to accept is the fact that two pieces attributed to him survive as far afield as Prague and Warsaw, but nothing near London, Nottingham or even France.

* cf. Nouvelle Biographie Générale, Copenhagen, 1864.
Pohlmann (loc. cit. p. 120) advises that "a few pieces are to be found in manuscripts in Warsaw (2010) and Praha NM (X. Lb. 210)". Neither source, on examination, actually gives Tallard as the composer. The Prague source (Koczirz' information on location was accurate at that time) simply heads the first two movements of the Suite with captions that mention him by name. Koczirz gives these inaccurately (DTÖ 50, p. 70 f.) as La Prise and L'Entrée respectively, as if Tallard had written the movements in description of his own wretched circumstances. Originally, however, they were entitled clearly in the third person as La Prise du Comte de Tallard and L'Entrée du Comte de Tallard à Nuremberg. Likewise the source in Warsaw, an extensive collection of anonymous or unidentified copies, refers to the opening Allemande of a Suite in a-minor as La Plainte du Comte de Tallard, but makes no reference to Tallard, either in the music or on p. 3 of the Index of pieces (recte; pp 72-76) as being the composer.

The mounting suspicion that both manuscript sources are far from being pieces spirited away from prison in Nottingham and transported across Europe, but simply pieces about Tallard, is consolidated by a unique print housed in the Universitätsbibliothek in Freiburg (BRD), a city in the immediate proximity of Breisach. Again the document is catalogued as being by Tallard, but examination of the text makes it abundantly clear that this cannot be.

The title reads:

$$Klägliches / MISERERE / Desz / Bey Höchstätt in Schwaben$$
$$Gefangenen / Commandirend- und lamentirenden / Frantösischen$$
$$General-Feld-Marschallen / Grafen / TALLARD / Anno Christi 1704$$

(Pitiful MISERERE of the Commanding and lamenting French Supreme Fieldmarshal Count TALLARD, captured near Höchstätt in Swabia, Anno Christi 1704).

The text is a parody version of Psalm 51, the Proper Psalm for
Ash Wednesday. Above each verse of the Psalm is an incipit of the Latin text. If it is by Tallard it is amazingly repentant and abject, and linguistically virtuoso for a non-native speaker in its use of the pun. The general wit of the text (assuming that it is a malevolent parody!) is nowhere more telling than in Verse 8, the parody of Asperges mihi:

Besprenge mich mit Isopen / so werde ich rein;
Wasche mich (aber nicht in der Donau) so wird mein Tallard /
welcher ganz schwarz und russig von der Schlacht / weiss werden.

(Sprinkle me with hyssop, that I may be clean: Wash me (but not in the Danube) that my robe, black with the soot of battle, may become white).

The reference to the Danube is motivated by the fact that Höchstädt is near Donauwörth, at the source of the Danube. The word used for "robe" is Tallard, thus creating a pun on the name of the lamenter, and on the word for a cassock or ceremonial gown, "Talar".

The overwhelming conclusion must surely be that Tallard was a soldier, and neither a poet nor a musician, and that the likelihood of the two lute Suites being by him is as remote as the Miserere described above (and also bearing his name!) actually being his work.

The Supplement (Nos 9 and 10) gives the complete text of the Miserere and of the Warsaw Suite in a-minor (La Plainte du Comte de Tallard) for readers to come to their own conclusions.

The unfortunate Koczirz has hardly fared any better with his selection for the third aristocrat included in DTÖ 50. Like Tallard, the Bohemian lutenist Jan Antonín Losy can hardly fit the description of 'Austrian' as implied in the title of the volume, and especially not at the sensitive moment in history when, in the immediate wake of World War I and the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, DTÖ 50 first appeared in 1919.
One of the items included by Koczirz is well chosen, in that it is a transcription of the only work by Losy to appear in print during his life-time. Philipp Franz Lesage de Richée included in his Cabinet der Lauten published in Breslau in 1695 (p. 32) a "Courante Extraordinaire de Monsieur Le Comte Logy". In the Preface to his Cabinet der Lauten the author gives expression to his regard for Losy in the following terms:

```
Es ist hier nichts fremdes, ausser einer einigen Courante
des unvergleichlichen Graff Logi, welcher jetziger Zeit der
Printz aller Künstler in diesem Saitenspiel zu nennen ist.
```

(No foreign works have been included, save for one single Courante by the incomparable Count Losy, who may be currently called the Prince of lutenists).

The ornamental title-page reiterates this praise in symbolic terms by depicting the works of the most eminent lute composers of the time: Gaultier, Mouton and Dufaut - while above them lie the works of Losy.

Apart from two "Inventions", one of them being a totally unconvincing Gique qui imite Kuku (cf. also MVH 40, p. 59 for the same in transcription and tablature), Koczirz included a Partie (D major). Both this and the "imitation of the cuckoo" have subsequently been placed by Vogl (3) as being "works that may be by Losy". In the case of the Partie, Vogl gives very strong argumentation for not accepting it as authentic (cf. p. 10 and p. 30 f.). It is ironic that the opening Overture to that Partie (cf. Vogl (3) p. 4) should have been singled out to form a motif round a surviving portrait of Losy in a design (1959) that is now frequently used (including by Vogl himself in MVH 40!) as a symbol for the music of this Bohemian Count. (See overleaf).
The haphazard survival of Losy's music and the exceptionally wide spread of extant sources can probably be attributed to his personal situation. As a legendary lute-player, whose travels took him, in his own words, as far as Italy, his music will have been much in demand by the amateur and professional lute fraternity alike. However, as a nobleman he will not have needed to earn a living as a teacher. In his case there were therefore no devoted pupils at hand to make scrupulous copies of his music, or to ensure that his works intended as complete Partitas or Suites actually survived in their entirety, or with the movements ordered into the sequence originally envisaged by their author.
At this point we must cross swords with the totally inadequate entry on Losy in NG. The concluding sentence of an uncharacteristically sketchy account of his life and works informs us that the greater part of his output comprises short Suites. In fact, though we may assume that the preponderance of individual movements that have survived may well have belonged to complete Suites and Partitas no longer extant, complete Suites as such are very much in the minority. Indeed, among the guitar pieces housed in the State and University Library in the Clementinum in Prague is a Suite specifically entitled Partie entière, since it deviates from the norm of its time of individual movement survivals.

This Partie is published in MAB 38, though Pohanka has misunderstood the meaning of the title (which he calls "Partie en Tiere" [p. 17 f., Suita VIII]), and offers it in transcription. Supplement (No. 11) shows the work as given in the source. It is perhaps indicative of the spirit of its age that the four movements making up this "complete" Suite are: Aria - Gavotte - Courant - Sarabande. A Rondeau that follows it in the source (but not in MAB 38), and might have made a satisfactory final movement for our tidy modern minds, is in g-minor (the Partie is in A) and presumably does not belong to it. Since no other Gique or Rondeau survives for guitar in the key of the first four movements, we must assume that it was thought complete as it was, or the movement with which it originally ended is no longer extant. Modern performers may therefore feel the need to transcribe one of the few surviving Giques or Rondeaux for lute in a major key, arranging it to make a "complete" Suite complete.

I am indebted to Ian Gammie (St. Albans) for his comparison of the source tablature with Pohanka's transcription of this particular suite. Pohanka notates the opening aria in 5/4 time. If the transcription were accurate, this would give Losy's aria some claim, perhaps, to being the first piece thus formally notated. In fact, the tablature (cf. Supplement No.
11) appears to be corrupt and haphazard in its rhythmic indications. Pohanka's editorial note claims to have done no more than insert bar-lines on occasion, but in this instance he has had to move existing bar-lines to make the piece conform to his contrived 5/4 interpretation, which Gammie finds to be unconvincing. Gammie does, however, make the interesting observation that this incomplete Partie entière may derive from a source giving a title more akin to Pohanka's faulty reading of the title as given unequivocally in the Prague tablature. The profusion of tenths may indicate an original title denoting Partie en tierces: a Suite in thirds.

Pre-eminent among Losy researchers in the post-war period was the Czech scholar Emil Vogl. In addition to his anthology of Bohemian lute music, MAB 40, mentioned above, three publications in particular have placed upon his name the onus of being an authority on the life and works of Jan Antonín Losy. Although reference has been made to one of these already, and all three are given in full in the bibliography (No. 3), I incorporate them in order with abbreviated titles at this point into the main text. They are:

(1) Zur Biographie Losys (1961)
(2) Joh. Ant, Losy: Lutenist of Prague (JLSA, 1980)

The latter two articles were published posthumously in translations of the original Germany transcripts to be found in the Microfilm Library of the Lute Society of America. Since the death of Vogl much valuable work on the bringing up-to-date and correcting of Vogl's material has been performed by Tim Crawford(4), again for the Lute Society of America's annual major publication. In the following, Vogl's articles will be referred to simply as Vogl (1), (2) or (3). Any reference to particular works will be taken from the lists given in Vogl (3) and referred to as V plus the number. It might be helpful at this point to place the spurious Overture
and Partie in D and the dubious Invention "that imitates the
cuckoo" as V 116 and V 128 respectively. Any further addition
from Crawford's many new findings will be prefixed by the
letter C.

Of the three major contributions made by Vogl, arguably (1) is
the most valuable, though the article itself does not
ascertain the composer's date of birth, despite asserting it
in the title as 1650. The date of his death is taken from
that of his funeral as given in his parish register in Prague
for August 22nd, 1721, to which was added a note to the effect
that he was 71 years of age. Assuming this to be true, then
he was born c. 1650.

The entry in NG, while listing Vogl (1) in the bibliography,
chooses to ignore the information given in the article, and
gives as the date of the composer's death the one given
elsewhere by Koczirz, namely between August 9th (the day he
signed his will) and September 2nd (the date on which the will
was registered) 1721.

On this subject there is a minor inconsistency between the
information given in Vogl (1) and Vogl (2). In the former,
August 22nd is given as the date of burial ("Eintragung über
sein Begräbnis unter dem 22. August 1721") but (2) - or at
least in its translated form - refers not to the date of
burial, but to the "death entry" (cf. p. 84); one suspects
that the date of burial is correct, and that the composer will
have died on about August 20th, 1721. By irony the building
in which this aristocratic composer died, Hybernergasse 7, now
houses the Lenin Museum in Prague, though with the changed
political climate one may hope instead for a use more
appropriate to Losy.

A further, more substantial conflict within Vogl's own
articles appears in his shift of position as to whether Losy
was himself a performer on the guitar. In (1) he comments,
with singular lack of logic (cf. p. 192):

The fact that Losy played the guitar is borne out by works written for the instrument, which may well be either original compositions or transpositions of pieces for the lute—though this does not detract from their worth. There is, however, nothing to support Boetticher's assertion that Losy also played the angelica. The existence of transpositions of compositions by Losy for the lute in Brno does not justify that assertion.

(The above is a translation by the present writer.) W. Boetticher is the editor of the RISM volume of lute tablatures* and other notable articles on the lute (cf. Pohlmann, p. 235); the angelica (Fr.: angélique) was a theorbo-type instrument with 16-17 courses, thereby minimising the need to stop the strings on the fingerboard of the instrument. Thurston Dart postulates its invention by the French lutenist Paulet Angélique (cf. Pohlmann, p. 288).

In Vogl (2) the author has radically shifted his position (cf. p. 82):

There is nowhere any mention of the Count playing the guitar. I will explain my standing on this matter in the second part of this study (=Vogl (3)), but will state now that all speculations that Losy played the guitar or composed for it are completely without foundation.

The promised discussion in Vogl (3) proves consistent with the above (cf. p. 8 f.):

Both Pohanka (MAB 38) and Wolfgang Boetticher (entry in MGG; Losy) have expressed the opinion that Losy's compositions in both the above mentioned manuscripts (II kk 77 [State and University Library] and X Ib 209 [National Museum], both in Prague) were originals for guitar, and that Losy was a player, not only of the lute and violin, but also of the guitar. This point needs to be considered further...

Following a description of the source material, and a discussion of the same pieces, presumed to be from lute originals, and noting how different versions have tackled the problems of transferring from one instrument to another, Vogl concludes:

_We are therefore justified in the assumption that there existed no original guitar versions and that all the guitar pieces are actually based on originals for the lute._

The paragraphs that follow the above in Vogl (3) (p. 9 f.) are a concentration of both valid and questionable material. On the positive side is the justified observation that the existence of transcriptions for the keyboard of pieces of Losy housed in the Stifts- och gymnasiebiblioteket, Kalmar Stadsbibliotek (Sweden), described in detail elsewhere by Rudén(5), does not lead us to assume that Losy must have composed for the harpsichord. Transcriptions of popular lute pieces are, as Vogl rightly points out, simply a known fact.

Vogl then goes on to criticise modern editors - and Pohanka in MAB 38 in particular - for forcing together into Suites pieces not found thus in the sources, and even changing the designations originally given to movements. In his complementation of Vogl's findings in the subsequent volume of the same Journal, Crawford(6) presents a most succinct counter-argument (loc. cit. p. 56 f.):

_Vogl states (p. 14) that "the assembling of dances in the same key into 'suites' [by the modern editor] distorts the picture that we have formed of the lute suites". The problem is that the modern editors here condemned are applying precisely the same process as the compilers of most lute manuscripts of the time seem to have done ... The only monumental source of Losy's music is the collection in Prague of 44 guitar pieces entitled "Pièces composées par le Comte Logis" ... Even if, as Vogl and others have maintained, these are mere transcriptions of lute music, their groupings into suites (implied by the note: "Fin de Partie") at the end of the series on p. 50 ... has some relevance, since it may reflect a similar grouping in the source from which they were copied or arranged - presumably one step closer to the composer ... So the picture of the lute suites is far from clear_.
(The article from which this is taken bears the year 1982, but the journal in question invariably appears some time later; I am indebted to Tim Crawford for lending me typescripts for the time between compilation and publication in 1984 and for manuscript corrections and additions dating 1985. The article does correct various ascriptions by Vogl and gives a large number of new concordances not dealt with in this Chapter.)

The issue of the re-naming of movements is likewise not merely a modern abuse. Vogl quotes in (3) on p. 9 a Gavotte from the collection described above by Crawford as "monumental", though the slender volume of pocket format hardly seems to warrant such an epithet; this is listed in (3) as V 72 and found in Pohanka's MAB 38 as No. 28. Vogl points out that this is referred to expressly as a Gavotte de Comte Logie in the Kalmar keyboard tablature (Ms. Mus. 41, p. 55), listed in (3) as V 110. Vogl and Crawford have both overlooked in Ms. Mus. 4b, (p. 7) a further keyboard arrangement of a work by Losy, an "Air de Cont de Loge" that for all the change of designation, proves to be a further transcription of the same Gavotte, leaving us with no fewer than three concordant arrangements, under two different designations, of the same presumed lost lute original.

I am indebted to Dr. Guy Oldham (London) for his kind transcriptions of these keyboard tablatures. The Supplement (No. 12) gives his transcriptions of the above Gavotte/Air from the two Kalmar collections of tablatures. These may be compared with Pohanka's transcription of the same from the presumed guitar arrangements in the State and University Library in Prague given below.

(see overleaf)
The same collection of keyboard tablature arrangements of Losy's music further helps to substantiate Crawford's objections to Vogl's rigid concept of Suite survivals. Incorrectly stated in (3) under V 107 as beginning on p. 23 of the folio, a "Suite de Monsr. Comte Logie" is found on p. 24.

Clustered between pp 18 and 25 are various pieces that warrant our attention. They are as follows:

p. 18: Gigue de Mr: Comte de Logie
Serra (= Sarabande)
p. 19: Serra continued
Menuet
p. 20: Menuet continued

p. 23: Echo de Monsr: Comte Logie
p. 24: Suite de Monsr Comte Logie - Allemande
p. 25: Allemande continued
Courante

Vogl identified the above Gigue (V III), Echo (V 113) and Allemande (V 107) and Courante (V 108), though the page
references are all slightly inaccurate. The Menuet on pp 19-20 was either overlooked or disregarded because the intervening Serra in a-minor would not appear to belong to the Gigue in G major that precedes it. But, as we shall see, there is good reason for ascribing that Menuet also to the Count.

The importance of the above only becomes apparent, if we shift our gaze from Kalmar to Rochester, New York, USA, and the lute-book compiled for a young English nobleman travelling in N. Europe (Holland and Germany) from 1706-11, Lord Danby. Such is the nature of fortuitous discovery that sources as far apart and apparently unconnected, can deepen insights.

Nos. 36-42 of Lord Danby's lute-book (and again I am indebted to Tim Crawford for placing his transcriptions of the pieces in it at my disposal, prior to publication) form an anonymous Suite in A major, with the movements:

ALLEMANDE - COURANTE - Sarabande - Menuet - Bourée - ECHO - GIGUE

Closer investigation reveals that the four numbers printed in capital letters derive from the same source as the four movements discussed above from the Kalmar keyboard tablatures, though Lord Danby's pieces are one tone higher, in what we may assume was the original key. The Menuet underlined is also concordant with the one disregarded by Vogl, and may now fairly safely be attributed to Losy, thus bringing a further new concordance to Crawford's list of newly discovered works (cf. p. 58, C 4). More significant than the discovery itself is, however, the fact that Vogl, in his determination not to throw together into contrived Suites pieces in compatible keys, so that for him it would have been unspeakable to put together the five movements found chronologically: Gigue - Menuet - Echo - Allemande - Courante in Kalmar into a more conventional order of Allemande - Courante - Menuet - Echo - Gigue, has failed to provide us with an acceptable Suite from
those numbers, in an order that actually accords with a source made in Losy's own life-time.

The keyboard tablatures also include an arrangement of a piece entitled "Les Forgerons du Comte Logie" (Ms. Mus. 4b, p. 57). This proves to be a transcription of a piece also incorporated by Koczirz in the "missing" volume of DTÖ mentioned earlier and to be discussed later. Vogl himself included it in MVH 40, p. 61, with the title "Il Marescalco" (or "Manescaico"). Between publication of MVH 40 in 1974 and article (3) a few years later, he appears to have had doubts about its authenticity.

The work appears, as a lute original, under V 129, as one of the "works that may be Losy", though the arrangements for keyboard (V 115 "Les Forgerons...") and for angelica in Brno (V 106 "Schmied-Courant") bear no such question mark. Whether or not it is genuine, the work appears in no fewer than five sources. The keyboard version has, for some unaccountable reason, days of the week inserted in three places in the tablature. These are (lines 1 & 2): *fri in råndag*; (line 3): *tosdag - onsdag*; (line 4): *torsdag - fredag*. The present writer remains at a loss as to their implication (cf. Supp. 14/15). The piece is heavily indebted to, if not actually an arrangement of, one of the dances from Praetorius' "Terpsichore" collection (Courante [No. 183] Wolfenbüttel, 1612).

Because of their importance and yet their relative neglect, many of these tablatures from Kalmar are given in the Supplement as Nos. 13 - 15, No. 13 rearranging the order as given in the source to present the five numbers as a complete Suite.

Further disagreement exists between Pohanka and Vogl on the question of Losy's public appearances as a lutenist.
The implication from Pohanka's Preface to MAB 38 is that Losy was a prominent figure in musical life in the Bohemian capital, and in the setting up of a Music Academy (not in the sense of a training establishment, but as a body concerned with public concerts):

In 1700 the French lutenist Jacques de Saint Luc visited Losy in Prague, staying there for some time, and organizing, together with Losy and a few other Bohemian lutenists in Prague a Music Academy.

The above is a translation from the German text; the English translation in the edition varies only slightly from it.

Vogl in (2) plays down Losy's role considerably:

Above I mentioned the wealth that Losy had inherited as sole heir after the death of his father. Therefore it is inconceivable that he would have played the lute in public as some commentators have maintained. Nonetheless I assume his passive participation in the founding of the Prague Academy, an association designed to promote the first public concerts in Prague.

The question must remain unsolved, no further light being thrown on the subject, either by Paul Nettl's(7) study of the musical life of Prague nor by Dlabacz.

Pohanka is, however, more guarded than Vogl over the provenance of the guitar music in the Prague tablatures. The German text to his Preface merely describes "some" (einige) of the works as having been originally for lute. The English translation tells us that this the case with "several" of them. The Czech original speaks of "nektere" meaning 'some' rather than 'many'. Certainly Pohanka's text does not refer categorically to "all" of the guitar pieces as being merely transcriptions, and like Vogl he does refer to the few concordant versions of them for the lute.
One is tempted to infer from Vogl's articles a certain hostility towards compatriot contemporaries researching the same field, and a certain reverence for the earlier generation of researchers such as Koczirz.

The early DTÖ volume of 1919 is singled out for praise (cf. (2), p. 63 f.):

> Turning to the lute music of Austria, we find that Adolf Koczirz has portrayed the subject in an exemplary manner.

As we have seen, Koczirz' aristocratic inclusions in the volume are all three of them open to question in one way or another. Vogl himself goes on to concede that this "exemplary" publication does include (mostly!):

> some lutenists only tenuously connected with the Austrian area. Among these are Rochus Berhanski ... the French Marshall Count Tallard ... the French emigrant Jacques de St Luc; and the Netherlander Adam Ginter. Even Theodor Herold does not belong ... Giuseppe Porsi only belongs to a limited degree ... None of these musicians can be considered part of a Viennese school", so far as one can speak of a school at all.

Vogl also - rightly - points out the error given in the description of Losy by Dlabacz in his lexicon of Bohemian composers. Dlabacz helps to promote the belief that Losy was elevated to a peerage by Emperor Leopold on the strength of his lute-playing. He also takes from Gerber the information that Losy died in his 83rd year, and was therefore born in 1638.

More alarming is Dlabacz' description of the character of Losy as being (cf. p. 232):

> a man of funny and witty ideas, who could imitate anyone speaking ..... In his old age he was afflicted by a stroke that made him more resemble a monster than a human being.

* It is of interest that Mattheson (loc. cit. 10, p. 274) does actually speak of the "Viennese style".
In fact Dlabacz, as Vogl points out, has merely misread p. 75 of Baron's "Untersuchung" of 1721 (one of the sources in fact acknowledged by Dlabacz at the end of the entry on Losy). The description of Losy given above was actually that of his valet ("Cammer-Diener") Achatius Casimirus Huelle. That the sentence "Er war ein Mensch, von lustigen und ingeniösen Einfällen gewesen, hat jedermanns Stimme ... imitiren können" does not refer back to Losy, but to his valet (and likewise the less than complimentary account of his unfortunate physical appearance), is borne out by the information that "he also composed". This fact had already been established one page earlier in reference to Losy, and must therefore now be referring to Huelle. Unfortunately Pohlmann's lists of sources contain no music by the said Huelle, nor of a Polish nobleman Riwitizky, mentioned by Baron on p. 76. Elsewhere Koczirz makes reference to a collection of works containing some by Huelle that confirm Baron's high opinion of him as a composer, claiming that his works surpassed those of all the French composers (p. 75).

Vogl can point with some satisfaction to the error made by Dlabacz, but he himself is likewise prone to errors of misreading, as instanced by his reference to Count Tallard ((2), p. 63):

...Tallard, an important lutenist who was executed in Bregenz.

Even if the two surviving compositions in question should, after all, prove to be by the French Marshall, his total output in terms of quantity and the workmanlike rather than inspired quality of the music, would hardly qualify the composer as "important". That he was "executed in Bregenz" is, as we have heard above, simply a careless misreading of the information given by Koczirz in his Preface to DTÜ 50, referring not to the fate of the Frenchman, who actually fared better than might have been expected, but to his unfortunate
adversary in the siege of Breisach, the commander of the Bavarian forces, who was subsequently executed for cowardice (ibid. p. 91): "Arco wurde zu Bregenz enthauptet" (Arco was beheaded in Bregenz).

Vogl in (2), p. 62 may also be overstepping the mark in asserting categorically that Huelse was Losy's teacher. The passage in Baron is ambiguous and syntactically bewildering. In the original (p. 75) it reads as follows:

Achadus Casimirus
Huelse ist Cammer-Diener bey hochgedachten
Geaftzen Logi gewesen, hat aber nach der Zeit
in Nürnberg gelegen. Weilen er nun wos
recht bey inn proicient, hat ihm dieser Herr
so hoch gehalten, das er inn, so offter durch
Nürnberg gereist, ihn sich holen lassen und be-
schenket.

This I would interpret as follows:

ACHATIUS CASIMIRUS HUELSE was valet to the esteemed Count Losy, but subsequently moved to Nuremberg. However, because he (= Losy) had derived so much benefit from him (= Huelse), this gentleman (= Losy) held him (= Huelse) in such high regard that whenever he (= Losy) was passing through Nuremberg he would arrange a visit and bestow presents on him (= Huelse).

Vogl's interpretation of "profiting" from his valet as meaning 'learning so much about the lute' is imaginative, to say the least, but by no means explicit from the text. Had this really been the case, then surely it would have been reiterated less equivocally, and with greater emphasis in other sources, such as Stölzel and Mattheson. It may well be that Alton Smith's¹⁰ translation lies behind Vogl's reading of the text, since he gives the page reference of that rather than of the original. However, it would seem very strange for Vogl to have relied on that source, as a speaker of German.
In fairness, it should be added that the situation of a valet doubling as a music teacher is not an uncommon phenomenon. Prince Johann Ernst of Weimar and Frederick Lewis (cf. Chapters 5 and 3 resp.) were both taught by their valets Eylenstein and Sammartini.

For all their questionable assertions, minor errors (the high number of misprints in the Latin quotation in (2), p. 59, can charitably be held against the editors of the journal), incompleteness and misreadings, Vogl's articles (2) and (3) do expose the inadequacy of the entry in NG. We have seen that the entry acknowledges Vogl's research into biographical detail, but ignores its findings. More seriously it fails to mention some important events, and also valuable judgements by his contemporaries. This omitted information can all be gleaned from Vogl (2), and is summarized below.

NG mentions the acclaim bestowed upon Losy by Baron (p. 73 ff). More significant, however, is the compliment paid to him by the much more critical Mattheson\(^{11}\). The latter has little good to say of the lute fraternity and abuses the lute as an instrument ("it always promises more than it can actually give") and those who write for it, with complete disregard for "the actual Science of Music" and with such paucity of invention (cf. loc. cit. p. 274 ff). The harangue - and this may well be a personal attack on Baron (whose own compositions do perhaps veer towards the perfunctory) is mitigated only by the praise, delivered in weak pun form, meted out to Losy and Weiss (loc. cit. p. 276):

*Apart from one /lutenist/, qui a son Logis à l'Aigle (i.e. who observes the rest of the scene from a position of complete superiority), it is said of one WISE lutenist (a deliberate mis-spelling of the name of the composer Weiss, using the German word 'weise' = 'wise') that he is a compleat musician (ein perfecter Musicus).*
Even beyond the context of a bitter harangue against the Lautenschläger-Schwarm, as Mattheson so rudely dismisses the 'partisans' of the lute, the association of Losy by name with that of Weiss (whose fame as an improviser ranked him as a peer of J. S. Bach) is an indication of the esteem in which he was held. In this particular context the praise is doubly telling.

In his *Musica Critica III* of 1725 (cf. Vol. II, p. 237) Mattheson also published a letter written to him by Kuhnau in Leipzig, dated December 8th, 1717, describing an encounter between Losy, Pantaleon Hebenstreit and Kuhnau himself. Although commentators have referred to the event as a "competition" (cf. Vogl (2), p. 78 ff) Kuhnau refers to it merely as a "Concertgen" ('a little musical gathering', perhaps) in which all three were to demonstrate the merits of their respective instruments. Hebenstreit's instrument was his own invention, apparently a sort of elaborate dulcimer or cimbalom that could play loud and quiet, depending on how hard it was struck, with additional variety of tone-colour achieved by having the hammers covered with cotton or leaving them bare. A description of the instrument is given in Koch's Lexicon (loc. cit. clm 1133 f.). Some idea of its effect may be gleaned from the fact that early fortepianos with a primitive action striking the strings from above rather than "von unten hinauf an die Saiten" were also given the name 'Pantalon' (cf. Koch, clm 593).

As Kuhnau describes the event, Losy played first, as the travelling virtuoso, with some preludes in the learned style, followed by a pleasant Suite in the galant manner, performed

NGDMI has a long entry on the instrument, together with an 18th century illustration of it. The reference to a concert with 'Pantaleone' in a Worcester newspaper in 1767 (cf. Burney/Scholes p. 148) will be to such an instrument, and not - as might have seemed likely - to a Zumpe pianoforte (still very much a novelty in England). We read that it was "eleven feet in length and has 276 strings of different magnitudes".

*
with "all imaginable delicacy of touch", and was followed on the clavichord by Kuhnau, an instrument considered by him, though quiet, to be the most expressive of keyboard instruments. The amusing part of the encounter is Losy's reaction to hearing Hebenstreit play the instrument of his invention (translation):

Finally it was Mr Hebenstreit's turn, and after demonstrating his musical resources in the form of preludes, fantasias, fugues and all sorts of capriccios with bare sticks, he bound the hammers with cotton and played a Suite. The Count went quite hysterical; he took me out of the room across the hallway, listening from the distance, and said to me, "What is this? I have been to Italy, and have heard all the fine things that music has to offer, but never before have I heard anything like this".

The interesting factor in the anecdote is not so much the incident itself, as the perspective in which we see Losy. He is not a secluded lutenist, but one keen to be part of the mainstream musical scene. We know that he practised the violin as keenly as the lute (always assuming that the description of the man and his life-style as given by Stölzel and quoted in Gerber to be true). That description, found in Gerber under "Logy" (clm 218. f) also tells us that a fine harpsichord was in his possession. What is generally omitted by commentators is the fact that Kuhnau, at about the same time as the above encounter, dedicated his third collection of keyboard works to Count Losy, his Frische Klavierfrüchte, published in Leipzig in 1696. The British Library houses a first impression of the work, and the collection was re-edited as DDT 4 (repr. Wiesbaden, 1958). Although the fulsome dedications of the Baroque are best taken with a pinch of salt, Kuhnau's enthusiasm and regard for Losy must surely be taken seriously (translation):

Evergreen in my memory is the inestimable happiness I once experienced here in Leipzig when, on account of my modest musical knowledge, you not only graciously granted me audience,
but allowed me to partake of the exceptional pleasure of seeing your amazingly skilled hand at work on a musical instrument. Then for the first time I could truly understand what it means, when elevated status and virtue are wed together ... 

If Kuhnau's date for the above encounter is correct (c. 1697), then it seems likely that he presented his Frische Klavierfrüchte on that occasion. Alternatively the date is incorrect, and this collection of keyboard works was conceivably written in the wake of Losy's visit to Leipzig, and meeting with Kuhnau and Hebenstreit. Kuhnau wrote his report in 1717, describing the encounter as having taken place "about twenty years earlier".

Stölzel's account in Gerber is perhaps of some general interest. We see in comparing the various 18th century accounts of Losy's life and music that much of the "legend" element seems to stem from Baron. He appears to be the first to claim that Losy's elevation to the status of Count came from Leopold I, in recognition of his musical talents. Vogl (1) adequately disposes of such a claim. Baron describes Losy as dying "at about the age of 80" (Sein Ruhm würdiges Leben hat er auf etliche 80. Jahr ohngefehr gebracht), and it is not clear where the extra three years came from in Gerber's 83*. Stölzel's account is not over-concerned with such biographical detail, it is merely a description of the man himself in his 60s, and as such can probably be considered reasonably faithful (translation):

Capellmeister Stölzel, who got to know him very well over three successive years there (i.e. in Prague) c. 1715 speaks with high regard for his knowledge and skill (Einsicht und Kunst) and tells us that he normally spent a few hours sitting up in bed in the morning, holding the lute, and constantly practising and improvising on it. And if he had a flash of inspiration that particularly appealed to him he would write it down immediately, and then have it locked away carefully in a

* Schilling is rather derogatory about this particular entry in general.
special container. After lunch he would play the violin in the room in which the wonderful harpsichord (Flügel) stood, accompanied by the harpsichord. Here he would often dwell upon a particularly appropriate dissonance, to savour it, calling out: "una nota d'oro!" If he particularly liked a movement, he would have it repeated three or four times, analyzing it down to the last detail. He was especially fond of the styles of Lully and Fux, and a movement that approached these always met his approval. The Divertissements in the evening normally ended with items from the printed works of Lully. This formed his entertainment, for he was over 70 (either Stölzel or the parish registers and Vogl (1) must be incorrect!). He died there (Prague) in 1727.

The account in Gerber, as translated above, is in fact an edited version from Mattheson's Grundlage zu einer Ehrenpforte (p. 171 f.) published in Hamburg in 1740, given in translation in Vogl (2). We note some discrepancies between Mattheson's source and its formulation in Gerber.

Baron's account of the announcement in Prague of the death of Losy is to be found on p. 75 of his Untersuchung, not on p. 68 as given in Vogl (2) (cf p. 85) for his references are clearly to the American translation. It read:

Three weeks ago our beloved Father of the Lute, namely Count Logi, leaving all, journeyed from this world to eternity. When told three weeks ago that he would not recover again, he said: "a Dio, lute a Dio violin - then ordered the lute and the violin to be placed face down, and a black ribbon to be bound round them, to show that the lute was also dead, and that all lutes should join in mourning for him.

The absence of most of this contemporary documentation in NG gives little insight into the high esteem in which he was manifestly held in the early 18th century, nor does the article hint at the positive re-assessment of much of his music in recent years. Leopold Sylvius Weiss' moving Tombeau sur la Mort de Mr. Comte de Logy, arrivée 1721, fittingly one of the finest surviving works for the baroque lute, is housed in the British Library (Ms. Add. 30387, f. 150v).
Though Count Losy was the most enduring, and the most highly regarded of the Prague-based lutenists, he was, as we have stated earlier, only one of several aristocratic composers for the instrument in that era, both in Prague and in Vienna.

Wilhelm Tappert\(^{(14)}\) in his early anthology of music for plucked instruments of the 16th - 18th centuries, gives as No. 81 of the 100 pieces included, a "Minuet par Mr. Conte de Taxis", from the lute-book of Count Wolkenstein-Rodenegg, 1686, a source no longer listed by Pohlmann. This is listed in RISM Vol. BVII, p. 26, making clear that the compiler himself also composed two of the pieces, but the collection's whereabouts have been unknown since 1945.

Of the many dilettanti to choose from, Baron singles out, apart from Losy and the dubious Polish nobleman Riwitzky (cf. p. 76), only Graff Questenberg (cf. p. 77):

> The noble Count Questenberg, who still lives in Vienna, has likewise written marvellous things for this pleasing instrument, and we note in his compositions an unusual spirit and lasting impression.

Koczirz (loc. cit.\(^{9}\)) has provided some biographical material (cf. p. 94 f.) and MVH 40 includes the Minuet in F found in the Casimir Wenzel Lute Book, previously held in Raigern (Rajhrad, ČSSR), now in the Moravian Museum in Brno (Hud. hist. oddel, ms A 13268). This is the same source as for the "Aria" by Emperor Joseph discussed in Chapter 1, and for a "Marche de Prince Louis" (No. 42, p. 73) and immediately following it a "Marche de M. Conte Castell" (p. 75). One may only surmise whether these are works for, about, or by the personalities named. Most probably these Counts are not the composers, though Pohanka\(^{(15)}\) states them categorically as composers (cf. loc. cit., pp 210 f. and 213), giving Louis as a pupil of the school of Gaultier, but "drawing a blank", in the words of the French abstract, in the case of the compositeur Conte Castell. Again no mention of either is to
be found in Pohlmann, though he does list the tablature from which they come (cf. p. 76).

The same library (under A 3329) also holds transcriptions for angelica of music by Losy ("Echau de M. le Comte Losgis") shown in facsimile by Pohanka (ibid., ex. 6). These are listed by Vogl under V 103-6, and for mandora (cittern) with shelf number 189, listed by Vogl under V 98-99.

It is surprising that Baron should have singled out Count Jan Adam Questenberg (1678-1752). Pohlmann lists three surviving works, none of any magnitude. One of them, a Rigaudon in the State and University Library in Prague, exists elsewhere in an arrangement for guitar.

The best biographical material available on the Count is the lavishly illustrated booklet that accompanies the Supraphon* recordings of music from the Count's country seat at Jaroměřic. The paucity of surviving sources must mean either that much of his output is lost, or (judging by the inconsequential nature of what has survived) Mattheson was right in criticising the lute fraternity for its low standards. Since, however, Baron does single him out for such praise, and since apart from the said Minuet in MVH 40 nothing of his has appeared in modern editions, the version of his Rigaudon for lute is given in the Supplement (No. 16). The shelf number of this tablature is LL kk 78.

Altogether much more substantial is the Suite in Bb by Prince Philip Hyazinth von Lobkowitz, published in the "missing" volume of DTÖ referred to earlier. Before discussing the work, it is appropriate to discuss the edition in which it appeared in 1942. It would appear that during the Anschluss, the annexation of Austria under the Third Reich, the DTÖ series was brought to a halt. Koczirz published the planned

* Supraphon 112 1921-22, 1973: Hudba na zámku v Jaroměřicích
volume referred to by Schnürl in DTÖ as part of Das Erbe deutscher Musik (EDM), as Vol. B/16. The political and social implications are obvious. Both DTÖ 84 and EDM B/16 bear the same title: Wiener Lautenmusik im 18. Jahrhundert. Schnürl, though mentioning the selection of music that had been intended, obscures any reference to the sad fact that the music had, in fact, already been published within a "German" series, making no reference whatever to that volume, and simply reserving the right to choose different music from that selected by the late Adolf Koczirz. Even Pohlmann has helped to obscure the existence of that volume by the fortuitous division of editions by Koczirz over two pages (cf. p. 219 f.), so that in defiance of alphabetical and chronological order the EDM volume appears where it is easily overlooked at the foot of p. 219, though the top of p. 220 is marked "Fortsetzung" (= continued). Whereas von Radolt and Tallard in their entries under French Lute Tablatures in Chapter 1 are cross-referenced for modern editions in Chapter 4, the composers in EDM are not all thus cross-referenced, and under Neuzeitliche Literatur (Chapter 5) this EDM volume is not included, whereas Koczirz' two volumes in DTÖ are both included (though Schnürl's volume 84 of DTÖ is omitted). In the case of Pohlmann, the omissions are probably all coincidental, though the initial silence over Koczirz' defection was clearly deliberate, and only in the reprint of 1966 has the picture been adjusted. Schenk's Preface to Koczirz' anthology in EDM summed up the political circumstance of the edition:

"With the present Anthology ... the early DTÖ are meaningfully brought to life again within a new organisational framework..."

To return to Prince Lobkowitz, we note that he is not mentioned by Baron, and is listed by Pohlmann as the composer of only the one Suite. Dlabacz lists no fewer than five members of this family in his Künstler-Lexikon für Böhmen, but not the Prince in question. The name will, of course, be
familiar to Beethoven scholars, but musical members of the family are traced by Dlabacz back to the 16th century.

Some mystery attaches to a later incumbent of the title, conceivably the grandson of our lutenist and father of Joseph Franz, Beethoven's friend and patron: Ferdinand Philip (1724-84). He, likewise, is not mentioned by Dlabacz, but according to Mercer (cf. p. 962²) Burney relates how the Prince and C. Ph. E. Bach jointly wrote a symphony, each of them contributing alternate bars. Unfortunately, I can find no trace of this incident in Scholes (- Poole's Introduction outlines the sources that Scholes omitted in his conflation). In fact Scholes' Index omits the name Lobkowitz altogether, though reference is made to Prince Ferdinand Philip, who (cf. Mercer ibid.) was a patron of Gluck's and according to Scholes (cf. p. 101) had spent some time in England in 1745-46 as a guest of the Duke of Newcastle. Burney refers to him, too, as a composer, though again, sadly, the works presented to Burney by the Prince's niece do not appear to have survived. According to Burney (ibid.):

He had cultivated music so far, as not only to play and judge well, but even to compose in a superior manner; and his niece gave me several pieces, which had great merit and novelty, particularly a song for two orchestras, which no master in Europe need be ashamed of.

In the curiously scant chapter on Dilettanti in the General History (listing only Frederick the Great, Maria Antonia Walpurgis and Max III Joseph, to whom Chapter 4 of this thesis is dedicated, a handful of non-aristocratic amateur composers and Prince Lobkowitz) Burney simply says of him:

PRINCE LOBKOWITZ, and his most amiable and accomplished niece, the COUNTESS THUN, as well as Mademoiselle Martinetz, were justly ranked among dilettanti of the first class at Vienna, in 1772.
The spelling of the family name given above is the standard German form, though modern Czech scholars have tended to opt for the spelling of his name as 'Lobkovic', but this may have no historic justification.

Pohlmann gives August Hyazinth as his Christian names, though elsewhere he is referred to as Philip Hyazinth. His father's name was, in fact, Ferdinand August Leopold (cf. Koczirz, loc. cit., p. 93) and it may be that Pohlmann has confused them. Like Questenberg, he befriended the travelling virtuoso Jacques de St. Luc (of whom we also spoke in reference to Losy), and he was apparently also acquainted with Leopold Sylvius Weiss (cf. Koczirz ibid., and Nettl, loc. cit. 1/15).

Koczirz' edition in EDM is in modern transcribed form, and consequently of little use to many practising lutenists, who will play only from tablature. Vogl published the work in MVH 40 (pp 88-94) in both tablature and transcription, but consistent with his views on not tampering with the order of movements as found in the source, he places the Menuet on p. 19 of the source (Nationalbibliothek Vienna; ms Sign. Supp. 1078) before the Partie beginning on p. 20. Most modern performers will prefer to look upon the preceding Menuet as Menuet 1 of a Complete Suite, with the order of movements otherwise as given in the source, namely: Allemande - Courante - Rondeau - Bourée - Minuet I & II - Gigue.

Since the work is readily available in one form or another, it is not included in the Supplement. One can only regret that he apparently wrote so little, and register with some surprise that the surviving inventories of his library in Schloß Raudnitz (cf. Nettl, loc. cit. 1/20) should have contained absolutely nothing of his own music.

Among the lute composers in Vienna were two further aristocrats with compositions to their credit, both included in EDM 42. These are the Counts Bergen and (Reichsgraf) Anton
von Gäsrock. Koczirz offers no biographical information of substance on either. An interesting possibility at least is the thought that the former may have become acquainted with the aforementioned Lord Danby. In a letter, dated April 29th, 1710, Danby's tutor informed the young nobleman's grandfather, the Duke of Leeds, (cf. Crawford (16), loc. cit. p. 61) of a meeting with two brothers, the Counts Atemis and Casin, who were "almost of the same Country with the Counts of Berghen". The elder of the brothers played the lute with Lord Danby "but they are not so brisk nor quite so well bread (sic!) as the Counts of Berghen".

A manuscript in the Nb Vienna (Suppl., 1078) - the same source as for Lobkowitz above - contains three Suites by him. Pohlmann (p. 71) also gives a Göttweig (Austria) source. There must also surely be a possibility that the pieces referred to as by "Berger" in the University Library in Warsaw (Lute books Rps Mus 56/57, Mf 2008, 8 and 2009, 9) may likewise be his work.

Of the three Suites in Vienna, one follows the order of movements: Allemande - Courante - Sarabande - Gavotte - Bourée - Menuet - Gigue and this is incorporated in EDM 42.

Another gives the order of movements: Allemande - Courante - Fantaisie - Gigue - Menuet I & II.

Whereas taste will be decided whether or not to place the "Fantaisie" before the Suite proper, with Menuets I & II, given here as the concluding movements, one may safely conclude that reasons of pagination alone account for their position, so that they can face each other on open pages, before turning back to the preceding Gigue that must surely conclude the Suite.

A third Suite, with movements: Allemande - Courante - Menuet - La Tournée is included in the Supplement (No. 17), since no
other work by him is currently available in tablature, and the music compares well with other commensurate works of the time.

Both surviving works by the Reichsgraf Anton von Gäsrock are given in EDM 42. He may be the only composer whose surviving output is outnumbered by the variants of his name. The source spells his name 'Gäsrock' in both cases; Pohlmann lists him under 'Gaisruck' after Koczirz in EDM 42, giving also 'Götsrock' as a viable alternative.

In reference to aristocratic lute composers, one further Bohemian Count remains to be discussed. The "Aria" by Emperor Joseph I, as we have said, survives in a lute-book compiled by or for a "Casimirus Wenceslaus Comes à Verdenberg et Namischt" now in Brno (Ms 13268). Elsewhere (notably in Manuscript II Kk 78 in Prague) we find the initials "C. W." against pieces, leading to the conclusion generally voiced that the Count in question also composed for the lute. The Czech scholar-performer Jiří Tichota(17) (cf. loc. cit., pp. 60-62) questions that assumption. As we shall see later in reference to Prince Anton of Saxony, the Dukes and Elector of Bavaria, and indeed even of Frederick the Great, the use of initials and copyists' unreliability all conspire to confuse.

In these tablatures (cf. the Rigaudon by Count Questenberg, Supplement No. 16) the pieces composed by a Count are identified by the letter C and the first letter of his title. C. Q. therefore identifies the composer as Comte Questenberg; C. L. is the sole identifying factor for Count Losy in some sources. In the case of "C. W." the issue is more complicated. The letters cannot refer to his Christian names Casimir Wenceslaus since this would not result in a derivation from his title, nor can they prima facie refer to his title, since all contemporary sources use Virdenberg as the spelling, as opposed to its modern form with an initial W. Tichota argues cogently for the acceptance of Comtesse Wilhelmina of the Lobkowitz family as the composer of this music, giving
contemporary evidence of her musicianship in a gratulatory poem of the time. Prince Philip Hyazinth married Anna Maria Wilhelmine, Countesse of Altmann. A court masque of 1727 refers to Wilhelmine — the name by which she was known — as a lute-player. "The lute dies in the Tombeau à la Weiss" (a reference surely to his wonderful Elegy for the death of Losy), "but when the Princess touches it, it revives and is happy again".

The argument would be quite convincing, were it not for the fact that the source specifically uses the masculine grammatical form: Sarabande du C. W. Tichota's argument would thus be dismissed, were it not for the fact that we do not have any information on the copyist or his source. If he spoke no French he may simply have been following a convention that prefixed a "du" in many cases, the copyist being unaware of its grammatical implications. Or it may be that his source itself simply bore the initials C. W. and the copyist asked no further questions, (cf. Suppl. No. 18). We shall see later that a contemporary copyist referred to Frederick II of Prussia as 'Friderico III', so that placing too much confidence in the accuracy of any such information may often prove ill-advised. Even if by Wilhelmine, it must pre-date her marriage, for from that moment she would have enjoyed the title Princess, with other titular initials.

The flourishing years of the aristocratic lute composer start to wane virtually with the death of Losy, and certainly during the decade that followed it (though Bergen's music is for the 13 course lute not found in use before about 1730). Gerber and Schiller (the latter probably directly derived from the former) both speak of a concerto for lute and strings by Margrave Friedrich, the husband of Wilhelmine, the favourite sister of Frederick the Great, of whom we shall hear more subsequently.
I have found no works fitting that description either in the Schloßbibliothek in Ansbach nor elsewhere, even among anonymous survivals of the time. Conceivably it is a reference to one of the concertos by Pfeiffer or Falkenhagen, and will be discussed later in the chapter centred on the works of the Hohenzollern family composers.

Plucked instruments were, however, still popular instruments throughout the first half of the 18th century and beyond (Duchess Anna Amalia of Weimar being accredited at the end of the century with the introduction into Germany of the "modern" Italian guitar that ousted its five-course baroque precursor).

Mattheson, as we have heard, was well aware of the popularity of these plucked instruments, and deplored it. Of the wide variety of such instruments that competed with the lute, especially perhaps in amateur circles, was the gallichon.

Neither the doctoral thesis by Lück\(^{(18)}\), the standard reference work on the subject* (subsequently clarified in detail elsewhere in lesser-known articles\(^{(19)}\)), nor even the recent entry in NGDMI on the 'Colascione' by Donald Gill\(^{(20)}\) have spelled out in detail the fact that the 'Colascione' and the German 'Gallichon' (unfortunately given as 'Calichon' or similar in many 18th century sources, thus compounding the confusion) are completely different instruments.

Pohlmann (cf. p. 291) typifies the prevailing confusion, by listing "COLASCIONE (auch CALICHON, COLOCHONE, CALCHEDON, COLACHON, COLOCHONE, GALLICHONA u.a.)" all apparently under one heading. He refers to Mattheson's praise for the instrument in Das Neu-Eröffnete Orchestre of 1713, not detecting what I suspect is partly ironic (the instrument may be permitted to play when it is drowned by the harpsichord, would appear to be the real implication!). Pohlmann does

* It does not appear in the bibliography for 'Colascione' in NG.
inform us that for Mattheson the instrument has 6 strings and not the 2 or 3 described elsewhere, though Mattheson actually refers to it as having five single courses, tuned rather like the bass viol, which he then describes confusingly as (D.G.c.f.a.d.) so that we cannot say whether the error is in the number of strings or the tuning scheme.

Before explaining the relevance of the gallichon to the theme of our aristocratic composers, it seems appropriate here to discuss the etymology and historiographical concept of the colascione and its later German relative, and to show how quite clearly, despite the title of Lück's dissertation and the material he discusses, and despite even later writers' inability to make a clear distinction, the two instruments are confusable in name alone, and not in shape or function.

Whatever the etymological background - the term 'colascione' is thought to derive from the Latin word for "spoon", and the shape of the real 'colascione' with its long 'handle' and belly-shaped body makes such a name appropriate - we may safely conclude that the colascione is an instrument on two (possibly three) strings, whereas the gallichon, however we choose to spell the word, is a five- (perhaps in the light of Mattheson, six-) stringed instrument, of guitar dimensions, tuned rather like a viol. Such instruments do survive in various collections, including that of the Castle Museum in York (GB)*. Although recent editions of works by Schiffelholz for two gallichons refer to them as being for two colasciones, the instruments in question are not those correctly designated thus by Burney\(^{(21)}\) as seen in Naples. Lück (p. 16) quotes from a German translation of Burney, with the original version given as a foot-note. We note minor discrepancies between the original and Eberling's translation.

---

* Some scholars (Segermann, Hodgson) incline to the belief that the terms mandora and gallichon may in fact be synonymous. Slb Mus 2/V/7 (cf. Pohlmann p. 147) may add weight to this theory of synonymy. Cf. Pohlmann p. 292 and p. 367 ff for description and survivals.
Janowka's entry in his lexicon of 1701 describes the instrument as coming in two forms, and these, too, with variants. For him, however, (cf. p. 57 ff) it is an instrument of six or eight strings. What is interesting is that he does not refer to it as a "Colascione", but enters it under "Galizona" with a German alternative form of "Colachon". He, like subsequent writers, associates it with the lower classes or with areas outside the German-speaking area: *Turcucae etiam Nationi valde usitatum instrumentum* - "an instrument much played by the people of Turkey". Schilling, over a century later (cf. Vol II, p. 80) gives under *Calascione oder Colascione*:

the name of a stringed instrument much played by the peasants and members of the lower social class in general in Southern Italy, in the shape of a small lute, but with a longer neck and fingerboard, on which, as with the lute and our guitar, frets ... from fine ivory or brass strips are inlaid. It has only 2 strings, tuned in perfect fifths...

Under *Calichon*, however, there is a separate entry:

*Ein jetzt völlig veraltetes Saiteninstrument ganz in der Form einer kleinen Laute, welches mit 5 einfachen Saiten bezogen war, die in Gcf a und eingestrichenem d stimmten, und auch auf eine ziemlich gleiche Weise wie die Laute gespielt wurde.*

(Translation: *Calichon*: a stringed instrument that is now completely obsolete, in the shape of a small lute with five single courses, tuned Gcf a and the d above middle C; it was played rather much in the same way as the lute).

One the face of it this is a 'corrected' version of Mattheson as given above, in which (as opposed to Pohlmann) the source is felt to be incorrect in the tuning scheme rather than the number of strings. In fact it is adapted from Koch's *Lexicon*, where we find under *Calichon* the following entry (translation):

*An obsolete stringed instrument in the shape of a small lute with five single courses, tuned Gcf a.*
Koch, too, gave a separate entry for "Calascione oder Colascione", (clearly Schilling's source) namely:

Ein Saiteinstrument, welches in Unteritalien sehr gebräuchlich ist. Es hat ein kleines Lautenkorpus mit einem langen Halse und Griffbrete (sic!)

(Translation: A stringed instrument that is very popular in Southern Italy. It has the body of a small lute with a long neck and fingerboard).

Walther, in his Lexikon of 1732 (cf. p. 174) seems to have drawn heavily on Janowka:

COLASCIONE (ital.) COLACHON (gall.) an instrument much played in Turkey, especially by women, with two or three strings (herein differing from Janowka) ...

its corpus is rounded like that of a lute; in contrast the neck, which has 16 frets, is six feet long. The Arabs call it Dambura. The Neapolitans use it a lot, plucking the strings with a plectrum or quill.

Mattheson, in his own copy of Walther's Lexikon, has entered by hand the words "Calichon, où es tu?" He, as Lück (cf. p. 15) rightly takes this to imply, sees the two instruments as different. Lück is incorrect, however, in excusing Walther's omission of the "German" instrument on the grounds that "he was apparently unaware of the later German calichon". Provincial as Walther was, he knew enough to adapt Janowka's entry to meet the description of the German instrument's more southern predecessor, and if the German instrument was known to Janowka thirty years earlier, and to his contemporaries, Baron and Mattheson, then we may only assume that he omitted the instrument in error, or thought it not worthy of inclusion.

The antagonism between Mattheson and Baron, as ever, makes amusing reading also in respect of the gallichon. The former, as discussed earlier, appears to be praising the gallichon, but is surely damning with faint praise. I give a fairly
We should finally permit the lively gallichon (den prompten Calichon) — a lute-like instrument with five single courses (tuned almost like the Viola di Gamba) /D,G,c,f,a,d,/ — to join the dominating harpsichord (in Gesellschaft des herrschenden Claviers) in occasionally accompanying a quiet voice (ein Stimmchen).

The customary references to "Turkey" or the "lower classes" are omitted by Mattheson in reference to the "Calichon", because he, at least, is not confusing an instrument popular in refined social circles in Germany, and even used in the opera, with the "Mediterranean" instrument described inter alia by Burney*. He reserves such derogatory comments for the guitar:

/*We should/ leave the strump-strump of the lifeless guitars to the Spaniards at their garlic-eating orgies.

He does, however, admit to knowing:

an amateur and great Maistre ... who could make even a plank sound like a musical instrument.

Mattheson's description of the gallichon as an instrument to be used alongside the harpsichord as an accompanying instrument, is something he may have experienced at first hand at the Hamburg opera, in Keiser's L'Inganno fedele, performed there one year after Mattheson's Das Neu-Eröffnete Orchester (cf. Lück, p. 25 f.).

* cf. Poole p. 161 and picture of colascione-player overleaf.
The above copy of an engraving by Pier Leone Ghezzi shows clearly that the "Neapolitan" Calascione (or Calascioncino in the present case) is completely different from the instrument described by Mattheson, and in his wake, inter alia, Koch and Schilling. We note, too, that the Bresciani brothers played before Frederick the Great in Sans Souci in April 1765, a rare instance of the King agreeing to listen to music by other than himself, or Quantz, apart from Italianate opera. The above Bresciani appears to be in no way connected with Guiseppe Antonio Brescianello who wrote for the gallichon.

* * * * *
Silvamire has the words (taken from the German verse translation of the libretto):

es setze sich ein jeder nach Belieben
Du', seh ich, hast die Querflöt schon...
und auch Sireno stimmt den Calichon...

Asterie, du spielst ja das Clavier,
Komm, setze dich, accompagnire mir,
Ich selbst will mich im Singen üben.

(Translation: all sit down and how you like. I see you have your flute ready, and Sireno is tuning his gallichon ... Asterie, you play harpsichord. Come, take a seat and accompany me, I would like to do a bit of singing).

The stage directions continue:

Silvamire singet nachfolgende Cantata (ital.), wozu Asterie auf dem Clavecin, Sireno auf dem Calichon, und ein anderer Schäfer mit der Traversière accompagniren.

(Translation: Silvamire sings the following vocal number (ital.), accompanied by Asterie on the harpsichord, Sireno on the gallichon, and another shepherd on the traverso).

The direct link between Mattheson and Keiser is an important one, not clearly emphasized by Lück, for not only were they both key figures in the Hamburg opera, but Keiser, according to the title-page of Das Neu-Eröffnete Orchestre, was the sub-editor of the book: Mit beygefügten Anmerckungen Herrn Capell-Meister Keisers.

