

Contents

Editorial	...	105
New Facts concerning Bigaglia's Sonata in A minor	<i>Thiemo Wind</i> ...	106
Treble Chance	<i>Theo Wyatt</i> ...	108
Back from Belgium, The Festival van Vlaanderen, Brugge	<i>Lia Starer Levin</i> ...	110
Recorder '84, The 36th 'Recorder in Education' Summer School	...	112
Obituaries: Gustav Scheck, Toke Townley	...	114
New Music for Recorders	...	115
Festivals, Courses etc.	...	117
Check List of UK Courses	...	123
Book Reviews	...	125
Martin Agricola's Poetic Discussion of the Recorder and other Woodwind Instruments		
Part 1: 1529	<i>William Hettrick</i> ...	127
School Section	<i>Herbert Hersom</i> ...	131
New School Music	...	133
The Society of Recorder Players	...	134

Our cover: Martin Agricola's recorder consort from *Musica instrumentalis deudsch* (1529)

Published quarterly in March, June, September and December by Schott & Co. Ltd., 48 Great Marlborough Street, London W1V 2BN (Tel. 01-437 1246) ISSN 0306-4409

EDITOR: Edgar Hunt

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Herbert Hersom

ADVERTISEMENT MANAGER: Mrs Joan Merson

Please address letters and inquiries to the following departments, and do not include advertising or subscription inquiries in letters addressed to the editor.

Editorial: 48 Great Marlborough Street, London W1V 2BN
Copy date for the March 1985 issue: 8 January

Subscriptions: Recorder & Music Magazine (Subscriptions), P.O. Box No. 1, Ashford, Kent.

Annual Subscription: £5 (UK, Europe, elsewhere by surface mail): £9 (Airmail outside Europe): **Single copies:** £1.50 (post free) **Subscribers in USA** should order through Magnamusic Distributors, Inc., Sharon, Connecticut, 06069 USA (Annual Subscription \$13)

Advertising: Mrs Joan Merson, Anthony Merson Ltd., 16 Little Common Road, Bexhill-on-Sea, East Sussex TN39 4JB (Tel. 0424-216900). Copy date as above.

© 1984 The Recorder and Music Magazine

Photoset and printed by Halstan & Co. Ltd., Amersham, Bucks.

The Recorder

AND MUSIC MAGAZINE

Incorporating 'The Recorder News'

VOLUME 8

NUMBER 4

DECEMBER 1984

Editorial

We offer our congratulations to Sir Michael Tippett on his 80th birthday (2 January 1985). A review of Ian Kemp's excellent (and well timed) biography of the composer will be found on page 125.

We are most grateful to Sigrid Nagle (editor of *The American Recorder*) and to William E. Hettrick the author, for permission to reprint the latter's articles on the 1529 and 1545 editions of Agricola's *Musica instrumentalis deudsch* together with his verse translation alongside facsimiles of the original. It is an important contribution to our understanding of this treatise and the renaissance recorders described therein. Questions of space limit our first installment to the first few pages of Part 1 (dealing with the 1529 edition). Part 1 will be continued in our March issue. This will be followed in due course by Part 2 which deals with the 1545 edition. For too long Agricola's work has been a closed book to students of the recorder, who are not generally familiar with old German.

We regret that pressure on space has meant that reviews of records, the next installment of our notes on 'Composers of Recorder Music, Recorder Players and Recorder Makers' and some other items have had to be held over to our March issue.

But we do have space here to include an announcement for SRP members, that in lieu of the Annual National Festival in 1985, the Essex Branch will organize a day of playing on Saturday 11 May at Brentford, to be followed on 12 May by the Society's Branch Delegates' Conference.

Edgar Hunt

New Facts concerning Bigaglia's Sonata in A minor

THIEMO WIND

In the June issue of this magazine my article concerning Bigaglia's sonata in A minor appeared, in which I made a comparison between the generally known version (as edited by Hugo Ruf) and the version as represented in Bigaglia's Opus 1, printed by the Amsterdam publisher Le Cène in 1725.¹ I concluded that Le Cène's reading is to be considered the closest to the composer's intentions and that the version represented by Hugo Ruf should be regarded as an arrangement.