Baron's response in his Untersuchung is understandable. He sees Mattheson as being interested only in music for the church or the opera-house, and therefore not attuned to the more discreet charms of the lute. His annoyance at Mattheson's apparent preference for the gallichon, as being more useful for the purposes of accompaniment is enlightening, not only in its concept of the instrument, but also because when Baron refers to the number of strings on the instrument, he is evidently referring both to the colascione and the
gallichon (cf. p. 132):

He also believes that the gallichon is much more useful than the lute for the purposes of accompaniment. He forgets, however, that it is pars testudinis (part of a lute) and only a lute bass, and that the pars cannot be greater than its totum, and that in accordance with reason, where you have many strings, you can achieve more than with three, four to six strings ...

The repertoire for the German gallichon, in terms of surviving sources, is miniscule. The works by Schiffelholz in the Sächsische Landesbibliothek in Dresden (DDR) are probably the most substantial. Ironically for an instrument so frequently related (albeit incorrectly) to popular, even vulgar contexts, three aristocratic composers can be associated with it.

Eitner attributes a collection of works for the instrument to Elector Maximilian III Joseph. We shall deal with his music later in a chapter devoted to his music and that of his elder sister, Maria Antonia Walpurgis, in order not to lose track of the central theme of this particular chapter. In anticipation, let it be briefly said here that this remarkable man renounced the Imperial title seized by his father Karl Albrecht. This allowed the embittered Habsburgs in Vienna to continue the line of rulers via Maria Theresia, and ended at least one major strife in Europe over succession. Unfortunately, he is cast in some musical histories merely as the Elector who (for purely economic reasons) did not respond positively to the young Mozart's hope of a Court appointment in Munich. He it was who introduced mass inoculation against chicken pox, only to die of the disease himself. Despite Christopher Hogwood's assertion (p. 96) that Karl Theodor of Mannheim was his son, Maximilian III Joseph died without heir, so that the line of succession moved for one generation to the Palatine line. Karl Theodor moved from Mannheim to Munich, and the famous Mannheim orchestra went into decline.
As we shall describe, Maximilian III Joseph was a modest though talented composer. In that knowledge Eitner made the ascription to him. But the title-page of the manuscript tablature in the SLb Dresden speaks of:

Tre Serenate
Per il Gallichona
De S. A. Duce Clemente
Di Bavaria.

In fact the tablature comprises not only the three "Serenades" of the title-page, but also a Pollacca and 12 Menuetti. Pohlmann (cf. p. 146) and Lück (cf. p. 56 ff) ascribe the whole collection to Clemens Franz von Paula, Duke of Bavaria. In fact all three seem to have right and wrong on their sides.

There are a bewildering number of Dukes of Bavaria at any given time in the 18th century, often with the same Christian name. Pohlmann and Lück both agree on Clemens Franz von Paula (1722-1770). Lück gives valuable biographical details (ibid.), and that profile is largely confirmed by Prince Adalbert von Wittelsbach (22) (loc. cit. 271). Lipowski (23) (loc. cit., p. 54) describes him as being exceptionally outward-going towards the arts, maintaining a good musical establishment at his Court. We discover elsewhere that this consisted of "one poet, 2 female singers, 3 first violins, 4 (other) violins, 1 harpsichordist, 4 waldhorns, 4 clarinets, 1 flute, 1 oboe, 1 cello, 2 bassoons, 2 double-basses, 1 tuner, 1 'Calicant' and one 'Vice-Calicant' (organ bellows operators)." The quite extraordinary constitution of the band can only lead us to assume that various groups of instruments were used for particular functions, rather than that they were intended to form a homogeneous orchestral team.

His known musicality, plus the fact that the catalogue of his musical effects included the works by Brescianello, of whom 18 Partitas for "Gallichone solo" likewise have survived in
Dresden, led Lück to assume that he must be the Duke in question.

Another Clemens, however, was also a composer of sorts. Were it not for his date of death (1723) one would be tempted to look also towards Joseph Clemens, who in 1689 became Archbishop of Cologne. In a letter of July 28th, 1720, this self-confessed "Ignoramus" wrote to a Court Councillor by the name of Rauch, enclosing eleven of his motets, and explaining how he set about composition. I quote from Thayer (24) (Forbes p. 6):

It is an amusingly frank letter, beginning with a confession that he was an Ignorant who knew nothing about notes and had absolutely no knowledge of musique, wherefore he admits that his manner of composing is "very odd," being compelled to sing anything that came into his head to a composer whose duty it was to bring the ideas to paper. Nevertheless he is quite satisfied with himself. "At all events I must have a good ear and gusto, for the public that has heard has always approved. But the methodum which I have adopted is that of the bees that draw and collect the honey from the sweetest flowers; so, also, I have taken all that I have composed from good masters whose Musikalien pleased me. Thus I freely confess my pilfering, which others deny and try to appropriate what they have taken from others. Let no one, therefore, get angry if he hears old arias in it, for, as they are beautiful, the old is not deprived of its praise .... I ascribe everything to the grace of God who enlightened me, the unknowing, to do these things." Not all "composers," royal or mean, are as honest as the old Elector!

Münster (cf. Bibl. 1/17, p. 295) adds the information that the above Wittelsbach "composer" also played the lute, though this is not confirmed by Thayer's report. Thayer's concluding comment will ring a bell later in the discussion of Maria Antonia Walpurgis, Reichardt speaking of Frederick the Great, and Brahms speaking of the species of aristocratic composers in general.

Tafel VIII of Prince Adalbert's book reveals a further Clemens (1700-61), the successor to the above Joseph Clemens as spiritual and temporal prince in Cologne, but the absence of
any references to this worldly Archbishop's musicality (various uncomplimentary references in Thayer) effectively rules him out as the "composer" in question, so that Clemens Franz von Paula remains the most convincing candidate.

Whoever composed the three "Serenades" in question, he was not, it would seem, the composer of the "Pollacca" and the 12 "Minuets". Despite the attention lavished on the manuscript by Lück, he appears to have overlooked the crucial initials at the head of these postscripts:


The ducal title has changed to that of His Serene Highness (Sua Altezza Serenissima) the Elector (Elettore) of Bavaria. Unless the copyist made an error (itself a possibility that can never be completely ruled out), the Pollacca and 12 Minuets must therefore be composed by Maximilian III Joseph. Sadly, neither the "Serenades" nor their postscripts betray the hand of a particularly skilled composer, and - unlike the works for two gallichons by Johann Paul Schiffelholz (c. 1680-1758) also in the SLb in Dresden - these works do not adapt well to performance on modern guitar. The first of these Serenades, plus the Pollacca and the final page of the Minuets from the manuscript (Mus 2701-V-Q) are given in the Supplement (Nos 19-20).

As we can see from the above, and was also the case with our Bohemian Counts, the correct interpretation of cryptic initials is crucial to the process of identification. Failure to understand the conventions is a sure recipe for misattributions.

Lück devotes three pages of his dissertation (cf. pp 59-61) to a work for gallichon known to have been composed by Prince Anton Clemens Theodor of Saxony (thought to be the godson of the preceding Duke Clemens, whichever one it might be!)
Prince Anton was a prolific composer, with possibly as many as one hundred volumes of his works in the SLb in Dresden. Those looking for information on him in MGG are advised that he was entered as an afterthought - for all his hundred volumes - in the Anhang.

Lück draws our attention to its publication in part by Wilhelm Tappert in his anthology "Sang und Klang aus alter Zeit" referred to earlier. P. 118 of that publication gives in tablature and transcription a Menuet aus einer "Sonatina per il Gallichona (Calichon) Solo di P.A." (Prinz Anton von Sachsen, 18. Jahrh.).

A footnote refers to "Calichon, Colascione, Gallicona, ein gänzlich verschollenes Instrument" (a completely defunct instrument). We are informed of the tuning of the six single courses as for viola da gamba (D G c f a d), and a reference to the instrument in a carnaval play in 1709 in company with the theorbo.

Lück laments that Tappert gave no more information on the piece, and gives the distorted account of the piece by Moser elsewhere, the title given by Tappert becoming inflated to a "Suite for the Neapolitan (!!!) Colascione" (loc. cit., Vol. 2, p. 128).

The work in question is neither a Suite, nor is it for the Neapolitan colascione, nor is it lost, nor is it by Prince Anton.

Lück, as also Boetticher, had failed to find the work in the SLb in Dresden, leaving Lück (cf. p. 61) to draw the sad conclusion that "this oft-quoted example of music for the gallichon disappeared without a trace in peace time".

The work has survived, and is to be found in its correct library in Dresden. The error that led to its assumed
disappearance lies in the misinterpretation of the initials of authorship given. Tappert was the first to take for granted that "P.A." must refer to Prince Anton. An 18th century Prince - in the 19th century there was a change - was accorded the initials SAS. In the case of "Prince Anton", most of his compositions were written after he had reached majority and been elevated to his ducal title, and consequently refer to him as Duke Anton. This makes it therefore unlikely that the initials refer to him.

The Court composer in Dresden in the early latter half of the 18th century was one Peter August or Pietro Augusto. Whichever form of his name we take, his initials remain "P.A.", and under his name the "missing" work has correctly been catalogued.

Lück has, perhaps, done Prince Anton a service by pointing out the vast nature of his output, most of which still awaits a satisfactory Verzeichnis. Prince Anton however - sadly - has no place in Lück's history of the 'Colascione' and the music written for it.

The Supplement gives the work (No. 21) in full, even though its royal authorship may be safely discounted.

Summary

Of all the groups of dilettante composers discussed in this thesis, those for the lute or other plucked instrument are the only ones whose place in the musical establishment was seriously challenged in their own time.

One's first reaction is one of sympathy for Mattheson's disparaging assessment of the lute fraternity. Much of what

---

Cf. also Pohlmann p. 145
has survived, be it by aristocratic or even "professional" composers, is trite and insubstantial.

Part of the problem, ironically, lies with plucked instruments themselves that allow simple sonorities to sound convincing and to beguile the ear, despite the paucity of invention. This was and remains part of their very attraction.

Count Losy's position in the "Republic of Music" at least was not challenged, though not all of his surviving music seems to justify the acclaim. Kuhnau's enthusiasm for Losy as a unique blend of "elevated status and virtue" must, however, be taken seriously. Conceivably, the Count's skill as a performer entailed improvisations and ornamentations only implied in the existing copies of his works, and that much of what survived should be seen as merely the bare bones of what the Count produced in performance.

In recent times scholars in the latterday lute fraternity have restored to Losy the status he enjoyed in his own time; editions of his music have become more available and a comprehensive list of all known sources and concordances has emerged.

While MGG has accorded Losy a dignified entry, those with only linguistic access to the English entry in NG will not glean much of the "restoration" process outlined above, and one may only hope that a subsequent revision of NG in future years will do something to amend the picture.
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Also:


In 1981, to mark the wedding of the current Prince and Princess of Wales, the present writer published an article discussing the composing Kings and Queens that Britain never had. Three German-born personages of rank were destined at some point to become King or Queen of England, but were cheated by circumstance from so becoming. Those three were: Frederick Lewis (1707-51), Prince of Wales, the son of George II and father of George III, whose premature death prevented him from succeeding George II; Wilhelmine, the favourite sister of Frederick the Great, whose betrothal to Frederick Lewis, for so long imminent, never finally transpired; and Anna Amalia of Brunswick, spared by George III's infatuation for the Duke of Richmond's daughter from becoming Queen of England.

The music of Wilhelmine (1709-58) will be discussed in detail below in the chapter dealing with the music of the Hohenzollerns. The failure of her brother, the then Crown Prince, to escape to England to sort out the betrothal, not only finally put an end to the long-awaited double marriage between the eldest daughter of George II to the Prussian Crown Prince in exchange for that between the British Crown Prince and Wilhelmine, it had gory and tragic consequences: the Prussian heir to the throne was punished by being forced to watch the decapitation of his adjutant, Heinrich von Katte, for his alleged complicity in the affair.
Anna Amalia, Duchess of Weimar

The failure of George III to marry Anna Amalia (1739-1807) had no such tragic consequences. This highly cultured lady married the Duke of Saxe-Weimar, and in her long years of widowhood she established Weimar as a cultural centre, enjoying a fruitful association with both Goethe and Schiller. One cannot imagine that as Queen of England she would have prospered artistically in the same way.

In numerical terms her output is relatively small, though three of her works are of real substance. Authenticated compositions by Duchess Anna Amalia of Saxe-Weimar number four, though some encyclopaedic sources imply that there may be two Sonatinas by her, and others contrive to confuse her with her Prussian namesake, the totally disparate Princess Anna Amalie. Others attribute to her an extended patriotic work entitled Die Siegesfahne, though this is by a later Princess Amalia of Saxony, born in 1794. Further information on the latter Princess Amalia, whose compositions fall outside the purview of this dissertation, can be found in Otto Schmid(2) (loc. cit., p.24 ff & p.35).

The four works - the source for numbers 1-4 being the Forschungs und Gedenkstätten der klassischen deutschen Literatur Library in Weimar - are as follows:

1. **Erwin und Elmire**: a complete setting of Goethe's Singspiel.
2. **Divertimento (Bb)**: an accompanied sonata for keyboard (Forte-piano) with clarinet, viola and violoncello.
3. **Sonatina (G)** for harpsichord (Cembalo Obligato) with Violino Primo/Violino Secondo/Viola/Basso/ with wind consisting of: Flauto Primo/Flauto Secondo/Oboe Primo/Oboe Secondo/Corno Secondo/Fagotto Obl.

A *Cavatina* for mezzo-soprano and orchestra (cf *inter alia* Eitner) is likewise by the later Princess Amalia.

Of the above, *Erwin und Elmire* is the most substantial. The orchestra is as for the *Sonatina* (No.3). Of the many arias in it (and seven high voices are called for) the setting of *Das Veilchen* has rightly achieved some lasting fame. Max Friedländer(3) published the work in short score in the earlier years of this century, but the piano reduction that has established the song cannot do justice to the skilful way in which the Duchess has marshalled the orchestral resources at her disposal. The original manuscript is heavily pencil-marked, presumably by Friedländer at the time, not making for ease of legibility, but the colourful use of the opening thematic figure, as it is taken up by all the instruments in the score, is impressive and effective. Friedländer judged this work to be redolent of Handel's "Messiah", performed in Weimar in 1780 (in fact four years after *Erwin und Elmire*), so that despite its partial illegibility it has been incorporated in the Supplement (No. 22), for others to decide whether or not Friedländer's judgement can be upheld (cf p.175). The present writer sees no similarity in scoring or style between this and any single aria in Handel's oratorio.

The setting of Goethe's *Singspiel*, not by the Court composer Ernst Wilhelm Wolf, but by the Duchess herself, seems to stem from some antagonism between the musician and the poet in the Duchess's entourage. Significantly Wolf's own *51 Lieder der besten deutschen Dichter* published in 1784 and also a similar anthology by the municipal organist Adam Eylenstein in 1782, *Lieder von beliebten Dichtern Teutschlands* contain not a single Goethe setting,
suggesting perhaps that local talent found Goethe's presence, over a period of nearly 20 years prior to those publications, less than welcome.

The Duchess's setting of Erwin und Elmire was performed four times in 1776, twice in the following year, and twice again in 1782, making eight performances in all. Reports of productions in Berlin and elsewhere refer, it is presumed, to a later setting by André. Breitkopf in Leipzig was approached to publish the work, but this never came about.

The other setting of a Goethe 'Singspiel', Das Jahrmarktsfest zu Plundersweilen is much less sophisticated than is the case with Erwin und Elmire. Of interest is the use of two clarinets in the aria of the Nürnberg. The score calls for pairs of flutes, oboes and clarinets, but never do all three pairs appear together. We must assume that the oboists will have doubled on the clarinets, these being still in their infancy as orchestral instruments, certainly in provincial Courts. The Duchess seems to have taken a keen interest in new instruments. According to Jakob August Otto(4) (loc. cit., pp.94-97), an instrument-maker in nearby Jena, it was the Duchess who introduced the "new" Italian guitar into Germany. The relevant excerpt, quoted by Tappert(5) reads in translation as follows (loc. cit., p.82):

This Italian instrument is now with us here. In 1788 Duchess Amalie of Weimar brought with her the first guitar from there to Weimar, and it was then considered to be a new Italian instrument. It immediately proved popular. Herr Einsiedel commissioned me to make one for him. I then had to do the same for many customers, and soon the guitar was known and liked in many cities like Dresden, Leipzig and Berlin. From then on, for 10 years, I had so many orders that I could hardly keep up with them. Then other instrument-makers took up making guitars, until soon they were on production lines in large quantities in such places as Vienna, Neukirchen and the Tirol.
By contrast with her proven qualities in *Erwin und Elmire* the *Divertimento* is something of a disappointment, though again it must be remembered that it will have been one of the first chamber works for the clarinet. The 'Forte-piano' part itself is well-written, but the overall effect of the piece is rather unsatisfying. Since it is short, and since it must be for others to form their own value judgements, the work is included as it stands in the Supplement (No.23).

The *Sonatina* for harpsichord and orchestra is a thoroughly worthy piece that has recently been recorded.* Confusion as to whether or not there are one or two works of this description by the Duchess arises from the arrangement of the individual parts. The eleven instrumental parts are in a separate folder from the keyboard part. Written in hand, by a member of staff from the Franz Liszt Conservatory just opposite the Library, is a note saying that the keyboard part has nothing to do with the other parts, and is clearly an independent keyboard sonata of the 1780s. A comparison of the Basso part with the opening bars of the keyboard part is enough to satisfy one that they belong absolutely to the same piece. The Library assures me that the offending note will now be removed, and the twelve parts will be kept together, to avoid continuing confusion. Between publication of MGG (where the entry still asserts that there are possibly two Sonatinas, not one, both in G and for identical instrumentation) and NG, the same contributor has dropped the *Sonatina* in G from the list of authentic works. Given that the source clearly ascribes the work to Anna Amalia, and given that the keyboard writing is so similar to that of the *Divertimento*, there would seem to be no justification for its tacit omission.

---

* Fono-Schallplatten Münster (FSM 53042). The obbligato harpsichord has become a modern pianoforte, and it is described as "Konzert für 12 (sic) Instrumente und Cembalo obligato". The *Divertimento* is also included as a "filler", but described - and performed - as a "Divertimento für Klavier und Streicher".
We mentioned earlier the confusion that surrounds Duchess Amalia and her namesakes*, the contemporary Princess Amalie of Prussia and the later Duchess/Princess Amalia (the terms 'contemporary' and 'later' referring to dates of compositions rather than their overlapping life-spans). One further confusion arises over titles. Maria Antonia Walpurgis, whose work will be discussed in detail later, is referred to in some sources as the "Princess Royal of Saxony" though Burney(6) refers to her correctly as the "Electress Dowager of Saxony" as does the hand-written "Souvenir" in the score of her opera Talesttri in the BL (London). A composing Duchess did exist in Saxony, Maria Charlotte Amalie (born 1751), the great-grandmother of the composing Prince Consort Albert. Schilling refers to her works as including some anonymously published songs, 12 Lieder einer Liebhaberin (1786), and a Symphony in 10 parts. I have searched in vain for an extant copy of those songs. The Forschungsbibliothek Schloss Friedenstein in Gotha (DDR), in response to a query over the Symphony, was unable to point to any known source, and regretted that in 1857 her musical estate was auctioned off in separate lots in New York, so that no further knowledge as to the whereabouts of her surviving compositions, if any, could be given. Subsequently an inconsequential Anglaise did come to light, and I include this in the Supplement (No. 24) though it betrays no hint that its authoress could have composed a symphony.

Duke August of Saxe-Gotha

It may also be mentioned here en passant that her son, Emil Leopold August (1772-1822), the grandfather of Prince Albert, and Duke of Saxe-Gothe and Altenburg from 1804, also composed. Eitner refers to songs by him appearing under the title "Kyllenion" in the

* Even Gerber (cf II 48 f.) may have confused Anna Amalie of Prussia's setting of the opening of Ramler's "Tod Jesu" with "an oratorio" by the Duchess of Weimar, of which otherwise nothing is known.
musical appendix to an edition of Die Zeitung für die elegante Welt (1806). No such works can be found as described, and one would have been tempted to assume total error on the part of Eitner, were it not for Gerber’s information that such songs *einem der letzten Jahrgänge ..... beygedruckt sind* (are appended to one of the last series [of the journal]). Eitner’s source includes, in fact, songs by a Graf von Winzingeroda, but not by Duke August. The songs in question are to be found (and how one wishes Eitner could have been more accurate and Gerber more precise) in the following year, 1807. They are three Eichendorff settings, *Marienwürmchen, Knabe und Veilchen* and König Olaf. The first one is particularly beautiful, worthy of any composer of that era, and appears in the Supplement (No. 25), since it serves to emphasize the tradition that produced the songs of the Prince Consort (and his brother Ernst), and the musically fruitful connection of the British monarchy with the relatively insignificant German Court united in the early 19th century from the three Duchies of Altenburg, Gotha and Coburg.

Frederick Lewis, Prince of Wales*

The links with the house of Coburg actually begin with arguably the main figure in this chapter, Frederick Lewis, who, having failed to marry the Prussian Princess, settled for Coburg in his choice of bride.

Since no major work of reference credits him with being a composer, Frederick Lewis would hardly have warranted inclusion in this dissertation. However, our attention is drawn to him as a composer by the inclusion of part of his most substantial work in the anthology referred to in the Introduction, published to mark the 25th Anniversary of the accession of Queen Elizabeth II, in 1977:

---

* Although generally given this title, there is no record of his Investiture ever having taken place.
Royal Collection: An historical album of music composed exclusively by Members of the Royal Family of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. This historically fascinating anthology is rather amateurishly edited by Neil Fairbairn and Clive Unger-Hamilton. We will refer to it in these pages simply as "RC".

The article in Musical Times by the present writer referred to above elicited a response in the following issue (September 1971, p.733) from Ms Peggy Daub of Yale University, at that time preparing a doctoral thesis on "Music at the Court of George II" for Cornell University. I am grateful to her for the correcting information found in her letter to Musical Times, and also for subsequent personal correspondence in January 1982. Minor correction to her published information will be made below.

The Prince's musical activity has generally centred on the famous portrait by P. Mercier showing the Prince playing the cello*. Observant viewers will have noted that there are two apparently identical portraits of the Prince with his sisters, but with differing backgrounds. Musical histories have generally vilified the Prince as the man who tried to bankrupt Handel by setting up a rival opera company in London, the "Opera of the Nobility". This latter company was under the direction of Nicolò Porpora, the man Haydn happily referred to as his teacher in composition. Porpora's connections as a famous singing teacher were wide-ranging throughout Europe, his pupils including Electress Maria Antonia Walpurgis, herself the named composer of two operas.

Ms Daub's letter does much to reassure that the Prince's antagonism to Handel is overstated, and that reconciliation and cooperation

* Colour reproduction of The Music Party (c.1733) in:
J.H. PLUMB: The First Four Georges, 1974, p.68 (Hampton Court).
took place between them. What is certainly true is that the Prince was a connoisseur of music. Of the compositions by Pardini, his teacher, only one has survived, a vigorous work of unmistakeably Italianate character, housed in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. The six cantatas for solo voice and basso continuo published by Porpora during his stay in London, and dedicated to the Prince, may give some insight into his expertise on the instrument if the florid bass part of the second cantata may be used as a judge. (cf. overleaf).

In general, Frederick Lewis, or "Poor old Fred" as he is still persistently known, has not been favourably received by historians, and Handel biographers in particular. Walpole(7) quoted the "epitaph" supposedly written for him, now part of folk-lore through its inclusion in anthologies and other popular sources(8): (p.108)

Here lies Fred, / Who was alive and is dead:
Had it been his father, / I had much rather;
Had it been his brother, still better than another;
Had it been his sister, / No one would have missed her;
Had it been the whole generation,
Still better for the nation:
But since 'tis only Fred, / Who was alive and is dead,
There's no more to be said.

(Anon.)

RC includes (pp.16-20) a copy of Mercier's portrait (with three of his four sisters) with Kew as the background, and the air Prince all Gallick councils fly, describing it as an "Air from Pastoral Cantata". Thoughtfully the source is given as RM 22 d 6 in the BL.

Inspection of the source material, not to mention a questioning eye over the words of the text, reveals - whatever else - that the cantata in question is anything but a "pastoral" cantata; it is "political" if any epithet is to be applied.
Altezza Reale
FREDERICO
Principe Reale di VALLIA e Principe Elettorale di HANOVER
delle Scienze e de le belle Arti
Amatore Possessore e PROTETTORE, munificissimo
Queste nuovamente composte Opere di Musica vocale,
Favorito, Sellore delle gravi Occupazioni-
Dal suo delicato Gusto
per il suo proprio apprezzo e
Dalla sua Regale Clemenza tede:
Di Graziosità e d'Obbligo in perpetuo Monumento
dedicar
L'universalissimo devotissimo e Obbligatissimo Servo
nicholo porpora
LONDRA nel MDCCXXXV.
The score that bears the shelf-mark quoted appears to be that of certainly two independent works, perhaps even three. Pages 1-12 form the work from which RC's "Air" is taken. The work is scored for 2 violins and basso continuo, with a solo voice, though the final number requires two trumpets, oboe and tympani.

The subsequent shelf-marks: RM 22 d 7-9 and RM 22 d 10 comprise a jumbled bundle that contains inter alia the instrumental parts for most of the cantata found on pp 1-12, though they do not tally with the score, nor do they follow the same order. The title given to all this bundle is Musick compos'd by HRH and the Dance's .(sic) made by Sig. Martini; for Lady Augusta's birthday, (= Sammartini). The parts are headed Violino Primo; Violino Secondo; Basso / and Lady Eliz. Part /. Lady Augusta was the Princess of Wales. Whether or not the music was all composed for Lady Augusta's birthday is not made explicit (and is unlikely). The most probable explanation is that only part of it was for that event - a masque-like work (or works) to an esoteric text with conflictingly, according to the individual part, three or four instrumental sections marked "Riprese", these presumably being the contribution made by Sammartini.

We will limit our discussion here to what can be positively identified from the source material, namely pp 1-12 of the score and the parts pertaining to it, leaving undiscussed the confusion of instrumental parts that allegedly go with it.

The work is significant both musically and historically. Whether or not it was performed on the birthday of the Princess of Wales, the words make it clear that it can only have been conceived as a birthday offering to Crown Prince Ferdinand of Spain. It must remain a matter for conjecture whether or not a copy was sent to him. A more likely scenario would be a private performance in or near London in the presence of the Spanish Ambassador, or other diplomatic representative.
The work opens with a French-style overture of 9 bars in the score, with demi-semiquaver flourishes and characteristic dotted rhythms. It is marked "Spiritoso". The instrumental parts, however, do not tally with the score, coinciding for only 2 bars, and reducing this "Overtur" to 7 bars.

The overture paves the way for a fugal "Allegro" in 6/8 time, a magnificently jagged and unpredictable piece of writing, redolent of Croft or Purcell. In the score it is 61 bars long, but the instrumental parts again correspond with it for only a few bars, before reducing the version in the score (much to its detriment) to a mere 45 bars.

A third movement in 3/4 time is marked "Sarabanda" in the parts, but is devoid of designation in the score; a fourth movement, called "Provincial Allegro" in the parts, is not found at all in the score.

The "Provincial Allegro" is another example of a final Gavotte-like movement in e-minor, given a rustic heading, here "Provincial", found also in the final movement of a violin concerto by Duke Johann Ernst of Weimar. In Telemann's concerto for recorder and flute in e-minor it is given specifically rustic connotation by the use of a 'musette' accompaniment in the strings. The Supplement (No.26) gives a transcription into score of the abbreviated versions of movements 1 and 2, and of this short but effective "Provincial Allegro", omitted altogether in the score.

The recitative that opens the vocal element of the cantata can only make sense if made applicable to Crown Prince Ferdinand of Spain, suffering as he was under political castration through the political machinations of his step-mother, Elisabeth Farnese:
Young Prince, we learn from your unhappy fate
the many dangers that on grandure wait,
The darling hope and Pride of ancient Spain,
but yet forbid her interest to maintain;
By an Imperious step-Dames pow'r confind
to mourn your sorrows with your Countreys join'd,
To you, on whom th'Iberian Chiefs depend
their miseries and your own at once do (= to?) end
to rescue from a female' cursed hand
your much abused, complaining, injur'd Land.

At this point the strings re-enter in an accompanied arioso with repeated semi-quavers in the string parts. The words here clarify that, even if the work might have been performed on the birthday of Lady Augusta, it was intended to mark the birthday of Frederick's Spanish counterpart:

Oh may your natal day propitious prove,
and may you know no future cares but love.

The Air included in RC then follows. This beautifully poised "Andante grazioso" for voice, two violins and basso continuo, proves to be a plea for peace between the two countries. It is an exhortation to Spain to shun the advice of France, whose government was enlisting Spain's support for an anti-British alliance, and to turn to Frederick, who advocated a peaceful solution to the political problems besetting Europe at that time:

Prince, all Gallick councils fly,
See their balefull influence round,
Noble Fredrick's freindship try,
all the Vertues him suround.
Let all bloody discord cease,
Spain and Britain live in peace.

The fourth line of the above otherwise serious plea for peace may be, in fact, a gentle pun, given that George Virtue was a Court engraver, whose works (or invited members of his family) may have been present at the cantata's first performance! The fairly
undistinguished (though thoroughly usable) poetry of "My Lady Erwin" reflects the same pacifistic sentiments expressed elsewhere in French verse by Frederick Lewis himself (cf. MaM, p. 55 f.):

(from a "Poem written after Fontenoy, 1745")

Peu d'amis, restes d'un naufrage / Je rassemble autour de moi
Et je me ris de l'étalage / Qu'a chez lui toujours un Roi.
Que m'importe que l'Europe / Ait un ou plusieurs tyrans?
Prions seulement Calliope / Qu'elle inspire nos vers, nos chants.
Laissons Mars et toute la gloire / Livrons nous tous à l'amour;
Que Bacchus nous donne à boire; / À ces deux faisons la cour.

(Translation: I collect around me my few friends, relics of my shipwreck, and laugh at the pomp that always surrounds a King. What does it matter to me whether Europe has one or many tyrants? Let us simply pray the Muse to inspire our songs and poems. Let us ignore Mars and all his glory, devoting ourselves entirely to love. Let Bacchus pour our drink, and let us court no deity but these two ...).

These lines are taken from a lengthy poem included in an anthology of poetry (MaM) written by British royalty over the past centuries. The poem is to be found as Appendix D of Walpole's Memoirs (loc. cit.), where it is described as a "Song" (as is the poem, Appendix E*), suggesting that the words were at one stage set to music. Walpole (ibid. p. 77) says of the Prince:

He was really childish, affectedly a protector of the arts and sciences, fond of displaying what he knew: a mimic, the Lord knows what a mimic! - of the celebrated Duke of Orleans, in imitation of whom he wrote two or three silly songs.

Before accepting unquestioningly such contemporary assessment of his character, we must ask whether or not the sentiments both of the cantata he set to music and the poem quoted above can be

* That poem, dedicated to Lady Augusta, is also included in MaM (p. 54).
lightly dismissed, whatever the man's demerits, as "childish" and "silly". Walpole's reference to the Duke of Orleans is also significant. Philippe, Duc d'Orléans, acted as Regent during the years until Louis XIV attained majority. His fame as patron of the arts and as a composer spread far beyond France and into the 18th century. Telemann was among those to praise him, and Gerber (II, p.129 f.) likewise reviews him with enthusiasm:

(Translation)

... an amateur of all fine arts, but especially Music, in which he even composed some large-scale vocal works - including the opera Orphée déchiré par les Bacchantes, which he had performed in the Royal Palace. Among those given special permission to attend the performance was the famous composer Campra. When the work was over, the Regent asked him if he had enjoyed it. Campra replied: "The music was good, but the libretto is not of the same quality". The Regent called over the Marquis de la Fare who had written the text of the opera, and said to him: "Campra finds your verse poor and my music good. Talk to him yourself, and he will probably turn the coin over, and find your verse good, and my music poor. But do you realize what he is really trying to say? The one is equally poor as the other".

The ultimate reflection of Walpole's words may actually be on himself, for this Duke of Orleans seems to be not the worst of models, if he is the one in question.

In the score of the cantata the "Andante grazioso" is followed by a final number which is highly militaristic in its musical effect, though again the theme is pacifist:

Charles the Great with glory crown'd
Friendship's bands did not disdain.
Conquest makes a King renowned,
goodness only hearts can gain.
Prince, if prophecy prove true,
You this maxim will pursue.
The score gives individual systems to: Tromba P^a; Tromba 2^a; Timballi; Oboe; Viol. P^o; Viol. 2^o; Canto; Basso. In the various parts we find this number given in the strings, immediately after the second movement of the Overture (!), but no individual parts are extant for the wind, brass and drums.

As we have said, it is a remarkable work, both musically and historically, and it is unfortunate that the only snippet of it in a modern edition should choose to distort its historical significance by giving it so bland and misleading a title as "pastoral".

Ms Peggy Daub* has correctly pointed out that at least one other work by Frederick Lewis is extant in the Royal Music Collection in the BL, with a shelf-mark one earlier than the cantata described above. She is, however, herself guilty of a slip. The "Canzonette" (text by Metastasio) to which she refers, BL shelf-mark RM 22 d 5, is not one single 'Canzonetta' but a set of *prima facie* six "Canzonette", using the grammatically correct Italian form. Like Emperor Leopold and Frederick the Great we note that the cultural range of Frederick Lewis spanned three languages apart from his mother-tongue, German.

Again we are confronted by a work of much intrinsic interest. Like the Birthday Cantata for Ferdinand, this work is also scored for Canto, two melody instruments (manifestly violins) and a bass. There is further strong resemblance to the Cantata in that the opening "Overtur" begins with a short dotted rhythm movement, Andante Sostenuto (4 bars), less French than in the former case, but with one demi-semiquaver pre-cadential flourish, before breaking into a fugal Allegro (51 bars). Here, however, the Overture ends, and the six 'Canzonets' begin. In essence they are

---

not unlike the six "Arie" of Maria Antonia Walpurgis, Electress of Saxony, to be discussed later, though the Prince's 'Canzonets' are shorter, simpler, and all follow AABB format rather than Da capo form.

Two interrelated features are of interest: the 'Canzonets' are preceded by an Overture - and the six Italian songs that follow, to texts by Metastasio, form a cycle. These two features are interrelated, in that they point to the fact that the work is intended to be performed as an entity, not as a random collection of songs, and for that reason an Overture is appropriate, in a way that it would not be if any other mode of performance were invisaged.

The initial description of these 'Canzonets' given above referred to them deliberately as being prima facie a collection of six, but in fact there are only 5, the final number being an arrangement of 'Canzonet' No. 5 as a duet with basso continuo but without melody instruments. Were it not for the fact that the duet version is one bar longer, the instrumental parts of 5 could be made to fit 6, so that the cycle could be performed by alternating singers, joining in the final number. With a minimum of arrangement this would still be possible.

However, the words of the text are such that one voice, the rejected male lover, is at the heart of all these songs, and the reason for the adaptation of No. 5 for two voices remains obscure.

To show the manifestly cyclic nature of the texts, I give below the words of each of the 'Canzonets' in paraphrase:

1. Grazie agl'inganni tuoi: (Now that you have deceived me, I am able to breathe again, o Nice; at last the gods have taken pity on me. My soul feels free from her power over me; I no longer need to dream of being free.
2. Di tua beltà ragione: I can now think of your beautiful features without feeling any affection for you. I remember how you have wronged me without seething with rage. No longer am I totally confused in your presence, and I can even talk about you to my rival.

3. S'io son sincero: To tell the truth, I still think you are beautiful, but you are no longer the be all and end all to me. Don't be insulted by the truth - but now I notice blemishes in your looks that I once considered so beautiful.

4. So che non credi estinto: I know you are convinced that the former flame is still burning, because I cannot help talking about you. I am driven to speaking of it, Nice, by a natural instinct to tell of the dangers one has faced.

5. Io lascio un incostante: I leave an unfaithful lover, you lose a heart that was true. I'm not sure which of us needs consoling more. Nice will certainly not find another faithful lover, whereas I will easily find another deceitful partner.

The author is indebted to Dr Anna Bull, then of the Italian Department, University of Reading, for her kind assistance in the transcription and translation of these Metastasio texts. Only subsequently did we identify them as excerpts from La Libertà, a lengthy poem divided into stanzas that do not tally with the above texts. The whole poem is incorporated (also with paraphrase) in the Penguin Book of Italian Verse (10) (pp 228-232).

Burney (cf. Scholes pp 81 and 101 f.), when visiting "the favourite poet of every musician", referred specifically to the opening text Grazie agli'inganni tuoi, defined by Scholes in his footnote as "one of the celebrated canzonette a Nice". This particular text
typifies for Burney Metastasio's characteristic "species of wit .... in which he turns trivial circumstances to account". Who adapted La Libertà to a 'celebrated' set of canzonet texts remains unclear, though it is not inconceivable that it was by Metastasio himself.

The Supplement (No.27) gives Frederick Lewis' setting of this text.

If these 'Canzonets' are conceived, as must surely be the case, as a cycle, then this must be one of the earliest examples of a song cycle in the history of music, pre-dating even Benjamin Gunn's cycle of three songs on the life and death of a rose in 1751.

The aim of the detailed descriptions of these two works is to try to give another aspect to the generally unfavourable picture that is painted of Frederick Lewis. As Ms Daub has pointed out, his alleged hostility to Handel is overstated: the Prince actually supported Handel's operatic ventures financially for most of the 1730s, and Handel is reported to have rehearsed with his band in the Prince's own home. His unpopularity in some circles in his own day may partly have arisen from the fact that for some it was expedient to uphold the opinions of George II (who loathed him) at the expense of the renegade son. Frederick Lewis' anti-militaristic and non-patriotic views - at times at variance with the foreign policies advocated by Walpole - will not have endeared him in many establishment circles.

His mother is reported to have said of him (cf. MaM, p.53):

My dear firstborn is the greatest ass, and the greatest liar, and the greatest canaille in the whole world, and I heartily wish he was out of it.

George II heard the news of the death of his son and heir with total indifference, hardly bothering to raise his eyes from his hand of cards. It is this legendary hostility that has entered our
historic consciousness, obscuring the Prince's genuine interest in the arts, and his own indubitable creative talents.

Apart from Porpora's 6 Cantatas, other important works were dedicated to him: flute sonatas by Sammartini* and concertos by Willem de Fesch**. The now famous Air "Rule Britannia" was first heard at the première of Thomas Arne's masque King Alfred, held under the auspices of the Prince in the grounds of Cliveden House, near Maidenhead. This was a favourite haunt of his, where he drank at the "Feathers" and played cricket for Taplow Cricket Club. His sympathy with many aspects of English life and culture was apparently greater than that of his father.

A modicum of scepticism is perhaps never out of place in the assessment of the music ascribed to aristocratic dilettanti: as in Brahms'(11) advice to Henschel, slightly misquoted at the opening of Hogwood's book (p.7) on the music of the Court: "You cannot be too careful when judging a work composed by a Prince, because you can never know who actually wrote it"***. One thing speaks in the Prince's favour when we assess the works ascribed to him. By and large they concentrate on one format: Voice, 2 Violins, Basso continuo. The cello-playing Prince's involvement as a performer is implied, perhaps, by the "Solo" and "Tutti" markings in the violoncello parts of the finale to the Birthday Cantata and the Overture to the 'Canzonets'.

The similarity in style between the works might well suggest that on the advice of Sammartini or other composer, he concentrated his talents on that one specific format, and chose not to deviate from the one form that he had so clearly mastered.

* Sonate/a Solo, et a due Flauti Traversi col L'ord. Basso / Opera Prima.

** 8 Concerti, Op.10 (c.1740)

*** loc. cit., p.72
Following the first performance in modern times of the Birthday Cantata, at a concert to mark the opening of the Windsor Arts Centre in February, 1981, Stanley Sadie, the Editor of NG, wrote the following in The Times (February 9th):

If Wilhelmine was a gifted composer, so, on the evidence of a cantata attributed to him, was Prince Frederick himself; far too good a composer to have spent his life as a prince. Or perhaps far too good to be true - one suspects that a generously helping professional hand of an English composer of Arne's generation may have been involved, on the evidence of this inventive, very English-sounding French overture and the graceful minuet aria.

One understands Dr Sadie's implied disbelief in the work's authenticity in the light of the sheer quality of the work. Clearly one cannot rule out the possibility of a "helping hand". There is, however, no documented evidence for close collaboration with any composer other than Sammartini, who served officially as his valet, and as music-master to his wife and children.

In informal dialogue, Dr Sadie ruled out Sammartini as a possible accomplice, on the strength of the utter Englishness of the Birthday Cantata. In fact, comparison with Giuseppe Sammartini's four "Concertos for the Harpsichord or Organ with the Instrumental Parts for Violins ec. Opera Nova" published by Walsh in 1754, and with the first concerto in particular*, is enlightening. We note the same accompaniment: 2 violins and a bass - and the whole work is in more extended form a replica of the schema adopted by the Overture of the Birthday Cantata: a short opening "Andante spiritoso" (NB!) of 31 bars, with typically "French" jagged rhythms. It lacks the demi-semiquaver flourishes specifically

notated in Frederick Lewis' Cantata, but there is ample scope for these to be improvised at the octave leaps. This "Andante spiritoso" is followed by an extended fugal "Allegro assai", of 172 bars in common time. There follows a more relaxed "Andante" in 3/4 time (not, however, a Sarabanda) of 90 bars, before a final tripping "Allegro assai" in 3/8 meter (258 bars). The length of the movements, as befits an autonomous concerto, is naturally greater, but the concept and format are manifestly identical. If any helping hand or guiding voice were at play, then surely Sammartini, who lived in his household, must be the obvious choice. The discrepancy in Frederick Lewis' Birthday Cantata between the score and the surviving parts may indicate that the shorter version derived from the parts (cf Supplement 26) represents the Prince's final version, then improved by Sammartini to become the final version in the score. The reverse is, of course, also possible: Sammartini reduced the Prince's more amorphous concept, to create a shorter (though inferior) version. Certainly the parts are preferable to the score by virtue of the inclusion of the "Provincial Allegro" that rounds off the Overture.

The composing talents of Frederick Lewis, Prince of Wales, were taken up in a minor way by his younger son, Edward Augustus, who died in his twenties in 1767. The Royal Music Collection in the BL contains two minuets, both of which are included in RC (p.22 f.) with unrealized basso continuo parts.

Three British Composing Earls

Had Frederick Lewis succeeded to the throne he might have lived long enough to witness the contribution made to British musical life by three peers of the realm, the Earl of Kelly (a Scot), the Earl of Mornington (an Irishman) and the Earl of Abingdon (a non-patriotic Englishman, and kindred spirit, one suspects, to the Prince). We shall deal with them in alphabetical order of title.
The eccentric Lord Abingdon (or Avington, as Haydn erroneously calls him) receives an adequate entry in NG, though complementary material may be gleaned from the many references to Abingdon in Robbins Landon's detailed account of Haydn's visits to London. A condensed version of much of what Robbins Landon has to offer is also found in Christopher Hogwood's more recent book on the same subject.

It was this Lord Abingdon who first tried to bring Haydn to London in the 1780s, and when Haydn ultimately did come, his Lordship assisted greatly in the financial undertaking. Understandably a bond of friendship appears to have grown up between the two, culminating in their collaboration in a book of glees and catches, but terminated by the Earl's trial and imprisonment shortly before Haydn's ultimate return to Vienna in 1795.

It may be assumed that after years of service in the employ of the Esterhazys, Haydn will have found no novelty in the idea of a composing nobleman. In fact, none of the Esterhazy Princes known to Haydn, whatever their expertise as instrumentalists, appears to have composed. The only member of that family with that skill seems to have been Paul (Pal) Esterhazy (1635-1713), a Lord Steward at the Court of Leopold I created Reichsfürst by Leopold in 1681. His output as a composer (cf NG Vol.6, p.260 f.) appears to be confined to a large set of sacred works of differing styles and scoring, comprising 55 items for use throughout the church's year: *Harmonia caelestis / seu melodiae musicae per decursum totius anni adhibendae ad usum musicorum / (c.1701)* NG clarifies that this date of 1701 refers to the final date of composition, a process that appears to have covered some 25 years all told, before final publication in

* Recent recording: Hungaraton SLPD 12561, Budapest (c.1984).
There have been various editions in modern times (Budapest, 1970 and Kassel, 1972) but the most recent, by Ágnes Sas in 1989 clarifies the issue of the dating of the work. She also expresses doubts as to the extent of Esterhazy's real authorship, suggesting that the Prince only wrote the melodies or sketched an idea, leaving a competent "professional" to realise the ultimate form of the work. This is what Reichardt disparagingly described (cf. Chapter 6) as the "royal method of composition" in respect of the works of Frederick the Great.

The surprise with Lord Abingdon, as Robbins Landon (p.290) so rightly observes, will have been the differing attitude towards the nobility manifested by non-Absolutist British society and the social norms known to Haydn; for the Earl was sent for trial and sentenced to three months' imprisonment in a libel case:

The very idea of trying a Lord must have seemed fantastic to Haydn, used to the practically unassailable position of the aristocracy in Austria. It was as if, mutatis mutandis, they had put Baron van Swieten on trial.

A detailed account of the trial is given in the Sporting Magazine of February, 1795 and quoted by Robbins Landon (p.289 f.). In assessing the man, his own comments at the trial are the most enlightening, for he is reported as claiming:

though he venerated the law, he would never fail to manifest his indignation against those lawyers who were the scourges and pest of society.

It is in the light of such radical utterance that we perhaps best understand the judgement given in NG that "As a song-writer he is distinguished more for his radical choice of words ... than for the music". The Supplement (No.28) shows one such ballad-like song, The Political Rationalist, a cynical appraisal of adherence to ideology, with an attack on the Monarchy in Verse 5:
I reverence the Church, and our Sovereign respect,
Till he aims to subvert what he's bound to protect;

In the jittery atmosphere of a London terrified that the forces of Revolution would spread from Paris to the English capital, such progressive thinking, and especially from a member of the Establishment, will have made his Lordship rather less than popular.

The fair comment in NG** - after all such songs are not conceived with elegance of melody uppermost in mind - may be taken in conjunction with one of the few less than generous comments made by Haydn. Hogwood (Haydn, p.97) appears to be relating the incident to the Twelve Sentimental Catches and Glees produced by the Austrian and the English nobleman jointly, the settings of the words being by Abingdon, and the perfunctory piano accompaniments by Haydn. This is not so. As Robbins Landon makes clear, on one occasion (p.271) the two of them set their hand at setting the same text, a text that will have appealed to Abingdon's known sense of humour and delight in ambiguity. The poem, a pun on the names of Salamon, the impresario who finally brought Haydn to this country, and on David(e), the famous tenor, reads:

*Salamon und David waren grosse Stiinder,
Hatten schöne Weiber, machten viele Kinder,
Da Sie nicht mehr konnten und kamen in das altier, (a)
macht der Eine Lieder und der andere Psalter.*

---

* DNB gives evidence of the Earl's support for the French Revolution.

** MGG in fact specifically praises his setting of The Spinning Wheel from "Six Songs ..." (1788) as being "almost redolent of Schubert", and in general lauds his originality.
(Translation: Solomon and David were great sinners. They had beautiful women and produced lots of children. But when they grew old and past it, one of them turned to songs and the other to the Psalter).

Haydn commented (cf. CCLN 299) and Robbins Landon (p.271):

NB. Lord Avington set it to music, but miserably; I did it a bit better.

The implication of the two statements together, NG's criticism of his songs, and Haydn's uncharacteristic lack of tact, may lead us to assume that the Earl was a worse composer than is actually the case.

Undoubtedly the Earl of Abingdon's most substantial and original work is his Representation of the Execution of MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS in Seven Views, the Music Composed for and adapted to each view. It was published by Monzani in Grosvenor Square "where the rest of his Lordships Music may be had".

The work, dedicated "To those female Philosorphers / Members of THE BLUE STOCKING CLUB" is staggeringly original, even by today's standards, where multi-media presentations are no longer rare. Its avowed aim, in the words of the Dedication, is to combine the "Sister Arts", defined as Music, Poetry and Painting, in one work. The music relates to seven plates, the contents of which are described in detail before the score, and the engravings themselves are then inserted at the appropriate places in the score.

Rather than give detailed descriptions of the plates and the score, I have placed in the Supplement (No.29) the "Description of the Plates", together with the final plate, depicting the Internment of Mary, Queen of Scots and the setting of the final dirge: Go Sorrow's Sigh, and falling Tear, in the hope that they will give some idea of the manner in which Abingdon has tried to link the
various art forms. The work is scored for SAB voices with an orchestral accompaniment of 2 trumpets / horns; 2 flutes; 2 violins, viola and violoncello "o Basso". In the central chorus: If in the melancholy shades below, the sopranos divide to provide an SSAB texture. The score abounds (except in the final dirge) in dynamic markings: forte; piano; mezza voce; sforzando; crescendo; calando. On p.13 "Tambour" appears in the Basso part, although elsewhere there is no explicit reference to the surely inevitable use of tympani.

The entry in NG dismisses the work somewhat as lacking in profundity, but the work surely deserves more credit for the sheer originality of its concept.

On p.362 f. Robbins Landon gives examples, one each, of the Catches and Glees referred to above, with an explanation of what a "Catch" actually is. For that reason no description is given here, nor are they included in the Supplement. For some reason this collection of Glees has not established itself in the repertoire of the Glee Clubs that still survive, though, as we shall hear later, those of the Earl of Mornington have endured better.

In reference to these glees, published about the time of the Earl's imprisonment, c.1795, Robbins Landon (p.364) observes:

Abingdon may have been an amateur but he was one with all the good taste which was so much a part of fin de siècle Georgian England ....
Perhaps he [= Haydn] will have tried out some of his Lordship's productions while that gentleman was languishing in prison.

In the case of the Earl of Mornington, and with this genre of vocal music in particular, we will be able to question that "good taste" which Robbins Landon takes for granted in Georgian England.
Hogwood (Haydn, p.97) refers to Abingdon as "the flute-playing Lord Abingdon". This we may assume from the fact that music for flute was dedicated to him, and forms the greatest part of his own instrumental compositions*. NG draws our attention to Abel's "Four Trios, two for two Flutes and a Bass", Opus 16, dedicated to him. The article omits, however, Haydn's "London Trios" (as they are now called), the second of which is dedicated to the Earl. Hogwood refers to these in general terms: "a number of delightful movements for drawing-room consumption, scored for two flutes and a 'cello". Robbins Landon (p.405) gives a more detailed account of their background, referring to them, rather surprisingly, as being for the "curious combination of two flutes and violoncello". Describing the social event from which they emanated, Robbins Landon relates how these "London Trios" came to be published by Monzani, the second (IV:2 in G) being dedicated to Abingdon, and the other for Abingdon's friend, Sir Walter Aston, 8th Lord of Forfar. Monzani, to Robbins Landon's puzzlement (p.276), dedicated No. 1 erroneously to Sir Willoughby Aston instead of Walter Aston. He comments: "We cannot explain how Monzani came to call Aston by the wrong name". But the answer is simple. "Willoughby" was Lord Abingdon's name, Willoughby Bertie, 4th Earl of Abingdon being his full title, and Monzani simply confused the names in question.

What Robbins Landon calls a "curious combination" appears to have been his Lordship's favourite. His Twelve COUNTRY DANCES and Three Capricios published "by his Lordship's permission" by Monzani are for precisely that combination of "Two Flutes and a Bass". They are all short - some of them two to a page - most of them pretty, and all with programmatic titles such as "April Showers" or enigmatic titles such as "The way to keep him". The three "Capricios" take up a page each, the first one enjoying the

* Grove 5, but not NG, gives documented references to the Earl's performance on the instrument.
intriguing title of *A cure for the Spleen*, and this is included in the Supplement (No. 30).

In summarizing the persona of this extraordinary aristocrat one can best take the concluding lines of the Dedication in "Mary, Queen of Scots", described as being by hand of

```plaintext
   .... HIM whose Wishes are
      Not here to say WHO but WHAT he is
   And so to Subscribe Himself

   HOMO SUM.
```

(2) The Earl of Kelly (1732-81)

On the face of it, musically the most substantial of these three Georgian Earls was Thomas Alexander Erskine, the Earl of Kelly (to use the preferred spelling of the title in the 18th century, though this has subsequently changed to 'Kellie'). We shall see later in the discussion of encyclopaedic entries that the criteria for enduring fame are more elusive than may be thought.

Whatever the outcome of that discussion, the Earl of Kelly's fame (even if only via Burney's generous assessments of him in his General History, 1789) spread beyond our borders, back to Germany, where he learned his art, to be included in both Gerber and Schilling. Below are translations of those respective entries:

1. Gerber (2, 33 f.)

   This dilettante, who ultimately acquired more knowledge of all aspects of the theory and practice of music than any of the leading professors of music of his time in London, hardly knew how to hold the violin before his journey to Germany. However he took up his musical education in Mannheim, studying with the help of Stamitz sen. composition and violin, with such dedication and enthusiasm, that when he returned to England, he manifested such powerful skill on the violin, and such genius for composition, that no professor in the art there could compare to him. He was dead by 1789. Cf Burney, Vol. VI

   I have found the following works by him:
The entry that follows in Gerber is for Kelly (...) "a different composer from the above". This is Michael Kelly, the tenor and friend of Mozart, whose memoirs\(^{(15)}\) give such vital insight into the musical life of the time. Gerber's entry on the latter concludes with the observation: "Probably No. 5 in the article above should be ascribed to this Kelly".

Schilling, as is frequently the case, bases his information on Gerber, though with some significant changes:

2. Schilling

Kelly, 1) Earl of, only a dilettante, but, as Gerber assures, given a versatile and thorough, profoundly artistic musical training, hardly matched by any professor of his time. He was born in London, and died there ca 1789. Before setting out for his journey to Germany, which happened ca 1770, he is reported to have hardly known how to hold the violin, and it was only in Mannheim, where he stayed for some time, that he trained himself under the guidance of Stanitz (sic) sen. in the playing of the violin and in composition, with such amazing speed that on his return to London he was considered one of the finest virtuosos on the violin in England. He composed several symphonies, overtures for orchestra, violin trio's (sic) and the operas "Feudal times" with the alternative title "Banquet Gallery" and "Beard of Blue" ..... The former is a mere spectacle piece, not performed until after his death on Jan. 1st, 1799; the latter was staged immediately after completion in the theatre in Drury Lane. Another English musician, singer and prolific composer of the same name, and probably related to him, is - 2) Michael Kelly, born in 1764 in Dublin .....
Comparison of the above with entries in NG and DNB (a full reference will be given below towards the end of this chapter) helps us to sort out errors in terms of biographical detail and musical legacy, without detaining from our pleasure at finding him included at all.

The Earl of Kelly in question was born not in London, as Schilling would have us believe, but in Fife, Scotland, in 1732. He died in 1781, not in London, as Schilling maintains, but in Brussels, and not in 1789. Gerber was correct in assuming confusion between his works and those of his Irish namesake. The operas quoted by himself and taken up by Schilling are by the singer-composer, to whom in fact he was not related.*

NG, far from extolling the miraculous speed with which the Earl was said to have learned to play the violin in Mannheim, informs us that he "seems to have learnt to play the violin at an early age."

In fact NG's contributor, David Johnson, has established elsewhere(16) (op. cit., p.72) that he probably had violin lessons from the family chaplain, and was known at an early age as "Fiddler Tam" in the nearby village of Pittenweem.

We will look in vain for a Volume VI of Burney's A General History of Music, as offered as a source by Gerber. The passage in question comes from the final volume, Volume IV, and reads (Mercer, p.677) as follows:

---

* Similar confusion still arises, though not with the works of his contemporary, Michael Kelly. The computerized catalogue of OUP music publications attributes to the Earl the works of the living composer Brian Kelly! We shall see how a very similar confusion of identity has arisen in the case of Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia.
The late EARL of KELLY, who was possessed of more musical science than any dilettante with whom I was ever acquainted, and who, according to Pinto, before he travelled into Germany, could scarcely tune his fiddle, shut himself up at Mannheim with the elder Stamitz, and studied composition and practised the violin with such serious application, that, at his return to England, there was no part of theoretical or practical Music, in which he was not equally versed with the greatest professors of his time. Indeed, he had a strength of hand on the violin, and a genius for composition, with which few professors are gifted.

The legend of the young nobleman unable to hold a violin properly is seen to be a slight mistranslation of the reference to his alleged inability to "tune" his instrument correctly (though still rather unlikely!). Gerber correctly used Burney's reference to "the late" Earl to give the date of death "by" 1789; Schilling clearly takes his evidence directly from Gerber and not from Burney, so that "by" becomes gegen which means ambiguously "towards", i.e. some time just before, or simply "circa". In the absence of a given place of birth and death in Gerber and Burney, Schilling hazards an incorrect guess for both as "London". The opera entitled Beard of Blue, in fact by Michael Kelly, is generally referred to in sources by the more familiar formulation Blue Beard.

In the absence of more precise information in Burney, both Gerber and Schilling assume that Kelly had set out with Mannheim as his intended destination, but other sources suggest that the young Earl had embarked on the Grand Tour, and stopped in Mannheim only en route to Italy, before opting to stay and study with Stamitz.

The date of the sojourn in Mannheim given by Schilling is likewise inaccurate, and will have been nearly twenty years earlier. By the 1770s the Earl was not only a leading figure in the musical life of Edinburgh, he appears to have been a member of a cryptic society of composers in London, and was invited to contribute to the famous
Fête champêtre held in Epsom (cf. NG). His major instrumental compositions appeared in the mid- and late 1760s, including a symphony found as No. 4 in a set of *Six Symphonies* by J. Stamitz, his pupil the Earl of Kelly, and others in 1765.

Much confusion surrounds that collection. Charles Cudworth(17), in general the Earl of Kelly's most enthusiastic supporter, deals with this particular set in a manner which cannot but bewilder. He is correct in informing us that the source in no way helps to assign the works to their respective authors, "who are unnamed except on the vague title-page" (loc. cit., p. 37). He then gives concrete examples of acts of plagiarism in the Earl's Opus 1, a set of six symphonies (ca 1761) in which (cf. p. 49(1)) Nos 1 and 4 derive from Stamitz' Opus 11, No. 1, and Opus 4, No. 6. Without further discussion Cudworth then, in the Appendix published one year later (cf. Bibl. 13), gives incipits of four of the six "Simphonies in four Parts" referred to above as works by the Earl of Kelly. Why these four? What of the other two? These are questions that he does not answer. NG, however, gives No. 4 of that collection as specifically the one that is provenly (via concordances) by the Earl; Cudworth omitted in the incipits, however - presumably because he felt them not to be by Kelly - this very No. 4 and No. 6.

The New Oxford History of Music, Vol. 7(18), quoting Cudworth as a source, gives an incipit of No. 5 of the above set as being by Kelly, seeing it as typical of Stamitz' style as taken over by his pupil. In fact, the work may be by the master himself, and is most unlikely to be by Kelly. Certainly there can be no justification for assuming that the Earl composed any of these works other than No. 4, despite Cudworth's decision to omit it from the incipits. In correspondence Dr. Johnson clarifies that in pointing out the existence of a concordant ascription he is not categorically offering No. 4 as definitively the work of Kelly. In fact he points to Riemann's Prefaces to the DDT volumes on the Mannheim...
symphonists (1902 and 1906) in which Anton Filitz may be seen to be the composer of No.4. In his own opinion No.3 in the collection (E major) emerges as the likeliest one to have been written by Kelly. In NG, however, No.4 remains categorically ascribed to the Earl in the work-list that foots the entry.

NG, in describing this "Simphony" No.4, comes to the conclusion that it is different from the Earl's other symphonies, and smacks of an earlier attempt at composition during his Mannheim years. The work is different from the other symphonies, but totally characteristic of other works by the Earl. The reason for this is to be found on the title-page of the set (a copy of which may be found in the BL: h2830x, despite its omission from the current catalogue). Though neither Cudworth nor NG draw our attention to the fact, the title-page refers to these "Simphonies" as being "proper for small or great CONCERTS". Like other works by Stamitz they may be played as solo chamber pieces or orchestral. That they may primarily have been conceived for chamber purposes may be inferred not only from the order given "small or great", but from the description above each of the works in each of the four sets of parts, where they are referred to invariably as "Quartetto". In fact, No.4 (III) of the "Simphonies" is in two movements only. The first movement has many dynamic markings, nearly all of them to indicate Forte, Crescendo or Crescendo Forte, and is designated Allegro spiritoso, brimming with the characteristic features quoted below from DNB, and abounding in the scrubbing violin parts with double or multiple stops, before a rather gentler second and final movement.

Kenneth Elliott(19) in his concise account of music in Scotland in the latter half of the 18th century likewise indirectly strengthens the view that the trios of 1769 and the 4th Symphony of c.1761 are

* Cf. the title-page to Stamitz' Op.1 Trios (Paris, 1755): "pour Exécuter à 3, ou avec toutes l'orchestre (sic)".
stylistically akin to each other. He sees the trios as coming "close to achieving the texture of style of the true string quartet". If "Simphony" No.4 is viewed primarily as a chamber quartet, then it would seem reasonable to see it more closely related to the trios than the other manifestly orchestral overtures.

For all the questions it poses, we should still be grateful to the New Oxford History of Music for at least mentioning Kelly. As we shall see later, he has not been treated generously by the various "Oxford" publications in recent times. In drawing our attention to Cudworth's article (though it should read 1952, not 1953, as the year of Proceedings of the RMS in which it appears), we find confirmation of the Earl of Kelly as a composer to be taken seriously, in the words of the concluding paragraph of that article, and to some extent corroborated later by NG:

After the middle of the century, the Earl of Kelly was undeniably our most gifted symphonist (p. 48)

Of his real symphonies, the "Periodical Overtures" in eight parts, published in London between 1766 and 1770, are the most important, and two warrant mention. No.28 is headed "The Maid of the Mill", the pasticcio opera assembled together by Samuel Arnold. Presumably the Earl contributed the opening overture. This will hopefully have been with the composer's acquiescence, though with Arnold, we gather, this was not always the case*. When Haydn attended a performance of Arnold's opera "Auld Robin Gray" he heard the music from the 'Earthquake' movement of his own Seven Last Words being used for the 'Shipwreck' music in Act II (cf Hogwood, Haydn, p.91). NG singles out No.17 of the Periodical Overtures, describing it in terms redolent of Mozart's amazement at the full complement of wind and brass that characterized the Mannheim

* Cudworth (p.36) quotes an instance where this very Overture was used as such in a performance of Handel's "Messiah".
orchestra*, and distinguished it from what he knew in Salzburg. The work, to quote NG, is "like a Sinfonia concertante - with clarinets**, horns and bassoon to contrast with the main orchestra". Though the contributor does not mention it, the work (edited by himself) appeared in a modern edition for Oxford University Press in 1973, though it is no longer in print.

The "Trios" described above and referred to both by Gerber and Schilling are the Six SONATAS for Two violins and a Bass composed by the Right Honourable THE EARL OF KELLY, published not by Preston, as in Gerber, but by Welcker in 1769. The fourth of these (as given in NG) was also published by OUP (1974), again by the contributor to NG, and this, too, is now deleted. Very recently all six have been published in a facsimile edition of the separate parts(10). A transcription into score of No.1 of the set is found in the Supplement (No.31). This was carried out for the purposes of performance in 1978 at the request of the author by Ms Susan Rennie in London. Despite the editor's comments in the OUP edition, and the pre-publication material issued by the Kings Music facsimile edition, performance has confirmed what seems apparent from the score: the title-page of the first impression makes clear that the works are for two violins. The suggestion that the first melody part may be successfully taken by a flute is open to question, especially if a one-keyed traverso is used. This is robust violinistic music, which unlike other trios of the period does not necessarily transfer well to the flute. The explicit up-beat given to the 2nd violin at the end of Bar 2 of the Minuet gives some clue as to the style of playing the Earl had in mind. Modern performers invariably decide to omit it, by analogy with the other two parts, but this may be felt not to be concordant with

* cf. Burney IV, p.582 on the same subject.

** Clarinets were in orchestral use in England as early as 1745. Cf. Cudworth, p.48.
contemporary descriptions of the effect of the Earl's music; refinement, it appears, was not what his public had come to expect of him (cf. NG and DNB):

 Loudness, rapidity, enthusiasm announce the Earl of Kelly .... While others please and amuse, it is his province to rouse and almost overset his hearers.

(Robertson's: Enquiry into the fine Arts, (p. 437 f.)

Similar sentiments were expressed also elsewhere at the time, notably by Dr. John Gregory(21) (cf. Elliott, p. 55) who admirably outlines prevailing musical taste in the 1760s, and Kelly's place in it:

The present mode is to admire a new noisy stile of composition, lately cultivated in Germany ... [it] sometimes pleases by its spirit and a wild luxuriance, which makes an agreeable variety in a concert, but possesses too little of the elegance and pathetic expression of music to remain long the public taste. The great merit of that nobleman's [Erskine's] compositions, who first introduced this species of music into this country, and his own spirited performance of them, first seduced the public ear. They are certainly much superior to any of the kind we have yet heard; though, by the delicacy of the airs in his slow movements, he displays a genius capable of shining in a much superior stile of music.

In summarizing the quality of the Earl of Kelly's music, the contributor to NG has come to the conclusion that it (or to be more precise, the early symphonies in particular) is 'structurally.
weak**, and not such that modern audiences can listen to them. This is, of course, a value judgement not only on the music, but possibly also an underestimation of the tolerance of the average concert-goer. At all events in their own time these symphonies were highly regarded "and only ousted by Haydn ... in the 1780s". The list of works given is reasonably limited to those still extant; a further list of works now lost is apparently held by the University Library in Edinburgh**. Certainly our knowledge of his music is greater than when DNB was compiled, for there we are told "the only genuine production of his that is still in existence is a fragment or two of a lyric piece entitled "The Kelso Races". Significantly, however, NG finds that he is "arguably Scotland's greatest classical composer", a judgement to which we will be returning at the end of this Chapter.

The Earl of Mornington, (1735-81)

The final Earl of this trio is Garret Wesley (or Wellesley), Earl of Mornington, an almost exact contemporary of the Earl of Kelly, though not to be found in Burney. He was born in Dublin in 1735 and died in Kensington, 1781.

His fame lies largely in the fact that he was the father of the Iron Duke of Wellington. In the original concept of this dissertation he was not included, or was destined to be mentioned en passant as a composer with too slight an output in terms of quality, quantity and variety to warrant serious inclusion. While conceding that the above judgement of his music is perhaps too harsh, gleeS and catches forming such an important part of musical

* cf. the conflicting judgement in NG's Italian counterpart given at the end of this Chapter.

** For more details of these last works cf. list at the end of this chapter.
life in this country at that time, and beyond, it was decided to include him, especially for historiographic reasons.

Of pertinence to this study is the observation made in the 9th and 10th editions of the *Oxford Companion to Music* (OCM)(22) that:

> He was a man of cool courage, for he is reputed to have been the first member of the British aristocracy who dared to walk through the London streets openly and unashamedly carrying a violin case.

This information, known to many, and now part of the folklore surrounding him, is given without reference and suppressed in its two-volume successor, the *New Oxford Companion to Music*(23) recently published.

As with the other earls in this chapter, the greater source of purely biographical information is DNB. In some ways the descriptions run parallel to that of his Scottish counterpart. We discover that:

> at nine years old he had learned to play catches on the violin, and soon afterwards able to take the second part in difficult sonatas.

Like the Earl of Kelly he became deeply involved in the music of the capital of his native country in early middle age, founding an Academy of Music in Dublin in 1757. He took his MusD at Trinity College in 1764 and became its first Professor, holding that appointment until 1774. He was elevated to the status of Earl by George III in 1760, possibly on account of his musical talents.
Ironically for a man whose fame rests to some extent at least upon the greater fame of his son, the Earl of Mornington's music, finally collected and published by Henry Bishop in 1846, had been previously prevented from appearing in published form by the Iron Duke himself, according to information given by Grove (5) but not NG.

Like Burney in praise of the Earl of Kelly, H. Bishop is reported to have assured the Duke that his father's compositions "do honour to any professor".

Characteristic of the conflicting information frequently offered by standard works of reference is the statement in NG that apart from a bowdlerisation of one particular double chant still in regular use, no church music, reportedly written by the Earl for St Patrick's Cathedral, has seemingly been found to exist. The contributor to ODM(24), published 1985, ascribes to him "church music, including a fine setting of the Burial service ...". A reference simply to such "mythical" (NG) church music, devoid of epithets, would permit us to believe that the contributor had simply resurrected incorrect information, but the insertion of the adjective "fine" allows the reader to assume that the work in question has been seen, and evaluated.

It is for glee and catches, however, that the Earl of Mornington has been remembered. The Supplement (No.32) shows the medal-winning Catch for 1777. The criteria on which such prizes were awarded is not absolutely clear*. Any idea that the prize-winning compositions were particularly meritorious may be questioned by an incident in the 19th century in respect of a prize to be awarded by the Glee Club for the best "serious glee". The following

* Some information is offered in NG in the article on J.W. Callcott. Certainly there appear to be differences in the rules of competition between the 1770s and the 1830s.
excerpt is taken from the memoirs compiled by Sir George Elvey's widow, though I have not been able to locate the source of the witty poem (p. 34 f.):

In the spring of 1836 the Glee Club in London offered a ten-guinea prize for the best serious glee, but omitted to state that only members of the club were allowed to compete. Mr. Elvey sent in a composition, "O Power Supreme," which was examined with the others on the appointed day, and pronounced the winner. When the name of the author was unfolded, however, he, not being a member of the club, was ineligible to receive the money, and the only reward he had, was being permitted to print on the title-page of his work that it was the prize composition. A few days afterwards the following amusing lines appeared:

"The funds of the Glee Club being in a condition
To afford a reward for a good composition,
The sons of Apollo in conclave agree
That ten pounds shall be giv'n for the best serious glee.
They resolve that the second-best man shall have five.
The design is proclaim'd, and the glee's are composed,
Under hieroglyphical emblems enclosed,
Sent in, and perform'd. The best glee is declared.
The party to hail the composer prepared;
And all hush'd in suspense, when, the seals being broken,
The disclosure appears a mistake to betoken!
The winner, the moment his name is detected,
Not being a member, of course is rejected.
So that out of the list, which at first numbered three,
The two standing candidates victors must be.
And this comfort they glean from the bottle thus burst,
(On the last day of April instead of the first.)
That as no rival glees will remain for the purse,
None, 'tis plain, can be better than theirs, and none worse.
The joy of the donors has likewise this zest,
That at once they reward both the worst and the best.
"Tis so in a donkey-race, where success depends more
Upon temper than speed.
To fulfil the old adage, though last, yet not least,
The prize is adjudged to the hindermost beast!"
A "Catch", as opposed to a "Glee", is a sort of round: Singer 1 sings the first verse alone, but as he moves to verse 2, the second system of the song, Singer 2 commences verse 1; when he has finished verse 1 (and Singer 1 has completed verse 2), Singer 3 enters with verse 1, etc. The song has therefore at one point as many texts as there are singers, and often the effect is to make innocuous words take on crude sexual meaning, nowhere perhaps more tellingly than in the glee "Says Sue to Prue" (Supplement No. 33). The War of Independence seems a total irrelevance to the gentlemen's clubs of London in 1777, and the glowing terms with which Robbins Landon referred earlier to the "good taste which was so much a part of fin de siècle Georgian England" are seen to be questionable indeed.

Not all of Mornington's gles and catches are in this vein. The term "glee", though denoting to us a jolly kind of piece, covered a wide emotional spectrum. The four-part glee Hail, hallowed fane "from lines written in Westminster Abbey" is a stately piece, as is the homophonic lullaby Soft sleep for ATTB. Glees are mostly, but not entirely, for male voice performance. Come fairest Nymph, for example, begins with the classically Anglican trio of ATB (lay-clerks frequently sang these "off-duty"); but at the words "Come then with pleasure at thy side" a soprano joins the male-voice trio, to provide "peace plenty, love and harmony".

Throughout the 19th century and into modern times* the Earl of Mornington's works have continued to be reprinted, and come in for praise in D. Johnson's(26) relatively recent article on the subject of the 18th century Glee.

Despite the serious musical pretentions of the compositions of the Earl of Kelly, and the sheer musical ingenuity and eccentricity of

* cf. the York Series of Anthem and Glees, published by Banks of York (Nos 136 and 430).
the Earl of Abingdon, it is the musically relatively innocuous works of the Earl of Mornington which have managed to survive, not only in terms of performance and editions, but in the esteem of the lexicographers. That the Earl of Mornington has in general found himself included in more works of reference may, at least in part, be explained by the fact that the City Glee Club has a history dating back to 1669, when it was known as the Civil Club, the name being changed with the club's reform in 1853. The "Noblemen's Glee and Catch Club" is likewise still in existence, and performs regularly for the House of Lords. Their continuing survival, and the existence of similar bodies, must surely have something to do with the persistent reappearance of the Earl's name, even in relatively small, single-volume dictionaries of music.

On purely musical grounds, one might have expected the encyclopaedists of this century to have placed the Earls of Kelly, Abingdon and Mornington in that hierarchical order, and above all for the British lexicographers at least to have included all three names in any major work of reference.

In reality the picture is different. Whereas all three composers have found their way into the German MGG (the articles in these cases being provided by English scholars, and Abingdon only as an "afterthought" in the Supplement, volume 15) our own biographers and historians have allowed nearly 200 years to elapse before Grove (5) incorporated all three. The most recent works, the New Oxford Companion to Music in two volumes (1983) and the Oxford Dictionary of Music (1985) find only Mornington worthy of entry.

Reasonably, the histories of music, from Burney onwards, have been preoccupied with mainstream music. In the case of Burney's "General History" of 1789, and the large New Oxford History of Music in numerous volumes, only the Earl of Kelly finds a mention. Abingdon in such a context is considered too eccentric, and the glees of Mornington too slight to warrant entry. In general,
Abingdon has fared least well among the English lexicographers, though by 1887, about 100 years in the wake of Burney, even Kelly in the Handbook of Musical Biography\(^{(27)}\) is dismissed simply as an "Amateur violinist and composer of moderate ability" with an incorrect date of birth of 1730. Here, too, Mornington is given a much fuller entry. The first edition of Grove symbolizes the ephemeral fame enjoyed by "Scotland's greatest classical composer" by omitting him altogether.

The history of the inclusion or omission of our trio of composing Earls in 18th century Britain is summarized in diagrammatic form below. We note that although MGG incorporated all three, it was not until Grove (5) that a British encyclopaedia did the same. The change of spelling of the Earl of Kelly's name in Grove (5) to "Kellie" (Grove 3 & 4 and NG retain the source spelling) might well lead to the assumption that he had been 'dropped', for no cross-reference is given, and the entry is to be found several pages earlier than might have been expected.

It should also be noted that although NOCM is much larger than the previous editions of OCM, and although NG is much more comprehensive and on a larger scale than previous editions of Grove, the article on Mornington is fuller in the earlier Companion, and in the case of Abingdon the article in NG is simply a slightly tidier and abbreviated version of that found nearly 25 years earlier in Grove (5). Although the initials mislead us, it is because both articles are in fact by the same author: "S.W.T:" in Grove (5) is given in the list of contributors as Simon Towneley Worsthorne, whereas the article in NG is named as by Simon Towneley. Although minor corrections have been made (the Twelve Sentimental Catches and Glees dated 1797 in Grove (5) are given an amended date of 'c.1795' in NG) and a few slight stylistic changes, the abbreviated version in NG suffers through the omission of biographical information, such as the documented references to Abingdon as a flautist.
The summary on p.142 highlights above all that if the Earl of Kelly, to quote NG again, really is "arguably Scotland's greatest classical composer", the "Oxford" works of reference have been particularly slow to recognize it. Whereas the "Companions" and "Dictionaries" have largely chosen to ignore his existence, the printed music department of Oxford University Press alone among British publishers has at least issued two works by the Earl of Kelly in conventional practical editions. More ironic still, given the proximity of Abingdon to Oxford, and the influential role played by the Earl of Abingdon in bringing Haydn to England (and inter alia the University of Oxford) is his continued omission, especially when we realize that the entry for Abingdon in MGG is contributed by the general editor at that time of the Oxford "Companion", Percy Scholes.

All three composing Earls have been better served by DNB than by its purely musical counterparts. As distinct from the musical encyclopaedias, however, DNB enters them not under their titles, but under their family names.

The Earl of Abingdon, "one of the most steady and intrepid assertors of liberty in this age" appears in Vol.II, p.410 f., under BERTIE, Willoughby. Unlike the entries for Kelly and Mornington, no reference is made at all to him as a musician or composer. The entry does, however, confirm the implication made earlier that he is likely to have been a supporter of the French Revolution (and opposed to the war with America).

Summary

In terms of their relationship with mainstream music of their own time, we see that the main figures discussed in this chapter present a varied and complex picture. Duchess Anna Amalia of Weimar converted her provincial Saxon Court into a cultural oasis. The very presence of Goethe and Schiller at the court attest her literary taste and interest. The picture is more confusing in relation to music. Her Court composer Wolf, like the town organist Eylenstein, can at best be described as worthy provincial musical figures, but not household names in the history or evolution of music. Yet, from one source or another, the Duchess did acquire sufficient expertise to produce in the Sonatina in G and in her setting of Erwin und Elmire two substantial works which to some small degree have managed to establish for themselves enduring quality.

For all that, we have no documentary evidence of any substantial interaction with wider musical contexts outside the confines of her own court, though her openness to musical developments is indirectly hinted at by her early use of the clarinet in two works, and also by her apparent attempts to have Erwin und Elmire published by Breitkopf. Her skill as an orchestrator, as verified by the song Das Veilchen in Erwin und Elmire and in the Sonatina, is remarkable for a dilettante of such wide interests, and her style - despite Friedländer's comparison with Handel's "Messiah" - is unequivocally post-Baroque, and much more akin to Johann Christian Bach, an idiom which demands more than mere grammatical accuracy to achieve anything like an acceptable end-product. Encyclopaedists from Gerber onwards have done her disservice by creating such confusion between her compositions and those of other noble ladies of differing times and places but of similar name. That confusion, coupled with the archival error at source over the identification of the keyboard part to the Sonatina, has meant that until recent times (notably MGG) lack of clarity as to whether one
or two works are extant has led to this genuine work being tacitly omitted from the latest written account of her work, namely the entry in NG. This was presumably for reasons of unsubstantiated caution, since there is no source evidence to suggest that it might be spurious.

Different problems arise in our assessment of Frederick Lewis, the Prince of Wales. No encyclopaedia refers to him as a composer, though his involvement in the operatic life of London in the 1730s is well documented. Unlike opera in Vienna or Prague at the time of the Habsburg Emperors Leopold or Joseph, which was intended primarily for the consumption of the Court and its invited guests, opera in London was, theoretically at least, a public matter. In fact, in practice, the clientele for Italian opera, vernacular opera (often described as "Musical Entertainments"), musical concerts and theatrical performances were socially differentiated, opera in the grand style being still the domain of a ruling, though not exclusively aristocratic class. The choice of title for the rival enterprise to Handel's operatic productions, namely the Opera of the Nobility, indicates the social class of the opera audience in London in the earlier decades of the 18th century.

Frederick Lewis remains a musical enigma, such that the unwillingness of a musical Establishment to view him at all as a composer, in the total absence of any worthwhile contemporary references to him in that capacity, is understandable.

But the fact remains that at least two works clearly stating him as their author do exist in early 18th century manuscript form. The work identified by the present writer as a political and not a pastoral cantata, an "occasional" work manifestly intended to mark the birthday of Crown Prince Ferdinand of Spain, is a work of considerable musical substance and historical importance. The discrepancies within the source material, in the conflicting readings of the score and the bundle of parts, only heighten the
enigma and do not detract from the work's intrinsic merits. Likewise the identification of probably the first song cycle in the 5 Canzonets after Metastasio makes our ignorance of Frederick Lewis as a composer all the more regrettable.

The Prince's almost total neglect by the "Republic of Music", both in his own time and in our own, is arguably the result of his personal unpopularity, and also a somewhat less adulatory regard for the monarchy in this country than elsewhere in Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries. Certainly, if merit alone decided, both the Cantata and the Canzonets would have been found worthy of publication, and due reference to Frederick Lewis as a composer would have been made, at some stage or other, in the major works of reference.

As we have seen in the case of the composing Earls of Kelly, Abingdon and Mornington, and as is shown in table form on pp. 148f, the intrinsic value of their music in terms of compositional competence, innovatory interest or even substance is not reflected pro rata in terms of encyclopaedic entries or modern editions. Nor even is national pride seen to be a factor, given that all three fare at least as well, in some cases better, in other European works of reference.

All three in different ways reflect, however, an involvement with the burgeoning middle-class musical activities of their time. Kelly and Mornington were key figures in the musical life of Edinburgh and Dublin respectively, and Abingdon was deeply involved in the entrepreneurial aspects of public (i.e. well-to-do middle class and upper class) concert-life in London during the latter decades of the 18th century - musical activity which had its roots outside, and functioned autonomously from, the life of the Court of George III.
In the case of the Earl of Kelly, confusion of identity with Michael Kelly from Gerber onwards has meant that our picture of him has only begun to achieve sharpness of focus in relatively recent times, most notably in NG. In very recent months the contributor to NG, Dr. David Johnson of the University of Edinburgh, has discovered a new manuscript source, containing several hitherto unknown works by the Scottish Earl, in a collection containing other compositions identifiably by Sammartini. These 16 new chamber works, it is stated, "change the received view of Kelly considerably". Dr. Johnson addressed the Royal Musical Association on the subject of "the Kilravock Manuscript: New Light on the Compositions of the Earl of Kelly", in November 1989, and hopes to publish information on these new findings in due course, thus deepening and expanding our knowledge of an important musical figure.

cf. inventory overleaf.
Inventory of works in the Kilravock Manuscript not identified by November 1989 as being by other than the Earl of Kelly:

1. **DUETTO** (E) No designation - Andantino - Tempo di Minuetto
2. **QUARTO** (No 2) (C) Allegro - Andante - Minuetto
3. **QUARTO** (No 3) (B♭) Allegro - Andante ma non molto - Presto
4. **QUARTO** (No 4) (E) Spiritoso - Andante ma non molto - Tempo di Minuetto
5. **QUARTO** (No 5) (A) Spiritoso - Andante - Allegro
6. **TRIO** (No 2) (A) Allegro spiritoso - Largo poco Adagio con Grandezza - Presto
7. **TRIO** (No 3) (c minor) Presto - Andante - Presto
8. **TRIO** (No 4) (F) Andante ma non troppo - Allegro spiritoso - Tempo di Minuetto
9. **TRIO** (No 5) (B♭) Largo - Allegro - Minuetto giacoso
10. **TRIO** (No 6) (g minor) Allegro moderato - Adagio maestoso - Minuetto
11. **TRIO** (No 7) (A) Andante con Temerizzo - Allegro - Minuetto
12. **TRIO** (No 8) (C) Andante grazioso - Fuga Allegro - Tempo di Minuetto
13. **TRIO** (No 9) (G) Andante - /Ala breve/
14. **QUARTO** (No 7) (E♭) Allegro - Andante - Minuetto moderato
15. **QUARTO** (No 8) (c minor) Allegro - Andante - Allegro
16. **QUARTO** (No 9) (A) Allegro molto - Adagio - Minuet

The above inventory was kindly placed at my disposal prior to publication elsewhere by Dr D. Johnson. All the works in the Manuscript were checked against DDT Folge 2: Die Mannheimer Symphoniker, and Eugene WOLF: The Symphonies of Johann Stamitz, 1981.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Abingdon</th>
<th>Kelly</th>
<th>Mornington</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burney: A General History</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Vol. IV</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook of Musical Biography</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>2 lines on Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove (1)</td>
<td>1878-89</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove (2)</td>
<td>1904-10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>includes biographical and musical source references not given elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove (3) (4)</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>&quot;Kelly&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove (5)</td>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>&quot;Kellie&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCM (2)</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCM (9) &amp; (10)</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>&quot;Kelly&quot; (plus portrait)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concise ODM (2)</td>
<td>1964-66²</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOCM</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>&quot;Kelly&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCM</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Oxford History of Music</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Vol. 7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>questionable musical example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Mornington</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart</td>
<td>1947-57</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>Abingdon in Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algemene Muziekencyclopedie (Antwerp &amp; Amsterdam)</td>
<td>'1957</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopédie de la Musique (Paris)</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Kellie' Thomas Lord Pittenwee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Musicien irlandais&quot;!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portrait (following page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enciclopedia della Musica</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>entry</td>
<td>'Kellie' vide 'Sinfonia'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Vol. IV, p. 225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;allievo di Stamitz e provviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>di un senso chiaro della forma&quot;*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mornington vide: Dublino</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = pupil of Stamitz, possessing a clear sense of form. This seems rather at variance with the judgement made in NG as discussed earlier in the chapter.
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CHAPTER 4

THE MUNICH-DRESDEN CONNECTION

Introduction

In the previous chapter we saw how Dr Burney's "General History" has helped to preserve the Earl of Kelly from oblivion. Cynics may observe that as a fellow-member of the cryptic guild of composers, The Temple of Apollo, the said Earl was bound to receive preferential treatment. Arguably Abingdon and Mornington might also have warranted at least passing mention, which they might well have received, had they also been members; but they were not (and were probably too dilettante to have been even considered for membership).

Dr Burney's judgements tend, on the whole, towards the generous, but we cannot accuse him of total lack of integrity. In his favourable assessment of the music of Karl Friedrich Abel (Vol. IV, p. 680 / Mercer, p. 1018 f) we see praise tempered with reservation - and a further reference to the Earl of Kelly, establishing some degree of friendship between them:

I have heard him modulate in private on his six-stringed base with such practical readiness and depth of science, as astonished the late Lord Kelly and Bach [= J.C.Bach] as much as myself.

That "General History" was preceded by Burney's famous "Tours"(2) to France, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands, whose purpose was to glean information for the subsequent historical work. Here, too, Burney's enthusiasm and diplomacy seem at times to put his judgement in question, though it may well be that he is expressing genuine aesthetic reactions that to our surprise do not quite accord with our own.

The German translation of the first edition in fact challenged some of his observations and "corrected" them for home
consumption.

That German public will have found no cause for criticism of his account of his visit to Munich, and his thoroughly positive assessment of two members of the Wittelsbach dynasty: the Elector Maximilian III Joseph, the Well-beloved' (1727-77), the last of the line of Wittelsbach Bavarian Electors, his successor being Karl Theodor of Mannheim fame (himself the end of the Sulzbach line of the Wittelsbach dynasty), and the elder sister of the above Max III Joseph, Maria Antonia Walpurgis (1724-80), for some time Electress of Saxony. The complicated genealogy of the family is well laid out in the Tafeln I-XII in the Appendix between pp 375-412 of Prince Adalbert's (1) admirable family history referred to in Chapter 2. The Electoral line is given in Tafel VII.

Max III Joseph was discussed earlier in reference to the gallichon, and we will return to him later. Meanwhile we will concentrate on Burney's visit to Munich, where he met both the Elector and his sister, and on the music ascribed to Maria Antonia Walpurgis. Prior to meeting the electoral siblings, Burney had met a Polish Prince by the name of Sapieha, who was staying at the same inn. This apparently musical young man discussed with Burney Polish folk music, and even gave him "two or three Polonoises" of his own composition, but these (cf Scholes, loc. cit., p. 58 f) are not extant.

Maria Antonia Walpurgis, Electress of Saxony

The opera Talestri

Burney's visit to Munich coincided, it appears, with rehearsals for an imminent performance of Maria Antonia's opera Talestri. The fame of this remarkable lady, who tried her hand at poetry and painting as well as composing, rests primarily on the two operas Il Trionfo della Fedeltà, published by Breitkopf in the mid-1750s, and Talestri, Regina delle Amazzoni, published by Breitkopf in 1765, though the work was first performed about five years earlier in Munich.
Burney's opening small talk (cf Scholes, p. 90) revealed a further talent of Maria Antonia: her ability not only to read and write English (a daily pursuit, she maintained) but also to speak it, though having learned from an Irishman, she had acquired (to quote Burney) "a vicious pronunciation" that "made it impossible for her to speak well"! Burney then turned small talk to more serious matters by informing her "that I had seen a great work, in England, meaning her opera of Talestri in which she had united those arts which had so long been separated".

Was Burney telling the truth: had he seen Talestri in England? The opera was not published until 1765, and Burney was speaking in August 1772, having spent some time travelling. He may, of course, have heard the overture, since it was published in London, c 1770, under the name of 'Princess Royal of Saxony' (copy in BL). However, neither The London Stage (3) nor catalogue entries for printed opera libretti in the BL can provide any clue as to where and when Burney will have heard the opera. Either he was lying, but could speak with first hand knowledge of the opera, having attended a rehearsal at the Nymphenburg, or he had attended a performance not publicised by the London press, or at a venue outside London.

In his earlier account of her operas (cf Scholes, p. 46) Burney referred to them as "much admired all over Germany, where they have frequently been performed" with no reference to previous first hand knowledge of them in London. It would seem strange, however, for Burney to have felt the need to be untruthful in the matter, for he might have been asked under what circumstances the opera had been performed in England. It may well be that he will have seen it in a private production, possibly under the auspices of the enigmatic "Temple of Apollo". Maria Antonia was herself a member of the "Arcadian Society" in Rome, and her two operas are published under cryptic pseudonymous initials: E.T.P.A. = Ermelinda Talea, Pastorella Arcada.

* The most recent source of information, namely Dr Simon McVeigh's database Calendar of London Concerts 1750-1800 (Goldsmiths College, London University) confirms the performance of an unnamed Overture by the "Princess Dowager of Saxony" in London in May, 1766 (Sept. 1790).
Amusingly, this has led to her entry into the catalogues of the BL (including the most recent music catalogue) as A., E.T.P., under which heading copies of the scores of Il Trionfo della Fedeltà and Talestri are to be found, with an explanation of the initials as pertaining to the pseudonym of "Mary Antonia Walpurgis of Bavaria, Consort of Frederick Christian, Elector of Saxony". Printed copies for performances of the two works in Dresden (1754) and Munich (1760) are also housed in the BL.

Il Trionfo della Fedeltà and problems of authenticity

Whether or not Talestri had been performed in England within five years or so of its publication, the fame of her first opera, Il Trionfo della Fedeltà (Leipzig, 1754), had reached Paris in a matter of months. The Journal Étranger (copy in BL) published in its May edition 1755 (pp 128-137) a lengthy description of the work, not from a performance, it would appear, (though the review is included under the heading SPECTACLES) but from the beautifully printed score "A Leipsick, chez Breitkof" (sic).

The final page of the review in the Journal Étranger summarises its enthusiastic reception thus: (translation)

In place of a short extract from this enchanting poem one would need to give a complete translation of it, to impart all its beauty. Purity of language, elegance, charm of the poetry, all are found united there. Is it the work of Metastasio, or some other celebrated Italian poet? One would doubtless assume it, if one were not aware that in this century more than one Prince, not content with protecting the Sciences and Arts, has been pleased to cultivate them. The Princess Royal and Electoral of Saxony, who writes poetry as a pastime, composed this Pastorale for her own chamber theatre (= le Théâtre de ses petits appartemens): but that is not all - she also set it to music.

The review ends with a promise (fulfilled in part in January 1756) of a sampler of some of the music ('quelques Ariett.') in due course.
One of the arias singled out for discussion is Clori's Aria: *Si, sperar tu solar puoi*, to be found in facsimile in the Supplement (No. 34). This appeared in the January edition of the *Journal Étranger* 1756 as the only musical example from the opera.

In mentioning the name of Metastasio the reviewer in the *Journal Étranger* of 1755 was unwittingly raising a sensitive and unresolved issue. Correspondence with Count Heinrich von Brühl, (cf Fürstenau[4], op. cit., p. 193 ff) makes clear in Fürstenau's words, that both Metastasio and Hasse "had an important hand in the game". Two major monographs have appeared on Maria Antonia Walpurgis: Weber's[5] two-volume account of her life and works, and in more recent times a doctoral thesis by Heinz Drewes[6]. Since Drewes' work is specifically about Maria Antonia as a composer, greater emphasis is laid here on its findings and observations, many of which relate to other literature produced by Fürstenau[7] in less accessible form.

In her utterances to Burney during his visit, the Electress spoke with pride of her compositions, saying that whereas her brother was modest about his compositions, she was at pains when she had produced a work "to have it known, as the birth of a legitimate child; and had, accordingly printed and published her two operas in score". In correspondence with Frederick the Great she likewise referred to the operas as having been written and composed by herself, so that Frederick in his letter of April 29th, 1763, could speak of "deux operas dont elle a fait les paroles et la musique". Rudhart[8] in his standard work on the opera in Munich (op. cit., p. 144 ff) gives a résumé of that correspondence. It makes clear that the text completed by Maria Antonia in 1749 (not 1759, as he gives in error) was massively revised by Metastasio, much to the distress of the Electress:
Metastasio l'a cruellement mutilé, il n'en a pas laissé un seul de mes airs dont je voudrais pleurer et ce qu'il y a de pis, c'est qu'il l'a changé de façon, que quant on le voudrait, on ne pourrait y mettre mes airs.

(Translation: Metastasio has butchered it so cruelly, and has not left untouched any single one of my Arias, so that I could weep. What is worse, he has changed things in such a way that one could no longer use my Arias, even if one wanted to.)

The authoress's distress is matched by Count von Brühl's indignation on her behalf:

Je suis veritablement fâché contre Metastasio d'avoir si terriblement renversé votre ouvrage et vous me feriez un bien sensible plaisir, si vous m'en envoyiez votre original.

(Translation: I am really angry with Metastasio for having made such savage changes to your work. I would be most grateful if you would send me your original.)

Brühl had wanted the libretto to send it to the composer Hasse, who was at that time in Paris "pour qu'il puisse d'abord commencer à travailler à Paris" (transl.: so that he can start working on it in Paris). Various questions arise that neither Rudhart, Weber nor Drewes have satisfactorily answered: What hand in the opera was Hasse precisely supposed to have? It seems at first as if the distribution of roles was primarily what Brühl and Maria Antonia had in mind. Earlier, however, the Count had written:

Le Sr Hasse ne tient pas encore la pastorale, qui est si divinement bien fait et Metastasio l'a encore entre ses mains ... Il serait bien dommage si la composition ne répondit pas bien à la poésie.

(Translation: Signor Hasse is not holding on to the Pastorale, that is divinely well done, and Metastasio has it in his hands again ... It would indeed be a shame if the music were not to turn out as well as the words.)

Obviously he could not have made the above comment if the Electress were intending to compose the music herself.

Of all the reactions to this confused situation, Rudhart (cf loc. cit., p. 146) gives perhaps the least satisfactory response. After quoting extensively from Weber (loc. cit., p. 66 f.) he concludes: (translation)
In the above we have expressed our misgivings about the authorship of the music to the Pastoralæ, but in so doing it is not our intention to steal one leaf from Maria Antonia's laurel wreath. We assume that she did contribute something, perhaps the melodies that will need to have been arranged for the orchestra, or that Hasse merely revised the instrumentation, going over the score and making the music compatible with the changes to the text effected by Metastasio.

Such a response is clearly unconvincing, for if the Electress' contribution was so small as perhaps only the melodies, then Maria Antonia's efforts to impress her peers with her musical and poetic expertise are seen as calculated fraud, making inter alia Burney's glowing praise quite meaningless.

The correspondence with Brühl unfortunately seems to break off at the very moment when the seeds of doubt have been sown, without clarifying crucial information, and allowing assumptions to be made without further question.

We assume, for instance, that the text to the published opera, as finally performed 1753-54 (there is some disagreement over the date of the first performance) is the Electress' text as revised by Metastasio. Since, however, no public recognition is given to the part played by Metastasio, then the possibility still remains that Maria Antonia rejected his butchering of her poetry, grew tired of waiting for Hasse, and did compose the full score herself.

Drewes' dissertation (op. cit.) sets out by means of comparative analysis to establish the extent of Hasse's influence on Maria Antonia, assuming that she is the real author of the two operas. His conclusion (ibid., p. 117) reads in translation as follows:

Our investigation leads us therefore to the conclusion that the "Trionfo della Fedeltà" and "Talestri, Regina delle Amazzoni" are operas of considerable stature. To the question whether or not they stem from Maria Antonia Walpurgis herself, the reply is affirmative. As proof one may offer, in addition to certain compositional solecisms, other typical examples of dilettantism, especially in the
Symphonies. It is possible that the secco recitatives, although they do not modulate much, deserve well and may have been written or revised by a professional composer. We may assume one of her teachers in composition, primarily Hasse, traces of whose influence may be found in the instrumentation. We come to understand the composer's modesty when talking to Burney, saying: "We who are only Dilettanti, can never expect to equal masters; for, with the same genius, we want application and experience".

As with the opera Trionfo della Fedeltà, the second opera Talestri has certain question marks against it. Its first performance in Dresden was August 24th, 1763. Rudhart, (p. 144) gives 1762, but the correspondence with Frederick the Great in 1763 confirms this as a misprint. The Electress herself sang the title-role. She studied singing under Porpora, but Burney's description of her singing when they met in Munich (and when she sang a scene from Talestri to him) is as full of excuses for her as of praise.

The text for the opera was written by Maria Antonia as early as 1753 (the very time at which the Trionfo della Fedeltà was performed in Dresden). She sent a copy of the libretto to her mother, former Empress Amalia, in Munich. Her reaction to it is interesting, though commentators have accepted it at its face value (cf Rudhart, p. 143):

"I find the opera not bad for a first attempt, though some lines seem rather unaccustomed and harsh to me. Your poetry and inventions in the oratorio about St. Augustine are much more pleasing and natural to us."

Was the mother really unaware of the fact that her daughter had already written one opera libretto, namely the Trionfo della Fedeltà (certainly

* Note on this subject Burney's judgement of Talestri that the "recitative was well written".
its recent performance in Dresden will have made it topical? Or is there an implication that this time the Electress was writing the whole thing herself without the professional assistance of Metastasio, whose involvement in the previous libretto was disruptive, to put it mildly?

A score in Munich gives Ferrandini as the composer, but in this case at least we can rule that professional out as the guiding or operative hand, for Ferrandini did himself set Talestri to music, and we may assume that the copyist simply confused the authors of the two completely different settings.

Among the principals in the first, as usual private, performance in Dresden was the very Count Brühl who had given such moral support to Maria Antonia over her earlier libretto (cf Fürstenau, loc. cit. (4), p. 369). Burney later met the Count and spoke highly of him. Vocal works by (later?) members of his family are housed in DStB/KHb (cf list given in the Postscriptum of this thesis). The young Prince Anton, of whom we spoke in Chapter 2, drawing attention to his immense output as a composer, also had a walk-on part at the first performance.

The modesty spoken of earlier by Drewes as an attribute of Maria Antonia was again not apparent in her desire to impress her peers. The Electress sent a copy of the libretto to Empress Maria Theresia, and the King of Prussia was appraised of the event in a letter of August 28th, 1763. Other works possibly by Maria Antonia Walpurgis

On the question of the authorship of other works ascribed to the Electress, Drewes is much less affirmative, though mildly contradictory. In principle he appears to rule out any works for which she did not herself write the words (cf loc. cit., p. 115):

We do not know whether the Electress set texts by others to music. The words of all dubious compositions are not written by her.
Two pages later Drewes states more specifically:

Apart from the operas, only the 29 Arias and no others may be considered as possible compositions of Maria Antonia. These follow a tri-partite scheme and also are characterized by compositional simplicity, even at times lack of expertise. In the case of all the other "questionable works" they must be rejected on stylistic grounds.

A footnote gives the shelf number at the Sächsische Landesbibliothek in Dresden (DDR), and describes them as being scored for "voice and harpsichord". Comparison with the Verzeichnis given on p. 119 finds them there described as: D7 IIlp Arie (29) a Sopr. con strm.

Our attention is then drawn to the fact that above the first aria the words have been added "Maria Antonia Princ. Bav", with Drewes' comment (transl.): "This is the only reason why the composition of these arias has been ascribed to the Electress". The stylistic reason given above is not reiterated.

Drewes does not make clear that the two preceding entries in his Verzeichnis, D7 IIk/m Arie (6) a Sopr. con strm (score and three part-books) are described as being:

Sei Arie / La Poesia e la musica è di S.A.R. la Principe Maria Antonia E.T.P.A.

Assuming the ascription to be correct, even by Drewes' expectation that only vocal works in which both words and music are by the Electress, these arias qualify at least for consideration as authentic works by Maria Antonia Walpurgis. The first of these is given in the Supplement (No 35). The current shelf number is Mus 3119-F-11, and the ascription is made
by hand of Fürstenau. The original score was in Munich, so that it would seem likely that these are early works, dating before her marriage to the Dresden Elector in 1747, if indeed they are genuine.

The entry on Maria Antonia in Schilling is a catalogue of errors and misprints. Her death is dated 1782 instead of 1780. The setting of her oratorio text *La Conversione di S. Agostino* is attributed to Hesse (who was a gamba player at the Prussian Court) instead of Hasse. Among the works listed is an occasional *Licenza* (1767) that is certainly spurious and mis-dated. The score of Talestri, we are told, did not appear until 1805, which is incorrect by at least 40 years. Burney was supposed to have heard her in "1722" (!) and was then delighted by her performance of a whole scene from *Il Trionfo* (whereas he himself was under the impression that it was Talestri). We are also informed that she composed a great deal, only a fraction of which has become known.

**Elector Maximilian III Joseph**

The Electress' younger brother, the Bavarian Elector Max III Joseph fares rather better in Schilling than she does. Again facts are gleaned from Gerber and Burney, and "imaginatively" expanded, to provide information that no longer completely accords with the source material. From Gerber's statement that the Elector played violin, violoncello and viola da gamba, and Burney's description of the concert in the Nymphenburg, at which the Elector played first the violin, then to Burney's delight, the viola da gamba, comes a distorted conflation, informing us that he played the violoncello then the gamba in Burney's presence, though we find no reference to him playing the violoncello during either of Burney's visits.
The entry in Gerber (2) reads in translation as follows:

Maximilian Joseph, Elector of Bavaria, born March 28th 1728;
was not only an amateur and connoisseur of music, but himself
a virtuoso and composer. His excellent taste guided him in
choosing the finest singers and players for his service, but
also the finest music to be heard in his church, chamber and
theatre. He himself played as ripieno violinist and
violoncellist, and as a master on the gamba. Burney heard him
in 1772 and assures that one did not need to be a great Prince
to find his dexterity, his performance of an Adagio and his
rhythmic precision excellent.

The date of birth given is inaccurate: he was born in 1727. Burney's
words are, however, somewhat distorted in the final sentence. I quote
below from the two separate paragraphs to which that last sentence
refers (Scholes, p. 51):

After this the Elector played one of Schwindl's trios on his
Viol da gamba, charmingly. Except Mr Abel, I have never heard
so fine a player on that instrument; his hand is firm and
brilliant, his taste and expression are admirable, his
steadiness in time, such as a Dilettanti is seldom possessed of.

The concert concluded with another piece, performed by the
Elector, with still more taste and expression than the first,
especially the Adagio. I could not praise it sufficiently;
it would really have been thought excellently well performed,
if, instead of a great prince, he had been a musician by
profession. I could only tell his highness, that I was
astonished as much as if I had never heard before how great
a performer he was.

So much for the Elector's prowess as a performer. What of him as a
composer? Since Burney (ibid.):

had been informed by all the musicians of this place, that
he had composed several excellent things for the church,
particularly, a Stabat Mater: he agreed to give me a Litany,
provided I would not print it. But Guadigni quite teased
him to let me have the Stabat Mater, as he said it was the
best of all his musical productions; and even a promise of
this was granted before my departure.

...
Both these compositions were transcribed for me, after I left Munich, and delivered to M. de Visme, by whose care and kindness they have since been transmitted to me in London.

At the second visit by Burney to the Nymphenburg the Elector's reluctance to part company with a copy of his Stabat Mater was made more explicit:

I went again to court at Nymphenburg, before my departure, and was again honoured by the notice of the Elector and his sister, and obtained a reiterated promise from both of a piece of music of their composition. The Elector at first made some difficulty, lest I should publish it; as his Stabat Mater had been stolen, and printed at Verona, without his permission, and would have been published, had not his highness purchased the plates, and the whole impression; but upon my assuring him that without licence I should never make any other use of the piece, with which he should honour me, than to enrich my collection of scarce and curious compositions, he was pleased to give orders for its being transcribed.

Whatever work, if any, the Electress of Saxony gave to Burney, we shall never know, for, like the two works mentioned above, they have apparently not survived in this country. Likewise the gamba sonatas by Kröner (whose violin-playing was not perhaps to Burney's liking) who, according to Rudhart (cf Eitner, p. 111 and Rudhart, p. 130) delivered sonatas by the dozen to the Elector, appear to have disappeared from the face of the earth. There are many musical members of the Kröner family. Confusingly Rudhart (ibid.) refers to a Karl von Kröner as the man who mass-produced the gamba solos. Eitner (ibid.) refers to him as Franz, but concedes on the following page that there is confusion between him and a Franz Karl von Croener. The BL in London has a set of six trios (2 violins and a bass) by a Sigm. Croner, but these seem to be rather earlier works, most likely by Franz Ferdinand (cf Eitner, ibid.)
who travelled widely, including in this country. The fugal second movement of the third sonata smacks more of the 1740s than the 1760s and later.

The pirate publication of the Stabat Mater foiled* by the Elector was not the only occasion on which his music was published in Verona. In 1763 the Accademia Filamonic published a set of 4 Symphonies by Max III Joseph, entitled:

Concerti / Dell' Altezza Serenissima / DI MASSIMILIANO GIUSEPPE / Duca ed Elettore di Baviera / etc etc etc / a piu Istrumenti Cioe ....

They are scored for strings (the violas dividing on occasion), oboes, corni da caccia, with flutes and trumpets in some symphonies, but not all, and in the keys of D, D, G, D. They are characterized by vigorous violin parts, with abundant multiple stoppings in the Allegro movements, and frequent rapid alternation of forte and piano markings (as in the central Andante to Symphony No. 4).

In the Sächsische Landesbibliothek in Dresden (where his works have survived, though not, strangely, in Munich**) is a manuscript survival, a symphony in D major. This looks less impressive than those works in the Verona publication, the instrumentation being limited to strings and two horns, and none of the three movements (Marche; Allegro - Andante - Minuet and Trio) displaying any real powers of invention. The shelf

* In fact the work was printed. RISM M 1454 f. give three copies of it, (Verona, 1766), in one instance 'sine loco & sine nomine'. It may be, given the location of these surviving scores in Munich and Dresden that they were privately made from the plates by the Elector himself.

** apart from the Stabat Mater.
number is Mus. 3261-N-1, and the title page reads:


Handwritten against the Violino Primo is 'flauti' and against Alto Viola 'fagotto', indications of legitimate performance practice in the question of ripieno instrumentation.

Eitner listed twelve Trios for Violini e Basso as also held by the SLb in Dresden. On enquiry in 1980 all of these except No. 9 in Bb were said to be war losses. In the Suppl. (No. 36) the author's transcription into score of the three individual parts may be found. Happily, in that same year, the remaining 11 came to light again. Of particular interest is No. 7, again in Bb. In the central Adagio the two violins both play virtually incessant double- or multiple-stopped parts, with the rapid alternation of forte and piano described above in the Verona symphonies. The opening movement of Trio No. 7 is also characterized by demi-semiquaver flourishes in all three parts. The cover to each of these trios has a deleted reference to a score; either one once existed and has subsequently disappeared, or the copyist was simply correcting an error. They have survived only in the three separate parts, and it is in that form that No. 7 is given in the Supplement (No 37).

It is a shade ironic that of these two composers, it is the sister, the Electress of Saxony, Maria Antonia Walpurgis, whose name as a composer persists, for as we have seen, some room for doubt must exist as to the extent to which she herself wrote the works. With Elector Max III Joseph,
who was altogether more retiring about his talents, no such doubts seem to exist, though no monograph or doctoral thesis has devoted itself to his works.

Concordant Sources of works by Maria Antonia Walpurgis

In the BL is a collection of six "Overtures" (g. 474 (7)), comprising works, presumably mostly symphonies (the terms were largely interchangeable at that time) by Stamitz, Haydn, Vanhal and Mysliveček, compiled by the composer Kambel. No. 4 in the set is by the "Princess Royal of Saxony". Although one might have hoped that this was the missing symphony in 10 parts by Princess Amalia of Saxe-Gotha (though at the time of publication, c. 1770, she would have been not yet twenty years of age) referred to in Chapter 3, it turns out to be the Overture to Talestri by Maria Antonia. The catalogue of the BL assumes, correctly, the Saxon Electress and lists the work under Maria Antonia, but has not identified its provenance. Likewise under her name is a Raccolta delle megliore Sinfonie di piu celebri Compositori di nostro tempo, Accomodate all'Clavicembalo (Leipzig, 1761).

Sinfonia II of the Raccolta 1 is an arrangement of the overture to Il Trionfo della Fedeltà for harpsichord solo, the three movements (Allegro - Andantino grazioso - Presto) according with those of the opening overture to the opera. Sinfonia I "da S.M. il Re di Prussia" turns out to be a similar arrangement for solo harpsichord of what is now known as the 3rd Symphony of Frederick the Great, and persistently inaccurately referred to as the overture to Il Re pastore. The final movement attached to Frederick's overture in this source is a Vivace "da Sign G.A.H." (i.e. Hasse).
The publication either in arranged form or as an autonomous symphony of both the opera overtures published under the name of E.T.P.A. is some indication of their popularity. As mentioned earlier, it is not inconceivable that Burney will have heard the overture to Talestri as a result prior to leaving for Germany, and knowledge of publication will have allowed him to speak of their current popularity in Germany. In this century the American composer Quinto Maganini adapted and arranged both overtures to form a "Triumphal March on themes from 'The Queen of the Amazons' and the 'Triumph of Fidelity' by Princess (sic!) Maria Antonia Walpurgis of Saxony" in a Suite for orchestra published in 1939, entitled "The Royal Ladies". The first movement, "Fête champêtre", is based on a song by Marie Antoinette, the second movement, "Threnody", derives from Anne Boleyn, and the concluding March from Maria Antonia's opera scores.

**Burney's retrospective observations**

Burney certainly believed Maria Antonia to be the composer of the operas ascribed to her. In the "General History" compiled on his return he writes in glowing terms of both the Bavarian Elector and his sister. A hand-written "Souvenir" in the score of Talestri in the BL summarizes what Burney wrote (cf Vol. IV., p. 580* f.):

> In Dr Burney's History of Music we read, that the late Electress Dowager of Saxony, when her time was no longer occupied by cares of State, applied herself wholly to the Study of the fine Arts; that travelling at one time to Italy, she there not only wrote two serious Drama's in the Italian Language Viz ....

> ... but set them both herself to music ....

> It further appears, that Singing had been taught this most extraordinary Princess by Porpora, and the Principles of

* Mercer, p. 944.
Composition by Hasse; that afterwards she really both Sang and Composed in such a manner, as did honor to those great Masters, as well as her own genius and application.

Apart from the assertion that the two operas were composed in Italy, the above is a faithful account of what Burney believed. Had Naumann whispered to him in private that Maria Antonia were not the real composer of Talestri, the opera he was currently rehearsing in Munich, then Burney would certainly not have made subsequent mention of her in this manner.

As it is, his visit to Munich and the meeting with these two electoral personnages seems to have had a profound effect upon him. Any belief that sycophancy inspired his initial reaction to Max III Joseph's virtuosity on the viola da gamba is dispelled by his subsequent description of the event (cf "History" IV, p. 679 / Mercer, p. 1020):

> Since the death of the late Elector of Bavaria, who next to Abel was the best performer of the viola da gamba I had ever heard, the instrument seems laid aside.

This praise is all the greater when we consider that Burney had also heard the legendary Anton Lidl (albeit Lidl was playing the baryton, an instrument that singularly failed to impress Burney, as being "expedient in a desert place or even in a house, where there is but one musician", but redundant in a city with no shortage of musicians to play an accompaniment, rather than battle with the instrument to provide both solo and bass parts).

Unfortunately Burney makes no reference to Hesse, the great virtuoso in Berlin, whom presumably he did not manage to hear performing at Sanssouci.

It is not only as a performer that Burney finds Max III Joseph worthy of praise; he sums him up (ibid., p.583) as:

> not only an excellent performer on the viola da gamba, but a good composer.

More significantly, in the Chapter of his "General History" devoted to German Dilettanti, Burney, having at the outset
given pride of place to "His late Majesty the King of Prussia", is suddenly reminded of his visit to Munich, and the scores given him, under some duress, by the Bavarian Elector. He interpolates an additional tribute, all the more telling because it implies a favourable comparison with the works of the Prussian monarch (cf Mercer, p. 962):

To the late ELECTOR of BAVARIA and his sister the late ELECTRICE DOWAGER of SAXONY, I have already paid my respects; yet it is but justice to the memory of that prince to say, that upon a late examination of the score of an entire mass* for four voices, with instrumental accompaniments, of his composition, of which his serene highness honoured me with a copy, I find the design and composition much superior to the generality of dilettante productions.

Summary

Setting aside the questions of authenticity that remain unresolved in the case of Maria Antonia Walpurgis, we see in these two dilettante composers a turning point in the relationship between composing aristocrats of high rank and the outside world of music.