A few days before the publication of the article, I ascertained that Le Cène published this Bigaglia sonata a second time, in quite a different version, in a set of 12 sonatas which appeared under the names of Francesco Geminiani and Pietro Castrucci.² After new research, I found that two further 18th-century editions exist in which this particular version appears. The first of these is a two-volume edition published by John Walsh and John and Joseph Hare around 1723. It contains sonatas by 'the greatest Authors' which were adapted for the German flute by a certain Pietro Chaboud:

SOLOS / for a / GERMAN FLUTE / a /
HOBOY or VIOLIN / with a / THOROUGH
BASS / for the / HARPSICORD / or / BASS
VIOLIN / being all Choice pieces by y^e greatest
Authors and fitted / to the German Flute by Sig^r
Pietro Chaboud [. . .] London Printed for I:
Walsh [. . .] and In^o & Ioseph Hare [. . .].³

Each volume contains six sonatas. Bigaglia's sonata occurs as sonata 2 in the second volume. About 1734 John Walsh published a reprint with nos. 427 and 428 on the title pages, of which no copies are extant.⁴

Le Cène, who was a fanatical competitor of John Walsh, recognized a sonata by Geminiani and another one by Castrucci in Chaboud's collection – Le Cène had printed these works before – and published the collection under the names of these composers:

XII SONATE / a Flauto Traversie, o Violino, / o
Hautbois e Basso Continuo / Delli Compositioni
/ dei Gli Sign. / FRANCESCO GEMINIANI /
E CASTRUCCI / Amsterdam / a / Spesa di
MICHELE CARLO LE CENE / N^o 551.

This one-volume edition appeared about the end of 1729 or the beginning of 1730.⁵ Did Le Cène really think that all the sonatas included were by these composers or did he only wish to represent them as such for commercial reasons? The latter is the more probable: both Geminiani and Castrucci were beloved composers. Moreover, if Le Cène could recognize these

composers, why did he not recognize Bigaglia, whose works he had also printed before?

John Walsh must have seen a commercial success in Le Cène's edition and imitated his commercial procedure. About 1743 he reprinted the Chaboud collection in one volume as

XII / SOLOS / for a / GERMAN FLUTE /
VIOLIN / or / HARPSICORD / Compos'd by
/ Sig^r Geminiani / and Castrucci. / London [. . .]
I. Walsh [. . .] N^o 428.⁶

This edition can easily be recognized as a reprint of the two-volume set. Walsh used the same plates as he did for the previous editions. After sonata 6, the numbering of both the sonatas and the pages starts again with number one.

The commercial tricks outlined above have led to confusion more than once in this century.⁷ There is certainly no reason to doubt Bigaglia's authorship. He is only one of the 'greatest Authors', who are not mentioned by name. Here we are concerned with a problem which is very similar to the problem discussed in my previous article: two different versions of the same sonata. To this end we must now examine the relationship between Chaboud's version and Le Cène's reading of Bigaglia's sonata in A minor, Opus 1 no. 7. The first question to be answered is: who was Pietro Chaboud?

Pietro Chaboud

Nothing is known about Pietro Chaboud's early life other than that he came from Italy.⁸ All biographical data come from the period of his stay in London, where he had worked as a musician. There he became generally known as 'Signor Pietro'.⁹ The earliest biographical document is the advertisement for a concert at York Buildings on 23 May 1707, where he played a sonata on the 'Flute d'Almain'.¹⁰ In the spring of 1708 he joined the band at the Queen's Theatre in the Haymarket as a bassoon player, a position which he retained for several years.¹¹ During this period he was in the service of the Duke of Ormond.

As a member of the opera band he played the bassoon. In solo performances he played the bass viol or the German flute, or even sung. Between 1710 and 1723 he participated several times in concerts given in London theatres.¹² All concerts in which Chaboud took part were given in the first half of the year. This may be an indication that he lived the second half of the year

outside of London. His last documented performance is in a concert at New Haymarket Theatre on 4 April 1723.

According to Baker, Chaboud once served James Brydges, the first Duke of Chandos, as composer for the flute and oboe.¹³ The Duke is known to have played the recorder by the end of the 17th century and possibly started to play the German flute later. One of the members of his private band, which was directed by Pepusch, was Jean Christian Keitch (Kytch), one of England's most proficient performers on the oboe. Because of the fact that the flute and the oboe were mentioned in the title of Chaboud's collection as well, it is likely that he made these transcriptions for the Duke of Chandos.