The Bavarian Elector's reticence to allow his performing skills to delight the ears of others than those specifically invited, represents a norm. Likewise his extreme unwillingness to have his compositional efforts exposed to the critical gaze of a wider public is characteristic of the posture of the higher echelons of aristocratic composers. His compositional models, too, reflect the utter introversion of many such dilettanti. Whichever member of the Cröner family it was who churned out chamber sonatas for him "by the dozen", he was certainly not a major musical luminary, involved in any way with the evolution of music, at a time when mainstream music was at an exciting period of transition, moving from the late Baroque to the "new music" typified by the Mannheim school, and so avidly taken up, inter alia, by the Earl of Kelly. Indeed,

*Presumably not a "Mass", but the promised Stabat Mater or even the Litany.
the Elector's rejection of the advances made by the young Mozart seeking employment at his Court, though probably genuinely motivated by economic necessity, may also indicate some degree of unwillingness to relate to the latest musical trends.

In spite of all that, word of the Elector's talents was spread abroad, and even if the publication of his *Stabat Mater* ultimately failed to receive the Electoral imprimatur, four Symphonies were engraved and published in 1763 by the Accademia Filarmonica in Verona, thus bringing at least some of his music from the strictly private closet to the public domain.

With his sister, Maria Antonia Walpurgis, that step is much more consciously and willingly taken.

Even if the performance of her two operas was primarily intended for private enjoyment before invited guests, the publication of the scores by Breitkopf, and the awareness of her works in Paris and London, either in part or in toto, in arrangements or separate publication of their Overtures, all attest the determination of their author (if that she is!) to make herself known as a composer, and for her work to be made available to a wider public.

Her apparent modesty in conversation with Burney belies the facts. Maria Antonia Walpurgis is perhaps the first aristocratic composer of high social and political rank to actively proclaim her talents.

Cynically one may observe that the difficulties that arise in authenticating her two major compositions may be inextricably linked with this same desire to seek public acclaim. If Hasse and/or Metastasio were more heavily involved in the production of the music and the libretti than is openly acknowledged, then she will have had little to fear from exposure to wider critical gaze.

Significantly, perhaps, the slighter chamber arias were not pushed forward in the same way, and remained as manuscripts in
private possession. In fact the ultimate irony cannot be entirely ruled out, namely the possibility that the slighter works, ascribed to her but unwillingly if at all by Drewes, are indeed her own work. The public works, of which she could be so justly proud - and which unequivocally bear her name - could be, on the other hand, largely created by the unacknowledged contributions of Hasse and Metastasio. By "going public" in this way Maria Antonia may have felt obliged to ensure that the product was manifestly worthy of bearing her name. By the same token she may have felt less obliged to be totally honest about the involvement in their production by professionals in her employ.

It seems unlikely that the issue will now ever be satisfactorily resolved, and despite lingering doubts it will remain reasonable to ascribe to her the two operas published in her name, and spoken of by herself in correspondence as being her own work.

Although no modern editions of the music of either of the two principal figures of this chapter have been considered worthy of publication, the latterday "Republic of Music" has not ignored them entirely. Maria Antonia has motivated one doctoral thesis and one large orchestral work this century, and the two major encyclopaedias of the 20th century, MGG and NG, both accord the two of them perfunctory but adequate entries, to be found, without cross-referencing, under the names "Maximilian" and "Maria". MGG refers to the survival of manuscripts in SLb, inter alia of a Litaniae - presumably the work that the Elector had specially copied for Burney - and the 12 Trios for two violins and basso continuo. This information must have derived from an earlier catalogue, since at that time (1947) only one of the twelve trios was thought to have survived the war. NG provides the information correct in its time (1980) but no longer true: all twelve trios are now back in situ. NG also confirms that the said Litaniae
is a casualty of World War II, so that unless or until Burney's own copy, as made specially for him in Munich, should come to light, this particular composition would appear to be lost.

The erroneously described three 'Sonate' per il gallichona by the Elector, referred to in NG, have been dealt with in Chapter 2 of this thesis; whoever composed them, these Serenate for the gallichon are still extant.

Both MGG and NG refer to the doubts expressed as to the authenticity of some of Maria Antonia's output. Both, however, offer the two operas as being unquestionably by the Electress, with no reference whatever to the events and circumstances outlined in this chapter that make even - or especially - those ascriptions to some degree unsafe.
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In a recent article (1) devoted to Telemann's activity as a teacher, three names are conspicuous by their absence. This is not to criticise the author for their omission, for the exact nature of the relationship between Telemann and his three noble protégés, Prince Johann Ernst, Duke of Weimar (1696-1715), Ernst Ludwig, Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt (1667-1739) and Friedrich Carl, Count of Erbach (1680-1731) in musical terms is hard to establish. In one way or another, however, these three composing noblemen may be described as protégés or associates of the great Telemann during his years in Eisenach and Frankfurt (and after). Whether they ever received from him any formal musical instruction is open to question - and perhaps even unlikely.

We shall consider them in the order of listing above.

Johann Ernst, Duke of Weimar

Arguably the most important of this trio is the above Johann Ernst. He died at the appallingly early age of 19, before his indubitable musical talents could reach full expression. Despite Telemann's advocacy and his association with Walther and J.S. Bach, he does not appear in MGG, and is entered in Eitner only in the supplementary volume (Nachträge, Vol. II).

Our most comprehensive picture of him is that given by Walther in 1732. Since the young prince had studied under Walther we may take the latter, perhaps, rather more seriously than the later Gerber and Schilling.

Walther informs us (translation):
Johann Ernst, Prince of Saxe-Weimar, born on 26th December in the year 1696, was well trained not only in royal qualities, but also in music, especially on the violin (which he learned from his valet, Gregorio Christoph Eylenstein*) but also played keyboard instruments, and shortly before his death, which occurred in the year 1715, on August 1st in Frankfurt-on-Main, he took to composing for about nine months. In that time, under my insignificant and humble guidance, he worked at producing 19 instrumental pieces, of which 6 concertos have been published in engraved folios.

Gerber distorts the above to make his entry (translation):

Johann Ernst, Prince of Saxe-Weimar, born on 26th Dec. 1696, received instruction in all the disciplines appropriate to his status. In this, music was so little neglected that, through the instruction given by his valet Gregor Christoph Eylenstein, he ranked among the good players on the violin. Apart from that he played the keyboard, which probably gave him the opportunity to study also composition formally with Walther, the author of the Lexicon. In the space of a mere nine months he had learned so much that he completed 19 pieces, of which VI Concerti per il Cembalo solo were engraved in folio while he was on a journey in his 19th year, from which he never returned, for he died in Frankfurt on 1st Aug., 1715. Walther does not tell us where these concertos were engraved, but probably this was done by Lotter in Augsburg.

This alarming process of distortion is taken a degree further by Schilling in his short entry (translation):

Johann Ernst, Prince of Saxe-Weimar, born on 26th December, 1696, and died on a journey in Frankfurt-on-Main on 1st August, 1715. He was a good violinist and keyboard-player. The former instrument was taught him by his valet, Georg Christoph Eylenstein. He studied composition under the lexicographer Walther, according to whom he wrote about 20 works of merit for violin and keyboard, of which, however, only 6 keyboard concertos were printed.

Schering(2) writing in 1903 at about the time that he was preparing his edition(3) of Bach's arrangements of keyboard concertos for the solo harpsichord, was able to add some important new information (loc. cit. (2), p. 241): (translation)

The dynastic nature of musical families at all social levels is confirmed by the fact that some 70 years later an Adam Eylenstein was the Weimar town organist (cf Chapter 3: Duchess Anna Amalia of Weimar).
The young Duke was indeed a musical talent of the highest order. He had enjoyed tuition in composition and keyboard under J.C. Walther*. Six of his concertos were published in copper-plate by no less a person than Telemann, c. 1715. Mattheson, in general a severe critic, was still praising these compositions two decades after their publication, mentioning a wonderful concerto in E major**...

The concertos by the Prince, to the best of my knowledge, have not yet come to light.

Schering was in a position at this time to speak of Telemann's involvement in the publication, but not to compare the arrangements with the source. This is presumably the reason why Eitner in 1904 made no mention of the Duke's concertos until the later supplementary volume (1912). To this day the number of survivals of the set is remarkably few (cf RISM, J 551).

The re-emergence of the complete set of six concertos confirmed Telemann's involvement and the Prince's sad demise in Telemann's (French) Avertissement:

You see, Reader, the name of the Most Serene Author on the title of this work. It would be hard to describe fittingly the extent and ardour of his superior genius. You will find in these concertos which we offer you some brilliant ideas (belles étincelles). His life lasted little more than eighteen years. Admire him for having acquired by that age such insight into an art so difficult as music. The philosopher J. Lips*** wrote of himself 'that he had a trained mind suited to all the sciences, except music.... Apart from the compositions of His late Most Serene Highness, which we leave to your judgement, he was a virtuoso on several instruments, especially the violin. Twenty-one months before his death this Prince was afflicted by a cruel and sad illness that sent him to his tomb. He composed without cease, that being the best remedy to alleviate his pains. He himself undertook to have this Opus engraved, but did not have the pleasure of seeing the final product; death seized him after he had given orders for it to be continued and to add a second part, which you will see in due course. May the Republic of Music give lasting homage to the memory of this incomparable Prince. In conclusion let it be said that just as Emperor Titus was known in his lifetime as the delight of the human race, in

* Spitta is given as the source of the information that Walther had also instructed him on the keyboard.
** Grosse Generalbass-Schule, p. 392. Conceivably this is a reference to No 5 of the set published in 1718.
*** = J. Lipsius, a classical scholar (1547-1606)
the same way our Most Serene Prince not only caused delight during the short time that he lived, by the delightful qualities of body and mind that he possesses - and to an eminent degree, but that through these works he will cause perpetual delight, even after his death. Frankfurt, Febr. 6th 1718.

G. P. Telemann

Leipzig and Halle, by M. Kloss and M. Sellius

(See facsimile of original overleaf)

The title-page reads:


No second collection seems to have appeared, though the existence of other works can be established, as we shall see below. The 'Basse de Viole' of Telemann's French title-page becomes variously 'Cembalo' or 'Cembalo o Violoncello' in the printed bass parts.

Two of this collection of six concertos are to be found in the 16 concerto transcriptions published by Schering: No 1 in Telemann's publication is No 11* of those transcriptions (Bb), and No 4 of the set, in d-minor, is No 16* of the Schering transcriptions, with a second movement based on La Follia.

In the article that preceded the published edition, Schering had still not identified Nos 11 and 16 as originating from the Prince, and came to the conclusion that the former was of German provenance, while an "Italian Master" was responsible for the latter. The discovery of the original set of concertos must therefore have occurred at some time between 1903 and 1907**. A third concerto by Johann Ernst in Bach's sixteen published by Schering (BWV 984; Schering No 13) is not to be found in the Prince's published collection of 1718.

* BWV Nos 982 and 987 respectively.

** Schering discovered one set in Weimar (cf Sammelbände der IMG, Vol. 5, 1904, p. 565 ff), and E. Prætorius found a further set in Rostock c. 1905.
Telemann's Preface to the Six Violin Concertos of Prince Johann Ernst, 1718

Vou voyez, Lecteur, le nom du Seigneur, l'auteur juré, titré de cet Ouvrage. Pour l'éloge et la louange de son génie supérieur, on ne saurait vous les bien dépeindre. Vous en trouverez des belles éclatantes dans les concerts qu'on vous offre. Il vint, parque de peu d'âge, avoir plus de vingt lumières dans un art aussi difficile que la Musique. Le savant J. Leprie écrit de lui même: Il avait l'esprit docile et disposé à toutes les sciences excepté la Musique. vinyl 11. Ses sœurs Cézanne. C'est la composition de feu S.A.S. qu'un abandonné à votre jugement, elle joignit en Maître de plusieurs instruments, surtout du violon. (C') Prince fut attaché vingt et un mois avant sa mort de la cruelle et étonnante maladie, qui le mit dans le tombeau. Il ne lâcha pas de composer ce qui était lui le meilleur remède dont il disposait, ses yeux, il entreprit même de faire graver cet Ouvrage; il n'eut pas le plaisir de voir la fin; la mort vint le ravir, après qu'il eut donné des ordres pour le continuer, et y joindre une seconde Partie, que vous verrez, sans peine. Que la République de Musique rende donc des hommage à sa mémoire, et que cet incommensurable Prince finit en disant que, comme l'Empereur Titus était appelé durant sa vie les délices d'artiste- humain; de même, aussi notre Serénissime Prince, non a pas seulement fait les délices le peu de temps qu'il a vécu, par les belles qualités du corps et du globe, qu'il possédait, dans un degré éminent; mais que par ses Ouvrages il en a laissé même après la mort, les perpétuelles délices. Frankfort le Jour 1718.

G. P. Telemann.

À Leipzig et Halle chez M. Klose et M. Neihus.
The discovery of the original concertos enables us to evaluate Johann Ernst as a composer, and to compare the versions at source with Bach's arrangements (to call them 'transcriptions' is an over-simplification), as well as to compare the judgements of commentators both prior to and in the wake of their discovery.

Based on the one work known by Schering to have originated from a concerto by Johann Ernst (BWV 984), Schering came to the conclusion that the first movement "shows a clarity of form and appealing Italian figuration". The second movement is seen to demonstrate an unusual element of Empfindung, and in the last movement Schering notes concerto-writing that is not Vivaldian. NG implies (no more than that!) a different interpretation:

*Italian violinistic figures are common. Vivaldi's influence is quite possible: the prince could have returned from Holland with Vivaldi's op. 3 concertos published in Amsterdam in 1722.*

Hans-Joachim Schulze gives us reason to believe that the young Prince may well have been more eclectic:

*Significant in this context is a letter written on 10th April, 1723 by one of Bach's pupils, Philipp David Kräuter. He writes of the return of Prince Johann Ernst of Weimar from the journey which marked his attaining majority as a nobleman, and expresses the hope that in the course of the summer 'lots of lovely Italian and French music' would be heard, 'which would be of great profit in the composition of concertos and overtures'. This and other comments lead us to believe that the Prince brought back from his journey not only the latest Italian music, but a similar volume of French music, and that at the Court in Weimar the French style continued to assert itself alongside the Italian.*

Examination of Johann Ernst's own concertos reveals that though they are Italianate, they are not specifically Vivaldian. There is a naivety and charm in, for example Concerto No 3 in e-minor. After an opening movement in which the solo part is of an arguably Vivaldian virtuosity, comes a short and gentle Pastorella in which Principal and first violin part company
for a mere eight bars, and a final Presto (or Vivace depending on the part-book used) in which the Principal and first violin are synonymous throughout.

This final movement is the one referred to earlier, an example of an e-minor gavotte-type movement, as found elsewhere in works by Frederick Lewis, Prince of Wales, Loeillet, and most notably in Telemann's Double concerto for recorder, flute and strings; Telemann, it may be noted, wrote that concerto in the wake of his experience of folk-musicians in Sorau, and that on his own confession, he did not consider concertos to be his forte (though he had composed 'eine ziemliche Menge' - (rather a lot) of them, and that they were influenced by French models ("Zum wenigsten ist dieses wahr, dass sie mehrentheils nach Frankreich riechen").

Johann Ernst's Concerto No III is given in the Supplement (No 38), transcribed into score. For reasons of space economy the five parts have been accommodated in four systems. Where there is no indication to the contrary, the uppermost system gives synonymous Principal and first violin parts.

As interesting as an investigation of the young Prince's own music may be, comparison between the source versions and Bach's arrangements will doubtless be seen as more enlightening. In the case of No I of these concertos, Bach's treatment of the second movement is of particular interest (BWV 982). Here the original has passages of five bars for basso continuo only, in his realisation Bach has produced rich harmonic effects and inner part writing quite alien to the simplistic efforts found in the albeit charming e-minor concerto discussed above. Likewise the figurations of his arrangement of the solo line (as in Bars 9-25) bring life to the predictably sequential writing of the original.

* modern edition: Bärenreiter-Verlag (HM 124), Kassel, 1954
** cf Mattheson, Grosse Generalbass-Schule, 1731, p. 167
In the original, however, at the end of that movement (which begins *Adagio* and breaks into an extended *Allegro*) come five bars of multiple-stopped quavers. Bach's arrangement converts these into dithyrambic demi-semiquavers, leaving open for us the question as to whether this is an act of adaptation of the idiomatic writing for one instrument to equally idiomatic writing for another - or whether or not this is an approximation of how a contemporary violinist will have interpreted the chords given, seeing in them not the challenge of technically demanding multiple stops, but an implied arpeggiation of them.

The whole of Concerto No I in B♭ is likewise given in the Supplement (No 39), transcribed into score for ease of comparison with Concerto No 11, pp 92-99 of the Peters volume.

Johann Ernst of Weimar - the "unidentified" source of BWV 592

In Schmieder's *Bach-Werke-Verzeichnis (BWV)* we see that No 591 bears the title *Kleines harmonisches Labyrinth*. As we shall also see, the work that follows it, BWV 592 and 592a, represents an historiographical if not harmonic labyrinth.

Not included in the 16 concerto arrangements, BWV 971-987, is an arrangement of a concerto in G for harpsichord of a concerto by Johann Ernst not to be found in the publication of 1718. Its non-inclusion in Schering seems to rest primarily on the fact that it was felt to be, in the words of the *BGA*\(^6\), (cf Vol. 38, p. 282 ff) "an arrangement, probably by Bach himself, for the clavier" of an existing organ arrangement of an unidentified concerto (BWV 592).

At the time of publication of the *BGA* Vol. 38, the only name attached to the work, other than that of J.S. Bach as the arranger (or in one instance Johann Ernst Bach as the copyist) is that of Vivaldi, for the whole set of concertos copied by J.E.Bach in Leipzig in 1739 bore the title "XII Concerto (sic)
di Vivaldi elab; di J.S. Bach". The manuscript collection is referred to in most literature as P. 280, housed in the Königliche Hausbibliothek of the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin (DDR). The first eleven of the twelve concertos form Nos 1-11 of the Schering collection, and Schering was able in 1903 to establish at least that all twelve could not derive from Vivaldi sources, though he was not in a position to establish the originator in each individual case.

A subsequent discovery in Leipzig, quoted by Peter Williams (7), though unfortunately omitted from his list of sources (cf loc. cit., p. 290 ff and 377 f) throws light on the matter, for the manuscript known as MB MS 11 specifically entitles this concerto arrangement as Concerto di Giov. Ernesto: appropriato all' Organo di Joh: Seb: Bach. Rightly, as it turns out, this title (also dated 1739) was interpreted as referring to Prince Johann Ernst, though it might conceivably have been alluding to Johann Ernst Bach, given that he was the copyist or owner of the manuscript collection referred to above.

As we have said, the concerto arranged here by Bach, and ascribed in its original form to a composition by Prince Johann Ernst of Weimar, is not one of the six published posthumously by Telemann. This is also true of BWV 984, a concerto arrangement for harpsichord, for which an arrangement for organ is extant (BWV 595), but of its first movement only. That organ arrangement gives what Schering describes (loc. cit., p. 236) as "the clear, unequivocal heading: Concerto del Illustiss O Prencipe Giov. Ernesto, Duca di Sassonia, appropriato all' Organo a 2 Clavier: e Pedal da Giov. Seb. Bach.

On the basis of this ascription, BWV 984 is invariably described as being an arrangement of a concerto by Prince Johann Ernst, though only the emergence of the original score or parts will verify whether all or any of the original source was by the Weimar Prince. The possibility at least remains that the organ arrangement is of a complete movement of an incomplete Concerto by Johann Ernst, and that the two subsequent movements are
derived from another source to make up a full concerto.

In the case of BWV 592 and 592a, the present writer, encouraged by the entry in NG on Johann Ernst, Prince of Weimar, stating that:

*Four compositions by Johann Ernst provide the basis for six keyboard concertos by J.S. Bach: unknown works were used for BWV 592 and 595 for organ (or 592a and 594 for harpsichord), and op. 1 nos. 1 and 4 became BWV 982 and 987, for harpsichord...*

and noting that the contributor(9) had researched specifically the field of the solo keyboard concerto, including those of Bach and Walther, assumed this to represent the latest state of knowledge on the subject.

Confirmation of the fact that in the case of BWV 592 and 592a the original is an "unknown" work is also implicit in the Schmieder entry (loc. cit., p. 438), for in the case of identifiable works by Vivaldi we are given precise details of source, and an indication of the nature of the original work (concerto, sonata, concerto grosso, etc). Such details are not given in the case of BWV 592, leading one to the belief that here the Vorlage (original source) is unknown.

Elsewhere the literature on the subject points to the same conclusion.

Hermann Keller(9) in his account of Bach's organ music in 1967 (loc. cit., p. 85) writes of this Concerto in G major, BWV 592:

*According to one manuscript [BWV 592] was composed by the young Prince Johann Ernst. Since Ernst died in 1725 at the age of nineteen, and since this work would hardly have been composed before his fifteenth year, one may infer that the origin of Bach's transcriptions should probably be set somewhere within the years 1711-1714. The young composer was a pupil of J.G. Walther and was esteemed by both Telemann and Mattheson. With its charming and natural melody, his concerto in fact shows more influence of Walther than Vivaldi; the last movement is not much more than a joyful noise,*
Many points arise from the above.

First, one wonders if the dismissive account of the last movement would have been made so easily had only the source giving Vivaldi as the originator survived. Certainly it is not shared by Peter Williams (cf loc. cit., p. 295) who describes the work in some detail, concluding that:

... its lack of scope for further development should not disguise the fact that even the Sonata BWV 530.i. may owe something to it.

Williams likewise questions Keller's observation on the respective claims to influence of Walther and Vivaldi, pointing out that only one one original concerto by Walther has survived, and is (ibid., p. 290):

different in all major respects - movements, structures, melodic construction, texture - and shows him deliberately taking account of Corelli’s various concerto techniques.

The mention of the name of Corelli as an influence on Walther - and therefore by implication also on his young noble pupil - reminds us that in Concerto No IV of the 1718 set (and arranged by Bach to become BWV 987; Schering No 16) the second movement is an extended elaboration of *La Follia*, a tune popularised among serious musicians by no-one with more advocacy than by Corelli in his famous set of variations in Opus 5, published in 1700.

To return to Keller, his dating process appears not to have taken cognisance of the fact that these concertos were written in a feverish burst of compositional activity by the Prince during the last twenty-one months of his life. If that is the case, then these works must date from about November 1713 onwards; Walther was more specific and spoke of the last nine months of his life, thus making 1715 as the earliest date for most, if not all, of these transcriptions.

In questioning whether or not Bach's arrangements were
"commissions" or "studies" Schulze (10) is perhaps begging the question. Given the short space of time in which they were composed, might they not have been, or some of them at least, posthumous tributes for the consolation of the family and the benefit of the musicians at the Court?

The most significant statement made by Keller, however, is that on one manuscript the young Prince is given as the originator of BWV 592. We may assume that he is referring here to the Leipzig source, MB MS 11 mentioned earlier, in which the words Giov. Ernest might just possibly have referred to Johann Ernst Bach, seeing that no titles or "illustrious" epithets were added. Certainly Keller seems unaware of any other identifying source or sources.

Norman Carrell (11), also in 1967, likewise seems unaware of any new light on the matter, and described the work (loc. cit., p. 244) as originating from a:

Concerto for Two Violins by Prince Johann-Ernst or Telemann.

In none of the sources is the name of Telemann* offered. Carrell may be confusing BWV 592 with 593, in one source of which a concerto in a-minor Telemann was given as the originator: Manuscript P. 288 bears the legend: Concerto per Organo ex Amoll composé p. Mons. Telemann pour les Violons et transposé par Mons. J. Seb. Bach. The words here in italics were crossed out in the source, and a correct reference to Vivaldi inserted. The reference to specifically "two violins" by Carrell is either pure invention, or a guess hazarded from the texture (cf Williams, loc. cit., p. 291).

E.M. & S. Grew (12) were similarly unsure of their facts in 1947 (cf loc. cit., p. 64):

Two of the clavier concertos are by Johann Ernst. Another is believed to be by him, and Bach liked it so much that he adapted it also for the organ. The organ arrangement is

* cf the concluding comments to the current Chapter section on Johann Ernst.
the first of the four concertos as published. Playing it today, we observe what this nobleman did more than two centuries ago, and what pleased Bach among his productions; since if this concerto is not actually by Johann Ernst, it is still from the mill in which he laboured.

The authors do appear to be rather confused.

There were three, not two, clavier concertos ascribed to Johann Ernst among the sixteen here discussed. The third one, "believed to be by him", is presumably BWV 984, but as an organ transcription it was only arranged in part by Bach, and was the fourth and not the first of the four organ concertos to which they refer. In effect the authors have confused the elements behind BWV 592 and 595. The question-mark raised by them in relation to the authenticity of its ascription to Johann Ernst again points to the authors' unawareness of any sources other than those already described.

The previous quotation was taken from a book in the Master Musician series. Its most recent update is by Malcolm Boyd in 1983. Here (cf op. cit., p. 74 f) an attempt is made to date Bach's transcriptions of the Prince's concertos, and again with incomplete information on the source work in question, though Boyd does not enter into discussion of the source material per se:

It may be assumed that they i.e. Bach's arrangements were made before the Prince left Weimar in July 1714, in a vain attempt to cure the illness that was to kill him the following year at Frankfurt am Main, when he was only 19 ... There are in all twenty of them, sixteen for harpsichord ... and four for organ ...

In a footnote Boyd then explains that the total of four organ concertos does not include BWV 595, this being "another version of the first movement of BWV 984".

Working backwards from the above, we note that while choosing
to mention that the figures do not include BWV 595, Boyd omits any reference to BWV 592a. If we include this, there are 17 harpsichord concerto arrangements, not 16. If there is doubt as to the authenticity of the latter as an arrangement by Bach himself (and Williams concedes that its authenticity is not established beyond doubt - cf loc. cit., p. 295) then some reference to that fact would not have been out of place. Likewise it cannot be established beyond doubt whether the harpsichord arrangement is made on the basis of the organ arrangement, or *vice versa*, or whether in fact they might be copies from independent sources.

On the question of dating, Boyd again demonstrates how difficult the issue is. He implies, though his source is not disclosed, that the Prince left Weimar definitively in July 1714. This date is hard to make compatible with the information given by Telemann and Walther, and far from supporting the theory that Bach wrote his transcriptions to please the Prince, it makes it not out of the question that, even if composed during the young nobleman's lifetime, they might have been composed in his absence, in vain expectation of a return, in improved health, from that final journey.

The catalogue of misinterpretation of information pertaining to Bach's arrangements of original compositions by Johann Ernst continues in the Kalmus Study Score (14) published with a perfunctory Preface in 1968.

In reference to BWV 592 and 595 that Preface informs us that:

*The 4 Vivaldi Concerti are not all transcriptions of Vivaldi Concertos. The 1st and 4th are supposed to be compositions by the Duke Johann Ernst of Saxe-Weimar,*

The author of the above comment was certainly not aware of any information that would have put the authenticity of the source works as compositions by Duke Johann Ernst beyond reasonable doubt.
At this point the present writer had hoped to bring enlightenment to the world of Bach scholarship, with the information that he had stumbled across the source of the original work on which BWV 592 is based, in the form of a concerto housed in the Forschungs- und Gedenkstättenbibliothek der klassischen deutscher Literatur in Weimar, for three violins, two violins di ripieno, viola, bass, in G major, with shelf mark Mus IV fl9.

It therefore came as a surprise to discover in Peter Williams' book on the organ music of J.S. Bach (op. cit.), not only a detailed description of the string parts of that "unknown work", to quote NG and indirectly the host of others, but that the set of parts to which Williams refers had come to light, not in recent years, but in research by a Bach scholar (15) as early as 1906.

The parts, as described by Williams from a Rostock source, differed in detail from those in the possession of the author on microfilm, but clearly showed a high degree of synonymity with them.

The article by E. Praetorius as long ago as 1906 does in fact clarify that BWV 592 is an arrangement of a concerto catalogued as Anonymous in the University Library in Rostock, with shelf number Musica saec. XVIII. 66. The work is, however, identifiable by the initials and title:

Concerto. a. 6. Violini e Violon
Cello. col. Basso, per l'organo,
Fatto del Illustriissimo Principe
G.E.D. si S.W.

The initials stand for Giovanni Ernesto, Duca di Sassonia-Weimar. Praetorius was unsure whether to interpret the first of these initials as a G or a J, but either would fit: MB MS 11, after all, had within one title used the italainised form of Giovanni for the Duke, while retaining Johann for Bach, while another Leipzig manuscript (Poel 39) italainises Bach's name to become Sign. Giov. Seb. Bach.
The source at the present writer's disposal had a slightly different title on the Cembalo part:

Concerto a 5 Violini, Alto, e Cembalo.

The cover to the Violino Principale part (elsewhere described simply as Violino Primo*) bears the title:

Violino Principale
del Concerto fatto del
P.J.E. di S.V.

It may be noted that though the Rostock source gives 'organo' in its title, that title is written on the part specifically designated 'Cembalo', so that the former term is apparently being used simply to designate the keyboard basso continuo instrument.

The second source of the work, unknown to Praetorius and unlisted by Williams, "found" by the present writer in Weimar, is likewise not as "unknown" as he had hoped.

Even before Karl Heller (16) in the context of the Bach NA volume (Series IV, Vol. 8, 1979) containing these concerto arrangements for organ had announced the publication of a new source in the forthcoming Critical Commentary (1980), the work had been briefly mentioned by W. Lidke (17) as early as 1954, with a printed facsimile of the first page of the Violino Principale part (op. cit., p. 92).

Heller's Critical Commentary, in which the two highly synonymous sources appear in edited form on pp 105-123, makes any further detailed discussion and the planned transcription unnecessary. Hopefully it will lead to the work being performed in its original form, and also terminate the long history of ignorance and mis-information that the musicological Establishment has attached to this concerto.

How did all this lasting confusion come about? Eitner appears

* The violin parts are designated in the Weimar source: Violino Primo, Secundo, Terzo; with Violino Primo Ripieno, Secundo Ripieno.
to have been the proto-culprit. His Nachträge of 1912 incorporated Schering's discovery of the Weimar set of parts of Johann Ernst's concertos published in 1718, as reported to the Internationale Musikgesellschaft in 1904. He does not, however, appear to have taken cognisance of Praetorius' article of 1906, for in the Nachträge mention is made only of the Weimar set, and not those found in Rostock, including also manuscript copies of Nos 1 and 4, the very two from that set that were arranged by Bach. Whoever set the trend, its persistence over a period of three quarters of a century is truly amazing.

The link between Weimar and Rostock in relation to Johann Ernst sources is an interesting one, for even the Rostock source of the G major concerto in question appears to derive from Weimar. The hand of the copyist seems to be the same as that for various Bach cantatas of the Weimar period, Heller (loc. cit.) postulates that the letters Dbnz in the Cembalo part of the Rostock source might well refer to Johann Döberitz, a tenor and Court Cantor in Weimar 1713-16.

The two sources of the G major concerto are linked by one further detail.

Whereas both keyboard arrangements by Bach designate the third movement simply Presto, the Rostock source apparently heads the movement Presto, e staccato. In the Weimar set of parts, the three obbligato violin parts, viola and bass all simply have Presto, whereas the ripieno parts are again marked Presto, e staccato. These minor discrepancies are omitted in Heller's otherwise scrupulous Commentary (loc. cit., p. 123).

A possible further missing Concerto by Duke Johann Ernst?

In an earlier page we noted how Norman Carrell in his book on "Bach the Borrower" (op. cit.) had attributed the G major concerto to "Prince Johann Ernst or Telemann".
For all we now know that the question of the source of BWV 592 had long been settled by the time Carrell was writing, and that there was no need for doubt, we may ask in conclusion whether a process that led to Carrell's open ascription may not entitle us to reverse that same process, and tentatively attribute one further of Bach's arrangements to a missing Johann Ernst source.

The originator of Schering 15 (BWV 986) remains unknown. Schering (1903) observed that in its meagre writing for the solo instrument this work could not be Italian, and tentatively posed the likelihood of Telemann as the source composer. The work is admittedly one of the poorer of the collection, one in which not even Bach could disguise the relative paucity of the original. For Schering to wish to ascribe the work to Telemann is perhaps a reflection on the low esteem in which that composer was held at the turn of the century.

Schering then adds that in structure it is very similar to the then unidentified organ concerto No 1 (BWV 592) which only subsequently came to be identified as an arrangement of Johann Ernst's concerto in G. Schering felt that this work, too, might have originally been composed by Telemann.

If these stylistic judgements hold true, and both works are conceivably by the same composer, then not Telemann but Johann Ernst might well be the author of that still unidentified composer behind BWV 986.

Prince Johann Ernst and the Republic of Music

Since Telemann coined the term "Republic of Music" in the specific context of this young Weimar Prince, in the hope that the said "Republic" would accord him posthumously the recognition he deserved, it seems pertinent to examine the extent to which
this has, or has not occurred.

One might have thought that Telemann's eloquent advocacy, the fact that the great J.S. Bach should have considered various of his works to be worthy of incorporation in his own oeuvre, and the generous references made to him by such respected contemporary lexicographers and practitioners as Walther and the often vicious Mattheson all speak for themselves.

In fact, sadly, this does not appear to be the case. The survival of only two sets of Telemann's original publication, and the complete survival of only one other work (again only in two sources, one of those being the "home territory" of the library in Weimar) does not allow us to state with any confidence that these works became widespread in the repertoire of their time. The inaccuracy of Gerber's information, referring to the six violin concertos published by Telemann as being "VI Concerti per il Cembalo solo" and the fact that he cannot state with certainty the publisher (giving, in fact, the wrong publisher) indicate that these concertos were known only by hearsay, leading to Schilling's fanciful elaboration of "20 works of merit for violin and keyboard, of which only 6 keyboard concertos were printed".

If such officials of the Republic in the late 18th and early 19th centuries served Johann Ernst less than well, the writers of the 20th century - apart from Spitta, Schering and Praetorius - and the lexicographers, including regrettably MGG in omitting any entry at all under his name, and NG in its factual misrepresentations, have failed to do justice to his contribution to the transcription concertos by J.S. Bach, quite apart from those works not arranged by J.S. Bach.

Not even Schmieder's Bach-Werke-Verzeichnis gives clear and unequivocal information, and only Williams and most recently Heller have redressed the balance. The concertos that have survived have not been embraced by the burgeoning early music movement, though of late requests have been made to the present
writer for his transcriptions of the e-minor and B♭ concertos (cf Supplement Nos 38 and 39) for the purposes of performance.

Ernst Ludwig, Landgrave of Hesse (1667-1739)

If Duke Johann Ernst's work shows primarily the influence of Italian models, French music is the predominant influence in the work of Landgrave Ernst Ludwig. The connection with Telemann derives clearly from Telemann's period in nearby Frankfurt, prior to his appointment in Hamburg.

Telemann was a close friend of Christoph Graupner, who was appointed director of the new opera house in Darmstadt in 1709, the years 1709-19 marking a particularly flourishing period in the life of the city, before economic pressures brought about the closing down of the opera after a mere ten years.

The entry in NG is a summary by Elisabeth Noack of the entry by Friedrich Noack, presumably a relative, in MGG. A minor mistranslation appears to have gone undetected in the process. MGG informs us that the Landgrave's interest in opera was such that in the years 1707-1709 he regularly undertook journeys to friendly Courts where he could enjoy Italian and German opera (Vienna, Munich, Hanover) and such smaller centres as Ansbach, Bayreuth and Weissenfels.

"Ernst Ludwig especially enjoyed staying in Hamburg where for many years (jahrelang) he owned a house, so that he could visit the opera". NG converts this to: "he even took a house in Hamburg for a year in order to visit the opera, becoming acquainted with Mattheson, Keiser, Handel and Graupner". In fact, of course, his acquaintance with Graupner dates from much earlier and is unrelated to Hamburg residency.
The MGG article on which NG's entry is based, itself complements an article by the same author\(^{(18)}\) written a quarter of a century earlier. The MGG greatly benefits from the archival material found in the Büchnersche Chronik housed in the Staatsarchiv in Darmstadt. Its value is such that it is given below in translation:

Throughout his life he attached great importance to music, and he himself invented many beautiful pieces of music and partly composed himself\(^*\). In his earlier years he played the lute in a gallant fashion, and for this reason maintained throughout a Court Capelle, not only to play church music on Sundays and Holy Days, but also to arrange and perform chamber music on Sunday afternoons, and probably also mid-week. Moreover he converted a covered Horse Hall into a specially built Comedy Theatre, for a time putting on there operas and French comedies performed by the Court musicians and by a band of Frenchmen specially engaged for that purpose. After a time the latter was disbanded and only the Capelle and Court musicians were retained, these including some consummate people, be they composers, singers or instrumentalists, including some ladies as singers.

Noack's earlier article also owes much to a series of articles on the musical life of the Darmstadt Court written at the beginning of this century by Wilibald Nagel\(^{(19)}\). This latter series, covering various of the Monatshefte produced by the Gesellschaft für Musikforschung is itself derived from a lengthy series of instalments on the cultural life of Darmstadt scattered through issues of Die Muse in 1853 (Nos 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 19, 20, 21-24), painstakingly assembled from archival material by Ernst Pasque\(^{(20)}\).

These latter two sources give fascinating insight into the organisational aspects of the music of the time, but concentrate less on a musical evaluation of the personalities involved, least of all Ernst Ludwig himself.

\* The distinction here between "inventing" and "composing" is rather obscure. Possible "inventing" implies either improvising or providing an initial idea, as opposed to putting ideas in finished, written-out form. The former may also be interpreted as meaning simply that he himself discovered new repertoire for his players on his many journeys.
The French influence in the compositions of Landgrave Ernst Ludwig is rooted in his early years. As a young adolescent he went on an educational journey with his younger brother Georg, not to Italy, but to Strasbourg, Basle and the South of France. The journey culminated in six months in Paris, where in 1686 the two young noblemen were invited guests at the first performance of Lully's *Acis et Galatée* at a private performance for Louis XIV.

While MGG omits the information, Noack's earlier article makes the interesting point that in the operas performed in Darmstadt during the rule of Ernst Ludwig no comic scenes were permitted. Whether or not this applied to the first performance in Darmstadt (in fact in Germany) of the said *Acis et Galatée* in 1687 is not clear. It would appear that the Landgrave developed a Pietistic austerity of thought that probably accounted for his disbanding the French troupe of actors, though austerity was not the keynote of the state of music at the Court itself, with singers and instrumentalists brought in from other Courts, when the need to impress arose. No secular cantatas written for the Court at this time have survived; perhaps these, too, were not acceptable to the Landgrave.

His link with German opera is attested by the overture he wrote for Graupner's opera *La Costanza*, first in 1715, followed by a new overture and some additional ballet music for a revival of the same opera in 1719 in Wolfenbüttel, where the additional numbers are to be found in Graupner's manuscript score, housed in the *Herzog August Bibliothek*.

The Landgrave's major work, however, is a collection of twelve Suites engraved in Darmstadt in 1718. Their appearance in score form makes immediate study easier than the concertos of Prince Johann Ernst, published in the same year in parts only.

The original title reads:
PARTITION / de / douze Suites et Symphonies / composées / par / S.A.S. / MONSEIGNEUR / ERNEST LOUIS / LANDGRAVE DE HESSEN / Prince de Hersfeld, Comte de / Catzenelnbogen, / Dietz, Ziegenhain, Nidda, Schaumburg, Ysen/bourg et Budingen, &. & / A DARMSTATT / 1718

The description of these works in Noack (loc. cit.), MGG and NG is clear and admirable, though a few details may be added here.

In principle one must agree with the manifestation of the French influence in these works as demonstrated by the choice of clefs used. All the works - and they are not "Suites" or "Symphonies", but like Bach's four orchestral "Suites", which are 'Overtures' followed by a Suite of movements - are "Symphonies" each followed by a "Suite".

Noack, in his earlier article, seemed to imply that Suites Nos 2-4 began with French overtures redolent of 17th century usage, but this does seem open to question. His entry in MGG makes no such claim, conceivably because on reflection he felt this not to be convincing.

On the issue of the clefs used there will be agreement. The highest of the four systems is notated in the French violin clef, the second in the soprano clef, followed by the conventional alto and bass clefs. Although written in four systems, the top system abounds in divisi markings, and 'Trio' headings are frequent, to indicate concertino sections, where the use of oboes and bassoon may be implied.

In terms of performance practice, various questions arise.

Noack's article refers to these works as being predominantly for string orchestra, with sections given to the Lullyian trio of oboes and bassoon. This may be an over-simplification. Such trio sections, though marked as such, offer no explicit instrumentation. The interpretation suggested above is convincing, but it must be borne in mind that the orchestra
at the Landgrave's disposal was a large one - "stark" in the words of the chronicler implying numerical strength.

A few years after the death of Ernst Ludwig a dispute arose within the ranks of the orchestra concerning seniority (cf Nagel, loc. cit., p. 72 ff). The matter was resolved in accordance with a judgement made during the reign of Ernst Ludwig, when a similar dispute had arisen:

> We remember that when during the time of the late Landgrave Ernst disputes arose over seniority and precedence, His Lordship wisely issued the decree that all members of the Court Capelle, especially in the first violins, (this term also including the flute, oboe and such instruments) should stay, and in future remain, in the order of entry into service ... 

We may safely assume from the above that the violins would frequently be doubled by another melody instrument or instruments, without explicit directives in the music.

The trio sections mentioned above are invariably notated as divisi of the uppermost system, allowing for allocation to violin and/or alternative wind instrumentation.

Elsewhere there are 'solo' sections for the two top systems, not notated as divisi markings, these being, perhaps, sections intended for solo strings alone. Significantly where this happens (cf No. 4: Air No 3 and 'Air en Gavotte') the bass part is specifically marked 'Violoncello'. This may imply the use of 8 ft bass only, the contrabass entering only at the 'tutti' marking, or it may indicate that such three-part sections are for strings alone, and not for flutes/oboes with bassoon.

The tempo and dynamic designations are predominantly French, though both French and Italian forms are found. Viste is more frequent than, but not totally to the exclusion of presto; doucement is preferred, but piano also found, especially in the context of an adjacent forte. The characteristically French 'agrément' indicated by the sign + above a note (some-
times below) is juxtaposed with the more Italianate tr. above (or below) a note, and in such close proximity to the French sign (as in the opening Symphonie of Suite No 5) that one is tempted to assume that a specific differentiation was intended.

The Noacks both point out the total absence of Allemandes and Courantes in these Suites. The Air is by far the best represented movement, with forty of them within the twelve works. Sometimes they appear in compound formulations such as Air en Gavotte (No 4) or Air en Sarabande (No 10).

An 'al fresco' element is brought into the succession of such predicatably 'courtly' movements as the Menuet, Bourrée, Gavotte and Sarabande by the introduction of more rural numbers, such as Menuet de Village (No 7), Pastorale en concert (No 8), Pastorale (No 5), Paisane (No 5) and the Musette over a drone bass that ends No 3, with a similar effect in the Symphonie to No 11.

There are a surprisingly large number of Loure movements, and other interesting instances are the Bourlesque (No 8) and the genuine Rondeau in No 11, in which the opening eight bars are interjected between each of the following four sections.

Noack gives as a characteristic of the whole set the full-textured writing, that makes the chordal support of a basso continuo instrument optional, and also the absence of virtuoso demands on the performers.

The latter observation in principle holds true, but a few movements do suddenly break away from the rather stolid mould of the work as a whole, as for example the Gigue in No 10 (cf Supplement, No 40).

The Noacks likewise rightly observe that the music, for all the charm of many of its movements, is too sequential, and thematically meagre in some of its movements. Although many of the shorter movements do have a melodic grace (as in the
Sarabande in No 1), many others are wooden, and the length of the suites (as many as 12 movements) makes them less than ideal in toto for current concert purposes.

There are, however, some surprises, such as the second Air in No 11. The most convincing movements in all 12 Suites, however, are the four Chaconnes. The longest of these (No 6) covers some 167 bars*. The Supplement (No 41) gives the Chaconne that ends Suite No 1. Apart from being arguably the most successfully conceived of all the nearly 140 movements, it manifests many of the features discussed: the division of the uppermost system, indicating perhaps alternative instrumentation to violins (though in this very instance the opening would need to be played an octave higher on any viable wind instrument), the use of both + and tr. signs for presumed differing embellishment, and an example of the disruption of four-part textures to make way for a trio, which in this instance looks particularly well-suited to performance with oboes and bassoon. Certainly the whole movement shows a mastery of technique that would not disgrace many of the Landgrave's contemporary professional composers.

Friedrich Carl, Graf zu Erbach (1680-1731)

Count Friedrich Carl zu Erbach (Erpac), like his friend Landgrave Ernst Ludwig, appears for the first time in an English language work of reference in NG, with an entry by the same contributor as for the Landgrave of Hesse. Again the NG entry and that in MGG overlap considerably, inevitably so, though NG, for all it is shorter, does have at least one important piece of information not found in MGG, and in their evaluation of the music there is some slight difference between the two articles,

* Symphonie IX which also ends in a Chaconne nearly 100 bars in length was published in modern score form by W. Kleefeld in Blätter Hessischer Tonkunst for B. Schotts Söhne, Mainz, 1905.
Of all three noble composers discussed in this Chapter, Friedrich zu Erbach is the slightest in terms of quality, though ironically the best represented in terms of recent practical editions, and is the one whose association with Telemann is best documented.

That friendship with Telemann is affirmed by the accounts of various meetings recorded by the Frankfurt patrician, von Uffenbach, made accessible in Preussner's (21) commentary. For the benefit of non-German readers there follows a paraphrase from Preussner's edition (op. cit., p.168 f), since it throws light on both the NG and MGG entries:

Telemann and Uffenbach spent many times together at the house of a third friend, Friedrich Karl Graf von Erbach, in the beautiful Odenwald. The Count was an enthusiastic music-lover and frequently invited Uffenbach to spend a few relaxing days out in the Odenwald, devoted primarily to hunting and music. He would fetch his guests by coach from Babenhausen, and usually they would be brought straightaway to the Count's music-room. We are given some idea of the splendour of these events in Uffenbach's poems where the concerts in the castle are described in some detail, as for example in the cantata "On the Garden of Count Erbach's Castle and the Conservatory at a Visit to the same". It begins:

In those beautiful valleys, in those meadows
where the clear stream feeds the opulent banks

followed by the first aria, in which the music from Handel's
La sorte mia from the opera Admetus is made to fit the words:

The blue distance is resplendent
from the legion of torches
of the golden stars.

A farewell cantata likewise contains such descriptions of nature, set to music by Handel, followed by words in praise of friendship. The duet between friends "Our friendship knows no separation", set to the music of Handel's duet "Alma mia" from Admetus may well have been sung by Uffenbach and the Count themselves. It goes without saying that the Count's own band of musicians will have been present, and this will have been especially true on those occasions when Telemann was there. He was Uffenbach's mentor, and also of the Count. The Count had himself tried his hand at composition. In a letter to Uffenbach he says that he was sending two dozen trios to Hamburg, to have them corrected by Telemann before having them printed. On another occasion he sent to Uffenbach "A Musical Opus of large-scale Concertos" which he had dedicated to him"
One would like to infer from the asterisked line from the above passage that the "clear stream" might be a pun on the name of 'Bach', and that his compositions were played, or at least parodied in the same way as those of Handel, but this seems extremely unlikely, since throughout the lifetime of von Uffenbach no single work by J.S. Bach appears to have been performed at any known musical event in Frankfurt, and nowhere amid the adulation for Telemann, Handel and Vivaldi is Bach's name mentioned.

The "large-scale Concertos" (starke Concerten) reported as sent by Erbach to Uffenbach have not survived. Our knowledge of him as a composer therefore rests on the "two dozen" trios sent to Telemann (or intended to be sent to Telemann - whether or not he did, and whether or not Telemann actually did correct them, remains conjecture). NG presents the conjectural as a fact. The statement that Telemann "was probably his composition teacher" derives from the earlier MGG entry, which informs us that:

The melodic lines and the style of the 30 chamber works extant show such an affinity with Telemann's style, that we are tempted to assume that during the ten years that Telemann was in Frankfurt the Count will have studied with his friend and composer.

The influence of Telemann, though self-evident, is perhaps overstated in terms of the end-product, and when NG informs us that "the pieces are all modelled on Telemann", one would like to have more specific information on which to base comparison before coming to any valid conclusion.

NG is, however, on more secure ground in pointing out that soon after the date in 1727 on which the Count had stated his intention of sending his trios to Telemann, the Hamburg composer did come to stay with Erbach in the autumn of that year, as attested by Preussner, and more recently by
Klessmann (22) (op. cit., p. 196) in the context of Telemann's letter of 12th November, 1727 to Uffenbach.

The "two dozen" trios mentioned are his sole surviving works. In fact the collection consists of twelve trios for two violins and a bass, a further twelve for two recorders or flutes and a bass, and an additional six duets for cellos or bassoons.

The least insubstantial of these three sets, namely that for two violins and basso continuo, is the only one not to have featured in modern editions. The unaccompanied duets were published by the MGG contributor in 1954*, and of published versions of the recorder trios the most recent (1972) is that of three of them (g-minor; G major; d-minor), edited originally in 1963 by Helmut Renz**.

No mention of the latter publication is to be found in NG.

Two copies only survive, both in the Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliotheek in Darmstadt. The Count's original proposal to have the works corrected by Telemann prior to printing does not appear to have been fully realised, for both surviving copies are in manuscript form, only the title-page (showing the music room in the Count's mansion) being engraved (cf illustration in MGG).

The specific interest in the context of this Chapter is that the whole collection is dedicated to Landgrave Ernst Ludwig, as an act of reciprocation for the copy of the latter's Twelve Symphonies sent by him to Erbach, presumably some ten years earlier.

The Franco-Italian juxtaposition that characterizes in part those Twelve Symphonies is clearly manifested in the

* Bärenreiter Hortus Musicus 122 (Kassel)
** Hänssler-Verlag HE 11.206 (Stuttgart)
presentation of Erbach's trios and duets. The outer, engraved title-page is written in Italian, whereas the inner, handwritten title-page and dedication are composed in French. The handwritten title-page makes clear that the second set of twelve Sinfonies, namely those generally designated as for recorders, are clearly conceived as for deux Flûtes à bec, ou Travers: - i.e. for recorders or flutes, though the further explanatory note in the Dedication, like the Italian title-page, omits any further reference to the traversières.

For a dedication to a social peer, the Dedication to Ernst Ludwig is unusually fulsome. Erbach writes as if in awe of the Landgrave as a musical superior. There is understandably no mention of Telemann's part (if such there was), but the Dedication may, perhaps, imply that at some stage the Landgrave had been the Count's musical mentor:

But since I know that masters are normally indulgent towards pupils, I flatter myself that Your Highness will excuse the faults in my composition enclosed herewith . . .

The Italian and French titles of these works: Divertimenti Armonici and Divertissements Mélodieux give the clue to their essence. Readers of both MGG and NG might be forgiven for deducing from the descriptions of them as found there that the works are of somewhat more substance.

Both the above works of reference speak of these thirty works as if they were major compositional achievements. MGG assures us that they are written in a 'dignified' style: der Tonsatz ist gediegen, and describes them as being mostly Sonate da chiesa (Kirchensonaten). The view is slightly modified in NG: "14 of them are trios in hybrid forms that combine features of the church and chamber sonata."
Their whole essence as Divertimentos seems abandoned in an attempt to put a descriptive label on to them. The pleasantly worldly, unpretentious nature of these works, of which hardly a single movement covers more than one side of manuscript, becomes distorted by linking them in any way to the "church sonata", if that is an acceptable anglicization of the Sonata da chiesa from which the German term 'Kirchensonate' is derived.

Of all twelve Divertissements for violins, only Nos 1 and 12 consist of four movements whose designations make them compatible with the sonata da chiesa. These comprise:

- Cantabile - Allegro - Grave - Allegro
- Grave - Allegro - Largo - Vivace

All the remaining ten - with the exception perhaps of Nos 6 and 8 - comprise movements of such secular connotations (Menuet; Polonaise; Lourée; Grattioso; Soave; Dolce; Con affetto) that one is unwilling to give them a title that smacks of anything other than the delights of an aristocratic music-room. The wind Divertissements are more markedly worldly: No. 1 of the Renz edition opens with an Andante followed by five dance movements (Gavotte; Sarabande; Bourree; Menuet; Gigue). No. 2 begins Dolce to be followed by Polonaise; Mouvement de Sarabande; Menuet; Musette; Menuet. Only in No. 3 does the opening Vivace show any semblance of serious contrapuntal writing, but this, too, gives way to a simple Largo with melody instruments largely in parallel, before a Paisane to the same rhythmic figure as the Rondeau in Bach's b-minor Suite for flute and strings, Menuet and Gigue.
MGG and NG do not define closer their concept of the Sonata da chiesa, but if the movement designations make it hard for these Divertissements to comply, the absence of contrapuntal techniques, especially in the traditionally fugal or quasi-fugal second movement, likewise questions the aptness of the title. In a few cases (cf No. 3) a short-lived appearance of an imitative approach to part-writing in the first Allegro movement gives way at the first possible moment to parallel thirds and sixths (or, in the case of No. 8) even less convincing unisoni. In many cases the concluding Allegro (Nos 3, 7, 8) is actually the conventional concluding Gigue under another name. The Supplement (No 42) offers Divertissement No. 8 for two violins and basso continuo. It is typical of the set in its four-movement structure, with alternating slow - fast - slow - fast designations (only No 2 with three movements, including a Menuet and double, and No 7 with six movements, deviate from that pattern).

The predominantly parallel part-writing and the brevity of the movements are all typical features. The music, though slight, does have a charm, especially some of the duet movements. To link it too closely to Telemann, however, is surely to inflate what they set out to be, and are: "melodious distractions".

The title-pages of the 24 trios and the 6 duets are found in facsimile at the end of the Chapter.

As with the 12 Symphonies of Ernst Ludwig we note here among the 120 movements (approximately) the conspicuous absence of the Allemande and the Courante. If one is tempted to ascribe this in the first place to an aversion on the part of the Landgrave towards those two genres, then
it would be logical to assume that Friedrich Carl would have been obliged to omit these in his collection, to avoid any offence towards the dedicatee. This would be logical, but historically perhaps simplistic.

We note in the four orchestral Suites of J.S. Bach one Courante and no single Allemende. Study of at least the best-known of Telemann's chamber suites likewise reveals the absence of these two in particular, though Sarabandes, Menuets, Bourées, Lourès, Gigue are abound, as do other more evocative title movements. It would appear that although the keyboard and lute Suites and Partitas still followed a conservative concept of the dance suite, the orchestral-instrumental counterpart was moving away from at least those two dance forms at this time. The Minuet, of course, survived for another hundred years at least. It is with some surprise that one encounters in an accompanied sonata (Opus 26, No. 2) by the Bohemian composer Václav Pichl (pianoforte, flute, violoncello), published in Vienna c. 1800, a movement entitled "Allemanda", though it is with less surprise that one perceives how little it corresponds to the Allemende as known a century earlier.

Eitner confused "d'Erpac" with another musician of that name (cf. Noack, p. 207). Schilling omits any reference to Friedrich Carl, but has an intriguing entry on a later incumbent of the title, perhaps the great-grandson of Friedrich Carl:

---

Erbach, Georg Eginhard, Count of, born 1764. Only a dilettante, but a man of genuine innate musical feeling and deep sensitivity. As a noble patron of the art, and one who avoided no pains or sacrifice to promote it, he deserves everlasting memory. He became a fine violinist under Schröder's guidance and set up with the greatest of effort a series of concerts for music-lovers. He died on 11th September, 1801 in a remarkable manner: In a concert in Michaelsstadt he played (directed?) the opening
Allegro of a Haydn symphony with such extraordinary involvement and warmth that many of his friends were so moved that they went up to him to thank him in admiration. He sank dead to the ground without a sound. The excessive agitation of his feeling had resulted in a stroke.

At the end of the Chapter facsimiles of the title-pages and Dedication of Friedrich Carl's Divertissements melodieux to Landgrave Ludwig Ernst of Hesse-Darmstadt are to be found.

The Landgrave of Hesse, the Count of Erbach and the Republic of Music.

The praise heaped by Telemann on Johann Ernst of Weimar in his Preface to the posthumous publication of the six violin concertos is not, it would appear, reiterated in respect of the two other noblemen who share the Chapter with him, and yet their relationship with that "Republic", both then and now, remains an interesting one.

Both of them accord perhaps with the archetypal picture of the dilettante composer, with their passion for music as a mode of spirituality or recreation. Their own efforts as composers are marked by conventionality, occasional solecism, and overriding charm.

The interaction between the Landgrave and mainstream music is manifested by the way in which he imported to Darmstadt French opera and instituted facilities for appropriate performance. His love of French opera did not, however, prevent him from an appreciation of Italianate German opera, which he travelled to experience at first hand in Hamburg, where opera was public and accessible to the "republican" middle classes of that Hanseatic city. That Graupner permitted him to write an alternative Overture and other Einlagen to his opera La Constanza for performance at the Court in Wolfenbüttel not only speaks in his favour as an aspiring composer, it shows the Landgrave to be interested in developments and events outside the confines of his own jurisdiction.
Economically Friedrich Carl zu Erbach was, in relative terms, a poor relation. The set of "large-scale concertos" allegedly sent to Uffenbach have not survived, if indeed they were ever written. The description of the music parties he organised, apparently on occasion with Telemann among the guests, smacks more of a domestic dimension than music on the grand scale, with cantatas, duets and adaptations to the vernacular of Handelian arias. His surviving 30 chamber works are correspondingly for limited resources, requiring only between two and four players for their execution, and making only the most modest intellectual and musical demands.

The description of Telemann as "his mentor" is surely an overstatement, and it is hard to imagine Telemann having done more than cast the most cursory of glances over his output, if indeed even that. Significantly the Dedication remains quiet on that subject, and seems even to point to the Landgrave as his real mentor, in speaking of the "master-pupil" relationship. Significantly, too, we see the music of the outside world drawn into his own, exclusive music parties, whereas some seventy years later his descendant, the Count Georg Eginhard, is seen as part of broader musical life, organising public concerts, and dying following a performance of a Haydn symphony in which he was actively, alas even over-actively, involved.

If one were to tentatively place the three composers of this Chapter in a hierarchical order according to the quality of their music, we would surely give pride of place to the young Weimar Prince, with the Landgrave, on the strength of the workmanship of his Chaconnes, as runner-up, and the Count Friedrich zu Erbach a cheerful third.

One would then expect the latterday editors and commentators to reflect that pecking order in their respective publications. We see that this is absolutely not the case.

MGG saw the two lesser figures as worthy of an entry, but not
the young Weimar nobleman; NG alone incorporates all three.

Some 260 years after the death of Johann Ernst one of his unpublished violin concertos appeared in toto in a commentary volume of the NBA, and apart from the two transcriptions appended to this thesis, none of the six concertos published by Telemann in individual parts in 1718 has been transcribed into score for modern performance.

Of the music by the Landgrave, one single Chaconne appeared briefly in 1905.

Only the Count has fared at all well at the hands of posterity. The slight duets for bassoons or cellos were published in their entirety in the post-war years, and are still available. Half of the almost equally lightweight works for two recorders or flutes and basso continuo have been considered worthy of publication, a fate that still awaits any of their arguably more substantial but no less amiable counterparts for violin.

Overleaf are found the title-pages and Dedication of Count Friedrich Carl's Divertissements mélodieux to Landgrave Ernst Ludwig of Hesse-Darmstadt.
Divertissemens melodieux,
ou
XXIV. Sinfonies,
Dont les XII. premiers & joyez de deux Violons
et les XII. derniers de deux Flutes & boc, ou Flageo.
y joint encore VI. Sii pour le Violoncelle ou Basso,
accompagnés les unes & les autres De la
Basse chiffrée,
Composées et dediées
à
Monsieur le Grand-Pré
ERNEST DE LOUIS
par moi
écrit & c. s. c.
Monseigneur!

Le comble des Grâces dont Votre Altesse m'a toujours honoré, me sont prétexte de vous offrir ce petit ouvrage de musique qui devroit pourtant hésiter de composer devant ses yeux. V. E. en étant non-seulement un grand connoisseur, mais aussi un illustre Maître, marque sa précieuse composition dont Elle a bien voulu m'en faire présent d'un Exemplaire.

Mais comme je sais, que les Maîtres sont ordinairement indulgents envers les Écoliers, je me flatte que V. E. excusera les humbles

ma composition et folâtre, consistant en
XXIV. Divertissements Melodieux
en Forme de Trios, dont XII. sont pour
Deux Violons, et XII. pour Deux Flutes
e basse avec leurs Basse chiffrees, y ajoutant
adjoute six Duo pour le Violoncello
ou Basson.

Ne doutant donc nullement que V. E. prendra en grâce
ma franchise, je la supplie très-humblement de continuer toujours sa bienveillance et ses pieux souvenirs envers celui qui
sera jusqu'à la fin de ses jours d'un égard
tout particulier, et avec le plus profond
respect du monde.

Monseigneur
De Votre Altesse

Je resterai toujours
Très humble et très obéissant

Frédéric Charles C. d'Espac.


CHAPTER 6

THE HOUSE OF HOHENZOLLERN

Frederick "The Great" (1712-86)

For most laymen, and even more knowledgeable scholars of musical history, including - with some reservation - inter alia Dr. Burney, a self-evident primacy among dilettante composers is accorded to Frederick the Great. However, neither on qualitative, nor even quantitative criteria, should he count as the most significant titled composer within the period under review.

Thanks to his purely historical importance, and to the wealth of contemporary anecdotal material, not to mention the fascinating reports of such as Dr. Charles Burney himself, the volume of surviving correspondence, as well as the King's conversations with his Swiss confidant, Henri de Catt\(^{(1)}\), scholars in the intervening years, both musical and historical, have produced no shortage of literature on the man as a political and historical figure, and as a musician.

Spitta's Anthology (SpFr)

In the wake of the centenary of the King's death (1886) the eminent scholar Philipp Spitta\(^{(2)}\), despite his heavy involvement with collected editions of Schütz and Bach, produced an anthology comprising 25 of the King's sonatas for flute and basso continuo, and the four concertos, with a Preface of characteristic thoroughness that appeared at the same time as an autonomous scholarly article\(^{(3)}\), in slightly abridged form, elsewhere. Since the anthology is more readily
accessible than that article, page references will be given in respect of the former. That preface, together with the study by the American scholar, Ernst Eugene Helm\(^{(4)}\), in 1960, has become the major and most accessible source of reference. A recent reprint edition of the 25 flute sonatas selected by Spitta unfortunately omits the editorial Preface\(^{(5)}\) and is consequently of diminished interest to scholars. Apart from these, and inevitably Burney, Thouret's\(^{(6)}\) lengthy book and the efforts of Gustav Lenzewski\(^{(7)}\) at a more popular level, deserve mention.

If we may single out Spitta and Helm as the most likely sources of reference, other than MGG and NG, then we see that for all their respective merits, the picture that they give is one that may in one way or another be questioned or revised. On the question of source locations, with one exception — the Overture of 17.47, better known as the 3rd Symphony (discussed in more detail below) — the King's works survive in manuscripts not so far embraced by any RISM volume, leaving us only with Eitner as a ready source of information, with neither the virtues of completeness nor of reliability.

Spitta, and in particular Helm, give a good account of much of the conflicting anecdotal material, and it is not proposed to summarize such material, since it is readily available, though comment will be made on some of their musical observations.

The defect of SpFr is simply that it acquaints us with barely one fifth of the King's flute sonatas, and the weakness of Helm's book is that since 1960, as Helm's own entry on Frederick the Great in NG bears out, the sources then considered lost have now come to light again, so that the bulk of the information in the earlier book is now out-of-date and in need of considerable revision. Some of the information is also misleading or inaccurate.
In selecting 25 of the 121* flute sonatas known to exist, Spitta did Frederick the service of drawing the attention of flute-players and historians to their existence. Indeed the opening words of the Preface to SpFr remind us specifically of the fact that these works were historically destined to be known but to a few:

The compositions of Frederick the Great were not intended for the public, and during his life-time very few of them were known to wider circles .... At the regular soirées musicales at which he played those compositions, he only very occasionally allowed an outsider to be present, and the pieces that he played were intended only for his own pleasure.

For as long as all the sonatas were available for others to decide for themselves whether or not Spitta had made a wise and representative choice with the 25 sonatas included in SpFr, no real disservice could be said to have been done. However, of the remaining 96 sonatas, only one, a sonata in b-minor (No. 122 in the Thematic Index), the autograph of which came into the possession of Franz Liszt (cf. SpFr, Preface iv), has subsequently been published elsewhere, and then in an edition that no longer meets the requirements of the serious performer of early music. (Rob Forberg Verlag, Munich, 1923.)

In 1945, at the end of the war, all the copies of Frederick's works, and those of Quantz hitherto held by the Königliche Hausbibliothek of the Preußische Staatsbibliothek in Berlin "disappeared", and were to be found neither in the East of the city, nor among the works housed by the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Dahlem, West Berlin. We may only suppose that their disappearance was motivated by the same spirit that

* According to MGG, Lenzewski quotes 122 flute sonatas (though not in the 1916 article where he speaks of 121). This is probably an error arising from the confusing coincidence that the "Liszt" sonata discussed above was not additional to the original 121, but taken from them. Unfortunately, its number in the original catalogue, with its complicated numbering system, happens to be 122.
refused to allow the King's name to appear on the restored opera house in East Berlin (cf. Helm, pp 99-101). By the time Helm wrote his entry in NG the vast majority of those works were available again, and by the same change of heart the famous statue of Frederick on horseback, that stood for decades near the opera house, has been "found" again, and proudly stands facing the building that still may not bear his name. One may only assume that the rapid rate of political change currently occurring in the GDR will ultimately lead to Frederick's complete historical and political reinstatement in the erstwhile Prussian territory.

To the generality, Spitta's 25 sonatas still constitute "the sonatas of Frederick the Great", and anyone wishing to search further may well be discouraged by Helm's discussion of the flute sonatas, that is based solely on those found in SpFr. This is coupled to the information that Quantz's own works, likewise held in the Königliche Hausbibliothek (cf. Helm, p. 167) had been missing since the war. Later we will list both the works by Frederick and Quantz now available in that location.

The quasi-comprehensive status of SpFr is reflected by such unfortunate errors in subsequent publications as the later reprint of some of the sonatas in SpFr by Breitkopf and Härtel (in which the original basso continuo realizations by Wald see are partly replaced by new realizations in the same style by Günter Raphael), Edition Breitkopf Nos. 5451/52. This anthology of an anthology describes the selected sonatas as deriving from the Gesamtausgabe*, quoting Spitta's numbers (ie. 1-25) as opposed to those of Spitta's thematic index (Nos 1-121) or the original catalogue index beginning at 106. Likewise Mercer, as editor to Burney's General History in 1953

* The more recent reprint referred to earlier (cf. Bibl. 5) likewise bears the title: TWENTY FIVE SONATAS...Complete in four Volumes. The presence of 121 incipits and the absence of any form of explanatory note must give rise to some confusion.
(cf. Intr. Bibl. 5), assuming SpFr to include all the surviving sonatas, informs erroneously in his footnote to p. 962 that "In 1889 B & H published 120 pieces written by Frederick the Great". We cannot, of course, hold Spitta responsible for such widespread misconceptions.

**Thouret's Alternative Selection**

Meanwhile it may be stated that Spitta's selection marks only one man's value judgement on the works in question. At about the same time as Spitta had performed that selective process, Gustav Thouret(8) was compiling the catalogue of works held by the Königliche Hausbibliothek that was completed after six years' intensive work, in 1895, and gratefully reviewed in the Berlin press by Wilhelm Tappert in May of that year.

Unusually, perhaps, for so objective a product as a Catalogue, Thouret not only listed the works in alphabetical order according to the name of the composer, he also marked with an asterisk those works which he considered to be of particular interest or merit, sometimes singling out complete works, and in other instances particular movements from them.

In all, he singled out for praise, either in part or in whole, 38 of the 121 sonatas of Frederick the Great at his disposal. Not one of those works or movements was chosen for SpFr. In short, two contemporary value judgements on the respective qualities of the sonatas fail absolutely to coincide.

It would serve little purpose here to confuse the issue even further by adding a third value judgement, but listed below are those works or movements particularly admired by Thouret, and in the Supplement (Nos. 43/44) appear Sonatas 182 and 189, both of which are said by Thouret to "belong to the finest, especially the opening Largo". The Supplement (No. 45) also gives Sonata 122, likewise singled out by Thouret. This is the work of which an autograph was presented to Liszt in
Weimar, where it is still housed. Though difficult to read (the final bars of the third movement are found appended to the first movement, there being no further space on the final page), it may serve as a useful comparison with the "practical" edition referred to earlier.

Very few works survive outside Berlin. The Badische Landesbibliothek houses under Mus. Hs. 151 a Flauto Traversiereo (sic!) Solo Di Friderico that proves to be an elegant copy of Sonata 44, SpFr 25, in g-minor. The interest in the Karlsruhe source is that the order of movements differs from that given in SpFr, the final Presto coming before the Allegro assai: probably here, too, the fact that the extended Allegro assai necessitated two pages has accounted for the change of order, and that Spitta's order of movements, taken from the Berlin copies, reflects the original intention.

The numbering of Frederick's works

Before listing Thouret's preferred works, a word of explanation is called for, with regard to the numbering system in operation. In most cases the Königliche Hausbibliothek houses again two copies of each work, consecutive shelf numbers in the Thouret catalogue. The list gives the Thouret number or numbers, together with the number in the original catalogue of these sonatas. In that original catalogue (cf. SpFr, p. vii) the numbering began at 88 with sonatas by Quantz. Those of the King began at 106. Nos 142 and 203 are both by Quantz, as are Nos 219-254. Nos 255-264 are again by the King, and are followed by a further 97 sonatas by Quantz. The concertos are listed separately, being through-numbered from 1-300, Nos 87, 88, 90 and 91 being by the King. Here there is a discrepancy between the two copies of the original catalogue, brought about by the missing No. 89. Spitta describes this in greater detail on p. vii.
The sonatas appear in two sets of copies, as mentioned, one set marked individually as "pour Potsdam", and the other "pour le Nouveau Palais". Both the residence Sans Souci and the Nouveau Palais are in fact in Potsdam, a mere matter of minutes by coach from each other. The concertos are likewise in two sets, again each individual work given its own folder of parts, and marked respectively "pour Potsdam" or "pour Charlottenbourg".

During the time that Helm was compiling his book, when the source material was not available, he appears to have overlooked this information imparted by Spitta. Helm follows throughout Spitta's numbering of the sonatas as found in SpFr, (i.e. I-XXV) and in describing the one Quantz concerto known to him (No. 182 in the catalogue of concertos; D major) he follows W. Upmeyer's edition of 1951*, itself based on a copy, and gives it the nickname erroneously given to it by the publisher, record companies and concert promoters ever since, of "pour Potsdam". In fact, as with the sonatas, virtually all three hundred concertos, both by the King and by Quantz, bear the same 'title' on one of the two copies!

### List of Those Sonatas Singled Out by Thouret

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thouret Catalogue</th>
<th>Particular Movement</th>
<th>Original Catalogue</th>
<th>key/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1331/2</td>
<td>first Allegro</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>b (Suppl.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1363/4</td>
<td>Recitativo</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365/6</td>
<td>Spirituoso</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1373/4</td>
<td>first Allegro</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377/8</td>
<td>Presto</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1383/4</td>
<td>first Allegro</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1385/6</td>
<td>final Allegro</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387/8</td>
<td>final Allegro</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1391/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399/1400</td>
<td>Recitativo &amp; 1.Allegro</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401/2</td>
<td>Presto</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403/4</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405/6</td>
<td>Allegretto</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1423/4</td>
<td>Grave &amp; final Allegro</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425/6</td>
<td>first Allegro</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1433/4</td>
<td>first Allegro</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1443/4</td>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1447/8</td>
<td>first Allegro</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451/2</td>
<td>final Allegro</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1463/4</td>
<td>final Allegro</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Bb (Suppl.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;belongs to the finest, especially the opening Largo&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479/80</td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483/4</td>
<td>Allegro vivace</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487/8</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>b (Suppl.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;belongs to the finest, especially the opening Largo&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493/4</td>
<td>Grave &amp; Allegro</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495/6</td>
<td>second Allegro</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505/6</td>
<td>Vivace</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1507/8</td>
<td>Allegro &amp; Cantabile</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the missing numbers, 1509-1560, among them 28 of the King's own sonatas (the remainder being by Quantz), Spitta fortunately included 10 in SpFr, so that of the King's 121 (or, if MGG is correct, 122) sonatas, just over 100 survive in primary or secondary sources. Of those, nearly 80 remain virtually unknown.

The table below lists those sonatas available in SpFr, but lost, at least temporarily, as source material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thouret Catalogue</th>
<th>Particular Movement</th>
<th>Original Catalogue</th>
<th>key/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>b lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522/3</td>
<td>Presto</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>C lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Allegro assai</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Eb lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>g lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td></td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Eb lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538/9</td>
<td>Allegro assai</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>D lost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any discussion of the works of Frederick the Great that excludes the fate of Quantz' sonatas and concertos written especially for the King, would be sadly imbalanced. Of the 296 concertos mentioned above, the following batches survive
in the Königsiche Hausbibliothek: Nos 1-47; 65-99*; 126-161; 177-300. The vast majority of the sonatas also survive.

Spitta's Critical Commentary

With Spitta the only serious complaint one may make today is that, like all anthologies, the ultimate selection remains a matter of taste. In fairness, Spitta claims not only to have chosen according to the respective merits of the sonatas, but also to give as varied a picture as possible (SpFr p. XVII):

Of the 121 sonatas I have tried to select the most substantial, and present them in such a way that the overall product may delight through the variety it offers.

By contrast, Helm's book disappoints in the uncritical, even inaccurate comment it offers, quite apart from the fact that it is dated in terms of the information it contains on source survivals. We look in vain for the sort of cogent argumentation, as that presented by Spitta in postulating a chronological order in the original thematic index.

Spitta's contemporaries**, however, criticised the basso continuo realizations on stylistic grounds. Those realisations, carried out by Paul Graf Waldersee and not by Spitta himself, tend to give fairly perfunctory three-part chords for the right hand, and these may be too thick and unvaried in texture for current taste. But the original bass is given with total clarity as the sole occupant of the lower stave, and the original figuring is given, where found in the source, so that the experienced basso continuo player is able to look upon the edition as having Urtext status. The score also presents the flute parts in their original form, though editorial suggestions in terms of articulation have been added

---

* this batch includes the King's own four concertos, all of which have survived.

** cf. MGG bibliography for source references.
to the separate flute part - and not all of these will still find favour. As a general assessment, however, one cannot but feel that Spitta's edition is more compatible with prevailing fashion than would have been the case had his critics performed the task themselves.

With some vigour Spitta denounces the myth, created in 1840 to mark the centenary of Frederick's accession, when a corrupt score of the Sinfonia written by Frederick c. 1743 and used in the performance of a Serenata by Villati in 1747, was published. That Sinfonia was in fact the only work by the King to be published during his life-time (albeit without the Royal imprimatur). The corrupt score to which Spitta refers was edited by S. W. Dehn, with a Preface by a Dr. Preuss. The 1840 edition not only printed merely the first of the originally three movements, it also omitted the two obbligato flute parts (the only instance where the King wrote for two flutes), so that the end result is no more than a torso - and all reference to the drastic editorial process is suppressed in the Preface to the edition. The Preface likewise refers to this Overture as being "hitherto unknown", though it had been published some 90 years earlier, albeit illicitly, but at least in its intended form.

Furthermore, the known fact that the work was intended as an overture to a Serenata by Villati entitled the editor to describe it unequivocally as the overture to Il Re Pastore. Spitta refutes this "fact" in the strongest terms (re-echoed by Helm, though not by Lenzewski or MGG; NG [also Helm] is ambiguous):

The Sinfonia is said to belong to a pastoral play, Il Re Pastore by Villati. No such work ever existed. The only musico-dramatic libretto by that name was written by Metastasio, and not until 1751; it cannot therefore have been performed in 1747.

Spitta did not include this, or any of the symphonies ascribed to Frederick in SpFr. The only edition of the work, subsequent to that corrupt version of 1840, is that by Gustav Lenzewski (Vieweg-Verlag, Berlin) in 1925. He, too, without further comment, describes this as the overture to Il Re Pastore, re-iterating the "myth" referred to by Spitta. Consequently, this "3rd Symphony" of Frederick the Great (D major) is still generally and persistently known by its incorrect title.

Part of that overture was incorporated in 1761 (i.e. also during the King's life-time) in an anthology of arrangements of orchestral music for harpsichord published by Breitkopf: Raccolta delle megliore Sinfonie Di più celebri Compositori di nostri tempo Accomodate all'Clavicembalo (Raccolta 1, No. 1). Here, too, only the first movement is a faithful arrangement; the second movement is transposed into c-sharp minor - and the final movement is taken from a source by Sign GAH (= Hasse). No mention of its original function is given, and the author is described as S[ua] M[aiestà] il Re di Prussia. We encountered this source earlier in the context of Maria Antonia Walpurgis.

Where Spitta is perhaps less convincing is in his value judgements on the quality of the music. He is at pains to clear the King of the charge that he knew relatively little of the techniques of composition, and did more than indicate to a subsequent copyist how the work was to be written in full. The allegation that this was his normal procedure stems from the pen of Johann Friedrich Reichardt, who knew the King personally in his professional capacity as Kapellmeister during the latter part of his reign. Reichardt is, however, an inconsistent and unreliable witness. The passage in question reads in translation (cf. SpFr p. ix):
He wrote the top part down in notation, and added in words what the bass or other accompanying instruments had to do. Here the bass moves in quavers, here the violin on its own, here everything in unison etc. This musical shorthand was generally translated into notated form by Agricola.

Spitta refutes convincingly that this "royal method of composition", as Reichardt disparagingly describes it, was in fact the fashion in which the King composed his sonatas, though the method may well have been true of the more schematic concertos. Again, Helm reiterates Spitta's arguments, adding - rather dubiously - that many respectable composers (including, intriguingly, Schütz, though without substantiating comment) availed themselves of the technique described.

Be that as it may, we know that the King did in fact learn the techniques of four-part harmonization in his youth. MGG dismisses this piece of information as speculation ("Vermutung"), on the rather unconvincing grounds that we have no evidence of the King as a contrapuntist in his works. Even if that were true, it would not mean de facto that he had never studied counterpoint. In fact, Sonata No. 190 (SpFr II) ends with a fugue, evidence that the absence of contrapuntal writing was made on aesthetic rather than purely grounds of technical ease. Elsewhere the MGG entry comes nearer to the most likely explanation (translation):

His rejection of the fugal overture form was partly the result of his dislike for French music per se, and partly his antipathy towards any use of polyphony in secular music. On the other hand he looked upon the fugue as having a rightful and integral place in the context of church music. The fact that church music was not cultivated at his court is to be explained by his general Weltanschauung, for Frederick, as a Deist, quite logically had no interest in a form of music that derives its strength from Christian convictions.
In Reichardt's dubious anecdotal report there is, as usual, a grain of truth, though in the event in question it is manifestly unfair to use it in evidence against the King. In the context of Quantz' Concerto No. 300 Thouret has entered the following remark in his Catalogue (entry 4191), using a quotation from Nicolai's(9) "Anekdoten" (Vol. III, pp 250 & 258):

Frederick the Great is quoted as saying that Quantz left this world with good thoughts. The King may well have had this Lento* in mind. On his death (1773) he had completed the first two movements. The King sketched out the Finale and had it drawn up by Aaricola.

At this level Spitta's support for the King is well-reasoned and convincing. His descriptions of the music are at times less viable. Footnote i on p. xii of the Preface to SpFr appears to imply that Frederick knew Bach's flute sonata in a-minor (BMV 1030) and reproduced it in the opening of his own sonata in b-minor (No. 119; SpFr XVII). True, there is a striking resemblance in the opening of the two solo parts, but the treatment of the bass is so disparate that one must conclude a coincidence as great as Bach's Fugue in Eb in the Clavierübung III and the hymn tune by Croft that has given Bach's work the nickname in the English-speaking world of the "St. Anne" fugue.

(see overleaf)

* This Lento is also a movement designated by Thouret as being of particular merit.
Those who know Frederick's sonatas, and have respect for the inherent understanding of the flute that they show, will find Spitta over-fulsome in his description of the King's Adagio movements (much admired, it must be said, by some of Frederick's contemporaries [cf. p. xiii]):

They reveal a surprising gentleness of feeling, a soul that seeks satisfaction in a smiling weariness and a gentle, almost feminine though never puny lament. The gracious Sicilianos of Sonatas III, XVI and XXV are redolent of the paintings of Watteau, with their decorative figures and their gentle fusion of colours, without losing their German depth (Imigkeit). One rarely encounters sentiments of such profundity and sombreness as those of the Grave in the third Concerto.
Even the concluding statement of the critical evaluation of the music given by Spitta will be felt by many to overstep the mark, though he is quite correct in pointing out that the strange mélange of genuine warmth and calculating coldness that permeates the music, is also a characteristic of the man himself (ibid.):

One thing is sure: the music gives the listener profound insight into the workings of Frederick's soul, and this itself justifies the publication of the music.

Helm's Monograph

Helm's judgements are in many cases more open to attack than those of Spitta. His justification for Frederick's tedious devotion to his own music and that of Quantz to the total exclusion of all other flute music cannot be simplistically attributed to the general lack of good music for the instrument elsewhere (cf. p. 77). Quite apart from Handel and Telemann, even within the ranks of his own musicians were composers well able to match or outshine either himself or Quantz: the Grauns, Benda, Czarth, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach and Schaffrath to name but a few.

Nor is there any truth whatsoever in Helm's contention (cf. p. 164) that "Bach" wrote no sonatas for solo flute before 1747. Indeed the sonata in b-minor thought by Spitta to have influenced the King's own sonata in a-minor (No. 119) predated 1747 by a good quarter of a century. If by "Bach" we are to understand C. Ph. E. Bach, then the statement would, however, hold true.

Likewise Helm's belief in the consummate mastery the King must have shown on the flute, based on experiments carried out by a conventional flute-player earlier this century (cf. p. 35 f.) shows a complete misunderstanding of the instrument involved. The embouchure required for the "German" flute of
the mid-18th century is so incompatible with that used by players of the subsequent Boehm flute, that it comes as no surprise whatever that the player in question\(^{10}\) should have produced such unsatisfactory results.

Helm, too, in ascribing to Frederick the Great such importance in the evolution of the fortepiano, by requiring J. S. Bach to use the instrument during his famous visit to Potsdam (cf. p. 248), is surely wildly overstating the case. (Cf. Burney's comments, History [Mercer] p. 961f).

Frederick's Vocal Music

Helm discusses the famous singer Astrua (p. 110) without any reference to the two arias written for her by the King: *Digli ch'io son fedele* and *L'Empio rigor del fato*. These survive in the SLb in Dresden (DDR) and appear to have escaped the notice of any previous commentators, from Spitta to Helm, Eitner, MGG and Grove.

Burney, in his History (ibid.) specifically refers to Frederick as composing also for the voice:

*Sometimes, the day before performance, his Majesty would send a new song to the maestro di capella to be introduced in an opera, and this was universally believed to be his own production in all parts.*

In general there is a certain unclarity attached to such arias. Lenzewski's article of 1916 includes a brief *Verzeichnis der Werke Friedrichs des Großen*, referring in Category 1 to "Nine operatic Arias" without offering titles. MGG lists eight arias, of which *Al suo di dolce canna* survives only in an instrumental arrangement in the *Königliche Hausbibliothek* (Thouret, 1846). Three known secular cantatas are listed in MGG and NG as lost. Lenzewski published the two arias from Villati's *Schäferspiel* of 1747 contributed by the King, in addition to the aforementioned Overture: *Sulle più*
belle piante and Nota v'è questa Dea. NG does not specifically list the authentic arias, but mentions four arias in Graun's Demofoont where MG quotes the titles of three. No title is given to an allegedly "doubtful" aria in Coriolano by Graun.

All sources quote the King's embellished version of Hasse's aria Digli ch'io son fedele from the opera Cleofide, for the castrato Porporino. Had their authors been aware of the two arias found by the present writer in Dresden they would surely have mentioned the fact that one of them is to the same text, but written specifically for a different singer. The King's embellished version of Hasse's aria, demanding the ultimate in vocal virtuosity, is to be found in Schmitz' book on ornamentation in the 18th century, as part of the Appendix of musical examples, including also embellishments written to one of his own sonatas by František Benda, for some time leader of the orchestra in Potsdam. There seems to be no ground whatsoever for not accepting the authenticity of these two arias. They are both included in the Supplement (Nos. 46 and 47) as new material. Their apparent omission from any of the major works of reference allows one to conclude that they have gone unnoticed in the past century.

The scribe of Digli ch'io son fedele, identified in correspondence with the Music Department of the SLb in Dresden as being an Italian copyist, inadvertently refers to this aria as a composition of Frederico III di Prussia, though none such after Frederick II ever again ascended the Prussian throne.

* Ledebur (p. 169) lists under (8) an aria from Coriolano composed by Frederick (who also wrote the libretto) that achieved immense popularity.

** Conceivably, Lenzewski's figure of 9 may be referring to the 7 genuine vocal arias mentioned in MGG plus the 2 "new" arias in question. It is unfortunate that he did not list them all by title.
The Symphonies

A similar state of unclarity exists in relation to the four Symphonies ascribed to the King. Spitta discusses only the famous Overture to Villati's Schäferspiel, published without the King's prior consent during the King's life-time (though no precise date of publication can be given) by Balthasar Schmid in Nuremburg. Whether or not the King knew of the Breitkopf arrangement of it is not known, but in view of the form it took in that publication, with a transposed middle movement and an 'alien' final movement, it would seem most unlikely.

Spitta, in a footnote to SpFr iii, refers to the publication by Dehn also of an Overture to the pasticcio Galatea ed Acide (1748). Spitta refutes Ledebur's information that any such publication was made. This does not itself, however, disprove that the King wrote an Overture at sometime to the work in question. In addition to other documentary evidence (cf. MGG), we may accept also Burney's information that the King, for the first performance of that work at least, provided not the Overture (which was composed by Graun), but some of the arias, (History, Mercer p. 961 f):

His Majesty, besides a great number of pieces for the flute, and some for the harpsichord, composed sometimes for the voice; particularly in the pastoral opera of Galatea et Alcides (sic!) of 1747, of which the overture and recitatives were Graun's, and the airs by the King jointly with Quantz and Nichelmann.

By 1916 Lenzewski was able to talk of "Three Overtures (Symphonies) for Orchestra". Ten years later he published four such Symphonies, without sufficient editorial comment to throw light on the situation. MGG informs that Lenzewski's published works are not all fully authenticated. NG accepts as authentic the Villati Overture, over which there is no question, and one of the two Symphonies (apart from the above
Overture, they are all for strings and basso continuo alone) in G is accepted as being "probably" by Frederick, without clarifying which of the two is meant. The remaining Symphony in G and the Symphony in A (known as the Fourth Symphony) are described as "doubtful", attributing the former possibly to J. G. Graun.

In fact, the symphony in G that may be by Graun is the so-called Second Symphony of Frederick the Great. In his sparse editorial note, Lenzewski informs that it appears to be a later, more mature work than the first symphony, though he offers no reasons for coming to that conclusion. The work was found in the SLb in Dresden among the works of Johann Gottlieb Graun. Mennicke, in his list of symphonies by J. G. Graun, does indeed suggest that one of them, in G, is by Frederick, being marked in the source "di Friderico". Unfortunately, it is one of the works by Graun that has not survived the war, so that clarity will probably never be achieved (cf. loc. cit., p. 539, No. 28).

The following table may help to make the situation clearer. We know that symphonies were among the earliest of works composed by Frederick during his years as Crown Prince (cf. SpFr p. x) with a symphony composed in 1735 and corrected by Graun.

(see overleaf)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symphony</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NG &quot;probably&quot; authentic. Found in a set of parts ascribed to the Re di Prussia in the Königliche Hausbibliothek of the DStB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NG &quot;doubtful (attrib. J. G. Graun)&quot;. Cf. Mennicke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>As Overture to Villati's Schäferspiel of unknown title its authenticity is not questioned. The title Il Re Pastore according to Spitta is quite unfounded. This is the only work by Frederick to require two flutes, and the only one of these 4 symphonies to require flutes, oboes and horns in addition to the strings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NG &quot;doubtful&quot; without further comment. Lenzewski's edition merely claims it to be the most recent of the King's works to come to light. No year is given on the reprint of 1976 (Munich).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All four were published by the Chr. Friedrich Vieweg Verlag, Berlin-Lichterfelde, with catalogue Nos: V 1586; V 1587; V 1598 and V 1702 resp.

### Frederick in the Eyes of Some of his Contemporaries

We will have noted in the last made reference to Dr. Burney that he spoke of Frederick as having composed "...pieces for the flute, and some for the harpsichord". Burney and others affirm that for the last dozen years of his life the King, having lost his front teeth, gave up playing the flute. Reichardt, and with him Burney, assert that he then gave up his daily concerts and an interest in music altogether: "a proof that his Majesty's chief pleasure in the art was derived from his own performance" (Burney, ibid.).

Other contemporaries are less damning and refer to him taking up the clavier again in later years. When Burney visited Potsdam the King was still playing the flute. He seemed quite
impressed by the King's prowess (Scholes, p. 181):

The concert began by a German flute concerto, in which his majesty executed the solo parts with great precision; his embouchure was clear and even, his finger brilliant, and his taste pure and simple. I was much pleased, and even surprised with the neatness of his execution in the allegros, as well as by his expression and feeling in the adagio; in short, his performance surpassed, in many particulars, any thing I had ever heard among Dilettanti, or even professors. His majesty played three long and difficult concertos successively, and all with equal perfection.

Though others, including Fasch, were less enthusiastic, especially about the King's ability to cope with technically demanding music, Burney has neither the need to indulge in sycophancy, nor has he any axe to grind, so that we cannot dismiss his judgement out of hand.

Any belief that the King was as enthusiastic about the clavier as he was about the flute is perhaps dispelled by Burney's observation (ibid. 178):

In another apartment, there is a most magnificent harpsichord, made by Shudi, in England; the hinges, pedals and frame are of silver, the case is inlaid, and the front is of tortoise-shell; this instrument, which cost 200 guineas, was sent to Hamburg by sea, and from thence to Potsdam, up the Elb and Havel, which, I was told, had injured it so much, that it has been useless ever since.

A Spurious Ascription to Frederick

Prima facie, given the conflicting nature of contemporary opinion, there is no reason to assume that the LESSON for the HARPSICORD or PIANO-FORTE composed by his Majesty the King of Prussia, should necessarily prove to be other than authentic. It forms part of a larger collection published by Preston (No. 105), dating c. 1786, a copy of which is housed by the British Library. The date of publication made it just about possible for either Frederick or his successor, Frederick William II,
to have composed it. Again this source appears to have escaped the attention of all Friderician scholars, and yet a most interesting tale attaches to it.

Both Eitner and Lenzewski list a work with the unlikely combination for Frederick II of "Cembalo obligato mit zwei Flöten oder zwei Violinen". The Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek in Darmstadt (BRD) holds the source of that work, with the original title Concerto / a / Cembalo obligato / 2. Flauti Traverse / o Violini, / composta / dal Re di Prussia (Mus. ms 320). Only the obbligato harpsichord part is extant.

The "Lesson" in the British Library turns out to be an arrangement of the first movement of the Cembalo part of the above work, and is ascribed to the King of Prussia, one may assume, as a translation of the title of that source (dated 1766).

By a quite extraordinary coincidence, Dr. Klaus Hofmann of the Johann-Sebastian-Bach-Institut in Göttingen sent the present writer a copy of a work for the same combination of instruments, found in the Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal in Brussels, (Wotquenne's Catalogue, 6581), believing that it might be of interest as concert material. In fact, this turns out to be the identical work to that found in Darmstadt, ascribed to a Signor Forster, but including the "missing" flute or violin parts. This, in turn, proves to be identical to a work, also ascribed to a Foerster (Christoph?) held by the Universitätsbibliothek Münster, in Rheda, Westphalia (BRD).

How the work ever came to be ascribed to the King of Prussia in the Darmstadt source remains obscure, but there can be no doubt that the "Lesson" in the British Library cannot claim Frederick the Great as its originator.
Overleaf is a copy of the piece, as found in the Preston collection.

The King's Musical Taste

In rounding off this survey of surviving sources of the King's music, two assertions made in relation to him need further clarification. Most commentators on the King's aesthetic preferences inform us that his taste in literature was French (his own correspondence and his poetry, even his operatic libretti were written in French, the latter being then translated into Italian verse)*. His taste in music, however, we are generally told, was Italian.

Although the opera was dominated by Italian performers (their financial reward being astronomic in relation to their German counterparts), the King's real devotion was not to Italian but to Italianate music. Graun and Hasse were masters of the Italian style (the King forbade the former to write French-style overtures), but genuine Italian music was not the order of the day. Likewise Spitta's assertion (SpFr p. xi) that the King modelled himself of Quantz is absolutely correct; that Quantz, like most composers of his era, modelled himself in his concertos on Vivaldi (and in his sonatas on Tartini) is probably also correct. In Quantz' autobiography, published in Marburg's Kritische Beiträge I (p. 205), we find the following (translation):

*For insight into Frederick as a librettist, cf. DDT 15, Graun's opera Montezuma, edited A. Mayer-Reinach, Leipzig, 1904, (Preface p. ix f.).*
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LONDON Printed for J. FREDON, No. 309, nearBowater Buildings, Strand.
Burney claimed the same of Quantz (Scholes, p. 206 f.) though the German edition added a footnote, explaining that C. P. E. Bach did not consider Quantz to have been an imitator of Vivaldi. At all events Quantz is not an Italian, nor even always a markedly italianate composer. Burney summarized the situation perfectly (ibid.):

> It does not appear that [his Prussian majesty] .... has placed his favour upon the best composers of that age. Vinci, Pergolesi, Leo, Feo, Handel, and many others, who flourished in the best times of Graun and Quantz, I think superior to them in taste and genius. Of his majesty's two favourites, the one is languid, and the other frequently common and insipid.

Ledebur, too, (p. 170) had this insight into the King's musical aesthetic (translation):

> In general the King liked only the music of German composers, though he singled out from among them those who could not be described as representative, people like Graun and Hasse. Handel and Gluck were not considered. But he held in similar low regard the works of Italian composers, and French music was similarly dismissed, even though he held French literature in such high regard.

Frederick therefore seems to have liked his Italian music "at one remove", so that his sonatas are in no sense particularly Italian, and his concertos, while schematically related to those of Italian models, are pale imitations of the genuine article. The personnel of the Court band was predominantly German or Bohemian, and the music that was performed with what must have been for the accompanying players a tedious, repetitive routine, stuck rigidly to the flute compositions of Quantz and the King himself. A devoted collector of true Italian music would have found little difficulty in acquiring it.
The King's Choice of Keys

Another popular theory, perpetuating itself in concert programmes and on gramophone recording sleeves, is that J. S. Bach in the famous trio sonata of the Musical Offering, written for the King in response to the theme put before him to play on the forte-piano on the occasion of his visit to Sans Souci in 1747, presented the King with that trio sonata a sort of revenge for the difficulty of the theme on which the King had expected him to improvise. The key chosen was c-minor, which, like any key of three or more flats, is not favourable to the flute of the time, and will have pressed the King's technique to its absolute limits.

Persuasive as the idea is, a few comments are necessary. Johann Sebastian will have been appraised of the nature of musical events at Sans Souci by his own son, Carl Philip Emanuel, who was Court harpsichordist. Neither father or son will have expected the King to perform the work at one of the evening concerts, since only the music of Quantz or the King was ever played at them.

Even had Johann Sebastian thought that the key would have presented the King with unaccustomed technical challenge, he would have been disappointed. Quite apart from Sonata 190 (SpFr II) thought by Spitta - and quite possibly correctly - to have been inspired by Bach's visit, since it is in c-minor and ends, uniquely among the works of Frederick the Great, with a fugal movement, the King wrote another dozen works in three flats, nine of them in Eb major and three in c-minor. He was therefore in no way intimidated by these unfavourable keys. Indeed, Nicolai believes that the King wrote his sonatas as personal technical challenges. If, however, we accept Spitta's convincing argument that the order of the sonatas in the original catalogue is chronological, then it is interesting to note that of the approximately three dozen sonatas written subsequent to Bach's visit, no fewer than six
are in three flats, half of them in c-minor.

Interestingly enough, the three sonatas in the similarly uncomfortable key of E major are narrowly spaced in their numerical order: Nos. 153, 155 and 161. After this last number none of the remaining 66 sonatas ventured into such realms, where modulations into B major and other virtually unavoidable keys with a high number of sharps cause particular problems of temperament, not to mention technique. It is as if the King, having made the technical and temperamental experiment with some concentration, abandoned that particular challenge, for whatever reasons, and moved on to others.

We will return to the music of Frederick the Great and its subsequent reception, but not before discussing the talents of two of his siblings.

Wilhelmine (1709-58)

Frederick's elder sister, known as Wilhelmine von Bayreuth, but born Princess Friederike Sophie Wilhelmine von Preußen, and his younger sister, Amalie Anna (1723-87) both composed. In markedly different ways they both made valuable contributions to musical life.

Wilhelmine was Frederick's life-long friend and confidante, and like himself, developed musical talents at an early age. Pierre Gaxotte, in his skilfully condensed account of much of the documentary evidence of the time, informs us (loc. cit., p. 40 f.) that:

There were daily concerts in Monbijou, given by the outstanding flautist, Johann Joachim Quantz. Frederick and Wilhelmine played duets. Wilhelmine called her lute "Principe" and 'Fritz' named his flute "Principessa" ...

Apart from a brief spell of estrangement, the two remained in intense letter correspondence. Earlier Frederick's distaste
for da capo arias was mentioned, summarized in the DDT edition of Graun's Montezuma. It was in the context of their correspondence\(^{(16)}\) that Frederick on May 4th uttered his famous adage that "it seems to me to be an abusive custom to repeat the same thing eight times".

In his correspondence with Wilhelmine, and with that other notable royal composer (if such she was) Maria Antonia Walpurgis, discussed earlier, Frederick gives us remarkable insight into the aesthetic, political and social values of some of the most outstanding personalities of the 18th century. His sister Wilhelmine can certainly be described as such. She it was who should have married the British (and Hanoverian) heir apparent, the composing Frederick Lewis, in exchange for the marriage of Frederick the Great, as Prussian Crown Prince, to the eldest daughter of George II. Frederick's abortive attempt to speed up the whole protracted business had tragic and traumatic consequences, culminating in the trial, re-trial and execution before Frederick's enforced gaze, of his closest friend, Leutnant Katte, for treason.

Gaxotte said of Wilhelmine that she was "Frederick's alter ego, freely translated into a feminine version"\(^{(17)}\) (loc. cit., p. 31). Frederick heard of her death in the immediate aftermath of his traumatic defeat at the Battle of Hochkirch, on the day on which she died, October 14th, 1758. The double trauma is poignantly expressed in his conversations with Henri de Catt (cf. loc. cit., p. 287) and also in his letter at the time to his brother Heinrich:

> Just think, I was born and brought up with my sister of Bayreuth. These ties are insoluble, and that heartfelt love never experienced any change; we are separate bodies with one soul.

She, like Frederick, tried her hand at writing opera libretti - notably for the opera Amaltea in 1756. This, like Frederick's libretto for Graun's Montezuma, was written in French and then translated into Italian verse: Drama per
The date, 1756, places it in the immediate aftermath of Graun's opera, whose libretto had stimulated so much correspondence between her and her brother, resulting at one point at Frederick's text being tried out - apparently with no great success, and singular lack of enthusiasm - by her court actors.

However, this was by no means her sole involvement with opera. She also wrote the libretto to Andrea Bernasconi's opera *L'Huomo*. Not content with providing the words, Wilhelmine also contributed two "Cavatinas" to the opera, this word being the chosen term for the replacement to da capo arias, as outlined above. In the famous letter of May 4th, 1754,
written by Frederick to his sister, he told her:

I am charmed that you are happy with my opera. As far as the Cavatinas are concerned, I have seen some by Hasse which are infinitely more beautiful than the arias, and take less time. One cannot have repeats simply so that the singers can embellish the music......

Frederick, in a letter to Alagarotti (October 1753: Oeuvres XVIII), had explained that the purpose of his libretto for Montezuma was to ennoble the "Mexican" hero, and to expose the "barbarity of the Christian religion". Wilhelmine's opera libretto, in like vein, advances humanistic as opposed to religious values. The two cavatinas, both with homophonic textures and extraordinarily high tessituras, are given in Schiedermair's(18) account of the history of Bayreuth's operatic tradition in pre-Wagnerian times.

Wilhelmine's ultimate choice of husband was a down-market aristocrat by her own standards, and in relation to the royal English and electoral Hanoverian thrones that were at one time potentially hers. Her mother was furious at the union, and tried to persuade her daughter not to consummate the marriage, so that at a later date it could be annulled, should marriage to Frederick Lewis again prove possible (cf. Gaxotte, p. 115):

Do not engage yourself in intimate relations with the Prince, but live with him as brother and sister. For that would be the only means of dissolving the marriage again; it would not be valid if it were not consummated.

The advice was not heeded; she married and produced offspring with her spouse, Margrave Friedrich of Bayreuth, himself a member of the Hohenzollern dynasty via the Franconian line. Like her brother of the same name, the Margrave was a flute-player, pupil of the great Chr. Fr. Döbbert.
Wilhelmine's Opera: Arqenore

For her husband's birthday in 1740 Wilhelmine composed the music for a complete Italian opera, Arqenore. Discrepancies exist between the printed Italian/German libretto and the words found in the large format score, both of which are preserved in the Schloßbibliothek in Ansbach. No modern edition of this truly remarkable work has ever been made, though the present writer has transcribed and directed recordings of arias from it for the WDR (West German Radio) in Cologne (May, 1981). At the time of writing Hans-Joachim Bauer of the University of Bayreuth is preparing a facsimile edition of the opera, though it is doubtful whether such a presentation will encourage performances of it. The handwritten score gives the impression in places of being put together under time pressure, in marked contrast to the published libretto with its German verse translation.

In the Supplement (No. 48) is one of Ormondo's arias from the opera. It was obviously written with her husband in mind. The aria is for tenor, four-part strings and basso continuo, with an obbligato flute part, written in the key of B major, a highly adventurous key for the traverso of the time, as was mentioned earlier in the context of her brother's flute sonatas. It is not only the complicated cross-fingerings that make the key such a challenge, but also the question of temperament makes it very difficult to make the music self-evident. In his list of keys and their characteristics, Mattheson finds this particular key to have a "somewhat desperate character". (Cf. Das Neu-eröffnete Orchester) p. 251 f.: "eine etwas desperate Eigenschaft". Cf. also Steblin(39), p. 314 f.)

Wilhelmine's Harpsichord Concerto

The only other known work by Wilhelmine is a Concerto for harpsichord and strings (g-minor) which - like the score to
Bernasconi's *L'Huomo* is held by the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel. Unfortunately, the original harpsichord part has not survived, though the present writer has scoured the libraries of Europe in search of even anonymous works that might prove to be concordant. The missing part was reconstructed by Willy Spilling in 1938 for the Vieweg-Verlag (Munich) and recorded by Bavarian Radio as part of Wilhelmine's bicentenary celebrations in 1958. That edition, by which the work has become known in certain musical circles, is found to be totally corrupt. The original string parts in Wolfenbüttel are complete and virtually free of errors, so that the job of reconstruction can concentrate simply on the given orchestral material, and the number of bars rests between the various tutti episodes. Spilling's version adds a flute part that is independent of the first violin, and is nowhere justified by the title given on the instrumental parts:

> *Concerto a Cembalo obligato, Duei violini, violetta e basso.*

Even as an imitation of 18th century writing, this flute part is unconvincing, since it goes beyond the effective range of the instrument of the time. Spilling has also distorted the surviving string parts, to make them accord with his reconstruction, by adding bars or omitting them. The reconstruction of the Gavotte that forms the final movement does not even have the correct number of bars for that dance form. The present writer has re-edited the work, using only those existing original string parts as the essential basis. To them he has added a new reconstruction of the missing harpsichord part in collaboration with the London harpsichordist, Paul Nicholson (to whom must go almost the entire credit for the keyboard part in the form given). At its first performance to open the Windsor Arts Centre in February 1981 it was enthusiastically received by Dr. Stanley Sadie in *The Times* (9th February, 1981), who wrote as follows:
The work is attractive, in an energetic C.P.E. Bach vein, but with a final gavotte more tuneful than he would have countenanced.

This work, too, was subsequently recorded on 18th century instruments by WDR in Cologne.

The Supplement (No. 49) shows how Paul Nicholson's reconstruction of the missing harpsichord part relates to Spilling's score. The spurious flute part has been removed completely; Spilling's string parts have been edited to conform to the source, and the length of the solo episodes made to agree with the correct lengths written into the string parts. In order not to prejudice the ultimate publication of this reconstruction in toto at a future date, the first movement only is included in the Supplement.

Neither MGG, Grove 1-5, NG, Lenzewski, nor any of the encyclopaedists of the late 18th and early 19th centuries mention Wilhelmine as a composer. Her husband was credited by some (notably Gerber and Schilling) with a concerto for lute and strings, the former referring to it as a Lautenconcert à 4 and the latter translating that into a 'Concerto for lute accompanied by string quartet'. No such work appears to have survived, not even under incerta or anonymous. It may well be that there is confusion between him and his director of music, the lutenist, Adam Falkenhagen (portrait in Thiel, No. 7), of whom Lipowski (p. 79) informs us that his main output included "twelve lute solos (= sonatas/suites) and twelve concertos for the lute".

The cordial relationship that existed between Frédéric and his elder sister, best characterized perhaps by the poem À ma soeur de Bayreuth written in 1734, did not exist between Frederick and his appreciably younger sister Amalie. These two sisters were completely different: Wilhelmine, the cultured woman of the world, married, interested in all art
forms, can only be contrasted against, rather than compared with, her unmarried, difficult, austere younger sister, who became abbess of the Lutheran convent in Quedlingburg.

Princess Amalie (1723-87)

Amalie has entered musical history on account of her interest in the music of Johann Sebastian Bach, at a time when Bach's music, and above all the contrapuntal ethos that lay behind it, was no longer fashionable. Copies of the music of J. S. Bach, made at her behest, have been blessed by Bach scholars in our own century where there is an absence of other reliable sources. The library she created, known as the Amalienbibliothek, is now housed in the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin (DDR). The most recent catalogue, that compiled by Eva Renate Blechschmidt(20), does not indicate which works belonged to the original collection, and which were added in the 19th century.

Neither MGG nor NG give a satisfactory account of Amalie's own compositions. Apart from Blechschmidt, the entry in Ledebur (though it includes some dubious titles) and the Verzeichnis der Werke der Prinzessin Amalie in Lenzewski's 1916 article, give more enlightening information on her own works. These all survive in a poorly ordered folder in her own Amalienbibliothek, as manuscripts, generally precisely dated, in a small, spidery hand that, coupled to the colour of the paper, presents a challenge even to today's reprographic techniques. Kirnberger published two of her compositions: an Allegro for two violins and a bass, incorporated as an exemplar of double counterpoint in Vol. II of Die Kunst des reinen Satzes in der Musik (1779), and also her setting of the chorus Sein Odem ist schwach from Rammler's Passion text Der Tod Jesu. This fugal setting was highly praised by her contemporary Naumann, the director of music to the Saxon Chapel Royal in Dresden, who said of it (cf. Lenzewski, p. 149):
It deserves to become more widely known; it does great credit to its royal composer, and puts to shame many professional composers.

In 1927/28 Lenzewski published a few of her compositions, including a heavily edited version of the Allegro (in D) mentioned above, and also her only "free" instrumental work, a sonata for flute and basso continuo (F major), dated 16th January, 1771.

The folder of her own compositions in the Amalienbibliothek, in their heavy emphasis on contrapuntal skills, give the clue to her own character and musical aesthetics.

In an article for the Hohenzollern-Jahrbuch in 1910 Curt Sachs(21) admirably set about the task of assessing the Princess's musical talents and her character. The key to her output lies in her relationship with Johann Philipp Kirnberger, as her Hofmusikus und Cembalist. She bestowed upon Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach the title of Hofkapellmeister only as a sort of farewell gesture in 1767, when he announced his imminent departure for Hamburg as Telemann's successor. The decisive figure in her musical entourage was, and remained, Kirnberger.

Burney, it may be remembered, himself met Kirnberger in Berlin, and he confirms the picture that emerges from Sachs' article of Kirnberger and his approach to music (Scholes, p. 201):

I was perhaps, the more flattered by the kindness and compliance of this ingenious professor, from his character, which is grave and austere; he is said to be soured by opposition and disappointment; his present inclination leads him to mathematical studies, and to the theory of music, more than the practice, in which he has such great abilities; and in his late writings, he appears to be more ambitious of the character of an algebraist, than of a musician of genius.
Unfortunately no documentation survives to confirm the teaching methods applied by Kirnberger in the case of his royal pupil. We may, however, assume that it was not radically different from the method of teaching meted out to Johann-Abraham Peter Schulz, who went on to become director of music to the Danish court, and was certainly one of Kirnberger's more successful pupils.

Since this material is less readily available than articles on Frederick the Great, I quote here in translation some of the enlightening information imparted by Sachs' article.

Schulz writes in respect of Kirnberger and his didactic methods (cf. p. 185 f.):

On his insistence I had to give up singing in choirs, including the church choir, and concentrate solely on composing. With iron determination and with ravenous appetite I worked for nearly three years according to countless rules on the simple and decorated chorale style, a field in which Kirnberger was inexhaustible, and through his instruction, it must be said, I made a name for myself in the art of pure and polyphonic composition, and of simple and double counterpoint. But this overprotracted study of one particular sort reached such a degree that without realizing it, I had forgotten how to apply them to works of my own, and they became my main preoccupation per se. Kirnberger delighted in seeing me indefatigable in this pursuit, and thought perhaps that in me he was training a second Sebastian Bach. At the beginning he forbade me absolutely to go to concerts or the theatre, to spare me, as he put it, from allowing my taste to follow the wrong direction. It soon became unnecessary to forbid my going to such events, as increasingly I found all modern music shallow and insufferable, and I became the devotee in body and soul of early, carefully worked-out music. I was attracted only to works that seemed to have been laboriously worked-out, and consequently my earlier facility in writing became laboured and painful. Practical music-making ceased to have any attraction for me, because Kirnberger himself was not a particularly good performer and never went to concerts. The organ, once my main instrument, became neglected, because I lost my confidence in improvising, and was afraid of making forbidden modulations. In a word, through my association and instruction with Kirnberger I had manifestly improved vastly in terms of knowledge, theory and critical capacity, but had lost just as much in terms of the flair (Genie) for producing compositions of my own.
In later years there was correspondence between Schulz and his Royal fellow-pupil. The former, by then an established and respected composer, wrote to Amalie with a request for her to include her name among the list of subscribers to a new work of his. She replied (cf. Sachs, p. 188):

*I forbid you absolutely to attach my name to a work to which I would never subscribe, for the simple reason that the music of today is not music at all.*

Worse was to follow when the Princess finally came to see the music in question:

*I can only imagine, Herr Schulz, that instead of sending me your own work, you accidentally sent the musical doodlings of a child, for I can find no trace of scholarly art in it; on the contrary, from the beginning to the end it is riddled with errors, both in expression, sense and understanding of the language, and in rhythm. The modus contrarius is pushed into the background, no harmony, no melody, and the thirds omitted. There is no clear sense of key, and you have to guess what it is modulating from; there are no canonic imitations, not a trace of counterpoint, fifths and octaves all over the place, and you call it music. May God open the eyes of those who so delude themselves, and give them understanding to recognize that they are mere hacks and scribblers. I have heard people say that the work is the master’s own praise, but now everything is turned upside down, and the masters themselves are the only ones to accord praise, even though their works stink. I have no more to say.*

Amélie (Berlin, Jan. 31st, 1785).

Gluck, however, fared no better (though Handel, too, was derogatory about that composer’s particular skills as a contrapuntist). In a letter to Kirnberger (Sachs, p. 188) she wrote:

*In my opinion Herr Gluck will never pass himself off as a competent composer. 1) He has no powers of invention; 2) a poor, miserable sense of melody; 3) no emphasis, no expression, everything is the same. He cannot be mentioned alongside Graun and Hasse, though he is very similar to ***. The Intrade is supposed to be a kind of Overture, but the good man is not fond of imitative writing - and he is right, because it is difficult. On the other hand he has a predilection for transpositions. One cannot complain too much, because if a bar is repeated several*
times, the listener remembers it better, but one gets the impression that it is because of a paucity of ideas. The whole opera is miserable, but it is in the new style that has many devotees. However, I am grateful to him for sending it to me. One can learn from the mistakes of others. Ask him to be so kind as to send me the libretto of the whole opera. But as for the music, I am not clever enough to find it good.

The above quotations help us to gain some picture of this highly complex personality, and her relatively few surviving compositions. Unlike Schulz, she never threw off the shackles of Kirnberger's stultifying contrapuntal training. Consequently her output is dominated by those contrapuntal exercises, many of which still survive in the folder of her works in the collection that bears her name in the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek.