Bigaglia's sonata

The question now arises: which of the two versions – Chaboud's transcription or Le Cène's reading of Bigaglia's sonata in A minor (Opus 1 no. 7) – should be considered as being more authentic? There are both musical and non-musical reasons which lead us to believe that Chaboud's version should be regarded as an arrangement, despite the fact that we know nothing about his source. Certainly he did not use Le Cène's edition of Bigaglia's Opus 1. Chaboud's second volume, in which Bigaglia's sonata occurs, must have appeared between 22 May 1723 (when the first volume was advertised in the *Daily Courant*¹⁴) and September 1725, the month in which John Hare, one of the publishers, died (after this date his name disappeared from the imprints of new editions¹⁵). Le Cène's edition of Bigaglia's Opus 1 was advertised for the first time in the *Gazette d'Amsterdam* of 14 December 1725, after Chaboud's collection had already appeared.¹⁶

The following important differences exist between the two versions:

1. Chaboud's version is in E minor, not in A minor. This is surprising, since the A minor version presented by Le Cène is suitable for the German flute, the oboe and the violin. In the E minor version some passages are a fifth higher, others a fourth lower, which has a detrimental effect on musical tension at some places.
2. In Chaboud's version the two fast movements appear in a different order: the sonata ends with the movement in triple time. This supports the suggestion I made in the previous article on Bigaglia: that in Le Cène's edition the two fast movements have been interchanged.¹⁷
3. The musical contents of the versions differ a great deal. Generally we can say that only the main thematic material is the same or similar. Only the versions of the third movement show minor differences.

It is not useful to go into these differences extensively,

as I did in the previous article, because the two cases are not equally interesting: Ruf's edition is generally known, Chaboud's version is not. However, I will go into one detail: the 'kinetic recurrence' principle. The energetic double repetition of a short motif (of which the second repetition may end differently, moving towards new melodic material) is a characteristic in Bigaglia's sonatas, as I have already pointed out in my previous article.¹⁸ It can be found in all 12 sonatas of Opus 1. In Chaboud's version the initial phrase of the fast movement in triple time was reduced from 10 bars to 8 by omitting one repetition of the two-bar motif, just like it is in Ruf's edition! (cf. mus. ex. 4^{a,b} of my previous article.) We can draw the conclusion that the irregular phrases were considered imperfect or old-fashioned already before Bigaglia's Opus 1 appeared in Amsterdam. Also the fast movement in duple time, in which Le Cène's reading offers irregular six-crotchet periods, was 'corrected'. In Chaboud's version these periods were shortened to four-crotchet periods, in Ruf's edition lengthened to eight-crotchet periods. (In Chaboud's version four crotchets, in Ruf's edition eight: does this mean that the original consisted of six?) The absence of Bigaglia characteristics is certainly a reason to regard Chaboud's version as an arrangement.

There are several external matters which support this statement. First of all, the fact that only Chaboud's name is mentioned and none of the names of the 'greatest Authors' suggests that Chaboud did more than 'fitting to the German Flute' and thus could not use the names of the real composers. Moreover, in the *Daily Courant* of 22 May 1723 the first volume was advertised as 'Solos for a German Flute [. . .] by Sig. Pietro'.¹⁹

The musical contents of the collection reeks of unauthenticity. For example, the third movement of sonata 3 in the first volume was inserted again in the following sonata. Obviously Chaboud did not hesitate to compile a sonata by means of separate movements.

In Chaboud's second volume, three sonatas and one separate movement can now be identified: sonatas by Castrucci (no. 1), Bigaglia (no. 2) and Geminiani (no. 4), and the second movement of sonata 6 which appears to be a rather different version of the second movement of Bigaglia's Opus 1 no. 3. Of these pieces only Geminiani's sonata was left intact, apart from some necessary transpositions. It is interesting to take a short look at Castrucci's sonata, which is an arrangement of his violin sonata Opus 1 no. 6. Of the original five movements, Chaboud omitted the fourth (Gavotta Allegro). In the second and final movement several bars were left out. With regard to Bigaglia the second movement is especially interesting. In bars 5 and 6 of the original, kinetic recurrence appears in the same way as used by Bigaglia. In Chaboud's version of Castrucci's sonata, one of the repetitions is omitted, just as it is in

his version of Bigaglia's sonata!

It is to be hoped that more sonatas and separate movements from Chaboud's collection will be identified in the future. Undoubtedly he had a personal style in his way of arranging, and examining this will possibly bring more clarity with regard to his relation to Bigaglia's sonata.