In the Supplement some of these are to be found. No. 50 (Lenzewski VII) is a two-part fugue for violin and viola, followed by a most skilfully contrived "circular" canon (Zirkel-Canon), dated 1779 (No. 51; Lenzewski V). These were both kindly transcribed in 1981 for performance purposes by Dr. David Hiley, then of Royal Holloway College Music Department, currently Reader at the University of Regensburg (BRD). In the case of the "circular canon", an ending has been realized, to prevent the circle of all the keys commencing again!

No. 52 in the Supplement is the Allegro in D used as an exemplar by Kirnberger. No. 53 is listed neither by Lenzewski nor mentioned by Sachs, a Figurirter* Choral. The folder includes four contrapuntal exercises on Jesu, meine Freude as cantus firmus. These are each given separately, but a further sheet provides all four and cantus firmus on one system. The interval between each note in the contrapuntal line and the cantus firmus is laboriously entered above or below each quaver, reminding us of Burney's reference to Kirnberger's

*Figurirt* has nothing to do with the "figures" she has entered, but means "decorated".
ambitions as an "algebraist".

These works are of particular interest, in that the charge is usually levelled against dilettanti that they understood little of the real science of music. With Amalie the opposite is more true, in that her interest lay more in the science than the emotional potential of her music.

Sachs, thinking in terms of her universally acclaimed chorus to Ramler's Passion text, excuses the perfunctory nature of her handful of song settings, on the grounds that "Amalie was not good at composing small pieces". This is perhaps misleading, for some of these contrapuntal exercises are worthwhile miniatures. What the Princess found difficult was presumably not small pieces per se, but free composition on a small scale.

Sachs is right, however, in finding these small vocal works too slight for lengthy discussion. Two works nevertheless warrant mention, at least in so far as they conform neither to the contrapuntal exercise norm, nor to the chorale-based categories that typify her surviving works. These are the duet Io moro, spietato amante, and the freely composed Sonata / per il Flauto traverso e Basso.

As with libretto texts by both Frederick and Wilhelmine, the duet text, too, was first penned in French by the Princess and translated into Italian verse, as the inscription bears out: Duetto - Composta in Francese ..... dalla Real' Principessa e tradotto in Poesia Italiana dal Sanseverino. It is an extended and technically demanding work for soprano and alto with a four-part string accompaniment. A less likely personality to have conceived this work is hard to imagine.

The flute sonata is an attractive piece, though Lenzewski's heavy-handed realization of the basso continuo part comes perilously close to obscuring the inherent charm of the work.
It has more in common with the flute sonatas of František Benda and C. P. E. Bach than with those of her illustrious brother, and is certainly rather less of an anachronism in the year in which it was written (1771) than the contrapuntal pieces that so fascinated her.

The contradictions that must form part of any assessment of her music and personality are perhaps best characterized by two quotations from a contemporary source. Count Lehnsdorff was moved to say of her on one occasion:

"The waves of the ocean are not more agitated than her demeanour. Good and evil, philosopher, woman of the world, pious nun (though appointed Abbess of the Convent in Quedlinburg in 1756, she does not appear to have ever been resident there), she is all of those, one after another. Ten times a week she is content and not content. This creature is as changeable as the weather and consequently a great pain to all around her. She is happiest when everything around her is in turmoil.

We would gladly accept this as a damning description of her, were it not that elsewhere the self-same commentator enthused of her in 1753 in the following terms (cf. Sachs, p. 182):

She is in every way an adorable Princess. Some reproach her with being changeable, but I believe that this comes about more from the worries she often has than from her whim. She is captivating to look at, and in my opinion she is the most beautiful woman in the world. She is not tall, slightly plump, but her appearance impresses all, and one sees in her whole being the greatness of her soul. One would always pick her out among a hundred others and recognize her Royal descent. Her eyes are of breathtaking beauty, a feature shared by all her illustrious family; her mouth is small, giving her immeasurable charm in speaking. In short (!!!) she is adorable to an extraordinary degree .... She is like many great men, in that there is nothing mediocre about her; either she is divine or diabolic.

The Musical Life of Frederick's Court

Contrary to popular belief, the compositional talents of the house of Hohenzollern did not die out with Frederick the Great
or his sister Amalie. But the death of Frederick in 1786 brought a completely new, and less anachronistic musical spirit to the Prussian court. The outstanding band of performer-composers that Frederick assembled around himself in the years just prior to his accession represented some of the finest musical talent in the German-speaking territory. However, Frederick's musical conservatism, and the rigid routine of music to be played, to which he committed himself and those around him, prevented it from keeping pace with the musical developments of the world outside. This is partly true of the opera (where Frederick shared completely Amalie's contempt for the reforms of Gluck, while perpetrating experiments of his own) and certainly true of chamber music. Carl Philipp Emanuel, not being a naturalized Prussian, could leave voluntarily after nearly 30 years' service, but most of his colleagues suffered the boredom in exchange for the security, and died in service. František Benda claimed that by 1763, i.e. after a quarter of a century in the willing service of the Prussian Prince and King, he had accompanied him in at least 10,000 concertos (by which he means performances of a much more limited number of different concertos!). In his Autobiography for Marburg's Kritische Beiträge he claims (cf. Ledebur, p. 167):

> It is of no little satisfaction to me that it was given to me to serve this truly great Frederick, and over the years to have played at least up to 10,000 concertos.

This already amazingly high figure (though just within the bounds of possibility) was later distorted by Gerber, claiming that Benda had played in 50,000 concertos by the year 1770.

The famous oil-painting by Adolph von Menzel, depicting Frederick playing in a recital of flute music in Sans Souci (cf. inter alia Hogwood, p. 83) is based on the artist's own previous pen-sketch, derived presumably from existing portraits, since the drawing was not made until the 1850s. There Menzel designated the various performers at Sans Souci.
The awesome continuity of the situation is reflected in the names he gives and the partly erroneous titles attached to them (cf. overleaf). He depicts as musicians (left to right) Kapellmeister Graun, (Princess Amélie and the Markgräfin von Baireuth sitting in front of him), Friedrich der Große in the centre, near to Philipp Emanuel Bach, Hofcembalist, and beyond him Concertmeister Franz Benda and at the edge, Quantz, des Königs Lehrer auf der Flöte.

The Graun brothers between them gave some 60 years to the King's service, Quantz about 40, C. P. E. Bach about 30, and Benda himself died in the same year as the King, having served the Court for almost half a century. The titles given by Menzel do not correspond to the year 1750, to which the scene in the music-room of Sans Souci is meant to relate. Benda became Concertmeister only in 1771*, on the death of Johann Gottlieb Graun in that year. His brother, Carl Heinrich Graun was the opera composer (often humiliated by Frederick to the advantage of Hasse) and Kapellmeister until his death in 1759. By the time Benda was rewarded for his loyalty and promoted in rank, both Grauns had already moved to eternity, and C. P. E. Bach to Hamburg.

Burney (cf. Scholes, p. 207) did not find that the musical establishment in Potsdam lived up to his expectations, either in "that style of composition, or manner of execution, to which his Prussian majesty has attached himself", concluding wryly that (ibid.):

> though the world is ever rolling on, most of the Berlin musicians, defeating its motion, have long contrived to stand still ....

> .... music is truly stationary in this country, his majesty allowing no more liberty in that, than he does in civil matters of government: not contented with being sole monarch of the lives, fortunes and business of his subjects, he even prescribes rules to their most innocent pleasures.

*cf. the note on Benda's demotion and promotion overleaf.*
Menzel's pen-sketch of the Music Room in Sans Souci in 1750. Franz Benda was not Concertmeister in 1750, a title that became his over twenty years later, when C. P. E. Bach had by then relinquished the post of Hofcembalist. Benda had, in fact, been Concertmeister to Frederick as Crown Prince, but on his accession Frederick appointed J. G. Graun to that position, though Benda does not appear to have held the demotion against the King.
Frederick died in 1786 without heir. It is doubtful whether the marriage was ever consummated, judging by the revulsion felt by Frederick at the very sight of his bride, Princess Christine of Brunswick-Bevern:

If the King insists that I marry, I will obey, but later I will leave my wife in the lurch, and live as I choose.

The above statement (cf. Gaxotte, p. 117) and even more significantly the hostile sentiments of the utterance below, give us insight into Frederick's attitude, and presumably account for the lack of an heir (ibid.):

As long as I remain a bachelor, I will thank God. And if I do marry, I will certainly be a bad husband, for I feel too little constancy within me and too little devotion to the female sex ... the very idea of having a woman is so distressing to me that the mere thought of it fills me with revulsion.

Support came from Frederick's mother, who found the Princess to be rather stupid, "with a silly laugh that turns my stomach". Wilhelmine was quick to seize the opportunity to express even greater hostility:

Oh, Your Majesty does not even know all her merits! One morning I attended her toilet. I thought I would choke. She stinks like a carcass. She must have ten or a dozen fistulas, for such things cannot be with a healthy person! I also noticed that she is deformed. The bodice on one side of her dress is padded out, and one hip is higher than the other.

The above biographical details, fascinating as they are, would have no place here, were it not for their implications for the musical life at the Berlin court following Frederick's demise. Not being his natural heir, the next King of Prussia was inevitably not one directly brought up to cherish the same cultural ideals as Frederick the Great.

But before moving on to subsequent generations of the
Hohenzollern dynasty, it is worth casting our eyes back over the generation of Frederick and his two composing sisters.

Privilege of position and wealth allowed them to impose their own aesthetic preferences on their immediate surroundings. We do not know for what purpose three of Frederick's symphonies were composed, if indeed he did compose them. However, the function of the sonatas and concertos is well documented: they served the King's own recreation, to be played before an invited and select inner circle. They were not intended in any way as the King's response to musical trends outside his Court, with the possible exception of Sonata 190 (SpFr II) which may have been influenced by J. S. Bach's visit. The extent to which by and large the outside musical world and that of Frederick's Court failed to touch each other was most cogently summarized in situ by Burney.

Likewise Amalie's totally different output (with only one flute sonata in common) derives almost entirely from a maverick dedication to the mechanics of music. Her fascination for the disciplines of counterpoint à la Kirnberger makes the main body of her music even more anachronistic that that of her brother. But in terms of social history it is a manifestation of the same phenomenon: her aesthetic preferences may have differed from those of her brother, but she shares with him the ability to impose and indulge them as she saw fit. Wilhelmine is in essence no different. Her most substantial work, the opera Argenore, for all its manifest merits, was not written to enrich the repertoire of the emerging German opera houses; it was written as a birthday celebration for her likewise musical husband, for the exclusive delight of the relatively few at a relatively low-ranking provincial court.

But the story is not all negative. The very wilfulness all three were able to practise had interesting, even positive side-effects. Frederick, we are told, rejected the operatic
reforms of Gluck. This was not because he resisted reform, but because they were not his reforms. Frederick himself, aided, abetted and followed by Wilhelmine, can be seen in the vanguard of experimenters in forms that extended opera beyond the well-established Metastasian norm. This arose from Frederick's self-professed boredom with the da capo aria (though he wrote such arias himself) and with the conventions of embellishment inherent to the da capo form (though he himself wrote such embellishments).

The substance of the libretti, both of Frederick's Montezuma and Wilhelmine's L'Huomo - incorporating as they both do the new "Cavatinas" in part replacement at least of da capo arias - strikes new ground in that classical mythology gives way perhaps for the first time to texts that make "Italian" opera the mouthpiece of emerging humanist, anti-Christian values. The exercise also brought the two Royal librettists into fruitful interaction with composers of the stature of Graun, Hasse and Bernasconi. That Frederick first had the libretti tried out - with no great relish, it must be said - by Wilhelmine's resident troupe of French actors, is but one example of how power and privilege could be put to action in an artistic cause.

Aesthetically Amalie seems to have little in common with the other two. But even her anachronistic pre-occupation with counterpoint had the positive effect of saving for future generations sources of the music of J. S. Bach, at a time when much of his output had ceased to be fashionable.

Apart from Spitta's efforts over 100 years ago in publishing about one fifth of Frederick's sonata output and all four concertos, only Lenzewski with editions of all four symphonies attributed to the King, one additional sonata and a few of his arias, remarkably little of Frederick's music has been published this century, though Spitta's original selections of 25 sonatas have been re-published or even duplicated (cf. SpFr
Wilhelmine's talents have arguably been the most under-recognised. None of the major encyclopaedias have found space for her; her opera Argenore, despite the efforts of Bauer and the present writer, awaits revival. Her Cavatinas for L'Huomo were reproduced in Schiedermaier's scholarly work of reference at the beginning of the century, and her harpsichord concerto found publication in a realisation that is too corrupt to warrant consideration.

Arguably less talented, her younger sister Amalie has to some extent fared better. Several encyclopaedias have acknowledged her activity as a composer; Lenzewski republished her Allegro originally offered as an exemplar by Kirnberger, and published for the first time the acceptable though untypical flute sonata in F. However, the quintessential Amalie, as revealed by the contrapuntal instrumental pieces, most notably the Cirkel-Canon, have found no such preferment, nor indeed have the four exercises centred on the popular Jesu meine Freude. Certainly there is an element of irony in the fact that, despite Blechschmidt's attempt at a catalogue of the whole collection, Amalie's own output remains largely unprocessed in one folder within the ordered confines of the priceless library collection that still bears her name.

Friedrich Wilhelm II

The new successor to the Prussian throne was Friedrich Wilhelm II (1744-97), the son of Frederick's younger brother, Heinrich. The late King's unmoving predilection for the flute gave way to his successor's passion for the violoncello. But more important, the rigid regime in Sans Souci, that had led to the total exclusion of all music that did not conform to the King's own conservative taste, gave way to a liberal reign, attracting the most prominent composers to Berlin,
including Mozart and Beethoven (the latter dedicating to the King his early cello sonatas, Opus 5).

In keeping with his status as a cellist, Friedrich Wilhelm's principal teachers were the Italian composer and virtuoso Graziani, followed by the Frenchman Duport, and a succession of German teachers. His interest in the violoncello may well have grown from an initial interest in the viola da gamba. Wilhelm Tappert, in his press review of Thouret's catalogue on May 3rd, 1895, said of the King:

*Beyond doubt Friedrich Wilhelm II was the keenest of collectors. As we know, he played the violoncello with some skill, and also seems to have shown a keen interest in the viola da gamba.*

Strangely, the Beethoven violoncello sonatas dedicated to him do not survive in the Royal Music Collection (Königliche Hausbibliothek) in Berlin.

One of the last great virtuosi on the viola da gamba, Ludwig Christian Hesse - not to be confused with his even more famous father, Ernst Christian Hesse (according to Schilling: 1676-1762) - was in the employ of Frederick. Schilling states that his appointment to the Court band of the Crown Prince of Prussia dates from 1760, but this may not be true, since in 1760 there was no Crown Prince, or even Heir Apparent, and Frederick had been King of Prussia for 20 years. This is possibly a mis-print for 1740*.

Hesse's presence probably accounts for sonatas for viola da gamba written by such Sans Souci composers as Carl Philipp Emanuel, František Benda and Christopher Schaffrath. The latter composer seems to have slipped from Frederick's favour, being ousted in turn by C. P. E. Bach and Nichelmann as Court

---

* NG 8, p. 537, clarifies that he entered Frederick's service in 1741 and moved to join Prince Friedrich Wilhelm in 1766.
1st or 2nd harpsichordist. His final years were in the service of Princess Amalie, and his relatively large output of chamber sonatas, including many with obbligato (i.e. written out) keyboard parts, survives in the Amalien-Sammlung.

Hesse's own output includes a large number of arrangements of current operas for the unlikely combination of two viole da gamba. Presumably the composer had another performer - perhaps his Royal protégé? - in mind. They take the form of duets, some with and some without basso continuo, and survive, some incomplete, in the Königliche Hausbibliothek of the DSTB. A further testimony to Hesse's presence is a single-movement sonata for violin and viola da gamba written by Frederick himself, originally as part of a Graun opera. This is the "instrumental" aria referred to earlier.

Carl Friedrich Abel, the associate of J. C. Bach in London, and likewise designated the last great virtuoso on the viola da gamba, visited the Berlin court in the 1780s, leaving with Friedrich Wilhelm not only the manuscripts of a few sonatas for viola da gamba, but also a sonata for cello and basso continuo (A major). This is included in the Complete Works of Abel(22), but described there (Sonata No. 38, p. 148 ff., Vol. 16) as being for violoncello or viola da gamba. The title page (cf. overleaf) gives only the former option, and the use of harmonics at the end of the first movement appears better suited to the cello than the gamba. From his experience the English gambist, Ian Gammie, advises me that the harmonics required (3rd, 4th and 5th) are stronger on the cello, the chords more cellistic in concept, and the use of the tenor clef points to its primary suitability for the cello, though it is not unplayable on the viola da gamba in its generality.

The new King's crucial role in the revitalisation of musical life in Berlin is attested by lengthy entries both in Schilling and Ledebur - though the former questions the nature of some of his models: (p. 262)
Sonata
per il Violoncello.
Even in the works of the most respected composers that appeared from this time, one misses here and there the solid seriousness and that strict correctness that distinguished them previously from composers of other schools.

The implication of Schilling's entry in its context, is that the King's own taste influenced their output to such an extent - even such composers as Reichardt and Duport - that the so-called "Berlin taste" went into a decline through the King's interest in more superficial music, though it might be fairer to ascribe the decline - if such it was - to the King's genuine artistic liberality.

No sources refer to him as a composer. The Königliche Hausbibliothek, which he himself inaugurated, contains a Rondeau for violoncello and a bass, described on the title-page simply as: Rondeau / de S.A.R. le Prince de Prusse / mis au jour par Charles Graziani. The bass is a so-called "Murki" bass, with permanent alternation of octaves. If the work was "brought to light" by Graziani, it must pre-date 1787, when the composer died, and the title "Prince de Prusse" will have been superseded in 1786 on the Prince's accession to the throne. This unique example of the King as a composer is given in the Supplement (No. 54). The large number of double-stops in the bass part probably indicates that the work was intended, like many cello sonatas of the time, to be accompanied by a second cello without keyboard support.

While Friedrich Wilhelm II just qualifies for this thesis with the meagrest possible of offerings, his sociological significance in terms of a positive interaction between a composing dilettante and the "real" musical world should not be overlooked.

We have seen how Frederick and his sisters composed almost in a personal capsule hermetically sealed off from musical
reality, with no place in Telemann's "Republic of Music". Schilling's mildly adverse comment on the new King's influence on the Berlin school of composition indicates a shift of position. Frederick had three Residences in Berlin; his sonatas and concertos were played virtually daily in one or other of them, wars permitting, over decades. Yet the King's only influence on anything approaching public musical activity in Berlin was limited to the opera house, which still functioned as a Royal opera house, relying almost exclusively on the output of the resident composers in the King's employ, Graun and Hasse.

Schilling is probably overstating the case when referring to the new King's over-liberal influence on compositional trends in the Prussian capital*. The change is that there was any interaction at all, and that the lines of demarcation between the musical life of the Court and world of music outside it, had become blurred.

Whether or not this can be solely attributed to the fact that Friedrich Wilhelm II was a performer and not a composer, and consequently less determined to foster his own brand of composing talent to the detriment of all other, is debatable. At all events his relatively short reign created an artistic atmosphere that allowed the most gifted of the Hohenzollern composers, his much younger cousin and a legendary Prince of Prussia, to come to some kind of fruition.

Prince "Louis Ferdinand" of Prussia

Of all the Hohenzollern composers the most substantial, and undeservedly neglected, is Prince Louis Ferdinand (1772-1806). He was the fifth child of August Ferdinand, the youngest

* Opinions are divided on the King's character. Frederick could not bring himself to speak to his heir, preferring the younger Prince Heinrich. Mitford (op. cit., 8/10) is particularly savage in her assessment (cf. pp 175f. & 191).
brother of Frederick the Great. His correct name was Friedrich Ludwig Christian. At his christening his father gave him the French form "Louis" of his second name, and this was the form by which he was generally known. However, to avoid confusion with one of the children of Friedrich Wilhelm II who was also christened Ludwig (or Louis), August Ferdinand's son became referred to as Louis Ferdinand.

During his life-time (and after!) he became a legendary figure, Prussia's hope of survival, and the transcension of the Napoleonic scourge in persona. His death on the battlefield at Saalfeld on October 10th, 1806, deprived Prussia of that symbol of hope, and the musical world of a musician of immense stature, whose neglect over the past 150 years is probably as much due to the dilettante label attached to him by posterity (though not by the musical world of the time), as to the non-enduring nature of his music itself.

During his relatively brief life-span the Prince became an established pianist, and from the publication of his Opus 1 in 1803 attracted increasing attention as a composer. Beethoven's biographer Schindler\(^{(23)}\) tells us that the repertoire of the outstanding pianist, Baroness Dorothea von Ertmann, "included all the works of Prince Louis Ferdinand and some of Beethoven's. Her playing of this music was unequalled" (loc. cit., p. 210).

Relatively little is known of his early musical training. Some commentators have surmised a link between Princess Amalie and the Prince's early musical stimuli (indeed the characteristic Fugue for pianoforte solo, Opus 7, has been cited to indicate some such association). However the spirit of that Fugue (incorporated in the Supplement as No. 56), and certainly the remainder of his musical output, is far removed beyond talking point from the basically baroque counterpoint of his aunt, and to base any link between them on the strength of the Fugue or any other composition of his, seems
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Le Prince Louis Ferdinand de Hesse

Opus 28. Édition, pour l'usage des musiciens de l'époque

par M. A. R.
inconceivable. One of the two very slight songs by Amalie is dedicated to him in the years of infancy. MGG quotes documentary evidence of Amalie's particular regard for him. She allegedly gave him many presents and persuaded him to play to her on the organ the contrapuntal pieces she had composed.

**Louis Ferdinand and Mozart**

The Hohenzollern-Museum in Hechingen in the south-west German province of Baden-Württemberg proudly exhibits, adjacent to some of Frederick the Great's flutes, the title-page of a set of concertos, allegedly dedicated by Mozart to Louis Ferdinand, Opus 82 (see overleaf). Mozart visited Berlin in 1789, when Louis Ferdinand will have been in his late teens, and presumably already displaying considerable pianistic talent.

The correspondence of Mozart\(^{(24)}\) makes no reference whatsoever to any meeting with the young Prince, nor is there any mention of any concertos being written for him, though other chamber works are mentioned.

It was not Mozart who dedicated the concertos to the Prince, but the publisher André, to whom Constanze had sold manuscripts in 1799-1800. Closer inspection of the title-page reveals the truth: ... dédiés par l'éditeur ... and Oeuvre 82 is an arbitrary invention, typical of the practice of the time, of putting a label to a work.

Comparison with RISM numbers under Mozart M 5830 - 5849 helps us to clarify which these six "grand concertos", "Op. 82", actually are:

- No. 1: K 503
- No. 2: K 595
- No. 3: K 491
- No. 4: K 482
No. 5: K 488
No. 6: K 467

There is, however, just a possibility that the dedication to Louis Ferdinand by André is not completely arbitrary, and that some link exists between them. RISM 5839 refers to another edition of K 503, No. 1 of "Opus 82". The title-page of that edition claims at least that the motivation to dedicate to the Prince came not from André, but from Constanze:

Concerto per il clavicembalo o pianoforte, composto di Wolfgango Amadeo Mozart e dedicato all' Altezza Reale il Principe Luigi Ferdinando di Prussia per Constanza Mozart.

No 1 del retaggio del defunto, pubblicato alle spese della vedova.

Without wishing to claim more from the situation, it remains within the bounds of possibility that Constanze considered it appropriate to dedicate these works to Louis Ferdinand in the light of things said by her late husband, and nowhere recorded in correspondence. Letters, inevitably, cannot give the complete picture. An alternative suggestion, in view of the fact that according to RISM 5839 the cost of publication was actually met by Constanze, would be that she hoped in this manner to gain revenue by attaching so powerful a royal name to the edition.

The question of the influence of Mozart on the compositions of Louis Ferdinand divides the scholars. MGG informs that "the influence of Haydn and Mozart is very slight". Hahn\(^{25}\) finds tangible evidence of Mozart's influence in the 1st and 3rd movements of Opus 1; with an almost literal quotation from the piano sonata K 331. Klaus Stahmer\(^{26}\) in his lengthy and detailed essay that accompanied the complete recording of the works of Louis Ferdinand by the W. German company, Thorofon (76.30834) in 1981, concludes the first part of his essay with the belief that:
Personally advised by modern thinking composers such as Reicha, Dussek, Winter and Lenz, influenced by Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven, he found a style - his own style. This Schumann was to characterize appropriately much later as the style of a Romantic of the classical era.

If Beethoven is the Prince's mentor in spirit, and we will have cause later to link the two, his real mentor and stimulus was the Bohemian piano virtuoso Jan Ladislav Dusík (Dussek), who accepted the post of composition teacher to the Prince after Reicha had declined the invitation.

Louis Ferdinand and Dussek

Dussek's colourful life (1760-1812) saw him a piano teacher to Marie Antoinette (whose imprisonment and execution he movingly described in musical terms in a programmatic work for solo harpsichord or pianoforte). Whether for political reasons, or because of his relationship with the wife of the harpist Krumbholtz (who committed suicide in Paris), Dussek fled France and came to London, where he was a leading figure in the musical life of the time. He was pianist in many of Haydn's London concerts, and through marriage with the daughter of Corri, the publisher, (likewise a harpiste) became a partner of the publishing firm. He fled from London when the company went bankrupt.

Mrs. Papendiek accredits Dussek with persuading Broadwood to add a fourth to the top end of the keyboard, and with being the first virtuoso to play, not with his back to the audience, but at right angles to it, so that the sound was projected towards the listener by the lid. Mrs. Papendiek also informs us of Dussek's habit of filling his pockets with bran to absorb his sweat between movements (cf. op. cit., Vol. 2., p. 184 f).

As a result of his association with Broadwood (whose pianos influenced his own style of playing) Dussek introduced the
Prince to these English instruments, hitherto considered inferior to their Viennese counterparts. Ledebur and Tschirch\textsuperscript{(28)} relate that the Prince is reputed to have owned no fewer than thirteen of them. As with the death of Marie Antoinette, the premature death of Louis Ferdinand drove Dussek to seek new patronage, which he found as piano teacher to Talleyrand in Paris, where he died in 1812.

Tschirch (loc. cit., p. 204) finds that Louis Ferdinand's music "far surpasses in vigour and melodic grandeur" that of Dussek. He also sees in the Czech's music a dangerous and dubious model for the Prince, for Dussek's compositions in his eyes (p. 202):

\begin{quote}
live only in the sickly delights of indulgence in feelings of pain, lacking more defined outlines, so that we can hardly listen to it these days, especially when its uniform substance is presented in larger symphonic forms.
\end{quote}

A similar sentiment is expressed, too, in explaining away what Tschirch sees as a weakness in Louis Ferdinand's own output (p. 212):

\begin{quote}
an imbalanced penchant towards Empfindsamkeit manifests itself in the preponderance of dark flat keys. Here Dussek's influence proved fateful - and there is hardly a piece of his that we can listen to today.
\end{quote}

In fact Tschirch does try to give a balanced account of Louis Ferdinand's music; despite his obvious enthusiasm for what he finds, he manages to present a fair picture of the Prince's limitations. In his description of the work assumed to the first substantial composition by the Prince, namely the published Opus 1, a Quintet in Eb for piano with string quartet (Tschirch referring to it in error [cf. p. 202] as for piano with string trio) he makes the following objective comment:
It cannot be denied that in the art of construction of the individual parts (Stimmführung) and in the independence of the different instruments, he cannot be compared with the really great composers. Here he simply lacked the indispensable professional training. But in the writing of wonderful melodic lines, in the effortless creativity and profound Empfindsamkeit he can be compared with his model.

The "model" in this case is not Dussek, but Mozart, for Tschirch joins the ranks of those listed earlier who see the chamber works of Mozart with piano as the decisive influence—an influence felt by Tschirch to be also perceptible in Opp. 2 and 3, and reflecting the opinion held by the review of the work given in Rochlitz' Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung in 1804 (p. 457).

Later Tschirch extends comparison to Beethoven, concluding that (p. 206):

In purely formal terms the Prince did not rise much above the status of a dilettante. Not only did Dussek's pupil lack in general true polyphony, such as Beethoven only gradually managed to achieve in his late quartets, but also quasi counterpoint, the interplay of question and answer between the various instruments, the captivating dialogue between the individual lines that gives such life to Beethoven's music.

Without wishing to disagree with the above author's frank statements on the Prince's shortcomings as a composer, one may find it simplistic to lay the blame as unequivocally as Tschirch does, at the feet of Dussek. His output and that of Louis Ferdinand, strangely enough, do not really correspond. Whereas the Prince is primarily the composer of chamber music centred around the pianoforte, Dussek was primarily a solo pianist, with an output predominantly orientated towards solo keyboard works, piano concertos, and harp solos and concertos. His chamber music falls mostly into the category of the sonata accompagnata. This is especially true of those works composed in England. They tend to be simple in form, more classical
and less bordering on the Romantic than his post-London solo piano music (which does veer at times towards the amorphous) and the chamber music of his Royal pupil. His Opus 65*, a Sonate / Pour le Piano-Forte / avec accompagnement / de Flute et Violoncelle / .... published 1803 by Breitkopf & Härtel, does show a real progression from his earlier London works, with much greater autonomy given to the violoncello, that is melodically and harmonically frequently independent of the keyboard part (the latter being almost relentlessly virtuosic). In that Opus 65 we see something of the character of Louis Ferdinand's music, but in principle the compositional thrust with both composers is a different one.

Louis Ferdinand and Beethoven

Louis Ferdinand's fame as a pianist is attested by Beethoven's testimony as recorded by Ries(29) and Thayer(30). Quoting from Ries' Notizen, Thayer records (Forbes, p. 186):

In Berlin he (Beethoven) associated much with Himmel, of whom he said that he had a pretty talent, but no more; his pianoforte playing, he said, was elegant and pleasing; but he was not to be compared with Prince Louis Ferdinand ... [whose] playing was not that of a king or prince, but more like that of a thoroughly good pianoforte player.

Earlier Thayer had described Louis Ferdinand (cf. p. 185) as Himmel's only serious rival in Berlin, concluding that the Prince "was endowed by nature with talents and genius which would have made him conspicuous had fortune not given him royal descent".

Beethoven, it must be said, was less enthusiastic about Louis Ferdinand's compositions, conceding grudgingly to Czerny that one finds in them "the occasional pretty bits" [ hübsche Brocken] (cf. Thayer, p. 357).

He did, however, dedicate to the Prince his 3rd Piano Concerto, published in November 1804. Ries (p. 111) gives an anecdotal possible cause for that dedication. This is given also in Thayer (p. 357) and in Wahl(31) - where the source reference is inadvertently omitted - (p. 232).

In 1804 the Prince was in Vienna. An elderly Countess organized a soirée musicale to which Beethoven was also invited. At the concluding meal Beethoven was made to sit at a lowly table, not that at which the Prince was seated and, feeling insulted, Beethoven left the gathering. Louis Ferdinand responded by inviting many of the same people to a luncheon, and arranged the seating in such a way that both the aforesaid Countess and Beethoven sat on either side of him at the same table. Beethoven was much moved by this gesture, and when the concerto was published shortly afterwards, the Prince's name appeared on it as the dedicatee.

Beethoven, who referred to Louis Ferdinand as "the most human (or 'humane') of humans" ("der menschlichste Mensch") (Ries, ibid.), had in the Prince a discerning and committed follower. Shortly after a first, unsuccessful hearing of the Eroica symphony at the Vienna Palace of Prince Lobkowitz, Louis Ferdinand was invited to that Prince's country seat. Lobkowitz had arranged for the work to be heard again, especially for Louis Ferdinand's benefit. The latter was so taken by the work that he asked for it to be played in its entirety again, and then requested a third hearing of the work.

The two repetitions of the work not only delighted the enthusiastic Prince, but also awoke in the players and the audience an understanding that until then had been dormant, so that Louis Ferdinand may rightly claim to have brought the Eroica to universal recognition.

Tschirch (p. 201 f.), like Wahl, gives the above account without disclosing Ries as the source.
Louis Ferdinand's esteem in the musical world may be judged by the generally complimentary references made to him by such fellow-composers as Spohr, who visited him in Magdeburg in 1804, when the Prince was there on military manoeuvres. Spohr (and Dussek) joined the Prince not only in musical activities - which started at 6 am before manoeuvres - but also accompanied him on the manoeuvres, until he became worried that the noise would be detrimental to his hearing. Spohr relates this incident in his autobiography, quoted by Wahl (p. 233 f.).

Reichardt, who was generally less well-disposed towards the musical endeavours of Frederick II, gives a most moving account of the effect upon him of hearing a performance of the Prince's Opus 6, the Quartet in f minor. He was present at a performance for an exclusive gathering, in an arrangement for two pianos, in January 1809 in Vienna, with Princess Kinsky and the ubiquitous Prince Lobkowitz among those present (cf. Wahl, p. 235 f. and Tschirch p. 205):

*The great and amiable sentiments, the profoundly melancholic character of that composition ... reverberated afterwards so clearly and so deeply within me; the spirit of that noble Prince, whom I had so often heard performing this very work to my delight - a work in which his whole soul so fervently lives, hovered round me with such purity, such clarity, that I felt the might of his genius, and his irreplaceable loss more profoundly than ever, turning my delight to melancholy.*

**Louis Ferdinand and other Notable Composers**

The death of Louis Ferdinand stimulated three notable composers at least to commemorative works. Weber produced a choral work *Lever und Schwert* to texts by the patriotic poet Theodor Körner. This is based almost entirely on themes from the music of Louis Ferdinand, predominantly from the Quartet in f-minor (Opus 6) that so moved Reichardt. Given the absence of choral music in the Prince's output, the chosen form of this commemorative work (published ten years after the
death of Louis Ferdinand) may seem rather odd.

More appropriate is Dussek's own memorial, an Elegy* for solo pianoforte: Elégie harmonique sur la mort de son Altesse royale Prince Louis Ferdinand de Prusse en forme de Sonate pour le Pianoforte et dédiée à son Altesse le Prince de Lobkowitz par J. L. Dussek. This was published as his Opus 61 in Paris (though it clearly post-dates the Opus 65 published many years earlier in Leipzig). It is a moving, at times stirring sonata, though not altogether innocent of Tschirch's global charge of lacking clearly defined outlines. The work begins with what must be a deliberate quotation from the opening of Sonata VI of Haydn's Seven Last Words: Consummatum est (cf. overleaf). The quotation, if deliberate (as it surely is), would be appropriate enough, the words meaning 'It is finished', but in the case of Louis Ferdinand it underlines the quasi-Messianic status he had begun to achieve in his life-time.

Tschirch (cf. p. 204) considers it more than likely that the Prince's influence extended to such composers as Spohr (a frequent guest of his) and Weber. More far-reaching testimony to his esteem and possible sphere of influence is the Elegy composed some time later by Franz Liszt. This, too, is based on thematic material gleaned from the Quartet in f-minor: Elégie sur des motifs de Prince Louis Ferdinand de Prusse, dédiée à S.A.R. Madame la Princesse de Prusse.

The autograph of the work is housed still in Weimar; although not the work of a royal composer, it has been included for its historic value in the Supplement (No. 55), in a copy of its revised form for the Berlin publisher Schlesinger.

A = Opening of Sonata VI of Haydn's Seven Last Words

B = Opening of Dussek's Elégie harmonique sur la mort de Prince Louis Ferdinand de Prusse in the MAB edition, based on the published version of the Sonata as Opus 61.

C = (overleaf) shows the opening of the autograph of the Sonata (Weimar). The manuscript is even heavier laden with dynamic markings than the published version.
Elegie harmonique

Lento pathetico
Sensa forsetti
Sotto voce e Legato

Pianissimo

Presto
The dedicatee of the Elegy, Princess Augusta, later became Empress Augusta. It was through her that Liszt became the owner of the autograph of Frederick the Great's flute sonata (No. 122), as discussed earlier as one of the works not included in SpFr (cf. Supplement No. 45).

Schumann, as we have heard, also knew of the Prince's music. Louis Ferdinand's music survived in the repertoire of public concerts for about a generation, before going into steady, though not absolute, decline. In 1906 Tschirch (p. 199) lamented that:

the Prince's music is lost, and we can only gain access to it via the dust of libraries .... Few musical histories attempt to place him at all, and even those that do, without any deep understanding of his music. At the present there are just a few chamber-musicians with a knowledge of the Prince's music.

In a footnote Tschirch praises the entry in Schilling; it is admittedly extensive, but in no real sense informative.

While there is a large grain of truth in what Tschirch says above, it does seem incredible that he should have made no reference to the publication of virtually all the chamber works of Louis Ferdinand commissioned that very year as a centenary gesture, under the editorship of Hermann Kretzschmar, and published by Breitkopf & Härtel in 1910. Kretzschmar's admirable Preface lists Moscheles among the influences on the Prussian Prince. There is strong similarity between the keyboard writing of both composers. It may well have been that Tschirch's exhortations brought about that edition, comprising 8 of the known works considered authentic. A Parade March in Upsala written "vom printzen Ferdinant", ascribed by Eitner to Louis Ferdinand is dismissed as an authentic work both by Tschirch and Kretzschmar, though Hahn (p. 98 f.) in discussing the work is not prepared to refute its authenticity with the same dogmatism.
While the Prince's music went into steady decline (Hahn's *Anhang II*, pp. 112-117 gives a very precise and informative picture of availability of editions, arrangements, reviews etc.) the volume of literature on the man himself never ceased to grow throughout the 19th century. The Prince's reputation suffered through various attempts to describe him as an impetuous, irresponsible figure, and claims that his death itself was the result of these character flaws, rather than any noble patriotic ideals. While it is not within the scope of this work to enter into that argument, it has to be conceded that the Prince's death, whatever its motivation, only deepened a national sense of humiliation, and was disastrous to immediate morale. Arguably, however, the resurgence of the Prussian spirit in 1813, culminating in the vital part played by Prussian forces in the crucial Battle of Waterloo, was partly brought about by the invocation of the romantic image of such "martyrs" as Louis Ferdinand.

In purely musical terms the Prince's ultimately vindicated concept of an Austro-Prussian alliance - quite contrary to the vision of Frederick II for all his high regard for Maria Theresia - was a fruitful one, re-cementing his ties with Beethoven (who had been at the Prussian court in 1796).

**A Kindred Spirit: Archduke Rudolph**

There was yet another fruitful musico-political link of interest to this thesis. Beethoven had a further, more vital connection with a Royal composer: Archduke Rudolph. His dates (1788-1831) take him beyond the current purview, but he is still worthy of mention. The Nationalbibliothek* in Vienna houses about two dozen of his compositions, some of them with Beethoven's handwritten comments and corrections, for Rudolph became a pupil of his at about the time Louis Ferdinand made his last visit to Vienna. The Archduke's output, as reflected

* According to NG the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde also holds source material.
by those works extant at the above source, consists mainly of sonatas for pianoforte with one instrument (normally clarinet, violin or 'czakan', the Hungarian recorder). Variations also form a large part of his output. The clarinet works were mostly written for the clarinet virtuoso, Count Ferdinand von Troyer. As a pupil of Beethoven's for seven years he was rewarded by the composition of the latter's Missa Solemnis (Opus 123) to mark his enthronement as Archbishop of Olmütz (though it was not completed until three years later). Among his sets of Variations is one for piano with violin, to a theme, yet again, from Louis Ferdinand's Piano Quartet, Opus 6, "dedicated to his memory" (Q 17755). While this work is clearly a commemorative tribute, there survives in Brno most of a Trio for Piano with clarinet and violoncello (R 35 in the Moravian Museum). The last complete movement, a Larghetto, is a set of variations on a theme from the Octet by Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia.

Since the inscription above the Larghetto does not make any reference to 'the late' Louis Ferdinand (assuming the inscription to have been correctly translated in the Musica Rara edition, then it would be tempting to postulate that this work by the Archduke may possibly have been composed under Beethoven's tutelage from a copy of the Octet brought with him by Louis Ferdinand to Vienna in 1804, prior to its posthumous publication in 1808. Stahmer (p. 11) feels that...

---

* "Variationen Für das Piano-Forte mit Begleitung einer Violine über den ersten Trio, aus dem Quatuor, Oeuvre VI; vom Prinzen Louis Ferdinand von Preußen. Seinem Andenken gewidmet von Rudolph Erzherzog von Österreich".

** Modern edition: Musica Rara 1206, Monteux (France) 1969.

*** I am indebted to Ms Ludmila Vodová of the State Library in Prague for establishing on my behalf that the title in the source reads Thema vom Prinz Louis Ferdinand von Preußen aus dem Ottetto. Despite the editorial information in the Musica Rara score, the manuscript is not in Brno (where incipits only are to be found) but in Kroměříž (Kremsier), in the archiepiscopal Palace (shelf no. 4 514 (-5)).
the more schematic nature of the Octet, with its adherence to sonata form, is likely to pre-date, for example, Opus 3, which was published in 1806.

Various arguments speak against this dating of the Trio. The Archduke's association with the clarinettist von Troyer began some time later. Furthermore the dates of his tutelage under Beethoven frequently given (1804-12) are misleading. Initially Beethoven acted only as the Archduke's piano teacher. Only later than the death of Louis Ferdinand (according to MGG post-September 1809) did the tuition turn to theory and composition (NG makes no precise distinction between the various forms of tuition). The pupil-teacher relationship became virtually a life-long association. An autograph set of variations by the Archduke (Nb. Vienna: XI 8244) contains handwritten suggestions and comments by Beethoven. From the title: Cavatina von Rossini aus der Oper Zelmira mit 8 Veränderungen für das Piano Forte mit Begleitung einer Clarinette we may safely deduce that they cannot have been written by the Archduke before 1822 when Rossini composed the opera of that title.

In the case of the Trio in question, the provenance of the manuscript in Moravia as opposed to Vienna strengthens the argument that the work postdates the Archduke's consecration as Archbishop of Olmütz in 1820, and that the Larghetto is a further posthumous tribute to Prince Louis Ferdinand. Neither MGG nor NG do justice to Rudolph as a composer, both stressing his relationship with Beethoven at the expense of his own creative output.

More Recent Literature on Louis Ferdinand

Of the literature on Louis Ferdinand himself Paul Bailleu's(33) is generally considered to be the most balanced. Literature on the music has been on the steady increase since Tschirch's first article in 1906, being followed four years later by
Kretzschmar's edition and Preface, and in 1911-1912 Tschirch\(^{(34)}\) produced another essay on the Prince's music. In 1915 Elisabeth Wintzner's\(^{(35)}\) monograph was published. Gustav Lenzewski's article of 1916 with a Verzeichnis of 14 Opus numbers, including the disputed Parademarsch (Op. 14), lamented that Kretzschmar's edition had omitted the Octet referred to above (Op. 12), informing us that the Gesellschaft zur Pflege altklassischer Musik had, under his direction, performed no fewer than five of Louis Ferdinand's works.

In 1917 Wahl's documentary work appeared (in which, however, the facsimile of the now missing autograph copy of Opus 4 [between pp. 234-235] is misleadingly dated at January 10th, 1800 instead of 1806). As a summary of contemporary documentation and anecdotal tradition it is invaluable, and we will return to it in the concluding paragraphs. Robert Hahn's doctoral thesis in 1933 was the first extended and thorough investigation into Louis Ferdinand's music. It has a successor in the doctoral thesis of Barbara McMurtry\(^{(36)}\) in 1972, the first major contribution to the subject in the English language, and in the same year Ernst Klessmann\(^{(37)}\) published his highly readable account of the man and his music.

The article in NG contains the statements that:

> Apart from a few songs, Louis Ferdinand's music was written entirely for the piano, most often with various chamber combinations. The early works reflect the waning concept of the accompanied sonata; the later ones make considerable technical demands on the players.

That the Prince wrote any songs at all came as a surprise to the present writer, and surely these, too, would have required the piano. Further bewildered by the conspicuous absence of any mention of songs in the work list, he wrote to the NG contributor for clarification, but none such has ever come. The Deutsche Staatsbibliothek lists ten songs in its
catalogue, composed by Prinz Louis Ferdinand von Preußen, but these are all written by the 20th century incumbent of the same name and title, himself also a composer!

If it is to these that NG is referring, then it is in startling error. One song ascribed to the Louis Ferdinand of whom we are speaking still appears in the card-index catalogue of the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, but it is no longer there (though thought to be extant in the Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz in W. Berlin).

The NG contributor sees a progression in style from earlier works still just within the accompanied sonata tradition, and later, more emancipated works. No further information is given as to which are the early and which the later works. Stahmer (ibid.) maintains that an exact chronology of Louis Ferdinand's works will no longer prove possible. Tschirch, Kretzschmar and Hahn could not state with any confidence any chronological order; Tschirch does, however, surmise that some of the works presented to Breitkopf & Härtel in 1806 and by Dussek in 1808 after the composer's death, may well be earlier compositions, now presented for publication in the light of the success of those subsequent works that had appeared in print in the intervening years.

As mentioned earlier, Stahmer feels that the Octet published posthumously in 1808 may well have been composed before 1803. At all events, the order of publication would not appear to reflect the chronological order in which they were composed, even those works published during the Prince's life-time.

The NG article is likewise slightly misleading in stating that the piano appears in the works of Louis Ferdinand "most often" with various chamber combinations. Of the 13 non-disputed works listed, only Opus 7, the fugue for solo pianoforte, does not place the piano in the company of other instruments. Of the remaining 12, only Opus 13, the Rondo in Eb is for piano
with orchestra*. Of thirteen works, therefore, the vast majority are for piano with chamber combinations.

The Complete Recording of Louis Ferdinand's Music

The most telling source of reference now available is the recording of the complete works (Opus 1-13) of Louis Ferdinand on six long-playing records. The accompanying book, with articles by Stahmer and Helmut König, is highly informative to the reader of German, though not without minor error.

Kretzschmar's "Jubilee" edition is referred to (pp. 13-15) as Ausgabe 1906 instead of 1910. On p. 15 Helmut König praises the initiators for their rediscovery of Opp 8 and 11, two of the works not incorporated by Kretzschmar. In fact, they were never lost. Louis Ferdinand, as a post-1800 composer, is simply not within the scope of any existing RISM catalogue. However, the present writer could have informed him that Opus 8, the Notturno, is held inter alia by the British Library. Of interest here is the fact that the BL source is a print by Steiner in Vienna, with approximate date in the BL catalogue as "c. 1805".

This represents a new published source unknown to Hahn, who lists the Breitkopf & Härtel first impression of 1808, a posthumous publication; a publication prior to that would have been of considerable importance in the vexed question of chronology. Unfortunately the dating given in the BL catalogue, according to information found in Weinmann(33), is a hopeful, but in the event quite inaccurate guess. In Volume 1 of his study (p. 215) Weinmann points out that plates Nos. 4001-4450 by Steiner do not refer to first impressions, but to reprints of other sources. The Notturno in question is No. 4338 (and Op. 9, likewise in the BL, 4340 - again unknown to

* The Rondo in Bb, Op. 9, seems ambiguously conceived as a chamber work with solo instrumental accompaniment, or as an orchestral piece.
Hahn). As reprints they were not reviewed in the Wiener Zeitung, but they cannot have been published before 1821.

König is most proud of the rediscovery of the Rondo for piano and orchestra, Opus 13, claiming that it is "mentioned everywhere, but nowhere actually known". In fact, according to Hahn, the work is held inter alia by the archives of Breitkopf & Härtel.

The Complete Recording and Kretzschmar's Anthology (KrLF)

On the question of performance material, König informs us puzzlingly that "only four of the works of Louis Ferdinand are available in usable editions". Which of the eight works published by Kretzschmar fall into either category, usable or unusable, is tantalizingly not disclosed. Comparison with the quoted sources used does not cast any further light. For Opp 2, 3, 4, 6 and 10 the "Ausgabe von 1906" was used - an erroneous reference to Kretzschmar's anthology of 1910 (KrLF), commissioned in 1906.

For Opp 1, 5 and 9 the recordings availed themselves of editions by "Verlag Breitkopf & Härtel, Wiesbaden" without year. Since Wiesbaden is only a post-war location for that publisher in Western Europe, these can only refer to reprints of KrLF. In the case of Op. 12 (which, like Opp 7, 8, 11 and 13, was omitted from KrLF), both the relatively recent Musica Rara edition (erroneously designated Op. 10 by the publisher) and the first impression (Breitkopf & Härtel, 1823: long after the death of Dussek, its presumed editor) are described as error-prone, though preference has been given to the original publication.

König stresses the necessity of going back to the first impressions, where differences exist between them and Kretzschmar. This is consistent with Kretzschmar's complaint that Dussek had apparently presented the publishers with
shoddily prepared manuscripts, so that corrections too numbered and self-evident to quote were tacitly made. Whether Kretzschmar's "improvements", or the flaws inherent in the original published versions as a result of Dussek's allegedly hasty editorship, should be given preference remains - in the absence of further specific information - conjectural. At all events Kretzschmar speaks of a large number of compositional errors, and points to the bewildering profusion and ambiguity of dynamic and articulatory markings.

Some inkling of this is given by the autograph of Dussek's own Elegy on the Death of Louis Ferdinand discussed earlier, where hardly a bar does not contain a marking of some kind.

Little mention is made in the discussion of source material to the Fugue à quatre voix for solo piano. This is unique among the works of Louis Ferdinand in that it excludes all other instruments. Despite its brevity and interest as a non-characteristic piece, Kretzschmar decided against its inclusion in his edition. The original was reprinted as a "Nouvelle Edition" as late as 1868 by Breitkopf. The Supplement complements Kretzschmar by including it in toto (No. 56) from an earlier Breitkopf impression (not known before 1807).

The editorial introduction that precedes Stahmer's truly profound contribution, blames the decline in the popularity of the Prince's music - despite the judgements of Weber, Schumann and Liszt - on his status as a dilettante composer, tarred in the mind of the public with the same brush as "Frederick the Great, Joseph II and Maximilian I". No compositions are known by the second of these, and one is intrigued as to the identity of the third.

As with many of these aristocratic and royal composers, our faith in the reliability of contemporary evidence is disturbed by the contradictions it often presents. Two noble-ladies
witnessed the scene at first hand when the corpse of Louis Ferdinand was brought back from the battlefield. The diary of Duchess Auguste of Saxe-Coburg describes it in the following terms (October 12th):

.... A detachment of infantrymen, with their Royal insignia, and unshaven woodworkers going before them, marched into the courtyard; in their midst they were carrying something on poles. Only when they put it down did I recognize it as the corpse of Prince Louis Ferdinand. Naked and wrapped in a large sheet the great Royal man lay there, his beautiful head exposed; no wound had disfigured his handsome face, but on the back of his head he had sustained some severe looking blows, and in his half-bared breast was the gaping wound from the thrust that had cost him his life.

Standing at the same window, watching the same event, was her lady-in-waiting, Amalie von Uttenhoven. She recalls how their hostess, Princess Reuss, after defeat in battle had been announced, and the castle commandeered by the French Fieldmarshal Lannes, drew her attention to a scene outside:

The Fieldmarshal went to the Duke, and while he was talking with him, a French officer entered to hand over the insignia of Prince Louis Ferdinand. While I was still in tears over this announcement of his death, Princess Reuss came to me and showed me a wounded soldier being carried into the castle on a stretcher. A company of soldiers accompanied the stretcher and a band was playing a cheerful victory march. What a sight! On the stretcher lay Prince Louis Ferdinand, the pride of the Prussian army. But now his pale corpse lay resplendent like the morning star.

I shall never forget that awful sight! On 13th October I slipped quietly with two servants bearing flowers into the Court Chapel and wound a laurel wreath round the head of the handsome Prince. His charming mouth seemed to smile. Death had not disfigured him, the nobility of his features still remained. I cut off a lock of his hair and placed my tear-drenched handkerchief on his wounded breast.

One may argue that the two reports (cf. Wahl, pp. 423 and 427 f.) are not at all at variance. What is revealing is the subjectivity of perception. The first report, partly coloured by the horror and distress of the situation, allows that to influence the writer's memory of the event. We must remember,
however, that the Prince had been dead already for two days, so that the possibility of far-reaching cosmetic treatment of his features either on the battlefield, prior to the return of the body, or even between its return and its lying-in-state in the chapel can be ruled out. The second account becomes stripped of the initial horror; the Romantic image of the Prince is already resurgent. Gone are the "severe looking blows", our attention is drawn instead to "locks of hair", and posterity is left to ponder how much of either account contains any element of objective truth.

Summary

We saw earlier how Frederick the Great's successor, Friedrich Wilhelm II, brought about a rapprochement between the music of the Prussian court and that of its capital. In the person of Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia we see that process carried towards its logical conclusion: the performing and composing talents of Frederick the Great's nephew brought him into co-equal interaction with the finest performers and composers of his time. Not that the bestriding of two worlds was an easy matter: Louis Ferdinand's sojourn in Hamburg in the quest of the most modern music of the time, brought him too near to dangerous "republican" ideas, and he was recalled to Berlin. However Louis Ferdinand represents that rare phenomenon: a composing aristocrat who does not act as a massive suction device, drawing to himself those things that appeal and may be exploited for personal pleasure. Louis Ferdinand also radiated something of value out into the wider musical world, both during his life-time and in the years that followed.

Schindler, Ries and Thayer in their major Beethoven biographies all find space for him; Reichardt and Spohr, as leading musical figures of his time, speak in glowing terms of him; Dussek, Liszt and Weber - not to mention the Archduke Rudolph - wrote elegiac works to his memory; Spohr and Weber
were arguably influenced by him; Schumann knew and valued his music. Beethoven's dedication of his 3rd piano concerto to the Prince, and the anecdotal reason behind that dedication (if true) all give Louis Ferdinand a place in Telemann's "Republic of Music", as does the Prince's moral support for Beethoven's *Eroica* symphony, following its initial lukewarm reception.

We spoke earlier of the "undeserved neglect" that befell his music, while at the same time establishing some of its defects, as perhaps overstated by Tschirch. His music, like the similarly virtuoso works of Moscheles, survived in the repertoire of German public musical life throughout the early decades of the nineteenth century, into the era dominated *inter alia* by Schumann and Liszt. That itself was an achievement at a time when printing processes had only just started to become economically viable enough to allow other than a relatively small number of composers to live on in musical life beyond the span of their own years.

It is true that Louis Ferdinand's music has not been resurrected in this century in any major way in terms of concert performances, and that the trend set by Lenzewski in the wake of Kretzschmar's anthology has not been significantly followed up. This, as Stahmer says, may well be the result of his aristocratic title. In an age when the name of Prussia itself has perforce disappeared from the political map of Europe, it is all too easy for Louis Ferdinand's music - for all its varied merits and demerits - to be dismissed as nothing more than the dilettante efforts of a privileged Prince of a State whose history is best forgotten.

Over and above that is the nature of the music itself. It is technically demanding, but does not quite manage to compete on even terms for the "late classical - Romantic slot" almost invariably filled by Beethoven in the mixed repertoire that such ensembles now generally offer. On the other hand the
specialist "early music" ensembles have only just reached Beethoven, as the movement presses on though musical history, and the demands of Louis Ferdinand's music for exponents of period instruments, are still daunting.

In may ways, however, Louis Ferdinand has fared better this century than his absence from the concert may indicate. Numerous monographs on his music have been written; the major encyclopaedias accord him due space; almost all his music has been published (though there is a question mark against the authenticity of the texts). Last but not least, the record industry - a branch of the Republic of which Telemann cannot have dreamed - has accorded him the relatively rare distinction of a complete recording of all his known music.

Two further composing aristocrats were attached to the House of Hohenzollern, though not themselves members of it. They are the Count von Kospoth and Baron von Münchhausen. NG gives a detailed account of the former, and Ledebur informs us of the latter that he was a chamberlain of Prince Heinrich, the brother of Frederick II and father of Friedrich Wilhelm II. Ledebur describes him as a highly educated dilettante, a good pianist and glass-harmonica player, who had established himself as a composer. The list of compositions includes keyboard music, symphonies, some of which were dedicated to Friedrich Wilhelm II in 1790, duos for violin and viola, and a collection of German Lieder.


5. sine nomine: Frederick the Great: 25 Sonatas for Flute and Piano, Complete in 4 Volumes. Berwin Mills Publishing Co., New York, no date. A reprint of the musical text of the sonatas in bibliographic entry 2. above, lacking the concertos and all editorial comment, other than the incipits of all 121 sonatas in both numerical systems.


16. J.D.E. PREUSS: (Editor) Oeuvres de Frédéric le Grand. 32 volumes (title speaks only of 30), Berlin, 1846-57: Vol. 27.


27. Vernon Delves BROUGHTON: (Editor) Court and Private Life in the Time of Queen Charlotte, being the Journals of Mrs Papendiek, Assistant Keeper of the Wardrobe and Reader to Her Majesty. (2 vols.), London, 1886-87.


Compelling reasons might have been found for ending this thesis with its examination of the case of Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia. In terms of chronology this would have had its own logic. Likewise the substance of his numerically relatively small output places him qualitatively into a different category from most of his fellow titled dilettanti brought together in this volume.

Socio-historically, too, we see him as differing from the vast majority of other dilettanti in his relationship to the music of his time and later, for the Prince had an influence on evolving musical fashion, winning in the process the genuine admiration of some of the leading musical figures of his time.

It is also tempting, though not utterly borne out by facts, to see Louis Ferdinand as the end of an era, as the increasing complexity of musical forms and search for expression took the composing of music in the idiom of its time more and more away from the realm of the talented amateur.

The qualitative aspects of the music composed are not, however, the prime concern of this thesis. Moreover, since an early consideration was the question of the proven authenticity of the works ascribed to titled composers, it seems fitting to bring the dissertation towards its conclusion with two examples - and one of those of considerable substance and merit - of compositions that have for long been attributed to the hand of composers with unchallenged places in the Republic of Music, but which have only relatively recently been identified as being, in one case genuinely and the other allegedly but inaccurately, as the work of an aristocrat.

1. "Pergolesi".

Albert Dunning wrote in 1980, at the end of his Preface to a facsimile publication of a famous set of concertos, with the intriguing sub-title of A master unmasked or The Pergolesi-Ricciotti puzzle solved (p.27):
Formerly I had been of the opinion that the great days of musical discovery were virtually over. This find, however, should put new heart into those involved in the study of the musical past of the Netherlands; there is much to be done and, maybe, more to be discovered.

The "find" to which he refers, and the "puzzle" mentioned in the sub-title, both allude to his startling discovery as to who had actually composed "Pergolesi's" Concerti armonici or Concertini as they were also known.

In the Collected Edition (2) of Pergolesi's works, and in no shortage of editions of various of the six concertos involved, they appeared frequently under Pergolesi's name between 1940 and 1961 alone. The record industry* and concert promoters still persist in that ascription.

For all that, Pergolesi's authorship had long been held in question. Handel's name was attached to one early 19th century source of these works (now housed in the Library of Congress in Washington). As early as 1759, less than 20 years after their first appearance, the works were sold at an auction in The Hague under the name of Willem de Fesch. Walsh's edition of 1755 published them as being by Carlo Bacciccio Ricciotti. In 1822 the Professor of Music at Oxford, William Crotch, offered the Concerto in B♭ (No 2 of the original order), in an arrangement for keyboard solo, as one of his "Specimens of various styles of Music". The 20th century scholar Hans-Joachim Moser postulated that Johann Adam Birkenstock was the composer, on evidence provided by Walther's Lexikon that the composer was sending 12 concertos of the same description as the Concerti armonici to be published in the near future (1730) in Amsterdam. Dunning himself in 1963 hazarded a guess at Fortunato Chelleri as a possible contender.

The "puzzle" of these six concertos for four violins, viola, cello and independent bass was certainly one that kept the musicologists busy. The "unusual" instrumentation is, however, not so rare as some would have us

* Decca 6'351 36 00 501 (Hamburg 1972 + 1975), for example, is a complete recording of "Pergolesi's" Concerti armonici and two flute concertos. Only in the commentary inside the box does Lothar Hoffmann-Erbrecht in his detailed notes concede the lack of authenticity attached to that ascription, not only in respect of the Concerti armonici but also of the 2 flute concertos in question - and indeed of a high proportion of all Pergolesi assignments.
believe. The publishing houses of London and Amsterdam had acquainted the musical public with no shortage of concetti grossi in the normative format of three obligati (2 violins and a bass) with four ripieno strings, making seven parts in all. Scarlatti (1740), Sammartini (Op. 5, 1747) and above all Geminiani (Opp 2 and 3, 1732 and Op. 7, 1746, as well as his arrangement of Corelli's Op. 5 into 7 parts in 1726 all had similar collections published in London. Dunning (ibid., pp 24 f and 33) quotes works by Avison and Festing, but regrets not having seen the scores of these concertos in seven parts, to know whether or not they comprise, like "Pergolesi's", genuine seven-part structures (and in general the textures are combinations of four to seven independent lines) or conventional italianate concetti grossi. Avison produced at least four collections (cf BUCEM). The Festing concertos (Twelve Concerto's / In Seven Parts, Op. 3, 1734) claim Nos 1-8 to be for "Four Violins, one Tenor, one Violoncello, / and a Thorough Bass" - i.e. prima facie identical to "Pergolesi's" set, but the individual parts (Dunning would have searched in vain for "the score") reveal their true orientation: Violino primo del Concertino etc and Violino primo ripieno etc. The seventh part, Organo, is a basso di ripieno synonymous with the sixth part (Violoncello) whenever it plays.

Collections by lesser-known native English composers such as William Corbett and John Hebden (notably the latter's Six / Concertos / In / Seven Parts / For / Four Violins, a Tenor Violin, / a Violoncello and a Thorough / Bass for the Harpsichord, / printed c. 1749 as "Opera IIa" in London come closest in spirit to "Pergolesi" as hybrids between their Italian forbears and full string concertos.

To return to the "puzzle": how did it come about? In 1740 the set of six Concerti amoninci was published in The Hague. Carlo Ricciotto acted as the publisher, and the music was dedicated to Il Signore Conte di Bentinck, this being a Count Willem Bentinck. Ricciotto in the Dedication to the "Illustrissimo Signore" to whom it is addressed, gives no further clue as to the author of the music, other than that the compositions were the work d'un Illustre mano (i.e. they were written by a person whose social rank warranted the description of "illustrious").

The Haagsche Courant announced a performance of these works on August 17th, 1749, describing them as Concerti Amonici gecomponieerd door een voornam Heer
Ricciotto had been known under the name of Charles Bachiche in a French opera-troupe in The Hague as early as 1702, becoming its director some time before 1725, when he left the company. He is not known as a composer. In 1755 Walsh in London produced a pirate edition with a virtually identical title-page design, save that Count Bentinck's name disappeared, and the C. Ricciotto, detto Bacciccia written in small print in the original publication gave way to bold print, with the information that the works were Composti da CARLO BACCICIA RICCIOTTO. To have named Ricciotto as the composer was a nonsense, since he in no way qualified for the title "Illustre".

Nevertheless the myth died hard, as outlined above. In 1979 a chance meeting between the art historian Wouter van Leeuwen, a man never before involved in musicological activity, and Albert Dunning, who for some time had dwelt on the problem of the true identity of the composer of these works, led to the equally fortuitous observation that the former was sure that he had manuscripts corresponding to the title discussed in conversation with Dunning, in the library of a castle in the Netherlands, for which van Leeuwen was compiling an inventory.

This manuscript was, in fact, able to solve the puzzle.

The late Charles Cudworth (3) said (loc. cit., p. 127 f.):

I know of no other Italian concertos of the time which have quite the same dignity and restraint, nor such astonishing beauty in the slow movements. Whoever wrote them was a master, but at the moment I feel we must leave these concertos attributed to that most prolific of all composers, Signor Anonimo. Yet I would not be in the least surprised any day to hear that they have been found in some Italian library bearing the name of an otherwise unknown nobleman.

Alas, Charles Cudworth did not live to see that prophecy almost come true, for the manuscript discovered by van Leeuwen for Dunning reveals its author
to be a hitherto completely unknown dilettante composer, not from Italy but from the Netherlands, Count Wilhelm van Wassenaer (1692-1766).

He wrote these works, on his own admission, "between the years 1725 and 1740". Ricciotti, who played first violin in performances of them in The Hague, prevailed upon him, finally with success, to have them printed. Wassenaer's only condition was that his name should not appear on them, though Ricciotti should feel free to add his, if he chose to, which he did. The Count continues in his own Preface:

He wanted to dedicate them to me, but I refused absolutely, at which Mr Bentinqu told him to dedicate them to him. So it was that these concertos became published, against my will. Some parts are passable, others mediocre, others bad. Had they not been published I might, perhaps, have corrected the mistakes, but other occupations prevented me from finding time to divert myself with them, and I would have acted unfairly towards the editor.

See overleaf for a facsimile of that Preface in its original French.

A further "puzzle" not quite resolved by Dunning presents itself in Concerto No 3 (A major). The second movement (cf p. 42 of the facsimile score) was originally marked: Da Capella. Canone di Palestrina. Wassenaer, however, corrected the information by crossing out Palestrina's name, and inserting in the space above it:

Le fameux canon qui fait le debut de la fugue suivante n'est pas de Palestrina mais du maître de chapelle de Henri 8 Roy d'Angleterre. On m'a assuré qu'il est gravé sur une plaque de cuivre dans l'église de Westminster. Je l'ai mis en concert a la prière d'un ami et j'ai tâché, de la remplir dans le même style....

(Translation: The famous canon that opens the following fugue is not by Palestrina but by the director of the chapel Royal of Henry VIII of England. I am assured that it is engraved on a copper plaque in Westminster Abbey. A friend requested me to incorporate it, and I have endeavoured to complete it in the same style).
Partition de mes concertos, gravés par le Sr. Ricciotti, vermoulu à Rache à.

Ces concertos ont été composés en différents temps entre l'année 1725 et 1740.

A mesure qu'ils furent écrits, je les portaï au concert élevé à la Flage, entre Horst Schoning, maï, et quelques seigneurs étrangers. Le Sr. Schoning jouait le 1er violon; je lui permis de prendre pour pièce gravée copie; la femme Antonia étant complète, il me demanda permission de les faire gravés. Sur mon retour tardive, il implora le secours de M. Schoningen de Goen, sur les formes insusantes, lequel, je me rendis enfin, à condition que mon nom n'y permêntait point et qu'il me fallait joindre le figure; lequel j'eussi d'abord; il me demanda si le décor, je ne refusai absolument; sur quoi M. Schoningen lui dit de les lui débiser.

C'est ainsi que ces concertos sont devenus publics, contre ma intention;

il y a du galbe, de mesure, de mauvais; dans la partition, j'en aurais, peut-être, corrigé les défauts, mais d'autres occupations ne m'ont pas laissé la faire à mon plaisir; et j'aurais fait tant à l'ouvrage.
It is not to be found in Westminster Abbey (cf Dunning, ibid., p. 26) though allegedly it is in the Vatican. It is not by Fairfax or any of his contemporaries, though it has been ascribed to William Byrd. Mattheson, Corelli, Pergolesi, Bach, Mozart and even Beethoven all apparently used the theme one way or another, but it was especially popular in England, members of the Academy of Ancient Music singing it to conclude their meetings.

This, together with the actual format of the concertos, indicates that there is a certain English influence upon these concertos, concordant with the cultural and social links the Count is known to have had with this country.

Only one other composition by van Wassenaer is known, the motet Laudate Dominum in sanctis eius, thought by Dunning to be an earlier, and much less skillfully constructed work (for two sopranos and basso continuo). Both the motet and all six concertos are reproduced in facsimile in Dunning's fascinating volume.

The music collection of Count Wilhelm van Wassenaer passed on after his death to his unmarried son, Jacob van Wassenaer, who auctioned it off in 1788. Among that collection (predominantly of French music, in fact, including as Item 1 the score of Rousseau's opera Le Devin du Village) is another aristocratic work, a Cantate Françoise, composée par M. le Comte de la Lippe Schaumbourg, à la Haye, Avril 1727. I have not so far succeeded in tracing this work, written by the man who cuckolded Willem Bentinck, the dedicatee of the Concerti armonici.

Dunning poses, and inevitably leaves unanswered, the question as to whether the identity of the composer, now revealed, will detrimentally affect their popularity. One cannot but surmise that it will; van Wassenaer is not so attractive a concert-billing as Pergolesi, whatever the intrinsic merits of the music. Meanwhile at least one movement seems destined to endure: the Tarantella of Stravinsky's Pulcinella Suite is based entirely on the Allegro Moderato that concludes the aforementioned Concerto in B♭.

Ironically the Count was not so enamoured of that particular movement himself, and wrote at the bottom of the page preceding it (cf Dunning, facsimile score, p. 35):
"L'Allegro suivant est trop uniforme".

Perhaps posterity should heed at least the comment made by Count van Wassenaer himself on the Concerto in f-minor (No 5) (cf facsimile score, p. 86):

"Je préfère en tout ce concert à tous les autres".

2. "Mozart"

Realistically we can expect few discoveries to be as significant as the above. A puzzle of smaller scale was, however, presented by the two rather trivial songs: Ehelicher Guter Morgen and Eheliche Gute Nacht that found themselves into Köchel's\(^{(4)}\) first Mozart-Verzeichnis. Köchel placed the two songs in Appendix 5, works ascribed to Mozart, as numbers 250 and 251, denoting the pair of songs as being compositions by "Dahlberg".

This ascription apparently goes back to Zumsteeg, who perceived in relation to Rellstab's 1798 posthumous edition of Sämtliche Lieder und Gesänge beym Fortepiano von Kapellmeister W.A. Mozart ("Opus CCLIII") that "some of the songs... have apparently found other composers for their author, for example Ehelicher Guter Morgen and Eheliche Gute Nacht by Dahlberg".

On the strength of this observation all subsequent editions of "Köchel's" Verzeichnis - including the current sixth edition (1964), p. 840 - have persisted in the belief that this pair of songs is the work of the composer and keyboard virtuoso, Baron Hugo Friedrich von Dalberg (1760-1812). In fact, of the 33 songs in Rellstab's volume, all but seven have been proved to be spurious, vindicating Constanze's assertions at the time that most of those songs were not by her late husband.

The two particular songs in question were published unequivocally as being by Mozart (see facsimile overleaf) by J.M. Götz before September 21st 1793 (when they were advertized in the Berlinische Musikalische Zeitung). Research by the Viennese scholar Alexander Weinmann\(^{(5)}\) has revealed, however, that though the settings as found in Götz and subsequently other publishers of the last
EHELICHER
GUTERMORGEN.
und
EHELICHE
GUTE NACHT.
s. Clavier
von
W.A. MOZART
Mannheim.
im Musikverlag von J. M. GÖTZ.
Preis 24 Xl.
decade of the 18th century, were certainly not by Mozart, they are with equal certainty also not by our Baron Dalberg. He did, indeed, set the same words to music, but as duets in no way connected with the Götz publication.

Who is actually responsible for "Dalberg's" "Mozart" settings remains a mystery. Although Weinmann's article is no longer a quarter of a century old, the Sächsische Landesbibliothek in Dresden is probably not alone among libraries holding that or other prints bearing Mozart's name who have "corrected" the catalogue entry to Dalberg, but have not - in the wake of Weinmann - corrected the impression that Baron Dalberg should continue to be held responsible for these two banal, even laughable settings of Schubart's texts.

Freiherr (Baron) Hugo Friedrich von Dalberg was an established performer and composer of his day, though not all contemporary reviews of his music were favourable. We may, however, link him in one instance at least with impunity with Mozart.

His Piano Quartet, published by André in Offenbach as Opus 25 (according to the work-list in NG this was also the Opus number given to two volumes of Deutsche Lieder published in Bonn in 1806), has as its second movement an Andante poco Larghetto, acknowledged in the keyboard part but not in the instrumental parts as being D'après un Thème de Mozart, in fact the famous theme for the opening variations of the piano sonata in A major (K 331) - a theme derived by Mozart from a popular S. German melody, "Freu dich mein Herz, denk an kein Schmerz", also found in his early sonata for clavier and violin, K 9). The specific interest of Dalberg's Quartet is that it began life with the unusual instrumentation of Haut-bois, Cor, /remplacé dans l'Andante par une Clarinette/ et Basson, these parts being subsequently arranged by Dalberg himself for the more conventional string trio as "Oeuvre 25".

Hugo von Dalberg was one of three brothers, all of whom achieved fame in their respective spheres: one (Karl Theodor) became the last Elector of Mainz and Chancellor of the Holy Roman Empire in its dying years, and the other (Wolfgang Heribert) became Intendant of the theatre in Mannheim, producing inter alia the first performance of Schiller's Die Räuber* - while Schiller wrote an

* cf footnote overleaf
Ode in Wolfgang Heribert’s praise).

Perhaps this wide range of cultural and political interests expressed itself in Hugo Friedrich’s own output, which is extremely varied, with translations from English and even oriental languages. The entries in MGG and NG give insight into his aesthetic writings that reflect the new “Romantic” feelings of German literature of the time. MGG, like NG, quotes from his Blicke eines Tonkünstlers in die Musik der Geister (A Musician’s perceptive Vision of the Music of the Spirits), published in 1787:

The Genius of Harmony hovered around my bed, whispering to me intimations of the high mysteries of the music of the spirits.

His London sojourn in the 1790s saw the publication here of the "Italian Cantata", Beatrice - a setting for voice and piano of a text by Dante, an extended work, beginning and ending in a-minor, but progressing via movements in Eb, Bb, f-minor, b-flat minor, C major, before a final Allegretto poco Andante in the opening key. His stay in London apparently also saw the publication of two sets of songs, both listed in the NG work-list as Opus 15. In fact the two sets are synonymous, both published by Corri, Dussek & Co, and dedicated to Lady Jerningham. Only the title: Three English Songs and a Glee or English Songs, and the name of the composer: Friedrich Dalberg or Baron Dalberg differ. No 2 of both publications, a setting of "Come live with me and be my love" is given in the Supplement (No 57).

Among his instrumental output the Baron’s sonata for five hands deserves mention. On the face of it, perhaps, as bizarre as Wilhelm Friedrich Ernst Bach’s sonata for six hands, with the teacher sitting between two lady pupils in cramped proximity, playing with an arm round each at the top and bottom of the keyboard (cf Das Dreyblatt, ed. K. Geiringer, Cambridge, Mass. 1955), Dalberg’s sonata (Opus 19; Bonn, c. 1803) gives the uppermost part to the right hand of the third player (La parte di sopra si suona con la man (sic) dritta del terzo sonatore). As the opening page (cf overleaf) shows, the part fluctuates between reinforcement at the upper octave of the right hand of the second player’s part, and independent virtuoso flourishes, both functions requiring precision of performance and a high degree of dexterity.

* footnote from previous page: Dalberg, the composer’s, 12 Lieder (Erfurt, 1799) include a setting of Schiller’s An die Freude. Of interest, too, in No 12 is the suggested use of the lute as an alternative to the clavier. Whether ‘Laute’ is being used poetically for ‘Gitarre’, or what precise lute-type instrument is intended, remains open to conjecture.
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\[\text{Musical notation image}\]
In concentrating exclusively on the published keyboard sonatas, the work-list in NG omits any reference to a substantial unpublished sonata in e-minor for two harpsichords housed by the SLb in Dresden.

The lengthy entries in MGG, NG (and also Grove 5) do however reflect fairly the status enjoyed by the Baron in his life-time. His works and interests are cosmopolitan. In addition to the Dante "Cantata" and the English songs and Deutsche Lieder referred to above, come Sei CANZONI con Accompagnamento di Piano-Forte, published by Götz in Munich, Mannheim and Düsseldorf, c. 1792, and Six Romances Françaises, published as Opus 21 in Bonn, c. 1803, so that his output of secular songs spans four languages. His works survive in libraries correspondingly scattered - the Sei Canzoni may be found in Budapest, and his Trio in Eb for piano with violin and violoncello (Opus 26) survives inter alia in Kongelige Biblioteket in Stockholm. In this work a startling enharmonic change at Bar 104 of the opening movement allows Eb to modulate into E major.

A W. German company* issued a record incorporating a movement from the Baron's late sonata for piano and violin, Opus 28 (c. 1810), but in general he has not enjoyed reinstatement as an important contemporary of Mozart to the same degree as Dussek, whose life-span tallies exactly with Dalberg's.

Eitner lists under the name of the composer's Electoral brother, Karl Theodor (Anton Maria) Dalberg a treatise(6) on the playing of the viola d'amore.

That the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna possesses such a work:

\[
\text{Eine kleine Erklärung vor die Viol d'Amor} \\
\text{Verfaßt von Einen Liebhaber der Viol d'Am} \\
\text{In Jahr (sic) 1795}
\]

is correct, but nowhere is any other name given to the anonymous little treatise (21 sides) than that of a "Liebhaber" (= 'amateur'), and there is no known reason why Eitner - presumably not completely arbitrarily - chose to ascribe it to Dalberg's exalted brother. The present writer (6) has recently transcribed and translated this quaint document to enlarge the sparse

* Issued in GB under the Musica Rara label: Mus. 14: Music of Mozart's time from Courts between the Rhine and the Mosel (c. 1968).
historic literature available for exponents of that particular instrument.

Whatever the merits and demerits of Baron Dalberg's music per se, his lifestyle as a composing aristocrat has something in common with that of his more illustrious contemporary, Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia, and one that is markedly different from the vast majority of earlier dilettanti discussed elsewhere in this dissertation. We see Dalberg as typifying what Leo Balet(7) and others have described as the "bourgeois evolutionary process" (Verbürglerlichung) that music progressively underwent as the 18th century drew to its close and the 19th century unrolled.

Unlike most earlier dilettanti, Dalberg, born as he was into a privileged class that eschewed cultural values, had no coyness about his musical talents, neither as a travelling virtuoso nor as a composer. His music was widely published and was open to public scrutiny. Indeed the mouthpiece of burgeoning middle-class musical opinion, the Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung (AMZ) was not inhibited in criticising his works (cf Eitner). Likewise the travelling virtuoso performer of Dalberg's era will have increasingly appeared, not in the closed confines of the aristocratic music-room, nor even in the semi-public invitation concerts that typified musical life in Vienna in the first decade of the 19th century (when fear of revolutionary fervour led to strict laws of assembly), but in the open musical events that characterised the cultural life of London, Amsterdam and Leipzig.

Wassenaer, by contrast, was keen to promote bourgeois musical life, but when it came to composing for such events he was constrained to resort to subterfuge, his manifest talents, as a result, being hidden under the proverbial bushel for the best part of 250 years.
This dissertation has confined itself to the genre of the composing nobleman or noblewoman in the 18th century, with a few years' tolerance at either end of the century. The scale of such an enterprise, should one choose to embrace their 19th century counterparts in addition, would take immense dimensions. The catalogue of the Königliche Hausbibliothek reveals over thirty aristocratic names, mostly unknown, but some who have even found their way into NG. To this list could come an equally lengthy one of Saxon composing aristocrats, of whom only one features in the Berlin catalogue.

Nor would it appear that the decline in the influence of the aristocracy in the 19th century should have led to a corresponding decline in the number of composing aristocrats. The composing talents of the British and German sides of the Royal family throughout the last century, be it prior to, during, or in the wake of the life of the Prince Consort, would be of itself sufficient to refute any suggestion that royalty and the gentry had become less cultural, more entrepreneurial as the 19th century progressed. The following list points to what could be, but has not as yet been investigated.

The "Conclusion and Summary" that follows this Postscriptum will, however, attempt to explain how social changes effecting the nature of musical life in general also influenced the output and function of the dilettanti in the 19th century.
Titled Composers in Thouret's Catalogue of Music in the
Königliche Hausbibliothek, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin (DDR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>ABACO Graf von</td>
<td>3 cello sonatas</td>
<td>= Giuseppe Dellabacco, not elsewhere given titled status. Cf NG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>AUGUSTA Prinzessin Wilhelm von Preussen</td>
<td>piano music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182-88</td>
<td>BAGGE C.E. Baron von</td>
<td>symphonies</td>
<td>violin concerto LOST Cf NG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189-93</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>chamber music</td>
<td>quintet LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717 f.</td>
<td>BRÜHL Carl Graf von</td>
<td>songs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>BRÜHL Gräfin Moritz von</td>
<td>song</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>BURGHERSCH (sic) Lord</td>
<td>songs</td>
<td>LOST. Cf NG and &quot;Westmorland&quot; below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954-59</td>
<td>DALBERG Freiherr von</td>
<td>songs</td>
<td>Cf Thesis, MGG, NG etc. Includes Elegy for Count Hatzfeld below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>E.T.P.A.</td>
<td>opera</td>
<td>Cf Thesis = Maria Antonia Walpurgis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1234 f.</td>
<td>ERNST Herzog zu Sachsen-Gotha &amp; Coburg</td>
<td>2 operas</td>
<td>LOST. Elder brother of Prince Consort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>EUGEN Herzog von Württemberg</td>
<td>opera</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1284</td>
<td>FLINT Lady</td>
<td>songs and duet</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315 ff</td>
<td>FRIEDRICH der Grosse</td>
<td>flute music etc</td>
<td>Cf Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>GALITZIN Sergius Prinz von</td>
<td>6 Romances</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>GEORG Prinz von Cumberland Kronprinz von Hannover</td>
<td>Complete works</td>
<td>3 vols., all LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.No.</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>GRÖBEN F. Graf von d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-99</td>
<td>GRÖBEN J. Graf von d.</td>
<td>vocal &amp; piano</td>
<td>some LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2107 f.</td>
<td>HATZFELD /Graf A. von?/ Die Rheinfahrt</td>
<td></td>
<td>? close friend of Mozart (cf Letters) Cf also Dalberg. LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2582-5</td>
<td>KOSPOTH Graf von</td>
<td>4 symphonies</td>
<td>Cf Thesis &amp; NG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2802 ff</td>
<td>LOUIS FERDINAND Prinz von Preussen</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>Cf Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2840 f.</td>
<td>MALTZAN M. Graf von</td>
<td>piano music</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2911-14</td>
<td>MEJAN Fanny Gräfin von</td>
<td>piano music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2989 f.</td>
<td>MILLIZ C. Freiherr von</td>
<td>vocal music</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3182 f.</td>
<td>MÜNCHHAUSEN Baron von</td>
<td>2 piano concertos</td>
<td>Cf Thesis; LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3258 f.</td>
<td>OGINSKY Graf</td>
<td>piano music</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3483 f.</td>
<td>PINTO Emmy Gräfin von</td>
<td>piano music</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3483</td>
<td>POCCI (sic) Baron von</td>
<td>songs</td>
<td>IOST. Presumably the early 19th century Bavarian Court composer, Count Franz von Pocchi, of whom works (including a Notturno for cello &amp; piano) survive in Munich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3495</td>
<td>PRONAY Gabriel Freiherr von</td>
<td>piano music</td>
<td>LOST. Described as Op.6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4521-28</td>
<td>RADZIWILL Anton Fürst</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>some LOST. Cf NG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4383</td>
<td>REDERN F.W. Graf von</td>
<td>2 quadrilles</td>
<td>1 Greek, 1 Czech! Both LOST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4953</td>
<td>SANNES Baron de</td>
<td>6 quartets</td>
<td>LOST. Described as Op.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5382-84</td>
<td>STOLBERG Luise, Gräfin von</td>
<td>vocal music</td>
<td>some LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5415</td>
<td>STREIF Baron</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5536</td>
<td>VIOLA Graf von</td>
<td>orchestral work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5653-60</td>
<td>WESTMORLAND Graf von</td>
<td>large-scale orchestral works</td>
<td>all LOST. Presumably this is the Lord Burghersch given above. Cf NG.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above list may not be complete, in that, for example, Dalberg was not given his aristocratic title, and there may be other similar instances. The rubric LOST means 'not to be found in the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek'. Some works marked thus may be held by the Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz in W. Berlin.

The library in Weimar (DDR) houses, in addition to the works of Anna Amalia and Prinz Johann Ernst dealt with in the thesis, the melodramatic setting of Goethe's Faust (including additional scenes especially provided by Goethe) by Fürst Radziwill, as found above. In addition to songs by Dalberg (published in neighbouring Erfurt in 1799) we find Prince George of Cumberland, whose complete works in three volumes were once held in Berlin (DDR), Lieder ohne Worte for piano by Duke Joseph of Saxe-Altenburg, an uncle of the Prince Consort, and a Fackeltanz (torch dance) for piano solo composed by the Prince Albert's brother, Ernst, for the wedding of Princess Luise of Prussia to Grandduke Friedrich of Baden in Berlin in 1856. The work was available also for wind band or orchestra, though it is not clear which of the three versions is the original intention of the composer. Of interest are also songs by an Austrian contemporary of Baron Dalberg, Count Moritz von Dietrichstein. His significance as a song-writer is attested by entries in Schilling, Fétis and Eitner, though no mention of him is made either in MGG or in NG.** The most recent references to him come in John Smed's (8) article on songs to and about the early piano, with a somewhat guarded account of one of his songs on the subject (cf p. 238 f.).

* Cf Gotthold, loc. cit., p. 21 f
** Wurzbach makes no reference to him as a composer and gives no date of death. The Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung has references in Nos 21, 23, 28 and 47.
Von Dietrichstein's dates (1775-1864)* take him just outside the scope of this dissertation, his first publication of songs being his Lieder von Goethe in 1810. By 1821 he had published no fewer than eight collections of songs and several of piano music. Since John Smeed's recent publication on the history of the Lied does not incorporate him, though a subsequent anthology may yet, I conclude the Supplement (No 58) with two of his many settings, these deriving from a set of six Lieder to texts by Heinrich Schmidt, published in 1814** Such Lieder, as will be discussed later, are highly characteristic of the output of the 19th century dilettante composer.

Perusal through the catalogue of the Royal Music Collection in the British Library likewise leads to encounter with a bewilderingly long list of such titled composers. These will not be further discussed here, since the source is accessible to many, and the vast majority belong (as with the two sources quoted above) to the 19th century and are therefore not within the chosen scope of this dissertation.

*Fétis and Eitner give conflicting dates of death: 1854 and 1864 resp.
** Otherwise Moritz von Dietrichstein's most telling contribution to the world of music was his illegitimate son, the notable composer and virtuoso pianist Sigismund Thalberg. Whether or not Raynor (11) is justified technically in referring to the latter as "aristocratic" is open to argument (op. cit., p.61). NG gives the soberest account of Dietrichstein's alleged paternity. Cf also MGG.
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   Cf also: M.E. PAYMER (diss. 1976) on question of ascriptions.


CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

The Introduction to this thesis promised, as a secondary purpose of its production, to see if identifiable classifications of aristocratic composers emerge in their relationship to mainstream musical activity of the 18th century. It also envisaged a tentative explanation as to why composing aristocratic composers are predominantly a Central European phenomenon and why they existed in such profusion in the 18th century. In fact, all three issues prove to be inextricably linked, though we shall deal with them here in order.

CLASSIFICATIONS OF INTERACTION WITH MAINSTREAM MUSIC

1. "Egocentric" interaction

The dominant impression arising from the study of the 18th century composing aristocrat is one of musical conservatism. In many instances the dilettante composer wrote in one particular idiom and exploited the musical establishment maintained by his Court to support and sustain that idiom, irrespective of music's evolution elsewhere. The greater the political sway and the economic power wielded, the greater the temptation is seen to have been. The exploitation of a Court musical establishment to indulge personal taste is most marked in the considerable output of Emperor Leopold of the Habsburgs and Frederick the Great of Prussia, though typified in diluted form by the generality of less prolific and less politically influential dilettanti from the lower orders of the aristocracy.

In the case of Emperor Leopold we observed how - apart from a few harmonically more telling works in response to personal loss - Leopold's output remained for forty years in the style of the mid-17th century. This is not to say that he was not a highly skilled exponent of that particular style, for at his best his extended Sepolcri in particular bear comparison with commensurate works by the "professionals" who surrounded him. But in principle the immense resources lavished by the Emperor on stage entertainments for the Court in Vienna, Prague and elsewhere served but to preserve an outdated status quo in comparison with the evolution that was taking place outside.
That evolutionary process in the context of the Habsburg Court became a revolutionary process. Leopold's successor as Emperor, Joseph I, had other models, more in keeping with the spirit of the age, and almost overnight Draghi and Schmelzer are swept aside to make way for Ziani and Buononcini, who - like the compositions of the Emperor himself - speak the same language as music's newest luminary, G. Fr. Handel, and the less flamboyant Fux.

The situation is essentially parallel with Frederick the Great. Allegedly a protagonist of Italian music, the King's staple diet was provided exclusively by his own compositions and those of the arguably Italianate but by no means Italian Johann Joachim Quantz. Similarly in the opera, still - as we shall discuss later - solely within the King's bounty, the immense financial resources ploughed into it are used to pay Italian performers, while the repertoire itself is dominated by the native talents of the King's preferred composers, Graun and Hasse, with occasional insertions in the same idiom by the King himself.

Of all examples of musical entrenchment and conservatism the most extreme example is probably that of Frederick's sister, Princess Amalie. Unlike her brother, who saw no place for contrapuntal devices in secular music, Amalie's own compositions radiate little of the spirit of homespun "Italian" music, but are centred on the almost anti-creative aesthetics of Kirnberger and obsessed by counterpoint. Her reaction to evolving musical taste is harshly dismissive and the subservient role accorded to C.Ph. E. Bach vis-à-vis that of Kirnberger serves to underline the fact that a "Court "patron" of music, especially where he or she was also a practising composer, was more prone to impede than advance the musical processes at work in the outside world.

We described Amalie's antagonism to the music of Joh. Abr. Peter Schulz. But Balet's (loc. cit. 7/10, p. 483) generous description of Schulz' contribution to a "genuinely bourgeois" ethos in music, as a representative of the so-called "second Berlin school of Lieder" helps to clarify at one and the same time both the hostility expressed by the Princess, and also the enormous popularity Schulz was coming to enjoy.
Even the above picture is not, however, as black and white as it would be convenient to believe. In the peripheral area of opera libretti both Frederick and his other composing sister, Wilhelmine of Bayreuth, experimented with forms that could break the stranglehold of the da capo aria. Furthermore, by composing libretti of an avowed humanistic nature, they broke new ground vis-à-vis the predictably Classical content of prevailing Metastasian operatic plots. The aim of such a break with the status quo was not aimed, however, at achieving universal operatic reform, but designed to satisfy their own aesthetic needs for private or at most semi-public consumption.

In fairness Wilhelmine shows less positive repression than that displayed by her siblings and is in general "neutral" (cf below) in her relationship with the wider musical world.

Indeed, in principle, most aristocratic composers of the first half of the 18th century composed only to fulfil their own recreational needs, and they remained remarkably unwilling to give their works wider circulation. This is borne out, on the one hand, by the survival of their music, mostly in manuscript form, in the very location for which they were written. Hardly a work of Emperor Leopold survives beyond the confines of Vienna, and the same is true of the Berlin concentration of sources of Frederick's music. He most certainly did not give his *imprimatur* to the publication of his "3rd" Symphony, and the arrangement of the same for keyboard solo with an alien movement would most certainly not have met with his approval.

Amalie's double-counterpoint *Allegro* was published, but in the sober, didactic context of Kirnberger's formal text-book on composition.

The same unwillingness to be known to the wider public as a composer also marked Elector Max. III Joseph of Bavaria. Of his compositions, the 12 Trios for two violins and a bass best reflect his known, intimate musical tastes. His model, one or other of the Kröner family, is hardly the expected choice of a man whose position could have commanded almost any notable composer of the day. However, Kröner's modest trios, and his own, fulfilled his chamber music needs. When the chance came to employ the young Mozart, this most sympathetic of 18th century rulers declined for reasons of economy.
There is, however, a dichotomy in his output. Some of his larger symphonies and a *Stabat Mater* were engraved for publication, but the Elector had the plates of the latter withdrawn, with the few surviving copies made only for his own purposes. Flattering as it might have been to have them performed by so public a body as the *Accademia Filarmonica* in Verona, and enlightened ruler as he was, Max III Joseph was not yet ready to see interaction with the outside world to be brought forward to any great extent.

The glaring exception to the rule of coyness is the Bavarian Elector's sister, Maria Antonia Walpurgis, the Dowager Electress of Saxony. She had no such scruple about having her two operas published at about the time they were written, the opening Symphonies also appearing in overture collections of the 1770s, even in London.

Of all the composing members of the 18th century aristocracy Maria Antonia is, however, the one against whom the most prominent question mark has been drawn, at least in the case of the two published works. Her chamber cantatas of rather slighter substance remained, as we have seen, manuscript survivals. Could it not be, one is tempted to ask, that the heavy involvement of a Hasse on the compositional side and conceivably of Metastasio even in the case of the libretto, gave her the confidence to have "her" two operas subjected to wider public scrutiny, simply because the "professional" contribution, though unacknowledged, made the interface with mainstream productions less likely to lead to public criticism that might reflect badly on her Electoral status?

Alternatively it may be argued that the operas ascribed by Maria Antonia to herself are genuine, and that she represents a turning point in the attitude of the aristocracy towards bourgeois musical culture. An ambivalence pervades the early and mid-18th century in this respect, at least in the German-speaking areas, as manifested by even such "nuclear" composers as discussed below as (possibly) Count Losy and (demonstrably) Count Wilhelm van Wassenaer.

Significantly Duchess Amalia of Weimar in the 1780s attempted to have her notable setting of Goethe's Singspiel *Erwin und Elmire* published by Breitkopf, as were those of Maria Antonia - but apparently with no success. It may well
be that by the time the nobility were prepared to "go public", market forces were playing the hand of the publishers in the costly process of engraving and printing, and that an illustrious name was not, of its own, a sufficient guarantee of economic success, especially with so extensive and cost-intensive a proposal as a stage-work.

2. "Neutral" Interaction

The lower the status of an aristocrat in terms of title or power, the less positively "egocentric" he or she is likely to be in any interaction with mainstream composers. The Landgrave Ernst Ludwig of Hesse-Darmstadt and his associate, the neighbouring Count Friedrich Carl zu Erbach may be taken, perhaps, as illustrative examples.

The Landgrave's first compelling musical influence was French grand opera in situ. This was not only to dominate the cultural fare of his Court theatre, for so long as he could economically maintain it, it determined the nature of his own major compositions, the collection of twelve orchestral Suites more in the style of French instrumental music in the early 18th century than anything else. Economic necessity, however, required him in later years to seek his operatic pleasures elsewhere than self-financed in Darmstadt. To that end he followed Telemann to Hamburg, witnessing there Italianate opera - in a public opera-house Am Gänseeiarkt - where the French influence, other than perhaps in the occasional Overture, will have been more conspicuous by its absence.

The fruits of those new experiences in the case of the Landgrave took the form of an alternative Overture to an opera by Graupner, for performance at the Court in Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel. Again the Landgrave was open to musical experience, and when he liked what he heard was skillful enough to re-create it. The Court at Darmstadt - as indeed at Celle and elsewhere - succeeded, it is true, in exposing some notable German musicians, including J.S. Bach and possibly Telemann, to French music as performed by the French at Court,
but the major feature of 18th century musical life, namely the rapid spread of Italian and Italianate opera, though fostered at huge expense by many a Court, asserted itself widely as an entertainment for the affluent bourgeoisie, dependent on local entrepreneurial impulses, but emancipated from the likes and dislikes or compositional talents of such "patrons" as the Landgrave.

The story is similar with the Landgrave's friend, Count Friedrich Carl zu Erbach. Erbach's compositional output reflects absolutely the environment for which they were written. The thirty 'Divertissements' described in the thesis will have been well-suited to the jovial, congenial music-parties that took place in the Count's family seat. Those entertainments, as described by Uffenbach, seem geared to fairly small resources, with a marked preference for parody performances of arias and duets from inter alia Handelian operas. Indeed Telemann's attendance and presumed enjoyment of these events will come as no surprise to anyone acquainted with Der getreue Music-Meister. The Count's own compositions demonstrate the consumer need for suitable music for domestic music-making, be it in an aristocratic or a bourgeois environment. The aim in composing them will not have been to extend the available repertoire for all like-minded musicians, but to satisfy the purely local need. True, the Count spoke of having the works engraved, which would have permitted wider circulation, but in the event only the dedication and preface were put on plate, while the music itself remained in manuscript, with probably no more than two copies. The opus is dedicated to the aforesaid Landgrave, thus creating a sort of "sealed system", keeping the music in its courtly environment.

The dedication makes no reference to the correcting hand of Telemann - a hope that had been previously expressed by the Count. In general any interaction between the Count and Telemann has tended to be overstated: Telemann's career had certainly no need of aristocratic promotion. Association with such as the Count may, however, have increased the composer's awareness, both as musician and as publisher, of the wide spectrum of musical needs in the advancing 18th century. Certainly few composers of that era catered for such a broad spread of taste and executive skill as did Telemann.
What is markedly different between Erbach and, for example, Frederick the Great in his relationship with Quantz, is that the association with Telemann by the Count makes no demands on the composer; it is an association freely entered into, with no strings attached, no enforced production of music in a prescribed style. To this extent Erbach in his interaction with Telemann created an open-ended relationship which — as with the Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt in composing an overture and ballet music for a Graupner opera performed at some-one else's Court — seeks neither to inhibit nor to influence, and is in that sense "neutral".

We may dismiss the Landgrave's Suites as stilted and the Count's Divertissements as trite, but in so doing we are casting judgement on much that was produced at that time. The survival of the music — and the Court environment has assisted its physical survival while other equally ephemeral music will have fallen victim to the varied ravages and hazards of time — does give us insight into a socio-musical phenomenon, namely the consumer-orientated music of that period.

3. "Nuclear" Interaction

Admittedly not the general run of aristocratic composers, but nevertheless firmly in evidence are those whose contribution is in no way inhibitory to the current trend, but in some way or other goes beyond a mere reflection of the status quo and makes some kind of dynamic mark on the musical life of its time, and even beyond.

As the 18th century progresses and into the early years of the 19th century such contributions by the dilettanti, certainly at the organisational level, are seen to increase. As bourgeois musical culture gained impetus throughout the 18th century, the aristocracy in some areas grew increasingly willing to be involved, playing a crucial role as entrepreneurs and/or benefactors, and in some instances as notable composers and/or performers. This was less true of Germany, where the profusion of Courts strengthened the isolation of the aristocracy from external events until much later in the century — a theme to which we will be returning.
In assessing which composers achieved this 'nuclear' interaction, the quality of their own output is not the deciding factor. Of the early 18th century composers, surprisingly perhaps, the Baron Ludwig von Radolt may be said to qualify.

His sole collection of consort pieces for lutes and other instruments is not of the highest order, and our biographical knowledge of him is inadequate to establish any links with public musical life in Vienna. The collection is, in fact, dedicated to King, later Emperor Joseph of the Habsburgs, thus creating the impression that this is prima facie music written by an aristocrat for a courtly environment. Von Radolt is, however, one of the first dilettanti to "go public". In publishing his collection he not only cast off the traditional cloak of coyness for one of his status, he presented a broader spread of music-lovers with the sort of domestic music that will have been in demand though not easily available. The collection will have served as an exemplar of the way in which currently accessible music could be arranged for the fashionable instruments of the time, and the detailed notes for performance will have fulfilled that didactic function.

That the music was not destined to remain in the confines of courtly music-making is confirmed by the wide spread of the many surviving (though all incomplete) sets of part-books, promoting the music to a category beyond that of an output conceived purely to meet the needs of its immediate environment.

The same wide spread of surviving sources also gives 'nuclear' status to the enigmatic Baron d'Astorga; his musical activities took him genuinely throughout Europe, and brought him into contact with inter alia so notable a composer as Caldara. Whether or not his Stabat Mater was commissioned by the Academy of Ancient Music for performance in Oxford may remain conjecture, but a century later the poet Grillparzer was still able to hear the work and be impressed by it in a public performance in Vienna, indicating indeed that although his works have not been revived in recent times, they did survive in the musical sub-consciousness of the 18th century, even after the composer's death.

Of all early 18th century aristocratic composers the most demonstrably 'nuclear'
remains the Bohemian lutenist **Count Anton Losy**. Apart from one work included in a published anthology of the late 17th century, the whole of Losy's considerable output is scattered in manuscript survivals, often in arrangements for other plucked instruments (guitar, angelica etc) or even for keyboard; these arrangements and the large number of concordances themselves attest the popularity of the "incomparable" Count's music in the 18th century. Even the severely critical Mattheson exempted him and the likewise legendary Leopold Sylvius Weiss from his damning dismissal of the lute fraternity as sub-standard in the world of composers. The **Tombeau** written by Weiss upon the death of Losy remains a monument in the repertoire of music for the lute, and a fitting reminder of the fact that Losy imprinted himself on the musical life of his time to a degree unparalleled by any aristocratic composer before him.

We have seen that Pohanka and Vogl disagree on the issue of Losy's involvement in the musical life of Prague by the founding of a Music Academy for the purpose of public concerts. Pohanka assumes the Count's involvement, though there is no actual documentary evidence to support the claim. Vogl describes as "inconceivable" the thought that the Count would have played "in public". The matter remains open, but despite the lack of documentary evidence one cannot but have sympathy with the more generally held belief in Losy's involvement. His fame will have become so widespread through his travels as a performer. That he was prepared to meet and play with other musicians is manifest from the Kuhnau/Hebenstreit anecdote. The event was described as a 'Concertgen' which may perhaps be interpreted as involving some kind of audience in addition to the three players. At all events it would seem incredible that musicians outside the lute fraternity, such as Kuhnau himself, should have held Losy in such esteem, had they never managed to hear him in public. Kuhnau, it should also be added, held the Count in such esteem that he dedicated to him his *Frische Klavierfrüchte* in 1696. It seems unlikely, though not impossible, that the Count was prepared to appear elsewhere as a travelling virtuoso, while maintaining a differing posture on his home territory in Prague, where his aristocratic rank will have been of greater local significance.
We may describe as 'nuclear', but for totally different reasons, the interaction of one other early 18th century noble composer with the wider musical world: Duke/Prince Johann Ernst of Saxe-Weimar. While the shortness of his life-span makes it impossible to assert any real organisational interaction with the outside world of music, and his position in a provincial Saxon Court makes it unlikely that any such involvement would have come about at that time, yet his compositions themselves, unwittingly, achieved a status in the "Republic of Music" that the young Prince cannot have dreamed of.

True, by publishing in engraved part-books six of the Prince's violin concertos, as a posthumous tribute, Telemann did what he could to establish the nobleman's talents beyond the narrower confines of the Weimar Court, and by giving them special mention in his Lexikon of 1732 Walther did his best to further what Telemann had set out to do. However, the ignorance shown by Gerber, almost within living memory of the Prince, indicates that the concertos per se, despite the efforts of Telemann and Walther failed to assert themselves.

The 'nuclear' nature of the Prince's contribution is as the provider of source material for at least six - and in the estimation of the present writer arguably seven - of the arrangements for harpsichord or organ of instrumental concertos by Johann Sebastian Bach. While the motivation for Bach to choose concertos by the Prince for that purpose remains conjectural, in this context at least Johann Ernst is seen to rub shoulders with composers of the ilk of Albinoni, Marcello and Vivaldi.

The dichotomy that exists in the early and mid-18th century in particular in respect to aristocratic rank and compositional talent had the most far-reaching consequences in the case of the obscure Dutch nobleman, Count Wilhelm van Wassenaer. In his case we noted his open involvement in the concert life of The Hague, and his willingness to have his concertos played in such concerts. What he was not willing to do, was to betray his identity as their author. The list of composers accredited with their invention, quite apart from the inevitable Pergolesi, ranged from such household names as Handel and De Fesch, through obscurer figures in musical history as Birkenstock and Chelleri. An Oxford Professor of Music singled out one of the concertos as a model of the baroque Concerto grosso, and Stravinsky used the last movement of the same concerto as the basis for the 'Tarantella' of his Pulcinella.
Suite - ironically the Count's own least favourite in the collection of six.

Hardly any music by any 18th century composer established itself so firmly and enduringly in the orchestral repertoire of the past two and a half centuries as van Wassenaer's *Concerti a monici*, yet the Count felt bound, for reasons of decorum, not to reveal the true identity of the "illustrious hand" that had composed them.

A different attitude appears to have prevailed in Britain, certainly in the second half of the 18th century. A special case needs to be made for the only representative from the first half of the 18th century, namely Frederick Lewis, "Prince of Wales". As the son of the monarch - and here we can compare and contrast him with Frederick the Great during his years as Crown Prince - one might have expected little or no involvement with public musical life.

But for Frederick Lewis public involvement was part of his protest against his father, George II. Consequently the setting up of the "Opera of the Nobility" in opposition to Handel's operatic enterprises in London in the 1730s was not a means of wresting opera from the public domain, as its title may indicate, and restoring it to its traditional beneficiary, the aristocracy. It was in essence an act of aggression against a German upstart patronised by the father he loathed.

In retrospect it may appear that in championing the cause of Porpora against that of Handel, the Prince was indulging in an egocentric inhibition of musical evolution. In fact, no aesthetic principle was at stake; Handel and Porpora were composers in the same mould, with one rather better than the other. The Prince was not trying to change or suppress any musical or sociological trend, but was waging his own war of personalities.

Though uniform in format, both the Prince's surviving works have a 'nuclear' quality. Uniquely the cantata is an example of music by a Prince of the realm, with a purely political motivation. As an unconventional birthday message for the Spanish Crown Prince, Frederick Lewis must surely have hoped that the work would be heard in a far wider context than an informal Royal gathering at Cliveden or in London.
His Canzonets likewise defy easy categorisation. Written in the conventional form of the day, the five text sections form a song-cycle, wittingly or unwittingly pointing towards what was to come, elsewhere and not within his lifetime.

In the case of the three musical earls, their Lordships Abingdon, Kelly and Mornington, we stand on firmer ground. The main body of instrumental music by the Earl of Abingdon, rather like the output of Count Friedrich zu Erbach, smacks of the aristocratic salon and light-hearted conviviality. Abingdon's music, however, was no longer conceived within the context of a "sealed system". Unlike Erbach's Divertissements, dedicated to the Landgrave of Hesse, the first of Abingdon's Capricios is dedicated to (in fact entitled) The Siddons, a reference either to the famous actress or her family. Likewise the extraordinary multi-media setting of the Execution of Mary, Queen of Scots is unconventionally dedicated to the Ladies of the Blue Stocking Club.

Abingdon's interaction with the cultural life in London in the last quarter of the 18th century is predominantly with the affluent bourgeoisie in its search for culture and entertainment, and in the organisation of professional musical concerts. These made him close working associates of inter alia the 'London' Bach, Abel, and - after the demise of those particular enterprises, with Haydn in the early 1790s.

Abingdon, we know, was a keen flautist. Understandably that influenced his own output; but there is no evidence to suggest that it will have in any way influenced the music promoted by the Earl. In this context it is enlightening to review those compositions written by Haydn that directly bear on Abingdon. The Trio for two flutes and a bass dedicated to His Lordship, is manifestly a goodwill gesture, written in the format clearly favoured by Abingdon in his own works. What it is not, is a commission or the fruits of noble command, as were Haydn's baryton trios for Prince Nikolaus in Eisenstadt and Esterhaza a decade or two earlier (cf Raynor(1), op. cit., p. 310 f).
Likewise, the perfunctory — and musically redundant — piano accompaniments to the Earl's Catches and Glees provided by "Dr Haydn" will surely have come about as an act of genuine friendship, aimed probably at boosting sales, rather than a formal quid pro quo for Abingdon's influential role in Haydn's triumphal visits to this country.

One may imply from comments on Lord Abingdon's own music, both here and elsewhere, that there is a "neutral" relationship to mainstream music in the matter of composition, however "nuclear" his involvement may have been at the organisational level. This is an over-simplification in relation to a highly complex personality.

True, the Country Dances and Capricios are compositionally conventional, even if one of them poses as a rather unusual "Cure for the Spleen". Like Frederick Lewis, however, Abingdon uses music as a medium for highly-charged political expression. Furthermore among his other vocal compositions MGG singles out from his Six Songs of 1788 "The Spinning Wheel" as "Schubertian" — "nuclear" indeed in reference to a major composer as yet unborn when the song was written. Similarly ahead of its time is the aforementioned Representation of the Execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, involving music, the visual arts and poetry, this combination of the "Sister Arts" being dedicated, as a further expression of progressive social thought, to the "female philosophers" of the Blue Stocking Club.

For all that, one searches in vain for even passing reference to his name in Raynor (op. cit. (1)), Young's (2) account of the concert tradition, and the specifically English socio-historical work by Mackerness (3).

The link between an aristocratic composer and the organisation of public musical life is perhaps more self-evident in the case of the Earl of Mornington, given that he was not born with that title, but elevated to it at the age of 25. By that time he had already founded an Academy of Music in Dublin, and four years later became the first Professor of Music at Trinity College in the same city.

His "nuclear" contribution to music was, more exclusively than in the case even
of Lord Abingdon, as an organiser and teacher. His own surviving compositions are so predominated by catches and glees that, if one did not know him better, we would best describe his interaction with mainstream music as "neutral". It is perhaps worth commenting at this point, as does not appear to have been underlined elsewhere, that the production of such glees is itself socio-historically significant. The Gentlemen's Clubs, for whose delight they were written, existed as a sort of parallel institution to the Court. In many ways they were certainly as exclusive, if not more so, than the ducal and princely courts of Germany, and rank and title were no guarantees of election to membership. It therefore follows that Mornington's involvement with bourgeois musical culture and the highly specific requirements of music for the Club milieu should remain at variance.

It is also interesting to note that whereas the Earl himself will have had no cause to be coy about his talents as a composer in a limited field, the obstacle to their publication came in the form of his son, the Duke of Wellington. The man of military might will not gladly have suffered association with such decadent recreational activity as the composing and singing of glees and catches.

Alone among the trio of composing British Earls in the latter half of the 18th century, the Earl of Kelly/Kellie is unequivocally "nuclear" in his interaction with mainstream music, both as an organiser and as a composer. Kelly's "Overtures" (as the Symphonies were generally labelled) in particular established themselves in the concert repertoire of the 1770s and 1780s, achieving immense popularity. As a concert promoter in Edinburgh the Earl introduced into the provincial capital "modern" music, including his own. Judging by the way in which works not by him came to be ascribed to him, we may deduce that his name had become synonymous with the latest musical fashion, and that works in similar vein, be they by Stamitz or Filtz became faute de mieux - the Earl's. Indeed his contemporary commentators in Edinburgh, Topham and Robertson (cf Johnson 3/26, pp 76 & 81), manifestly mistook the 'Mannheimisms' of his music for the new Scottish style of composition!

As was also mentioned en passant even the biblical oratorio, that with the
dramatic rise of the middle-class choral institutions - often with a municipal base - became an ever more powerful force first in Britain then beyond, was unwittingly enriched by the Earl: his Overture to the 'entertainment' assembled by Samuel Arnold, was on one occasion at least, used to replace Handel's original in a performance of "Messiah".

The London public was ultimately discerning enough to allow Kelly's symphonies to be replaced by those of Haydn, but as a force in public musical life for over a decade the role played by this Scottish earl as a composer and arbiter of taste should not be under-estimated.

The rise of the choral societies both in Britain and subsequently abroad had a powerful influence on the very concept of socially broad-spectrum musical events. It was followed, beginning with Mozart, Beethoven and Dussek, by a different phenomenon: the rise and cult of the composer-performer.

Surprisingly, Vienna - with all its profusion of aristocrats - proved to be the place where the professional musician could rely on an enthusiast ic audience from different walks of life that mingled freely socially when the music was over. This has been shown by Raynor's description (loc. cit. (1), p. 324 ff), not only in relation to the matinees held by Prince Lichnowski*, but also in the context of the six subscription concerts undertaken by Mozart at the Mehlgrube in the early months of 1785.

Increasingly, however, Vienna was becoming a mecca of aristocrats who neglected their country estates to take up permanent residence in the capital. Consequently a situation arose, not dissimilar to that in London, where the nobility freely mingled with and became influential supporters of affluent middle-class and upper-class urban culture. The main difference is that whereas London had long boasted of its "Professional Concerts", a

* Raynor (ibid.) ascribes the comments to (Franz Gerhard) Wegeler, though the source quoted was by Ferdinand Ries (cf op. cit., 6/30).
spirit of amateurism dominated the musical life of Vienna, especially in the sphere of orchestral music. The first professional orchestral concerts did not come to the Austrian capital until 1842.

It is in the context of the above that we may view the two final aristocratic composers whose relationship with the prevailing musical world may be described as "nuclear". These are Baron Hugo Friedrich von Dalberg and Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia.

We described earlier how all three Dalberg brothers came to play important parts in the cultural and political life of Germany at a time of great ferment. Baron Dalberg may not have joined the ranks of enduring composers, but both by publishing compositions and aesthetic writings he played his part in establishing the cultural ethos of his day. That process was further intensified by his travels as a virtuoso pianist, at a time just prior to the rise of the virtuoso pianist in the early 19th century.

Eitner has drawn our attention to unfavourable reviews of his music in AMZ. What is significant is that Dalberg made so many of his works available for open scrutiny - a major shift from the concept of noble decorum of much of the 18th century before him. His chamber music is in the slightly amorphous style that typifies much that was written after the death of Mozart and during the years of Haydn's decline, by such composers as the Bohemians Pichl and Gyrowetz. But unlike an "egocentric" such as Frederick the Great, Dalberg was not out to adversely influence or suppress; unlike Erbach or Wilhelmine he was not merely reflecting musical fashion, for his own ends and from the side-lines; Dalberg, for all his musical shortcomings, emerges as an active part of the musical life of his time, again as the wide spread of surviving prints and places of publication can attest.