Notes

- ¹ Wind, Th. – *Bigaglia's Sonata in A minor, a new look at its originality*. RMM Vol. 8 no. 2 (1984), pp. 49-54.
- ² I would like to express my thanks to Alfredo Bernardini (Amsterdam) for drawing my attention to this.
- ³ Further abbreviated as 'Chaboud's collection'; for the present study I have used a microfilm of the copies in the British Library.
- ⁴ Smith, W. C. & Humphries, Ch. – *A Bibliography of the Musical Works Published by the Firm of John Walsh during the years 1721-1766* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1968), p. 74 (nos. 330 and 332); see further note 9.
- ⁵ Lesure, F. – *Bibliographie des Editions Musicales, publiées par Estienne Roger et Michel-Charles Le Cène* (Amsterdam, 1696-1743) (Paris: Heugel, 1969), p. 91.
- ⁶ Facsimile reprint by Musica Musica, Basel; John Walsh used the plate number of this edition (no. 428) previously for the second volume of Chaboud's collection (see Smith & Humphries, *loc. cit.* (no. 332)).
- ⁷ For example, the worklist of Geminiani in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (London: MacMillan, 1980), Vol. 7, p. 229 only mentions Walsh's edition of c. 1743. In the worklist the last six sonatas are attributed to Geminiani, since the compiler recognized sonata 10 (or rather: the second sonata 4) as a transposition of Geminiani's violin sonata Opus 1, no. 10.
Hugo Ruf, who edited sonata 3, used Le Cène's edition, in which sonata 7 is headed 'Castrucci'. By this, he wrongly attributed the first six sonatas to Geminiani (Geminiani, F. – *Sonate E-moll für Oboe oder Querflöte oder Violine und Basso continuo* hrsg. von Hugo Ruf (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1961; Hortus Musicus 178).
- ⁸ *The London Stage, 1660-1800, Part II: 1700-1729*, edited by Emmett L. Avery (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1960), [hereinafter abbreviated as *London Stage*], pp. 224-225.
- ⁹ The name 'Chaboud' can scarcely be found in contemporary documents. We find evidence for the predominance of his Christian name already on the title page of the second volume of Chaboud's collection: 'Note the following pieces may be had where these are sold [...] Pietro's 1st Book for the German Flute'. See further Smith & Humphries, *op. cit.*, p. 74 (nos. 329-332). The authors are wrong in stating that 'Pietro was Pietro Castrucci'. Castrucci was always named by his surname in advertisements. Also none of Castrucci's supposed *Books for the German Flute* are known.
- ¹⁰ Tilmouth, M. – *A Calendar of References to Music in Newspapers published in London and the Provinces (1660-1719)*. Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle I (1960), p. 69.
- ¹¹ Milhous, J. & Hume, R. D. – *Vice-Chamberlain Coke's Theatrical Papers, 1706-1715* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982), pp. 33, 79.
- ¹² *London Stage*, pp. 224-225, 352, 443, 448, 528, 538, 539, 666, 674, 717.
- ¹³ Baker, C. H. C. & M. I. – *The Life and Circumstances of James Brydges, First Duke of Chandos* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), p. 132.
- ¹⁴ Smith & Humphries, *op. cit.*, p. 74 (no. 329).
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. vii.
- ¹⁶ Lesure, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
- ¹⁷ Wind, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 51-52.
- ¹⁹ Smith & Humphries, *loc. cit.*

Treble Chance

THEO WYATT

Shortly before the Irish Course in 1983, I got a letter from a friend in Ireland saying, "Please choose a Moeck treble for me and bring it with you." I wrote hurriedly back, "For Heaven's sake, give me an idea of the price you want to pay. There are five models running from £44 to £167." My friend replied with maddening insouciance, "I trust your judgment. I will pay whatever you say." So I tried all the Moeck trebles that Gordon Saunders had sent for the instrument shop at Theobalds Park. Then I asked Margaret Westlake, who was tutoring on the course with me, to try them. We both agreed that the second cheapest, the 239 at £66.50 was probably the nicest and certainly the best value. So I bought it and I think the recipient was pleased with it.

At Theobalds Park this year, we again had from Gordon Saunders a sample of each of the Moeck trebles, the 236 (Tuju) at £44.80; the 239 (Rottenburgh

maple) at £66.50; the 339 (Rottenburgh boxwood) at £104; the 439 (Rottenburgh rosewood) at £135.50; and the 539 (Rottenburgh blackwood) at £167.70. With last year's experience in mind, I thought it would be interesting to see whether the assembled students could detect any difference in quality between the cheaper and the more expensive models.

We put Paul Clark with the five instruments behind a screen and he played each of them in a pre-arranged order unknown to the listeners. On each in turn he played a slow scale of two octaves up and down and then a lively piece by Hotteterre. Then he played a different piece (a study by Alan Davis) on each instrument, taking them in the same order. The forty-two students had to try, on the basis of these two hearings, to place the five instruments in price order. The results were as follows:-