That spread of places of publication is not the case with Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia, whose claim to "nuclear" status rests on other criteria. Only one of the Prince's approximately one dozen chamber or orchestral works was published during his life-time. For all that the Prince's activity, both as an outstanding pianist (with lavish praise from no less a figure than
Beethoven) and as a composer (his Opus 6, the Quartet in f-minor, moving so severe a critic as Reichardt to glowing tribute) establishing him as a formidable figure in the still largely only semi-public musical life of Berlin and Vienna.

Ries may have overstated the case, but at least some credit must accrue to Louis Ferdinand for bringing the Eroica symphony to "universal recognition". Likewise the Prince's moral support for Beethoven - earning him the dedication of the 3rd Piano Concerto - after the composer had been snubbed by an "elderly Countess" (probably Countess Thun), shows a new relationship between aristocrat and professional composer, though this had become a feature of musical life in Vienna, as reported by Ries (cf Raynor, op. cit. (1), p. 344) in his "Notizen".

The significant aristocrat-composer relationship is not, however, that between Louis Ferdinand and Beethoven, but between himself and his mentor, Dussek. As we have seen, the chinks in the Prince's armour as a composer have been ascribed to Dussek; but Dussek, however much he might have influenced Louis Ferdinand as a pianist and as a composer specifically for the piano, did not have by any means a parallel output to that of the Prince.

Dussek did not lead his royal pupil into the composing of solo sonatas or piano concertos, and vice-versa. Louis Ferdinand did not require Dussek to provide him with models for the production of piano-orientated chamber works. Whatever the social relationship between them, as composers at least they appear to have worked as co-equals.

Unlike earlier royal and aristocratic performer-composers, Louis Ferdinand likewise did not "monopolise" a chosen composer or composers for his own purposes. Beethoven, Dussek and Spohr all appear to have interacted with the Prince, and his music is consequently in Haydn's terms "original", with scholars at variance as to whether his contemporaries alone or Mozart and Haydn also served as influencing models. In this respect Louis Ferdinand is seen as a more progressive figure than the aforementioned Baron Dalberg, who
was born but a decade before him and survived him by a further six years.

For all the visionary, early Romantic verve of his *Blicke eines Tonkünstlers in die Musik der Geister* of 1787, Dalberg remained fixed in his Mozartian mould, while Louis Ferdinand's works, whatever his models, belongs to a new era. The blanket charge of "musical conservatism" as a feature of the general run of aristocratic dilettante composers is manifestly out of place in the context of Louis Ferdinand.

In one further crucial respect the Prince must be regarded as the antithesis of the "ego-centric" dilettante. Not only does he stand at a musical cross-road, and points the way towards what is to come, rather than what was or is, Louis Ferdinand's effect upon posterity was manifest.

The "Tombeaux" written variously by Dussek, Weber, Liszt and Archduke Rudolph testify to the esteem in which he was held over a lengthy period. The earliest of them, that by Dussek, is the only one that does not share a significant characteristic: they all otherwise are based on the Prince's own music, notably the Opus 6 that so moved Reichardt. The posthumous publication of his music, often also in arrangements for two pianos, ensured the physical survival of his works, but their continued performance at public concerts for nearly half a century after his death must be ascribed to the integral quality of the music itself.

The composing aristocrat: a Central European phenomenon?

Although the primary aim of this thesis is not directed towards the above question, the fact remains that of all the noteworthy composing members of the nobility in the 18th century identified in these pages, only the exotic Baron d'Astorga (Sicily) and the three British earls (Frederick Lewis, Prince of Wales was born in Herrenhausen, Hanover) did not originate from the German-speaking area comprising Germany, Austria and Bohemia.
The Duke of Orleans, to whom passing reference was made, is the sole French representative, but he belongs to the 17th century and consequently is not covered by the thesis, while the legendary Conte de Tallard, who has found his way into the literature and anthologies for the lute, was not, in the opinion of the present writer, ever a composer.

The cryptic Count Wilhelm van Wassenaer qualifies as Dutch, but as the spelling of his Christian name suggests, and the strong links with the German aristocracy (notably the Count of Schaumburg-Lippe) confirms, the Dutch nobleman blended a Germanic sense of decorum - hence the unwillingness to reveal his identity - with an openness to the advanced bourgeois musical life of The Hague, such as typified the later generation of musical aristocrats in Britain in the latter half of the 18th century, and ultimately the Viennese and German aristocracy in the early 19th century.

In short, the Count's posture is consonant with what Balet (loc. cit., p. 94) describes as the "aristocratic-republican" government of the Netherlands in the first half of the 18th century.

The question is then: why "Germany"? - or alternatively: why not in Britain or France? The answer appears to lie in the strength and isolation of the Courts in the German lands. Music - or the Arts in general - and many a noble lady in particular also tried her hand at painting and poetry - and hunting appear to have been the main recreational pursuits of the aristocracy. As we see in the case of Landgrave Ernst Ludwig of Hesse-Darmstadt, piety, musical sensitivity and wanton slaughter of game were by no means incompatible.

In principle as many as three forms of music were required by the Court:

1. Sacred music for the Court Church
2. Opera or Singspiele (referred to in 18th century England as "entertainments") for the theatre and for more "representative" purposes (in the German sense of the word, meaning display of wealth or power)
3. Chamber music for more intimate recreational purposes

While the lower orders of the nobility may have required only the third of the above, Emperors, Kings, Electors certainly, Dukes even Landgrave probably
will have maintained all three. Frederick the Great, on the other hand, for personal philosophical reasons, was happy to dispense with the need for the first.

18th century "Germany" was a confederation of a profusion of large central (Berlin, Dresden, Munich, Vienna etc) and small provincial Courts. The Courts functioned in isolation from the bourgeois municipalities and catered for their own cultural needs, as dictated by the tastes of the presiding Prince (using that term to cover the whole aristocratic and imperial spectrum) and normally, though not always, economic factors.

These Courts maintained a Kapelle - a "chapel" in the parlance of the English printers' union to this day) of musicians under the supervision of the Kapellmeister, in most cases supported (or even obstructed!) by a Vize-Kapellmeister and a Konzertmeister (leader of the orchestra).

To one or various members of this musical establishment fell also the post of music-master to the various members of the noble household, this function to include the principles of composition, instrumental instruction, and accompaniment at the keyboard. The main burden of composition fell upon the Kapellmeister, especially for the large-scale operatic and sacred works. The Vize-Kapellmeister or even the Konzertmeister at smaller Courts, may also have been required to produce smaller sacred works or chamber music for the presiding Prince.

Printed music became increasingly more available throughout the 18th century, and was bought, especially on journeys, as we saw in the case of the young Prince Johann Ernst of Saxe-Weimar; but primarily, as the inventories of most former Court libraries confirm, the lion's share of works held or performed was produced in situ by the musical establishment employed for that purpose.

Inevitably the relationship between the Court composer and the presiding Prince was often a difficult one, with the latter dictating the style and

* As we have seen in various instances, for economic reasons a resident music-master, producing compositions as well as instructing, may have been hired in the guise of a valet!
and nature of the music produced. We saw in the case of Frederick the Great how this came to stultify the musical life of Sans Souci. However, anecdote records that the King lived in awe of Quantz, and their relationship was at times a stormy one. Quantz, it appears, was at least able to voice private dissent, even if ultimately acquiescence was the only course.

Of course, obversely, the relationship could also yield positive results. Commentators have seized on Haydn’s autobiographical description of his relationship with Prince Niklaus Esterhazy, as recorded by Griesinger (4):

> My Prince was content with all my works; I received encouragement, and as director of an orchestra I could experiment, observe what serves and what detracts from its effect, so that I could amend, add, cut, take risks. I was isolated from the world; no-one in the vicinity could distract or torment me, consequently I could not fail to become original.

(loc. cit., p. 24 f; translation).

Taken at its face value Haydn seems to have found ideal working conditions for a composer. But the intuitive Robbins Landon (5) and in his wake Raynor (loc. cit. (1), p. 310 f) have questioned its reliability. Robbins Landon points to the very lack of adventure that crept into Haydn's symphonies as the 1770s progressed, in stark contrast to the earlier Sturm und Drang works, and surmises that the Prince had had enough of the powerful, tragic content: of the earlier works, and "demanded that an end be put to this particular vein of expression" (Raynor, ibid.).

More concrete evidence of the way in which nobleman and musician interacted has been revealed by Hansdieter Wohlfarth (6) in his research into the life and works of Johann Christoph Friedrich Bach and his years of service at Bückeburg, seat of the Counts of Schaumburg-Lippe.

Of Count Wilhelm (1724-77) Wohlfarth reports that:

> in the secular sphere (he) loved almost exclusively Italian music, allowing works by German composers to be performed only if they sounded as nearly as possible identical to their Italian models... As a composer Johann Christoph Friedrich was required in the first place to respect without question his master's taste.
The Count, we are furthermore informed by the Court Chronicle was characterised by:

"a certain severity and majesty that frightened off all who approached him... No discourse ever took place with any of his servants, for they had become too accustomed to a monosyllabic subservience." (ibid.)

The above description highlights the changes of attitude that often came about as one nobleman succeeded another. We saw in Chapter 7 how van Wassenaer's friend, "M. le Comte de la Lippe-Schaumburg" had presented his Dutch peer with a "Cantate Françoise" dated 1727.

The profusion of such Courts, operating as Haydn attests still in the latter half of the 18th century for large parts or all of the year in isolation from the world of commoners, therefore played a crucial role in the German lands in producing a large number of noblemen from all ranks who, having derived the benefit of tuition from a resident composer, often of some profile, went on to develop that particular talent. Where there was skill and application, the dilettante had the time to exploit that talent, with the added motivation of a musical establishment at hand to perform the works on demand, and doubtless to tactfully or tacitly edit out any major shortcomings in the musical grammar, where appropriate.

Court and Public Musical Life in Britain

The situation in France and Britain appears to have been different. In the first place, in both countries the Court was a highly centralised affair; we speak of it, significantly, in the singular, and it revolved round the figure of the monarch.

In Britain some aristocrats - the Dukes of Caernavon, Newcastle and Rutland, Lord Burlington (as near to the capital as Chiswick) and the Earl of Darlington, to name some at least - do seem to have maintained some form of musical establishment. What is important is that they do not represent a norm. Burgh(7) (op. cit., Vol. II, p. 233) informs us that Handel conducted:
concerts at the Duke of Rutland's, the Earl of Buckingham's, and the houses of others of the nobility who were patrons of music. There were frequently concerts for the royal family, at the Queen's Library in the Green Park, in which the Princess Royal, the Duke of Rutland, Lord Cowper, and other persons of distinction performed.

Burgh's description highlights how some, but by no means a representative sample of the members of the aristocracy took an interest in music, though the aim was not the constant, even daily consumption of music for their individual country seats, nor even primarily to display power and wealth to neighbouring peers, but was often a more collective activity, with various members of the titled aristocracy providing mutual entertainment, if at all possible with members of the Royal family present.

Significantly, too, Percy Young, in discussing the musical life in London at the time of Handel, dismisses the active role of the aristocracy - apart from symbolic acts of patronage by the monarch to such institutions as the Royal Academy of Music - in a few lines (op. cit., p. 75 f):

> While certain members of the aristocracy used such undertakings to further their own reputation, or to work off private enmities, to form agreeable liaisons with female singers, or simply to appear to be in the swim, others took a lively, if limited, interest in music for its own sake.

Whereas arguably the emergence of a middle-class musical culture in Germany owed its origins to an extension into the secular sphere of the activity of municipal church musicians in Lutheran towns and cities, and to the activities of the Collegium Musicum in University towns, both emulating the musical life of the Courts, Britain's public musical life that flourished throughout the 18th century appears to have its genesis in such unlikely locations as the tavern and the coal-store of Thomas Britton in down-town Clerkenwell, to quote Hawkins: "in such a place, and under such circumstances, as tended to disgrace rather than recommend such an institution." (loc. cit., Vol. V, p. 1).

Britton's concerts took place in a room above his coal-store; previously Thomas Mace in the Preface to Musick's Monument in 1676 had proposed a purpose-built music-room, paid for from the public coffers. The idea was not taken up, and until Britton concerts, such as those organised by John Banister (one of the King's "24 Violins"), took place in tavern-like conditions.

*One may argue, of course, that the use of the Coffee House, as by the Collegium Musicum in Leipzig, was not so different a phenomenon in Germany.
The public-house, as the cradle of public concerts, had already scandalised one French traveller, as reported by Evelyn (cf Young, loc. cit., p. 34), the Frenchman complaining that the perpetrators had:

translated the organs out of the churches to set them up in taverns, chanting their dithyrambics and bestial bacchanalías to the tune of those instruments which were wont to assist them in the celebration of God's praises.

Banister's concerts were certainly not so bawdy as the above suggests, taking place initially in his own house in White Friars before moving to Covent Garden. But the audience sat around small tables, as in the ale-house, and paid one shilling to entitle to as much ale and tobacco as required.

His audience consisted of "many shopkeepers" (ibid.). The tradition carried on by Britton, however, in much less congenial circumstances over a period of thirty years, was to attract a clientele of "Civil servants, representatives of the aristocracy, and a miscellany of writers and wits" (ibid., p. 36).

Inauspicious as much of the above may seem, the growth of music in this country is seen as springing from the private initiative of fairly ordinary people. Britton for many years levied no charge, though ultimately he put the price of one shilling upon his entertainments. The performers included such as Pepusch, Handel and Dubourg, while the repertoire of music played ranged from the most modern Italians of the time: Corelli, Vitali, Vivaldi, the German lands being represented by such as Biber and Rosenmüller, and France by Grétry and Lulli. Britton's music collection also contained a wide selection of English composers, from such "ancient masters" as Byrd, Gibbons and Tallis, with fantasias by Coperario and Jenkins, as well as the contemporary composers Blow, Croft and Purcell.

While traditionally histories have referred to royal and aristocratic "patrons" of music, arguably no figure in 18th century music was so influential and beneficial a patron in terms of the familiarising and propagation of music as the said Thomas Britton, "a man who for a livelihood sold small-coal about the streets" (Hawkins; ibid.).
There are further significant differences between the British and "German" situation. With the Restoration of the monarchy the musical establishment - the Chapel Royal - was modelled on Versailles, with choir, trumpets and sackbuts for musical and ceremonial purposes, and "24 violins" (in the sense of stringed instruments of all sizes). In the course of the 18th century the choir became increasingly the instrument of sacred music only; the ceremonial function of the trumpets and sackbuts survived, but the orchestral establishment of strings (and "hautboys") ceased to exist, hired players being found for major acts of State (funerals, coronations etc) where their presence was required.

In short, in Britain an exclusive, monopolistic relationship between the centralised Court and the appointed musicians - the normal modus operandi in the German lands - disintegrated completely.

The royal household did require and engage musicians, but less and less in the function of composers. Instead composers served royal needs on an ad hoc basis, acting as teachers and accompanists. We see from Mrs Papendiek (op. cit. 6/27) how being known as a musician favoured by the Royal household could, as in the case of J.C. Bach, generally aid a composer in the existential quest for rich pupils (the standard means by which a composer could hope to maintain himself and his family). Bach's associate, the gamba virtuoso Abel, according to Mrs Papendiek (ibid., p. 154) suffered in comparison through his lack of favour at Court (though his Opus 6, a collection of six sonatas for flute and basso continuo (1765) specifically refers to their author as being Musico di Camera (sic) di Sua Maesta la Regina della GRAN BRETAGNA ...).

Whatever the reason for that loss of favour, and Mrs Papendiek implies that "stimulants" (= alcohol!) were at the heart of the problem, the very fact that Abel could offer a household title "Musico di Camera", and still be free to publish the music, is in marked contrast to the relationship between, for example, Frederick II and Quantz, whose 300 concertos remained the private property of the King, and have survived, or at least most of them, in localised manuscripts only.
One of the few works of Quantz to be published, his SOLOS for a GERMAN FLUTE a HOBOY or a VIOLIN with a Thorough Bass etc* refers to "Sigr Quants" as "Musician in Ordinary to the King of Poland", who in situ would most certainly not have permitted publication, any more than subsequently Frederick the Great.

Haydn, too, as Vize-Kapellmeister and eventually as Kapellmeister was required to compose symphonies, sacred music, operas and baryton trios for his Prince at Esterhaza and Eisenstadt. The original contract of 1761 was quite specific on the question of publication:

*The said Vice-Capellmeister shall be under obligation to compose such music as His Serene Highness may command, and neither to communicate such compositions to any other person, nor allow them to be copied, but he shall retain them for the absolute use of His Highness, and not compose for any other person without the knowledge and permission of His Highness.*


The revised contract of 1779 dropped the above clause (4) from the agreement, partly, we may assume, because pirate copies of Haydn's symphonies were by then in circulation as far abroad as London. Partly we may perhaps also explain its omission by a greater liberalisation, as witnessed also in Berlin on the death of Frederick II and — as discussed above — in Bückeburg with the accession of Philipp Ernst in 1777.

Meanwhile in London J.C. Bach (like Abel), as Music Master to HER MAJESTY and the ROYAL FAMILY could publish his Four Sonatas and Two Duets for the Harpsichord or Piano Forte with an ACCOMPANYMENT for a GERMAN FLUTE or VIOLIN as his Opus 18.

We see here a mutual convenience in the relationship, but one where Royal command and possessive rights appear to have played no part.

Haydn, too, despite years of service to a feudal overlord, saw that he could

*Published as Op. 2 by Walsh. Copy in BL (g 1090); facsimile edition by Afore Editions, London (no date).
politely decline Queen Charlotte's offer of a royal apartment in Windsor Castle, and returned from England to bourgeois Vienna.

About the same time, again as reported by Mrs Papendiek, George III required a music-master to the children of the royal household. Among others Dussek declined the offer, and finally the post was filled by a local worthy, partly because, like the King himself, he preferred the harpsichord to the pianoforte. The royal wish, within these shores, had manifestly ceased to function as a command (cf loc. cit., Vol. 2, p. 190).

**Court and Public Musical Life in France**

There are many parallels and as many striking differences when we look at the evolution of court and public music in France. Like Britain, France operated a highly centralised Court, and the profusion of Courts that characterises the German lands does not exist.

As in Britain, musical establishments did exist outside that central Court, notably those maintained by the Duke of Orleans, the Dauphin and the Princesse de Guise. Unlike Britain, the monarch's taste became the norm for national musical life, and provincial municipal concert life, apart from that set up by the German refugee and exact Haydn contemporary, Franz Beck, in Bordeaux (where there was a large German settlement) hardly existed in the latter half of the 18th century. Indeed many of the figures who came to influence the national musical life of France - Lully, Rousseau, Gossec, Piccini and Gluck (not to mention Cherubini in the 19th century) - came from 'outside'.

Speaking in reference to sacred music in particular, though we may extend the situation to a broader context, Raynor has pertinently summarised the reason that lies behind the relative dearth of aristocratic musical establishments outside Versailles:

... the king's ideas became a standard, because noblemen spending most of their time in ceremonial attendance on the king neglected their own musical organisations in which other, perhaps more personal styles of ... expression might have been cultivated.

Louis XIV and later Louis XV, in an evolution that began in 1669, succeeded in establishing at public and private levels a specifically French national aesthetic in music whose influence on French musical taste has survived revolutions and the rigours of time.

Again we may be grateful to Raynor for his perceptive observation:

The extent to which all ... forms of music ... depended on the taste of Louis XIV ... is obvious. His place in the history of music is not simply that of a patron who was lucky enough to find first-rate composers and reasonable enough to pay them well ... Because he found first-rate composers who provided the music which appealed to his own educated taste, he laid down the lines along which French music has travelled ever since ... We can refer to the France of Louis XIV as the point of departure for all subsequent French music and note that those composers whose view of music did not coincide with King Louis's, at whatever period they lived, never had an easy time with their compatriots. (ibid., p. 233)

As in Britain, the relative lack of provincial Court musical life went hand in hand with highly organised public offerings. Since the King himself did not compose, the pressure (or danger!) of emulation did not exist (the Duke of Orleans being perhaps the exception that proves the rule), leaving the nobility to concentrate on the serious business of 'ceremonial attendance' on the monarch.

What does differ from Britain, apart from the Absolutism of the French monarchial concept, was the nature of those public offerings. Louis XIV, while maintaining for his own purposes from 1661 under Couperin a Grande Écurie of three dozen instrumentalists, a further complement of two dozen string players for chamber music, from whom later half their number formed the exclusive Petits Violons, and the Sainte Chapelle of 22 boys and men for service in the Royal chapel, also saw to it that nationally his ideals became accessible.

It was not, however, the royal taste in chamber music that was to establish itself in public musical life, but - as opposed to elsewhere in Europe - the opera. Through the efforts of Louis XIV, opera, be it opéra-ballet or tragédie lyrique, moved from the Court to public domain, on a self-financing basis,
long before this became the norm elsewhere.

The history of French opera in the 150 years prior to the Revolution has been expertly charted by Norman Demuth (9). From 1669 Louis XIV granted a monopoly for the performance of opera to an Académie d'Opéra, with branches throughout the country. Any other entrepreneur wishing to stage an opera (a term that existed only in the title of the organisation, not – as yet – for the stage works themselves) paid the licensee, initially the playwright Pierre Perrin, for the privilege.

Perrin's reign was short-lived, for after dubious business transactions he was soon languishing in jail as a debtor, and his mantle was passed on to Lully. The institution, however, endured, simply because Louis XIV wished it to, to which end he accorded it royal status as the Académie Royale de Musique, with appropriately dignified residence at the Salle du Palais Royal.

The 'nationalisation' of opera obviously came as a shock to the nobility who hitherto had attended such entertainments free of charge as invitees of the monarch. Now there was no right of free entry, even to courtiers, a situation that caused virtual chaos at the first public performance in 1671 when ticket-holders had to be restrained from violence at the prospect of being 'crowded out' by members of the aristocracy and their entourage, who had not gathered the implications of the new system.

A courtly element was retained in the works themselves, with their "elegance, ... glorification of grace and courage and the almost obligatory reflections of royal grandeur in (their) prologues" (Raynor, ibid., p. 230).

The behaviour at the opera indicates a clientele socially somewhat removed from what the traveller might have experienced elsewhere. Addison, writing in The Spectator in 1711 (No 29, April 3rd), had certainly been surprised by what he saw and heard: 

The chorus ... gives the parterre frequent opportunities of joining in concert with the stage. This inclination of the audience to sing along with the actors so prevails with them, that I have sometimes known the performer on stage do no more, in a celebrated song, than the clerk of the parish church, who serves only to raise the psalm and is afterwards drowned in the music of the congregation.
The social mix was actually a deliberate policy, with due regard to the ability to pay, within the overall context of the opera having to be financially self-supporting. Not only had royal decree from the outset prohibited free entry to the Court, tickets varied in price from 10 livres down to 2, and the Droits des Pauvres of 1697 soon established the principle that the rich should pay an extra one-sixth surcharge to subsidise the seats of the less wealthy. For those determined to witness a premiere performance the price was doubled, and those choosing to attend when the King was present were charged four times the usual amount.

By royal intervention we see therefore that in France a national musical institution, according with the monarch's tastes, was established, and designed to embrace all social classes. The presence of this Académie Royale will have demotivated or inhibited the satellite nobility from catering for its own needs to any large degree; and even in the German lands, where a different situation obtained, the number of dilettante composers willing or able to launch themselves into the composition of whole operas is understandably very small indeed. Apart from the prolific Emperor Leopold I in the 17th century, Wilhelmine of Bayreuth, questionably Maria Antonia Walpurgis in Dresden, and Anna Amalia in Weimar no names spring to mind for the 18th century, though surprisingly a few did emerge in the 19th century.

What it does not explain is the absence of dilettante composers of chamber music in the style favoured by the King - nor can we satisfactorily explain why public concerts of instrumental/orchestral music were so slow to establish themselves in France, given their success rate elsewhere in Europe.

A possible explanation for the absence of the dilettante noble composer may be found. As we have seen, the urge to compose is partly explained by the need to play music for reasons of personal recreation. The onus to produce such music fell primarily upon each Court Kapellmeister, and his efforts remained the property of his prince. Consequently most music written for the German Courts remained in manuscript, in situ, with occasional copies being made for friends and relatives at other Courts.
In France, as in Britain, no such situation obtained. The French Court composers were prolific publishers of their music, the permission to do so being freely given by royal privilege. The title-page of François Couperin's \textit{Concerts Royaux} of 1722 tells its own story:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Concerts Royaux / Composé par / MONSIEUR COUPERIN / Organiste de la Chapelle du ROY ; ordinaire / de la Musique de sa Chambre; et cy-devant / Professeur-maître de composition, et d'accompagnement / de MONSEIGNEUR LE DAUPHIN Duc de / Bourgogne, Père de sa MAJESTÉ.}
\end{quote}

\textit{Avec Privilege du Roy}

Far from being the jealous guardian of the music composed for his recreation, Louis XIV was keen to propagate it, as the manifestation of his own ideals. Consequently there is no dearth of printed music available, either for aristocratic or bourgeois consumption, and the music of the royal favourites, the Hotteterres, Philidor, Michel de la Barre etc, freely available as it was, may well have acted as an inhibiting factor to the aspiring dilettante.

Had either Louis XIV or XV composed, the situation may have been different, and we may only speculate as to the prudence or otherwise of emulation. As it is, it may well be that the ready availability of music will have satisfied the active needs of the performing nobleman, and the productions of the \textit{Académie Royale} will have catered for more passive - or even, it appears, participatory needs.

\textbf{The profusion of aristocratic dilettante composers in the 18th century}

The dilettante composer was not a specifically 18th century phenomenon. The apparent profusion has two explanations.

First, we have seen that the large number of smaller Courts that characterised the German lands, each with its own independent musical establishment, encouraged the development of the dilettante in that Central European area. Earlier centuries were neither bereft of aristocratic composers, nor were there fewer "German" courts to produce such practising composers. The \textit{mediaeval quadrivium}, comprising arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music, will have
seen to it that most educated noblemen will have learned enough of the rudiments of music to have dabbled with some degree of success, where the motivation was present. King John IV of Portugal and Henry VIII of England are examples of Renaissance monarchs with some skill in the art.

Secondly, we must remember that until fairly recent times music was primarily an ephemeral recreation, and the survival of much that was produced has been a fortuitous matter. A single manuscript copy of a work clearly had less chance of survival than a printed work with multiple copies. Fires, war, negligence all contribute to the rate of loss.

Peer example will, however, almost certainly have played a part in establishing, as the 17th century wore on, that successive Emperors of the Habsburg family: Ferdinand III, Ferdinand IV, more notably Leopold I, and with the turn of the century Joseph I all made music a respectable pursuit. Above all, however, the emergence of lavish operas, masques and stage works during the 17th century allowed music to be used more and more in the major Courts as a means of impressing (or intimidating) neighbouring Courts. Increasingly economic power, political power and military power were becoming synonymous, and lavish "representations" could act as a symbol, sometimes hollow - of that power.

That "Old Regime" in Europe tottered with the Revolution in France in 1789 and admitted final defeat with the Congress of Vienna in 1815, when no fewer than 121 minor German states became merged with more powerful neighbours.

The wealth of the aristocracy dwindled rapidly in the generation that spans the Revolution to the Battle of Waterloo, and inflation made the regeneration of the former aristocratic musical establishments generally unrealistic. Raynor (op. cit. 7/11, p. 1) uses the case of Beethoven's ally, Prince Lobkowitz, to illustrate the point:

In 1803 Beethoven's patron and friend Prince Lobkowitz had supported the orchestra which gave the first performance of Beethoven's Eroica symphony; after 1812 Prince Lobkowitz was apparently satisfied to be an active member of the newly formed Vienna Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde.

The fate of the opera-houses may serve as the exemplar in the shift of
emphasis from the nobility to the municipality as the pillars of musical culture. We have seen how in London and France "royal" patronage was a matter of title only. The institutions of opera maintained themselves at no expense to the monarch.

In the German lands this was not the case, for the reasons outlined above. Frederick the Great opened his opera-house in Berlin on December 7th, 1742(10):

> It was a beautiful and supremely comfortable building with room for a thousand carriages to park outside. Seats were not for sale: the audience was invited by the King. (Mitford, op. cit., p. 80)

This brought the Prussian capital into line with the capitals of Austria, Bavaria and Saxony. By 1768 the "Royal and Imperial Opera" in Vienna, once the very symbol of Imperial power and sway, had been placed under the care of a commercial manager, and despite the continuing subsidy by Emperor, King or the State coffers, all the old Court opera-houses of status in turn were, in Raynor's language (op. cit. 7/11) 'commercialised", and became dependent on the takings of the box office.

In Dresden the opera was temporarily saved by its Russian Governor, Prince Repnin, as a public institution. On the restoration of the monarchy in 1817 its title of Hof-Oper was restored with it, but the title could not disguise the fact that it was now open to and dependent on the general public. In Munich, a year later, the old Hoftheater burnt down; the new building two years later was significantly adapted to the change of circumstance, and re-named Hof- und Nationaltheater.

This tandem act of Court and State was to be tellingly symbolised by the turn of the century by Prince Ludwig Ferdinand of the Wittelsbachs. In addition to being an eminent physician (itself an indicator of the changed status of the ruling aristocracy) he was also a skilled violinist, and a desk in the orchestra pit in the Opera was permanently reserved for him. (Cf Prince Adalbert(11) op. cit., p. 201).

It would therefore be easy to generalise and state quite simply that in the wake of first the French Revolution and subsequently the Napoleonic Wars and
the Congress of Vienna, purely economic (and consequently political) factors robbed the aristocracy of its traditional role of Kulturträger, patrons of the arts, so that progressively individual musical establishments dwindled, and with them the dilettante composer.

As a generalisation that view may be upheld, but the truth is less clear-cut in detail. Coupled to the undoubted financial hardships that the dying years of the 18th and the early years of the 19th century brought, was a more liberal spirit that manifested itself markedly in many places as one prince of the old Absolutist school was replaced by a more liberal successor.

Wohlfarth (op. cit.) has described how in the relatively unimportant Court in Buckeburg this should have its effect. On the death of Count Wilhelm in 1777, Philipp Ernst took over. He was married to a young Princess from the Court at Philippsthal in Hesse. Her liberal spirit:

brought about a radical change in the way the place was ruled and an increasing Verbürglerlichung. In the person of Juliane we encounter for the first time in the court at Buckeburg the phenomenon of a 'genuine patron' (Mäzen), that as yet still aristocratic phenomenon in terms of influence on the arts, but one that essentially belongs to the post-courtly period. (ibid., translation)

The Verbürglerlichung to which Wohlfarth refers manifests itself - for all the apparent severity of the language - in a statute issued by the Count in 1782 concerning concerts in the rooms of the Schloss set aside for that purpose. These were to take place twice a week, on Sunday and Thursday afternoon from 3 pm to 6 pm, with or without the presence of the Count and Countess:

Local inhabitants who are normally granted access to the Court and visitors of rank may also attend these concerts if they wish.

In essence, the situation whereby in England for some time even royalty attended public concerts, was but a short step removed from the open invitation to the bourgeoisie to enjoy the music laid on by the Court.

Financial and political upheaval hastened rather than effected the shift from the aristocracy to the bourgeoisie as the organisers of musical life. Schubert's trials and tribulations in Vienna (cf Deutsch (12) and Brown (13))
serve to illustrate two developments. First, the replacement of an Absolutist prince by bourgeois entrepreneurs as the arbiters of taste did not guarantee greater liberality in the treatment of the composer. Secondly, the culturally and socially powerful aristocracy that had managed to influence for good Beethoven's early years in Vienna (including, incidentally, the aforementioned and highly influential Graf Moritz von Dietrichstein, in his capacity as Court Intendant for Music) were manifestly less able twenty years later, despite their personal support, to achieve the same for Schubert.

But flourishing survivals both of Court musical establishments and of aristocratic composers persist through the 19th century, albeit in drastically reduced number.

The obverse to the disappearance of the Court musical establishments is the increase in the number of musicians available for bourgeois musical institutions and events. At the same time, however, the demands of the prevailing style post-Beethoven meant that orchestras needed to be larger to play the works - a quantitative consideration - while simultaneously the technical demands, both in terms of the skill required to perform them, but even more crucially the talent required to compose in that idiom - qualitative aspects - militated on all fronts against the effective Court band and the serious noble composer.

If the purpose of maintaining an orchestra and composing had been primarily for "internal consumption" in the 18th century, the 19th century saw to it that by and large the most satisfactory provision was outside the confines of the Court, outside the economic reach of most Courts, and beyond the skill of all but a handful of noble composers.

The list of works by aristocratic composers either once held or still held by the Königliche Hausbibliothek in E. Berlin (cf Chapter 7) confirms the point. The vast majority of compositions produced by the 19th century dilettante composers comprise songs to the piano, or solo piano works (including the new genre of Lieder ohne Worte) - coinciding of course with the beginnings of mechanised production of pianos, a considerable industry in itself, and
the rise of the piano virtuoso as a cult musical personnage (cf Raynor, op. cit. 7/11, p. 61 f).

Surprisingly, a few did try their hand at operas, notably the melodramatic setting of *Faust* by Prince Radziwill, for which Goethe provided new additional texts. The list includes two operas (now lost) by the brother of the Prince Consort, Duke Ernst of Saxe-Gotha and -Coburg. Songs by Ernst appear in some of the mid-19th century anthologies of songs by Albert himself; in general they are much less sophisticated than those of his younger brother and one cannot imagine opera in the flamboyant style of the time emerging from his pen.

Felix von Lepel, in his lexicon of *Fürstliche Musiker* (13) referred to dismissively in the Introduction to this thesis, ascribes to a 'Fürst Yourij Nikolajewitsch GALITZIN' "Masses, instrumental works and songs". His relationship to the 'Prinz Sergius von Galitzin' in Thouret's Catalogue in Berlin or the 'Prinz Nikolaus Galitzin', dedicatee of various of the works of Beethoven is not stated. Lepel is frequently inaccurate, but if this information were correct, then this Russian aristocrat would indeed be one of the few, after Prince Louis Ferdinand, to venture into the sphere of instrumental and orchestral music.*

Only the Bavarian Court composer, Count Franz von Pocchi (cf NG, MGG), otherwise emerges as a composer of music other than exclusively songs or piano solos.

The scene of musical life had shifted from the aristocratic music-room to the public concert hall for serious chamber and orchestral music. The only domestic need not fulfilled was for the informal salon, where songs and piano solos still had their place.

The Prince Consort, as is well known, was a skilled writer of such songs - as indeed many of these dilettante composers of the 19th century were, beginning with the Duke's grandfather, Duke Emil Leopold August of Saxe-Gotha and Altenburg, whose setting of Eichendorff's *Marienwühmchen* (cf Chapter 3 and

---

*In fact NG under GOLITSIN confirms Prince Yury Nikolayevich (1823-72) to be the son of Prince Nikolay Borisovich, Beethoven's correspondent (1794-1866). Yury Nikolayevich was for some time active in London as a political refugee, and did indeed compose large-scale orchestral, sacred and choral works.
Supplement No 25) is an outstanding miniature. Prince Albert's activities on and following his marriage to Queen Victoria confirm that the concept of the Court band, like that of the noble composer, was still not utterly dead.

The Court orchestra in the adjoining (later adjoined) Court to Coburg, that of Gotha, was one of those to survive into the 19th century. For some time Spohr was its Kapellmeister - and consequently available in Magdeburg when Prince Louis Ferdinand was on manoeuvres (cf Chapter 6).

Presumably because he was used to better, Prince Albert expanded the private band of the Royal family (cf NG), converting it into the orchestra with which he gave the first performances in this country of Schubert's 9th Symphony, Bach's St. Matthew Passion and, almost inevitably, various choral works by Mendelssohn. NG also informs us that he directed the Concert of Ancient Music. This itself was a private royal institution, at least earlier in the 18th century. Mrs Papendiek (op. cit. 6/27, Vol. 2, p. 185) in referring to the activities of the Prince of Wales and his attendance at public concerts, pointed out that "their Majesties no longer attended them, as they had their own Ancient Music Concerts". Previously such public concerts had been supported "by music lovers and the old nobility" (ibid., Vol. 1, p. 133).

The Court orchestra in Gotha was not, however, the most notable musical institution of a politically relatively insignificant Court to survive the upheavals. As late as 1881 Brahms accepted an invitation to a residency with the Court orchestra in Meiningen. His Gesang der Parzen (Op. 89) is an act of thanks to Duke Georg of Meiningen. The entry in NG under the place name summarises the fortunes of this Court orchestra, with whom not only Brahms, but before him Hans von Bülow and after him Reger were also associated:

... in 1831 a new Hoftheater was built ... and later in the 19th century Duke Georg II considerably enlarged the Hofkapelle and, by inviting many leading musicians to conduct it, raised it to become one of the finest orchestras in Germany.

As an aristocratic institution the orchestra survived until World War I brought about its demise. The theatre is now run by the municipality, in the vicinity of a Brahms and Reger Museum.
Why these particular Court musical establishments should have proved so resistant remains unclear. The Royal private orchestra in this country did not survive the death of Albert, though Albert's talents did survive in the song-writing skills of Princess Beatrice (= Princess Henry of Battenberg). This gifted daughter was still composing at the turn of the century, her output containing *inter alia* settings of poems by Disraeli (= Lord Beaconsfield). Otherwise this century has produced few composing aristocrats of note, apart from the eccentric Lord Berners (cf NG), whose centenary was passed a few years back and marked by the resurrection of some of his music, and Prince Louis Ferdinand of the Hohenzollern, whom we discussed earlier in the context his earlier and more famous namesake.

The main aim of this thesis was not, however, to trace the extinction of a species, nor even to speculate on the profusion of that species in one area or at one time in history. Its main concern is the identification of as many composing aristocrats in the 18th century as could be found, to locate their music, to amend where appropriate the picture painted of them in available works of reference, and to review their "reception" in the musical world, both in their own day and in more recent times.

**Identification and location of sources**

The identification of these aristocratic composers is inevitably a haphazard process. Lepel's and Wasielsky's publications on the subject (cf Introduction) prove to be of little or no use, and even Dr Burney is of little assistance. Librarians in charge of music collections can rarely help, unless furnished with a specific name (though the motet by the Archduchess Maddalena (cf Chapter 1 and Supplement No 5) came to light as the result of a hopeful enquiry in general terms in Wolfenbüttel).

Prior knowledge, general reading, consultation of source lexica such as Eitner, RISM, BUCEM and Pohlmann, and the perusal of library catalogues yielded some fortuitous discoveries. The present thesis cannot claim to have tracked down every single noble dilettante composer of the 18th century;
indubitably, however, it has brought together for the first time a significant proportion of them for individual and collective appraisal.

If the process of identification was haphazard, the question of the location of source material was itself less smooth running than anticipated.

**Location of Source material**

The most likely source lexica have been quoted above. **Eitner** is the first resort, because he lists both manuscript and printed survivals. **RISM** catalogues are more reliable and complete, but list only printed sources, which proves less than satisfactory in the context of dilettanti, most of whose output - almost by definition - has remained in manuscript copies.

**BUCFM**, like **RISM**, lists only printed sources, and few of the works of Central European dilettanti to be published have filtered through to British libraries. **Pohlmann** is indispensible for the research of sources for the repertoire for the lute and other plucked instruments, and is as up-to-date as one may hope. But even here, acceptance of Pohlmann's information led to a fruitless journey to Bratislava in search of a part-book of the consort pieces by the Baron von Radolt. Pohlmann also accepted without question the **Comte de Tallard** as a composer.

**Eitner** remains a permanent source of admiration and frustration. The volumes of his source lexicon were compiled decades in advance of the micro-chip technology that has revolutionised such projects in recent times. In global terms, however, it is in the event often either incomplete or inaccurate. In the context of this thesis Eitner proved to be the villain of the piece behind the confusion attaching to Prince Johann Ernst of Weimar's Concerto in G that formed the basis of arrangements by J.S. Bach (notably BWV 592). The Regensburg location for an oratorio by Emperor Leopold (reiterated by MGG) proved fictitious, and the inaccurate date given for the publication of songs by the Prince Consort's grandfather, Duke Emil Leopold August of Saxe-Gotha (probably because Gerber had been imprecise) impeded their ultimate
discovery.

Not all the shortcomings of Eitner may, however, be laid to the charge of its author; subsequently two World Wars have played havoc with library holdings, and quite apart from the expected hazards of fire and flood, social upheaval has also led to the re-location of the former Bohemian monastic libraries (making Pohlmann a more predictably reliable source of information for lute tablatures) and the uncertainties as to which library holds what on either side of the recently dismantled Wall in Dahlem and Unter den Linden - a situation which must now surely come to an end.

Attributions

It is one thing to establish an 18th century aristocrat as a composer, and another to locate the compositions. It is yet another issue to decide whether or not the ascription should be considered authentic.

As a matter of principle ascriptions have been allowed to stand, unless there is prima facie reason to challenge it. In the case of Maria Antonia Walpurgis (cf Chapter 4) the issue is left open; the present writer's intuitive belief is that her "public" offerings, namely the two operas, may well have been heavily assisted by other hands, though the simpler manuscript survivals are in all likelihood her own work.

A similar 'open verdict' has been cast in the completely different case of the Miserere ascribed in all sources to Emperor Karl VI but attributed by Adler, with some justification, to Emperor Leopold. Here the present writer postulates that the latter is the originator and the former is responsible for an arrangement of it. (Cf Chapter 1).

No such 'open verdict' applies, however, in the case of the aria Tutto in pianto, ascribed with no apparent justification by Adler to Emperor Joseph I (ibid.) though it can only be accredited to Ziani.

The thesis has also established that the legendary Comte de Tallard (cf
Chapter 2) was not a composer at all, and that a work ascribed to Frederick the Great in the British Library is not by the 'King of Prussia' at all, but is an arrangement for keyboard of a likewise totally misattributed work in Darmstadt (listed in good faith by Eitner), that turns out to be by Christoph (?) Förster, with concordances in Münster and Brussels (Cf Chapter 6).

In the case of Frederick II the present writer (ibid.) identifies explicitly two operatic arias by the King that are not listed, or imprecisely listed by Lenzewski, MGG, NG, and similarly points to concordances of works by the Count Losy (cf Chapter 2) that appear to have been overlooked elsewhere.

Attribution to a noble composer often hinges on the recognition of the initials used in abbreviated forms of titles. In the case of the lute tablatures these initials are the only form of identification (causing unresolved confusion in the case of "C.W." - cf Chapter 2). The present writer was able to discount the initials "P.A." as referring to Prince Anton of Saxony (ibid.) and establish the real author of a "missing" Royal composition for the gallichon as a Peter August, re-locating the work in the process.

Similar confusion over initials and music for the gallichon obtained in the case of a manuscript collection of three serenades, twelve minuets and a pollacca for the instrument. While scholars (Eitner; Lück; Boetticher; Pohlmann) conflictingly offer the Bavarian Elector or a related Duke Clement (ibid.) as the author of all 16 pieces, scrutiny of the initials used establishes both of them as the apparent composers of different parts of the collection.

Chapter 7 draws our attention to the misascriptions long attached to Count Wilhelm van Wassenaer and the Freiherr Hugo Friedrich von Dalberg, as clarified by other authors, and in Chapter 4 the present writer tentatively suggests that the aforementioned Prince Johann Ernst of Weimar could be the author of one further concerto used as the source for an arrangement by J.S. Bach.
The Reception of Aristocratic Composers

The "reception" accorded the aristocratic composer may be evaluated from various sources: opinions recorded in their own time or shortly after; 18th and 19th century encyclopaedic entries; late 20th century encyclopaedic entries; 20th century monographs and articles; anthologies; modern editions; recordings.

18th century judgements, gleaned from anecdotal material, as in the case of the Habsburg Emperors, is of very limited value. Mostly it is derived from sources that are not specifically concerned with music; the judgements are often naive, and, as we have seen in respect of the Habsburgs, Mattheson's alleged comments on Emperor Karl VI appeared in Wurzbach over a century later, in reference now to Leopold I.

With personalities of such political importance as the Habsburgs and later Frederick the Great it becomes extremely difficult to decide what is genuine, and what is inspired by sycophancy or retrospective malice.

Burney is perhaps more useful in this respect, but he does tend to err on the side of generosity in his judgements, though in the case of the stagnating state of music at Frederick's Court and Kirnberger's aspirations as an "algebraist" he is remarkably perceptive and forthright. By contrast it is hard to assess the genuineness of Frantisek Benda's assertion in 1763 that he had derived "no little satisfaction" from serving Frederick, and playing for him in the performance of at least 10,000 concertos (cf Chapter 6). The King was still alive and Benda still in his employ; it is unrealistic to expect too much in the way of critical or negative comment.

Likewise the early encyclopaedias do not prove to be reliable. Partly the encyclopaedists were too dependent on the fortuitous circulation of information and printed music: Walther's lexicon, for instance, contains an entry on so obscure and unprolific an English composer as Woodcock, while virtually all the said Woodcock's significant English contemporaries are omitted. Presumably a copy of Woodcock's sole collection of printed concertos had happened to come Walther's way, while the music of the others had not.
In a whole variety of instances we have seen how Gerber managed to distort or elaborate in a rather fanciful manner. Schilling appears to have taken over much from Gerber, with further "elaborations". The entries on the Earl of Kelly (cf Chapter 3) serve to illustrate the melange of believed fact and fantasy that characterises the early encyclopaedic entry.

Until this century the encyclopaedias also tended to confuse some of the personalities involved. Dependant as they were, to some extent at least, on hearsay information, it is hardly surprising that with the profusion of composing nobleladies named Amalia (or Amalie/Amélie) that persistent confusion should have arisen over the works of Duchess Anna Amalia of Weimar, Princess Anna Amalie (Amélie) of Prussia and the slightly later but overlapping Princess Amalia of Saxony (cf Chapter 3).

In more recent times Grove, and more tellingly MGG and NG have become the most ready source of information on most of the "composers" discussed by this thesis. Some notable names, however, have fallen completely through the net: Wilhelmine of Bayreuth (cf Chapter 6) and Frederick Lewis, Prince of Wales (cf Chapter 3) are entered nowhere as composers, despite their obvious talents, involvements and serious contributions. More surprisingly, perhaps, Johann Ernst of Weimar (cf Chapter 5) was omitted completely from MGG (though not subsequently from NG), and Prince Anton of Saxony, surely the most prolific of all dilettante composers (cf Chapter 2), appeared only in the later Anhang (Supplement) to MGG.

Similarly Grove (5) and NG are the only British reference works to list all three British composing Earls, as discussed in detail in Chapter 3; surprisingly MGG found all three worthy of entry, while the New Oxford Companion of 1983 gives reference only to the Earl of Mornington, arguably the least important of the trio. The Oxford Companion (9) and (10) had included the Earl of Kelly, and his omission in the latest edition seems hard to justify.

In general, where there are entries in NG and MGG on the composers included in this thesis, they may be considered sound, though inevitably condensed. The entry on Count Losy (cf Chapter 2) in NG is particularly disappointing.
in its brevity and minor inaccuracies. The entry in NG on Prince Johann Ernst is, as detailed in Chapter 5, inaccurate in its reference to the concertos of the young Prince arranged and adapted by J.S. Bach, and continues a long line of misinformation that was correctly presented as long ago as 1906.

In the case of Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia (cf Chapter 6) there is in NG a puzzling reference to songs, not included in the work-list; we may only assume confusion on the part of the contributor between the early 19th century Prince and his 20th century namesake, who is also a composer.

In two cases, Landgrave Ernst Ludwig of Hesse-Darmstadt and Count Friedrich Carl zu Erbach (cf Chapter 5) MGG and subsequently the revised versions in NG have given, perhaps, greater significance to these two composers than they may be said to warrant.

Some aristocratic composers have been the subject of monographs.

Prince Louis Ferdinand has been best served in terms of quality and quantity. Volkmann, however, deserves special credit for sorting out fact and fiction in the case of the Baron d'Astorga (cf Chapter 1), and Drewes' dissertation, despite some questionable conclusions remains the most compact source of detail in the case of Maria Antonia Walpurgis (cf Chapter 4).

Helm's standard work of reference on Frederick the Great (cf Chapter 6), though generally preferable to Thouret's somewhat sentimental earlier work, is seen to be in urgent need of revision, since the missing sources at the time of publication are now virtually all available again in the Staatsbibliothek in (East) Berlin, as correctly included in the NG entry by the same author.

More problematic is the catalogue of works by Emperor Leopold I (cf Chapter 1), compiled by Brosche as part of a Festschrift published in 1976. While claiming to be a "systematic-thematic" catalogue of surviving compositions, it omits all mention of those separate items written for "insertion" into the works of other composers. Until a work of reference on Leopold I can incorporate all those arias, thought to be in excess of 150, our precise knowledge of this prolific Emperor's output will remain impaired.
In other cases the composers in question have been well or adequately served by essays and articles. These include Vogl and Crawford on Count Losy; Johnson on the Earl of Kelly (with much information not included in the NG entry); Sachs on Princess Anna Amalie of Prussia in the Hohenzollern-Jahrbuch where a subsequent volume does similar service for Prince Louis Ferdinand; Noack on the Landgrave Ernst Ludwig of Hesse, and above all Dunning in the case of the cryptic Count Wilhelm van Wassenaer, in a publication (cf Chapter 7) that attaches the highly informative revelation of authorship to the musical text itself.

The problem in general with virtually all of the above publications, is that all too often they represent the only sources of information and judgement. With monographs and articles on mainstream composers, they take their place in a line of similar publications, a process that allows for correction of error and a comparative basis for judgement. With minor and the vast majority of 18th century aristocratic composers there is insufficient secondary literature for truly informed appraisal, in most cases, to be made.

The clutch of monumental anthologies that appeared in the last decade of the 19th century in honour of Frederick the Great (Spitta) and the Habsburg Emperors (Adler), followed by Louis Ferdinand (Kretzschmar) in 1910 and DTO 50 (Koczirz) with aristocratic composers for the lute in 1919, all have their strengths and failings.

On the positive side they have served in no uncertain way in drawing our attention to the genre of aristocratic composer. In general their Prefaces are detailed and a major source of scholarly information on the composers concerned (so much so that an English article on "The Habsburg Emperors as Musicians" (1927 turns out to be no more than an adaptation of Adler's Preface of 1892!).

Apart from the DTO lute anthology, whose selection is dubious and in transcriptions unwelcome to lutenists, these volumes are still mostly "user-friendly", presenting Urtext editions quite usable by today's breed of performer more orientated towards questions of authenticity. In the case of Louis Ferdinand the absence of manuscript source material makes the evaluation of Kretzschmar's texts difficult, and we note König's imprecise objections to them.
The very presence of these anthologies does itself, however, represent an act of positive reception towards their chosen composers. The main flaw of all anthologies nevertheless remains that they are by definition selective.

While we may assume that Adler has given us the complete oeuvre of Emperor Joseph I - augmented, as described earlier by one totally spurious and baffling misattribution - and a fair cross-section of the varied output of Emperor Leopold (varied in terms of genres, not of style), and in the case of Kretzschmar, apart from the omission of the short piano fugue that is unique among the Prince's compositions, we have been given representative insight into Louis Ferdinand's relatively limited output; Spitta's selection of 25 of the solo sonatas of Frederick the Great has come to be regarded as "complete", even though another eight dozen of them, with one exception, have all remained unconsidered manuscript survivals. This is seen to be all the more tantalising in the light of Thouret's praise for 38 of the holdings of the Königliche Hausbibliothek in E. Berlin, to the exclusion of any of the 25 chosen by Spitta (cf Chapter 6). At least there is here a conflict of opinion that might one day whet the appetite of an inquisitive mind, whereas in most cases we are dependent on one single value judgement.

In the case of Adler, his enthusiasm is tempered by the more reserved judgements of some of his contemporaries towards the music of Emperor Leopold, and surprisingly Brosche, too, is distinctly lukewarm towards the 17th century Emperor's merits as a composer, despite producing an admittedly flawed and incomplete Verzeichnis of his works.

Of the more recent anthologies positive mention may be made of Vogl's anthology (1977) of Czech lute tablatures (MvH 40), including works by the Counts Losy and Questenberg and Prince Philipp Hyazinth von Lobkowitz, and Pohanka's collection (1979) of presumed arrangements for the baroque guitar of lute originals by Count Losy (MAB 38), though again the transcriptions of the latter do not meet with the universal approval of exponents of the five-course guitar of the time. Vogl's anthology, on the other hand, offers both tablature and transcriptions, to cater for all needs.
The British Royal family is served devotedly, if amateurishly, by Fairburn and Unger Hamilton in their Royal Collection of 1977. This is the only musical as opposed to historical or biographical publication to draw our attention to Frederick Lewis, Prince of Wales as a composer, even though the "pastoral" attribute given to the one aria taken from the Prince's highly political cantata in question is totally inappropriate. Chapter 3 details the true nature of the work, and the press reception to its first performance in modern times.

Friedländer, by publishing in short score Duchess Anna Amalia of Weimar's setting (1776) of Goethe's Erwin und Elmire in 1921 (with separate publication elsewhere of its most popular number, Das Veilchen) drew our attention to Amalia's manifest achievement, though the short score presentation of the edition obscures the colourful instrumentation of the music.

The most corrupt recent edition of music by an 18th century noble composer is surely that of Wilhelmine of Bayreuth's harpsichord concerto as realised by Spilling for the Vieweg-Verlag in 1938. Its additional and unidiomatic obbligato flute part (cf Chapter 6) and reconstruction of the missing solo part that distorts the extant and complete string parts do violence to the surviving torso. The present writer's own reconstruction of the work together with the harpsichordist Paul Nicholson (cf Supplement 49), like Frederick Lewis' cantata, was enthusiastically received by the London Times at its premiere in 1981.

The most recent edition of works by an aristocratic composer is Agnes Sas' (1989) publication of the 55 motets comprising the Harmonia Coelestis by Prince Pal Esterhazy. Written in the last quarter of the 17th century, the collection was prepared for publication in 1699-1700, but the collection appeared ten years later than expected in 1711, and with a different publisher from the one first contracted. Unfortunately the original manuscripts are now missing, but Ms Sas makes clear her belief that the Prince cannot be given full credit as the composer of these motets, but was assisted by other or others (cf Chapter 3).

Although this thesis has deliberately minimised the casting of value judgements on the music revealed by the pursuit of the given subject matter, it
is with some sense of irony that the present writer noted how one of the qualitatively least significant collections, the Divertissements Mélodieux (c. 1723) by Count Friedrich zu Erbach, and indeed the slightest of the 30 works in question, namely the 6 duets for cellos or bassoons and some of the 12 "Symphonies" for 2 flutes/recorders and basso continuo (cf Chapter 5), have found favour among publishers, in editions dating from the latter half of this century, while other equally accessible and less inconsequential works by other noble composers continue to languish in obscurity.

Two aspects of technology and more recent consumer demand in the last quarter of the 20th century have, however, begun to make their mark on the aristocratic repertoire: the recording industry in its quest for new and different projects in the era of the "authentic" revival of "early music", and the advance in reprographic techniques for the production of facsimile editions of 18th century music.

Without protracted search the enquirer will find recordings of some of the flute sonatas of Frederick the Great (invariably drawn from Spitta), all the flute concertos, and all four symphonies ascribed to the Prussian monarch. Complete recordings have also been made of the oeuvre of Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia, and of the Concerti armonici of Count Wilhelm van Wassenaer, albeit pre-dating the discovery of the true identity of their author. Various recordings of works by Count Losy are in existence, including some of the music transcribed into keyboard tablature and given in the Supplement (Nos 13-15) to this thesis. Although nowhere published, an enterprising record company (cf Chapter 3) has also recorded the Sonatina for keyboard and eleven instruments and the Divertimento of Duchess Anna Amalia of Weimar, albeit deploying resources slightly different in both cases from those originally envisaged.

Two noble composers have profited from the relatively new consumer market for facsimile editions: Wilhelmine of Bayreuth with her opera Argenore (cf Chapter 6) and the Earl of Kelly (cf Chapter 3) with his 6 Sonatas for Two Violins and a Bass, as originally published by Welcker in 1769.
The composing nobility of the 18th century were a heterogeneous collection, in common parlance a 'motley crew'. They were disparate in talent; disparate in their regard for musical trends; disparate in their involvement with non-aristocratic musical life; disparate, too, in the attention and regard which subsequent generations of scholars, performers and editors have accorded them.

In their very disparate ways they were, however, an integral part of the richly coloured and varied picture of musical life and endeavour in the 18th century, be it as employers, patrons, performers, and not least as open or covert composers.

Thus the aristocratic composer emerges as omnipresent in 18th century musical culture, and cannot be ignored in its historiography. His - or her - influence may have been positive, negative or negligible. But by assessing - or in some cases re-assessing - the varied individual contributions made by a broad spectrum of such dilettante composers in terms of their known preferences and surviving output, we see in clearer perspective the collective contribution they may be said to have made.

Derek McCulloch
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July 1990


